



**Framework Convention on
Climate Change**

Distr.: General
4 November 2011

Original: English

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Thirty-fifth session

Durban, 28 November to 3 December 2011

Item 7(a) and (b) of the provisional agenda

National adaptation plans

**Synthesis report on the process and the modalities and
guidelines for national adaptation plans**

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

This report synthesizes the views submitted by Parties and relevant organizations on national adaptation plans. It reports on the process to enable least developed country Parties to formulate and implement national adaptation plans, building upon their experience in preparing and implementing national adaptation programmes of action, and on the modalities and guidelines for the least developed country Parties and other developing country Parties to employ the modalities formulated to support national adaptation plans. This report synthesizes a number of different themes and issues that were raised in the submissions. It concludes with a synthesis of views on the next steps and the launching of the national adaptation plan process.

* This document was submitted after the due date as a result of the timing of the expert meeting on national adaptation plans.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Introduction.....	1–7	3
A. Mandate.....	1–2	3
B. Scope of the note.....	3–6	3
C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation.....	7	3
II. Background.....	8–10	4
III. Synthesis of information provided by Parties and relevant organizations on the national adaptation plans.....	11–112	4
A. Introduction and definitions.....	11–14	4
B. Guiding elements.....	15	5
C. Processes at the national level.....	16–36	5
D. Processes at the international level.....	37–48	9
E. Synergy with relevant processes and activities.....	49–54	10
F. Design and implementation approaches.....	55–62	11
G. Assessments.....	63–77	12
H. Communicating the national adaptation plan.....	78–80	14
I. Support.....	81–103	14
J. Reviewing and updating.....	104–110	18
K. Summary and ideas on next steps and launching of the national adaptation plans.....	111–112	19

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. The Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI), at its thirty-fourth session, invited Parties and relevant organizations to submit to the secretariat their views on the following matters, by 15 August 2011, for compilation by the secretariat:¹

(a) The process to enable least developed country (LDC) Parties to formulate and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs), building upon their experience in preparing and implementing national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs);

(b) The modalities and guidelines for the LDC Parties and other developing country Parties to employ the modalities formulated to support NAPs.

2. At the same session, the SBI requested the secretariat to prepare a synthesis report based on these submissions, for consideration at its thirty-fifth session.²

B. Scope of the note

3. This report synthesizes the information on NAPs contained in 16 submissions,³ representing the views of eight Parties and three groups of countries,⁴ and five from intergovernmental organizations.⁵

4. It begins with an introduction to the topic and discusses the definitions and guiding elements of the NAP process.

5. This report then synthesizes the views on the process for the LDCs at the national and international levels, and discusses synergy with relevant processes and activities outside of the Convention. It also discusses the role of research and science, knowledge sharing and approaches for the integration and participation of relevant stakeholders. It then moves on to a discussion on design and implementation approaches, assessments and the prioritization of activities. A synthesis of views on support is presented, including on financial, scientific and technical, capacity-building, and technology support. Reporting under the NAP process is then discussed, as is reviewing and updating.

6. Finally, the report presents a summary of ideas on the next steps to be taken and on the launching of the NAPs.

C. Possible action by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation

7. The SBI may wish to consider the information contained in this document when making recommendations to the Conference of the Parties (COP) on NAPs.

¹ FCCC/SBI/2011/7, paragraph 100.

² FCCC/SBI/2011/7, paragraph 101.

³ FCCC/SBI/2011/MISC.7.

⁴ Also made available on <<http://unfccc.int/5902>>.

⁵ Also made available on <<http://unfccc.int/3714>>.

II. Background

8. At its sixteenth session, the COP established the Cancun Adaptation Framework, and under it a process to enable the LDCs to formulate and implement NAPs, building upon the experience gained in preparing and implementing NAPAs. Through the NAP process, Parties are to identify medium- and long-term adaptation needs and develop and implement strategies and programmes to address those needs. By the same decision, the COP also invited other developing countries to employ the modalities formulated for these NAPs.⁶

9. At the same session, the COP requested the SBI to elaborate modalities and guidelines for the NAPs, in the form of a decision, for adoption at its seventeenth session.⁷

10. The SBI, at its thirty-fourth session, initiated a discussion on the NAPs, and set out a process to prepare for its thirty-fifth session, which includes an invitation to Parties and relevant organizations to submit their views on NAPs, the organization of an expert meeting on NAPs, a synthesis report to be prepared by the secretariat based on the submissions and a report on the expert meeting.

III. Synthesis of information provided by Parties and relevant organizations on the national adaptation plans

A. Introduction and definitions

11. There were many views on what the NAP process would entail, with many common elements. Generally, Parties envision NAPs to be a dynamic and continuous process, designed to move the LDCs towards meeting national goals for addressing climate change through adaptation. Besides being seen as a process to guide government ministries and other relevant stakeholders to plan adaptation, many Parties also suggested that the NAP process be communicated through some or all of the following:

(a) A stand-alone report or document to communicate the NAP, to be published and submitted to the secretariat for archiving and wide dissemination, and made available to all stakeholders;

(b) Periodic outputs and communications in the form of reports, additional to the main NAP document, to ensure accountability and to facilitate the exchange of knowledge, lessons learned and good practices. These reports would serve to convey the priorities and needs for adaptation to both the UNFCCC process and donors. Numerous Parties felt that this reporting could be facilitated through the Convention, to convey to the UNFCCC process and to donors the priorities and needs for adaptation;

(c) A regular update on progress made in adaptation planning and implementation.

