

**Fourth meeting of the Adaptation Committee
Nadi, Fiji, 5–7 September 2013**

**Note on NAPs for non-LDC developing countries, including collaboration
with the LDC Expert Group**

1. Introduction and background

The Adaptation Committee (AC), in its three-year work plan, agreed to establish an ad hoc group, in collaboration with relevant organizations and experts, to work on modalities and guidelines for NAPs for non-LDC developing countries to plan, prioritize, and implement national adaptation planning measures, in accordance with decision 5/CP.17. The AC at its second meeting created as a first step an ad hoc group of three AC members and one member of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), to review the existing LDC guidelines with a view to determining their adequacy and gaps. The ad hoc group was tasked with preparing a report¹ for consideration by AC3 on the result of the review and with recommendations, including additional work within the AC in collaboration with other experts.

Following considerations at AC3, the AC requested the ad hoc working group to develop a more specific proposal for how the Committee can engage with the LEG on next steps on NAPs collaboration, including providing input into the LEG's efforts to develop supplemental NAPs information/guidance on NAPs by March 2014.

The ad hoc working group reviewed support for non-LDC developing countries that seek to plan, prioritize and implement long-term national adaptation actions. The review considered, inter alia, the different elements of the NAP technical guidelines and identified aspects that are applicable and not applicable for non-LDC developing countries in developing NAPs. This work is responding to the request of the COP on the matter of non-LDCs² and NAPs and also contributes to overall objective of the Adaptation Committee to promote coherence on adaptation under the Convention, including with the LEG and its support to LDCs.

A particular focus of the review was on the technical guidelines for the NAP process, which were developed by the LEG based on the initial guidelines for the formulation of NAPs developed at COP 17.

Work undertaken includes:

- The development of a proposal on engagement of the AC with the LEG on collaboration on NAPs;
- Considering the recommendations and agree on any follow-up work as outlined in section 4 of document AC/2013/15;
- Engaging the LEG in discussing the possible next steps in the creation of additional support materials to complement the technical guidelines, such as additional materials through NAP Central, and the preparation of supplementary materials;
- The development of a proposal for exploring means for identifying non-LDCs that would require technical support, the types of support needs, and how these needs could be addressed by the AC and others;
- Considering progress made by the (Global Environment Facility) GEF in responding to COP guidance on support to non-LDCs, including on the Global Support Programme (GSP) for LDCs, with a view to making recommendations on support to non-LDCs during the AC meeting following the publication of the GEF report to COP 19;
- The development of a proposal on how to build on the work by LEG on the NAP Central;

¹ See document AC/2013/15 available at <<http://bit.ly/15DIaWU>>.

² Decision 5/CP.17, paragraph 30 and decision 12/CP.18, preamble.

- Proposing elements for terms of reference (ToRs) for a group, in collaboration with relevant organizations and experts, including from the LEG, to work on modalities and guidelines for NAPs for non-LDC developing countries, as per the workplan approved by COP18.

2. Key findings

As noted by the LEG, the technical guidelines are indeed designed to support any country in its planning and implementation of adaptation at the national level. The review revealed a number of gaps in, and limitations of, the NAP guidelines, which stem from the boundaries set by the initial COP guidelines.³ Nevertheless, the ad hoc group concludes that these guidelines are broad and non-prescriptive and therefore flexible enough to be applied to non-LDCs. However, the question of enabling support for non-LDCs to start the process needs further consideration, such as more explicit guidance to the GEF for the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF), as a follow-up to the initial request to the GEF in decision 12/CP.18 to consider how the SCCF may be used.

According to the LEG, *“the NAP process is designed to be flexible and non-prescriptive; hence countries may apply the suggested steps based on their circumstances, choosing those steps that add value to their planning process and sequencing NAP activities based on their needs to support their decision-making on adaptation.”* Key questions and indicative activities may be equally insightful and/or many highlight the same gaps for non-LDCs as for LDCs. This depends to a great extent on national circumstances therefore Parties would need to determine whether they need to improve their national institutional arrangements.

The approach of the LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process is to outline a process but not to provide in-depth guidance on how to undertake specific steps such as V&A assessments or appraising adaptation measures. Although in-depth and step-by-step guidelines are available for the specific steps elsewhere (e.g guidelines developed by WHO in relation to NAPs), there may be a need for additional guiding materials for some steps within the process, which can be further discussed. For now, until the technical guidelines are not implemented, discussing such supplements is premature.

A key issue is that non-LDCs do not have a group under the Convention nor anywhere to promote or provide support as they embark on NAP-related activities. There could be a gap in the possible guidance and support that non-LDCs can access as they try to implement adaptation action. While a few countries may already have local capacity, others may feel that in the process of formulating NAPs, using international support as foreseen by the COP decision is the quickest or most feasible way to undertake or contribute to their NAPs process and move towards implementing adaptation action at the earliest. The balance between building capacity to fill gaps identified in the NAP process and moving towards implementing adaptation priorities coming out of the process would need to be decided by the countries in the early stages of their NAP process, through their framework and strategy.