12. Parties indicated their preference for a process that would be facilitative rather than prescriptive, one that would not simply require the LDCs to prepare a NAP document as the main output, but rather guidelines on how to approach adaptation in a comprehensive manner and on an ongoing basis, and how to integrate the NAPs into existing adaptation and development planning, with concrete activities to address adaptation as part of the process.

⁶ FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1, paragraphs 15 and 16.

⁷ FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1, paragraph 17.

13. The distinction between what constitutes a modality, as opposed to a guideline, was discussed. In general, many Parties suggested that modalities are integral elements that would move the process forward and would ensure that developing countries are able to develop and implement medium- and long-term adaptation. They added that the modalities would function at both the international/COP level and the national level.

14. On the other hand, guidelines would be the specific steps and actions that Parties can take in order to identify and implement adaptation needs and activities, including steps to integrate adaptation into their existing and ongoing development, poverty alleviation and climate change strategies and plans, and would specify how to access funding, monitor progress, present the NAP and report on progress to the COP, etc. Guidelines are also seen as a set of guiding provisions for the preparation and implementation of the NAPs. It was pointed out that given the breadth of adaptation, and ever improving techniques and data, the guidelines would need to be flexible and non-prescriptive and allow for periodic review as necessary.

B. Guiding elements

15. Many elements were proposed to guide the NAP process, including the following:

- (a) The NAP process is to build upon the NAPA process in the LDCs;
- (b) The NAP process is to be integrated into national planning processes;
- (c) The implementation of NAPAs is to follow a programmatic or sectoral approach wherever possible, in order to facilitate a long-term approach to addressing adaptation and to ensure the effective integration of proposed activities into national development planning;
- (d) The NAP process is to follow a gender-sensitive approach;
- (e) The NAP process is to be inclusive and participatory, involving and engaging all relevant stakeholders, and taking into account the perspectives and needs of vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems;
- (f) The NAP process is to be continuous and iterative, to allow frequent update and revision as new results and assessments become available;
- (g) The NAP process is to be flexible and dynamic and easily adapted to national priorities, needs and capacities;
- (h) The NAP process is to be country-driven and owned, transparent, strategic and scalable;
- (i) The NAP process is to be pragmatic, holistic, results-based and effective.

C. Processes at the national level

1. National institutional arrangements and coordination

16. Several Parties referred to the need for improved coherence and synergy among national-level institutions, with a view to enhancing work on the full range of adaptation actions, from planning to implementation and beyond. They also mentioned the need for support for the latter, particularly in terms of continuous and predictable support for the LDCs (see chapter III.H).

17. Some Parties felt that national institutional arrangements should be established or strengthened to support the NAPs, and would be as important as the NAPs themselves.

Others felt that it is important to build and strengthen national institutions under the NAP process, as well as to ensure that coordination of these institutions is elaborated in the NAP modalities and guidelines. This could be achieved through various activities under the NAP process, such as through the following:

- (a) Strengthening national capacities and expertise;
- (b) Ensuring long-term political ownership of the process;
- (c) Building permanent, in-country teams of experts through continuous and predictable support;
- (d) Creating or strengthening national and subnational committees;
- (e) Enhancing or establishing a national-level office or agency for adaptation to coordinate all activities;
- (f) Improving national centres for research and systematic observation, vulnerability and adaptation assessments, decision-making and policy development;
- (g) Ensuring systematic collaboration among all stakeholders;
- (h) Enhancing or creating enabling environments and effective and inclusive governance arrangements.

18. One Party felt that the NAP process could be integrated into, or strengthen, existing arrangements, or that new ones could be developed, in accordance with developing country circumstances. Furthermore, in the LDCs, NAPs could build on the current institutional arrangements established for NAPAs and could factor in the wider range of entities necessary for longer-term planning. In those countries where new arrangements would be necessary, the process of developing NAPs could be led by national governments and their central ministries, with the active involvement and ownership of a diverse range of stakeholders and subnational governments.

19. Some Parties indicated that the NAP guidelines and modalities should include a clear role for a coordinating institution in countries. One Party elaborated that action could be driven across sectors and ministries by a strong agency with influence across the government and community. The Party added that country ownership is important, and that a number of different institutional frameworks could be effective.

2. Synergy with existing adaptation planning

20. It was pointed out that some developing countries, particularly non-LDCs, might already have well-built planning systems and processes that fall just short of comprehensive adaptation plans. Others noted that, in the LDCs, the NAPs should build upon the NAPAs (see chapter III.C.4). Many Parties supported the idea of nurturing synergy between the NAPs and other existing adaptation planning.

21. A large number of Parties proposed that the NAP process serve as the overarching national strategy or adaptation policy, and that all adaptation activities in a country should contribute to the NAP in a coordinated manner.

22. Some Parties felt that an integrated approach to adaptation planning should be taken, and that adaptation planning should take place within existing planning cycles and systems. In the same vein, others felt that NAPs should have the flexibility to encompass, integrate and add value to existing plans, and should not duplicate existing medium- and long-term adaptation plans.

23. In line with the integrated approach, some Parties believe that NAPs should support adaptation planning processes, rather than be seen as a separate plan. NAP guidelines

should thus be generic in nature and flexible and should avoid being prescriptive. One Party added that given that adaptation planning differs from country to country, standardized processes will have limited value, whereas tailored and integrated NAPs would be more effective.

3. Integrating adaptation into existing national development planning processes

24. Several Parties referred to the fact that climate change will affect almost all sectors of society, and that there is an inseparable link between development and adaptation planning.

25. Some called for the NAPs to be integrated into existing plans, particularly sustainable development plans, at the national level. The NAP process would help developing countries to better integrate adaptation into their existing and continuous development, poverty alleviation, health and climate change strategies, plans and goals, as this would be more effective at reducing the risk of climate change for vulnerable populations and sectors than creating new stand-alone plans or separate processes.

26. One Party also noted the need to integrate disaster risk reduction, climate change and environmental considerations into development programmes and planning, as this will be cost effective in the long term, will result in more sustainable development outcomes and will aid progress towards the Millennium Development Goals.

27. In terms of entry levels for mainstreaming, a Party noted that the full mainstreaming of climate change considerations at the national level, as well as all levels of sectoral and territorial planning, is needed, alongside in-depth changes in behaviour and production practices. Another mentioned that NAP modalities and guidelines could also address climate change adaptation in subnational development plans.

28. The need for flexibility in terms of integration was also suggested, whereby countries that are at different stages of addressing climate risks in their development planning and budgeting would have the flexibility to organize their NAP process to best fit their local context and circumstances.

29. With regard to lessons learned, one Party pointed out that a lesson learned from the NAPA process was that in order to integrate the NAPs into existing national programmes, predictable and adequate funding is required. Some Parties also referred to the need to take into account lessons learned and experiences from other national level planning processes, including low-carbon and climate-resilient development strategies.

4. Building on the national adaptation programmes of action

30. Many Parties suggested that the NAPA process should provide a good starting point for the development of NAPs, and that the NAP process should build upon NAPA preparation and implementation in the LDCs. In addition, some Parties elaborated that the NAP process is distinct and separate from the NAPA process and that the NAPs should build upon, but not be determined by, the NAPA process.

31. Some Parties highlighted that the NAP process complements the NAPA process by more comprehensively addressing medium- and long-term adaptation needs. Parties recognized that there is a need to go beyond NAPAs and develop medium- and long-term national approaches to adaptation. In cases where urgent and immediate project ideas emerge from the NAP process, they can be channelled through the NAPA for expedited support, through a coordinated revision and update of the NAPA. Another Party mentioned that the NAP process should not divorce short-term planning from medium- and long-term planning (another reason why the NAP process should build on the NAPAs).

32. Some Parties pointed out the benefits of the NAPA process. Those Parties involved in the NAPA process acknowledged that the process of NAPA preparation has been beneficial in helping them to understand issues related to vulnerability and to identify their urgent and immediate adaptation needs at the local level, and to some extent at the national level. Furthermore, they acknowledged that the process has helped to build national capacity and provides useful experience in terms of participatory processes.

33. One Party mentioned that the NAPA process had limited time and resources and could not cover detailed vulnerability assessments of all climate-sensitive sectors. Other Parties mentioned a lack of administrative capacity, a shortage and unpredictability of funding, the limitations of the current institutional structures and coordination challenges across multiple focal points.

34. A majority of the Parties, in their submissions, pointed out that many lessons can be learned from the NAPA process to guide the effective design of the NAP process. One Party called on the LDCs to identify and share the difficulties encountered in implementing the guidelines, in order to benefit from their lessons learned. Other Parties highlighted lessons that they felt have already been learned from the NAPA process, which can be taken into account in the NAP process. They encouraged the NAP process to ensure that:

- (a) There is a strong sense of national ownership;
- (b) The document is well embedded in national and sectoral planning processes;
- (c) Funding processes are streamlined (see para 85(b) below);
- (d) Countries retain the flexibility to revise NAPs as circumstances require;
- (e) A participatory approach is taken throughout the process that consistently works with stakeholders and civil society, including women's groups.

35. Parties also highlighted some aspects of the NAPAs that were beneficial for Parties and should be retained and built upon. These include the following:

- (a) Technical assistance, including through support documents like the *Least Developed Countries Step-By-Step Guide for Implementing National Adaptation Programmes of Action*,⁸ and the support of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG);
- (b) The NAPA analyses of impacts and vulnerability;
- (c) The existing systems at the country level engaged in the NAPA preparation process in the LDCs;
- (d) The climate change focal points of the Parties, which could also help to coordinate and facilitate the preparation and implementation of NAPs;
- (e) The involvement of different stakeholders;
- (f) Existing and documented coping strategies;
- (g) The method for integrating policies into planning.

36. In terms of the timing and sequencing of activities between the NAPAs and NAPs, Parties cautioned that the NAP process should not delay the implementation of the NAPA process. Some Parties emphasized the need for the NAPA process to continue, and for the necessary financial support to be provided for urgent NAPA projects. In addition, the priority would be for urgent adaptation needs to be met through the implementation of the

⁸ <http://unfccc.int/essential_background/library/items/3599.php?such=j&symbol=FCCC/GEN/250%20E#beg>.

NAPA, while the medium- and long term needs are considered under the NAP process. It was stressed that the implementation of NAPAs should not be overlooked in favour of the development and implementation of NAPs.

D. Processes at the international level

1. General

37. At the international level, and under the NAP process, Parties also found synergy and coordination to be important. Many Parties referred to the need for the Convention and its subsidiary bodies to facilitate this coordination, and to draw on the efforts of other international processes and agreements. Others mentioned the need for the NAP process to draw on the Cancun Agreements, particularly the provisions in decision 1/CP.16, paragraphs 12 and 13.

38. One Party suggested that it is necessary to determine how international initiatives can be best designed to support national adaptation processes.

2. Least Developed Countries Expert Group

39. Many Parties identified the LEG as a potential key support body in the NAP process and noted that valuable lessons could be drawn from the ongoing work of the LEG in its support to the LDCs. Some suggestions for support functions include the following:

(a) Providing direct and practical support to Parties in the development and implementation of adaptation activities, including specific methods and approaches for the NAPs;

(b) Providing expertise and advice to the LDCs on the NAP process;

(c) Supporting medium- and long-term adaptation and elements that relate to the LDC work programme;

(d) Assisting the LDCs with the integration of adaptation into development planning;

(e) Supporting capacity-building in the LDCs for the preparation and implementation of the NAPs;

(f) Leading the process to produce guidelines to develop, implement and monitor NAPs;

(g) Serving as an important source of information for the Adaptation Committee (AC) on this matter;

(h) Providing technical guidance by developing and disseminating more detailed guidance and documentation for steps in the NAP process, such as through step-by-step guides. One Party suggested that Parties could draw, inter alia, on good practices and lessons learned from NAPAs and other forums, such as the World Bank's Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) and other initiatives.

40. Some Parties pointed out the current mandate of the LEG to support the identification of medium- and long-term adaptation needs. Duplication of work stipulated by the Convention needs to be avoided, the Parties added.

41. In terms of the countries to be supported by the LEG, LDCs mentioned that it could be mandated to provide support to the LDCs, as well as other developing countries that may also need such assistance, although they do not foresee that many non-LDC developing countries will require such direct assistance from the LEG.

3. Adaptation Committee

42. Alongside the LEG, many Parties see the AC as a key body in terms of supporting the NAP process. They further stressed that the AC and LEG should seek to complement each other in providing their support to the LDCs.

43. Many Parties indicated the important role the AC could play in supporting the formulation and implementation of the NAPs. They mentioned that the AC could achieve this by the following:

- (a) Providing broad guidance and direction on strategic priorities for adaptation;
- (b) Drawing up policies and guidelines on how adaptation should be supported under the Convention;
- (c) Contributing to providing technical support and relevant information;
- (d) Assisting with the coordination of capacity-building for adaptation;
- (e) Undertaking the process of adaptation analysis and review at the international level.

4. Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change

44. Some Parties indicated that valuable resources could be drawn from the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, including through some of its products and information systems. As with the other existing bodies and programmes, additional mandates would be required to fully support new requirements for NAPs.

45. A Party pointed out the benefit of more focus being given to sectoral approaches, and how the Nairobi work programme could contribute to capacity-building and outreach on appropriate tools and methods.

5. Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention

46. A few Parties felt that the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention could also play a role in the NAP process. They mentioned that the expertise it has gained in the field of vulnerability and adaptation assessments could assist in informing the development of NAPs.

47. Other Parties referred to the national communications, mentioning that valuable lessons could be drawn from the experience of Parties in developing them.

6. Technology Executive Committee

48. A reference was made to the potential role of the Technology Executive Committee in the NAP process.

E. Synergy with relevant processes and activities

1. Programmes

49. Numerous Parties mentioned the need for synergy between the NAP process and existing programmes, and the need to draw on broad expertise. The PPCR was highlighted as an important programme in this regard, with one Party mentioning that the NAP process should take into consideration the significant investments already made by the PPCR. It

added that the NAP process should not duplicate or undermine ongoing efforts, but rather build upon the inter-ministerial decision-making platforms, stakeholder consultations, priority setting and investment plans already under way.

50. Some Parties also noted that experiences could be drawn from other funding entities that have provided support, such as the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and bilateral entities.

2. Multilateral environmental agreements and other bodies

51. Many Parties proposed that the NAP process should also draw on the work and expertise of, and valuable lessons learned by, other relevant organizations and institutions, including, inter alia, civil society organizations, research institutes, intergovernmental organizations and multilateral programmes and on external planning processes. Some Parties and organizations highlighted the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Hyogo Framework for Action, the Millennium Development Goals, the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination Against Women, World Health Assembly resolution WHA61.19, and others associated with development cooperation.

52. One organization proposed that a collaborative team of representatives from national and international organizations be created to support the NAP process.

3. Regional intergovernmental efforts

53. Some Parties pointed out the importance of coordination and synergy with regional intergovernmental efforts, and the integration of the NAP process with regional approaches, in order to enhance the development and implementation of NAPs and to ensure that efforts are informative and mutually supportive.

54. One Party mentioned that the outcomes of regional efforts and forums are useful to consider when establishing the NAP process, and highlighted the Lessons for Future Action Conference,⁹ held in May 2011, as an example of such a forum.

F. Design and implementation approaches

1. Sectoral approaches

55. Many Parties mentioned that a sectoral approach would be an important component of the NAP process. One Party pointed out that climate change will affect almost all sectors of society and that planning for sectors such as agriculture, health, transport and construction needs to take climate change into account in order that they become sustainable. This Party emphasized that NAPs should be integrated into the continuous process of sectoral planning at the national and subnational levels. Another Party felt that the NAP process should contribute to the overarching national adaptation strategy or policy for all sectors.

2. Cross-sectoral approaches

56. The importance of understanding cross-sectoral approaches was highlighted, with one Party suggesting that there is a need to assist decision makers to address the trade-offs and linkages that adaptation demands. Another Party pointed out that the NAP process should complement cross-sectoral approaches, in order to ensure coherence and synergy.

⁹ <http://www.adaptationpartnership.org/images/stories/Pacific_Workshop_Meeting_Notes.pdf>.

Coordinating such related strategies and plans, the Party suggested, would enable countries to capitalize on linkages among different sectors and to ensure the integration of adaptation into those plans. It added that this can also promote the implementation of good practices and enable effective and informed decision-making.

3. Regional approaches

57. Many Parties highlighted that regional concerns could be included in NAPs, and that regional projects and programmes could result, where advantageous. One Party suggested that regional approaches to planning should reinforce national planning agendas.

58. It was also mentioned that the regional approach would be appropriate for addressing transboundary issues, including ecosystems and food security.

59. Another Party mentioned that the NAP process could also promote synergy and strengthen linkages between organizations, centres and networks, including those at the regional level, in order to enhance the development and implementation of NAPs, and should ensure that efforts are informative and mutually supportive.

4. Participatory approaches

60. Many Parties felt that the integration and participation of a large number of different stakeholders from all sectors is important in the NAP process. Numerous Parties called for a participatory approach throughout, with meaningful participation from, inter alia, the following:

- (a) Governmental organizations at the national and subnational levels;
- (b) Local government;
- (c) Universities/academia;
- (d) Non-governmental organizations and civil society, particularly women's groups and gender-focused organizations;
- (e) The private sector;
- (f) The most vulnerable/disadvantaged groups, local communities and ecosystems, including indigenous people; and the youth.

61. With regard to reaching a broad range of stakeholders, one Party elaborated that this type of participation will improve problem identification, priority setting, decision-making, implementation, monitoring and evaluation and that it will also help to manage trade-offs and reduce the risk of conflict, for example within or between communities and sectors. Another mentioned that it will ensure opportunities to build and/or enhance national and local capacities to address the challenges of climate change.

62. In terms of the subnational level, Parties stressed that priority should be placed on the full and effective participation of local-level stakeholders in order to ensure local ownership, so that the plans are made as operational as possible and that local needs and priorities are integrated.

G. Assessments

1. Assessments of gaps and needs

63. As part of the assessment process under the NAPs, a few Parties highlighted that an assessment of information gaps is important as a first step in planning. One Party suggested that relevant background information should be assessed and reviewed, in order to ascertain

what is available and what the information needs are. Another Party mentioned that significant gaps in climate, population and socio-economic projections need to be identified and, where possible, addressed. The same Party stressed that without gap analysis optimal forward planning will not be feasible.

64. Another mentioned that gap analysis, looking at if and how adaptation is integrated into development plans, could be helpful in guiding further planning.

65. One organization suggested that there is a need to undertake gender-responsive stocktaking to identify any gender inequities in relation to the components of adaptation.

66. One Party stressed that minor gaps should not stop the commencement of planning, and that the planning should be pragmatic, flexible and capable of integrating emerging science as the gaps are addressed.

2. Vulnerability assessments

67. Many Parties referred to the importance of comprehensive impact and vulnerability assessments, of all sectors, as part of the NAP process. Some stressed the need for these to be participatory and integrated.

68. One Party mentioned the importance of including experiences gained from national adaptation planning and implementation efforts in this regard. Some Parties also referred to building upon the NAPA assessments. According to one Party, the NAP preparation process should adopt a more comprehensive vulnerability assessment than that which the NAPA process undertook, including the development and use of climate change scenarios.

69. In terms of scope, some Parties mentioned that assessments of vulnerability in the medium and long term should be undertaken in order to identify the corresponding medium- and long-term actions needed. Others added that the NAP vulnerability assessments should incorporate more comprehensive analysis and modelling to address all the components of vulnerability. Another pointed out that assessments of the vulnerability of existing medium- and long-term strategic sectoral plans were also necessary to identify communities, sectors and ecosystems vulnerable to climate change and to provide medium- and long-term adaptation actions to address climate change challenges in geographical areas or sectors.

70. Numerous Parties stressed the need for capacity-building support for developing countries to undertake vulnerability assessments in order to accurately identify effective adaptation measures.

3. Risk assessment and disaster risk reduction

71. A few Parties mentioned the need for risk assessment, with one Party mentioning that national priorities are best shaped once the risks have been thoroughly assessed. Another Party mentioned that action plans or programmes to enhance the adaptive capacity of vulnerable countries need to be based on these and other assessments.

72. Furthermore, Parties added that risk assessments should not be a one-time endeavour, since adaptation and disaster risk reduction are long-term agendas that require long-term planning, an iterative process to incorporate new information and evolving assessments of risk.

73. An organization added that existing disaster risk assessments could be built upon, and that national reports on progress in the implementation of the Hyogo Framework for Action can be utilized.

74. A Party also noted the need for assessing the risk of loss and damage and to identify approaches to address loss and damage. The Party added that this can be very difficult,

owing to the lack of expertise and financial barriers in many developing countries. Another Party mentioned that assistance is needed to ensure synergy between the outcomes of the analytical work related to loss and damage caused by climate change and the adaptation planning processes.

4. Prioritization of activities

75. According to some Parties, the issue of the prioritization of adaptation action is an important component of the NAPs, and should be informed by the different types of assessments mentioned above.

76. One Party mentioned that NAP guidelines could contain criteria to evaluate and prioritize adaptation needs. Another suggested that, after vulnerability assessments have been undertaken, NAPs should include country-driven criteria for ranking medium- and long-term vulnerabilities in order to determine priority action. Other Parties also felt that local-level priorities should be taken into account in medium- and long-term adaptation prioritization.

77. Adaptation priorities under the NAP process should, according to one Party, also be flexible enough to allow the LDCs to adjust priorities and programmes as climate information improves and lessons are learned.

H. Communicating the national adaptation plan

78. A few Parties referred to the national communication process as a way to report on the progress achieved under the Convention. One such Party noted that the adaptation chapter of national communications could provide a natural vehicle in which to reflect on the NAP process, with the ability for continuous revision through each iteration. The Party added that NAPs could be placed in the section on adaptation measures that includes, inter alia, “appropriate and integrated plans for coastal zone management, water resources and agriculture” (Article 4, para. 1(e), of the Convention).

79. Another felt that national communication guidelines on adaptation could be improved to capture and support the NAP process and that the LDCs could report on progress made in the NAP process through the national communications.

80. A Party added that the secretariat should make the NAP available via the UNFCCC website.

I. Support

1. Funding

81. The majority of Parties highlighted the importance of financial support for the NAPs. Many Parties mentioned that financial support will be required for NAP design and preparation and the identification and implementation of programmes and projects. Many Parties felt that the principal modality necessary for the formulation of NAPs is the scaling up of support provided by Parties included in Annex II to the Convention (Annex II Parties) in line with the provisions of the Convention. Others also mentioned that adequate, continuous and predictable financial support is crucial to implementing the NAPs. One Party added that it is imperative that this support continues and intensifies during the phases of implementation and monitoring.

82. Parties emphasized that there must be provisions laid out in decisions on financial support, and that the negotiations on finance under the UNFCCC process can provide some

input in this regard. One Party suggested that the SBI should elaborate on how the NAP process shall be funded, in particular regarding issues of sources of the resources and their disbursement channels to the LDCs, and another suggested that any means of support must be developed in a flexible manner, given that different countries are at different stages of adaptation.

83. Many Parties felt that funding sources need to be clarified and appropriate arrangements need to be made in order to initiate the financing of the NAP process, so as to ensure commencement of the preparation of the NAPs immediately after COP 17.

84. Many Parties stressed that financial support for the NAPs must be in line with the Convention. Some mentioned that support for the implementation of NAPs should be in accordance with decision 1/CP.16, paragraphs 11 and 18, and others mentioned that it should be based on the principles and provisions of the Convention to ensure the fulfilment of Article 4, paragraphs 4 and 9.

85. In terms of financial support for the NAP process, Parties recommended that:

(a) The provision of funds for adaptation should be equal to that for mitigation in developing countries;

(b) Building upon lessons learned in the NAPA process, there should not be long delays between the approval and the delivery of funds; sufficient funding should be made available; processes, procedures and forms should not be altered substantially after their establishment; programmatic approaches should receive financing through the clustering of projects; and co-financing requirements should be removed;

(c) Support should be provided in a timely, appropriate manner without unnecessary duplication or extra bureaucratic procedures, particularly in relation to disbursing agencies;

(d) Sources of funding should be appropriate and dedicated;

(e) The private sector as a source of funding should be further explored;

(f) Financial support should be programmatic, given that NAPs should be integrated into the national planning processes of countries;

(g) Guidelines governing funds should make a clear delineation of funding in the Adaptation Fund (AF) sourced through certified emission reductions from the clean development mechanism;

(h) The provision of funding should be clear and transparent for NAP preparation and implementation;

(i) Institutional support should be given to facilitate the accreditation of entities allowing direct access to support.

86. Parties referred to relevant funding institutions and initiatives, including the following:

(a) The Green Climate Fund;

(b) The AF;

(c) The Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF);

(d) The Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF);

(e) Bilateral support.

87. Arrangements would need to be made to provide funding for NAP preparation, such as through existing funds, including the LDCF and the SCCF, using the GEF-agency

model to access funds, or through direct access. Parties emphasized that there should not be barriers to access. One Party pointed out that there have been barriers, which need to be avoided in the NAP process, in terms of coordinating with agencies, with the GEF co-financing requirements and with the complexity of the assessment of the additional costs for adaptation.

88. Coordination and complementarity between funding mechanisms and arrangements was also seen as important by some Parties. Some proposed that the future modalities of the Green Climate Fund should complement activities supported by the AF, LDCF and SCCF. Another mentioned that a strong and well-integrated governance structure could assist with coordinating engagement with donors and would increase the effectiveness of support. The Party added that NAP governance arrangements could be integrated within, and used to strengthen the delivery of, climate change programmes and development assistance more broadly.

89. With regard to the prioritization of support, Parties felt that priority attention should be given to the LDCs. One Party also suggested that due consideration should be given to prioritizing support to the LDCs that have not benefited from the PPCR. Another Party suggested that support should be provided, especially to particularly vulnerable countries, in accordance with decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 11, in order to enable countries to undertake the actions and measures outlined in decision 1/CP.16, paragraph 14.

2. Scientific and technical support

90. Many Parties proposed that NAPs should be informed by improved climatic data and observation, robust science, broader climate scenarios, climate-related research and systematic observation, including for climate data collection, archiving, analysis and modelling. Several Parties also noted that the LDCs require technical support in this regard.

91. Numerous Parties felt that the formulation and implementation of NAPs will also require an increase in support for research in the LDCs so that they have improved capacity to develop NAPs that reflect local adaptation priorities. Another Party felt that good scientific information would allow countries to assess the costs and benefits of immediate adaptation.

92. One Party pointed out that significant gaps exist in terms of climate, population and socio-economic projections, but that these should not stop the commencement of planning that is pragmatic, flexible and capable of integrating emerging science as it becomes available.

93. In order to address the gaps, one Party emphasized that an integrative planning process is required, combining the available climate science, analyses, modelling and assessments, vulnerability analyses of existing medium- and long-term strategic sectoral plans, and robust consultation and coordination across agencies and stakeholders. Furthermore, it called for the development of processes for informed decision-making to enable trade-offs between present and future needs, and in river basins between upstream and downstream communities.

94. According to one Party, the immediate granting of technical support is imperative for the development and implementation of NAPs. Other Parties are in agreement, with a number mentioning that technical inputs and support from other relevant and specialized experts and/or agencies is necessary. They added that the LDCs need technical support and assistance in terms of the following:

- (a) Promoting consistency with regard to the scope of the NAPs;
- (b) Building national, local and civil society capacity;

- (c) Coordinating climate strategies with other national plans and processes;
- (d) Adhering to principles included in the Cancun Agreements (including 1/CP.16, para. 12);
- (e) Developing sectoral adaptation plans for selected key sectors, such as agriculture, water, health and energy;
- (f) Building understanding of the tools and resources available, such as decision maps, mapping and visualization tools that display key climate data and impacts, screening tools to assess development projects for sensitivities to climate change, adaptation decision matrixes, and tools to estimate the costs and benefits of adaptation options, to help them to make cost-effective short- to long-term decisions that keep open future options as the impacts of climate change unfold.

95. Parties noted that the NAP process can assist Parties with a need for access to information, and that benefits can be derived from sharing lessons learned, best practices and knowledge tools, including expert rosters and knowledge networks.

96. One organization suggested that the NAP process should incorporate a range of analyses, as well as sex-disaggregated data.

97. One Party elaborated that the process should aim for shared learning among the LDCs and other developing countries, taking into consideration geographical issues, and issues related to border communities and ecosystems. Others also referred to opportunities for shared learning, including South–South learning, and the roles that the LEG and the AC can play in this regard.

98. Some Parties emphasized the opportunities for the NAP process to enhance understanding. One Party mentioned that an enhanced understanding of the following issues is needed:

- (a) Economic drivers and development priorities;
- (b) Current and future climate risks, vulnerabilities and impacts;
- (c) Institutional capacities and gaps;
- (d) How to effectively plan and integrate adaptation priorities into broader sustainable development processes.

99. One Party also called for support for education for climate change adaptation at the tertiary level, including university and vocational training.

100. Furthermore, one Party mentioned that the NAP process can also be supported through the provision of guidelines, etc., in different languages.

3. Capacity-building

101. Most Parties recommended that capacity-building under the NAP process should be directed at strengthening national institutional capacities at all levels. They also emphasized that support is needed for such capacity-building.

102. The following areas were identified as requiring capacity-building:

- (a) Strengthening institutional arrangements at various levels, including for focal points and national coordinating bodies, women’s groups, and the national institutions and experts that will be implementing the NAPs;
- (b) Strengthening networks, communication, education, training and public awareness;

- (c) Applying new approaches, such as programmatic approaches;
- (d) Integrating gender considerations in adaptation;
- (e) Integrating adaptation into development planning;
- (f) Understanding current as well as future vulnerability in order to accurately determine particular areas of vulnerability and their integration into broader sustainable development frameworks;
- (g) Using various modelling techniques and tools;
- (h) Improving knowledge, awareness and skills for effective decision-making that takes climate change into consideration;
- (i) Identifying appropriate adaptation actions and implementing them;
- (j) Communicating about, and coordinating, adaptation among government agencies and ministries;
- (k) Undertaking consultations that are: bottom-up and designed by local communities and affected peoples; participatory, with appropriate notice, access provisions and diverse media for inputs and outputs; multi-stakeholder in their targeting; and geographically diverse;
- (l) Promoting community-based projects in order to avoid top-down imposed policy responses that fail to serve the affected communities and risk compounding the adverse effects of climate change;
- (m) Collecting relevant data during the whole process of the formulation and implementation of NAPs, in order to enable periodic reviews and updates of the NAPs.

4. Technology support

103. Some Parties noted that modalities to enable technology transfer and capacity-building to develop NAPs will be critical for their effective formulation. These may include revisions of intellectual property rights and the sharing of knowledge and expertise.

J. Reviewing and updating

1. General

104. Numerous Parties referred to the NAP process as one that will evolve and be iterative. Parties felt that NAPs need to be living documents that are modifiable, dynamic and responsive to changing conditions and the latest information and that address emerging obstacles and take advantage of new opportunities and developments. They should, another Party noted, allow the LDCs to adjust their priorities and programmes as climate information improves and lessons are learned.

105. Other Parties mentioned that the process should build on experience and lessons learned from implementing COP guidance and should therefore allow enough flexibility to review progress and provide additional guidance as necessary over time.

106. Parties seemed to converge on the idea that national-level periodic updates and revisions will need to be part of the NAP process, with one Party specifying that they could be updated once every 10 years, and others specifying that a review could be provided once a year, for every COP.

107. The process of updating and revising the NAP should help the LDCs and other developing countries to take a stepwise ('no regrets') approach to decision-making, with

early decisions that can be revised at a later stage. Another Party proposed that the NAP process should include an independent technical review to ensure that planning is broadly consistent with the goals articulated in the Cancun Agreements and the guidelines and modalities that are to be elaborated at the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa.

108. Numerous Parties stressed the need for technical support for the updating of plans.

2. Monitoring and evaluation

109. Numerous Parties mentioned that key steps in the NAP process include measuring, evaluating and learning from progress in order to improve and adjust plans through periodic and regular reviewing and updating.

110. Some added that review and monitoring is necessary of not only the implementation of the NAPs but also of the support provided, with others specifying that modalities and guidelines are needed on the monitoring and evaluation of Annex II Parties' assessed contributions to relevant funds and of technology for the support of NAPs.

K. Summary and ideas on next steps and launching of the national adaptation plans

111. Parties proposed that at COP 17 a decision on the way forward for the NAP process could include the following:

- (a) Provisions for the immediate launching of the NAP process;
- (b) Guiding principles;
- (c) Guidelines for the preparation and implementation of NAPs, including elaboration on how to define successful implementation strategies;
- (d) Arrangements for financing, technical support and capacity-building, including provisions for their immediate delivery;
- (e) An elaboration of the role of the LEG, the AC and other bodies, including appropriate new mandates;
- (f) An elaboration of the role of the secretariat;
- (g) An elaboration of the role of Annex II Parties;
- (h) Provisions for LDCs to report on progress being made at the national level and provisions for presenting the NAP and its various outputs to the COP via the secretariat;
- (i) Provisions for the periodic and regular review and monitoring of progress on the NAP process under the COP.

112. Parties also proposed that after COP 17 the following should constitute the next steps:

- (a) The immediate launch of the NAP process;
- (b) Training (taking into account regional and language aspects);
- (c) Institutional capacity-building (for countries to be immediately able to start the preparation of their NAPs);
- (d) An expert meeting for the LDCs and others to identify and discuss technical approaches to vulnerability and risk assessment in key sectors, within the framework of the

guidelines to be adopted at COP 17, and on how to institutionalize the process of these assessments to produce periodic outputs for the NAPs over time;

(e) An invitation to the Nairobi work programme partners to make available information, data and other resources to contribute towards the formulation and implementation of the NAPs;

(f) Periodic submissions and views from Parties and others to inform the review of progress in the formulation and implementation of NAPs;

(g) LEG input as per its current mandate, and any additional areas of support that Parties may decide on during the adoption of the guidelines for NAPs.