On the specific manner of supporting the national adaptation plan process in eligible developing countries, and specifically considering *“Operationalizing support to the preparation of the national adaptation plan process in response to guidance from the UNFCCC COP”*,⁴ it would appear that the COP has requested the SCCF to support the NAPs process. However this will as usual depend on the contributions to the SCCF, which have over the years been inadequate. The ad hoc working group hopes that this will change given the importance of mainstreaming adaptation efforts into developing countries national development agendas.

An additional concern arises from paragraph 15 on the scope of the LDCF/SCCF in particular the need for further guidance for support to the following elements: laying the groundwork and addressing gaps; preparatory elements; implementation strategies; and monitoring, reporting and review. Also, paragraph 26: "combining cross-sectoral activities"; and paragraph 28 that refers to the "principle of additional costs". The document can be contradicting and confusing. For example, in paragraph 4 it was stated that the document introduces the GEF's approach to operationalizing support towards the preparation of the NAP process in response to guidance

³ Annex to Decision 5/CP.17.

⁴ GEF/LDCF.SCCF.14/06 May 23, 2013.

provided by the COP. However, it is not clear how the new approach introduced by the GEF is going to be delivered to countries in an expedient manner and how the NAP process will be financed through LDCF/SCCF, particularly if developed countries will more resources to these Funds.

Countries require the capacity to prioritize adaptation actions and they also need support to implement more effective interventions in order to reduce some of the impacts of climate change. If they are unable to take effective adaptation action, the financial, human and ecological costs of climate change will dramatically increase. However, it is very unclear whether resources will be adequate enough to support these actions, given the fact that “The GEF’s ability to support the NAP process through the LDCF and the SCCF will remain contingent on the availability of resources.”⁵ Further, the GEF states that “any support provided by the GEF, through the LDCF and the SCCF, for the NAP process would differ from past LDCF financing towards the preparation of NAPAs both in its objectives and its scope,”⁶ which could seem contradictory as the goal of the GEF adaptation programme under the LDCF and the SCCF (see footnote 4 of the GEF paper) is similar to the first objective of the NAP process (vulnerability reduction, increase of adaptive capacity). Paragraph 11 of the paper, which states the close alignment of the objectives of the NAP process and the strategic objectives of the LDCF and SCCF. In addition, Paragraph 5 is intended to clarify that, while countries can develop a plan/document if they so choose, they did not have to develop a plan first in order to access funding for other activities, like concrete actions, capacity building support, etc. (like with the NAPAs where support for implementation could only be accessed if a country had a NAPA doc). The statements regarding the new approach conceived by the GEF require further consideration to obtain clarification on these statements.

3. Engagement with the LEG

The AC ad hoc group suggests to enhance the AC-LEG collaboration on NAPs to ensure broad based support to both LDCs and non-LDCs, overcoming the limitation that the LEG can only support LDCs. Early action in this regard would give momentum to the NAP process. For this purpose, the matter of “strengthening national institutional arrangements” should be considered more carefully. For example, the AC could define what constitutes good institutional arrangements and provide templates that countries could use to identify their various needs bearing in mind that one size does not fit all. This could be done in the form of a dedicated group under the AC with engagement of LEG, and as appropriate, outside experts looking at the NAPs process for all Parties. There is also the need to look at how the AC can collaborate with the LEG in offering training on the NAP process, through activities that are arranged in a coordinated manner, including workshops that include both LDCs and non-LDCs on the NAP technical guidelines, and other forms of support. The LEG will be revising its training materials on NAPs, and it would be beneficial to include components that the AC would advise on, to enrich the materials so they can also be applied to non-LDCs.

4. Work of the AC towards recommendations for consideration by COP 19, including on support for non-LDC developing countries that seek to formulate and implement NAPs

Follow-up on limitations in guidance on NAPs to date

As noted before, developing supplementary guidelines is premature and could lead to more confusion as countries are beginning to understand the NAP process. There could potential collaboration between the committee and LEG on this matter. The AC could collaborate with the LEG to address the needs for both LDCs and non-LDCs. For example, the LEG and the AC could assemble information, possibly through the NAP Central Information System, on how different planning activities have used other tools and methodologies to share this information with all developing countries as examples/case studies.

The LEG is working with various organisations in developing supplements to the technical

⁵ Paragraph 20, GEF/LDCF.SCCF.14/06 May 23, 2013.

⁶ Paragraph 5, GEF/LDCF.SCCF.14/06 May 23, 2013.

guidelines to offer more step-by-step guidance for countries. Such supplements will focus mainly on Elements B and D of the NAP technical guidelines, and would cover sectors and other cross-cutting issues. The first set of supplements is expected by end of the year, and will involve testing and interaction with NAP teams to ensure that the needs of these teams are met. There are multiple options to address needs that Parties may have in using the guidelines. Some of these are employed through, for example, regional trainings and other training modalities, to bridge the gaps of having non-prescriptive guidelines but requiring more direct guidance and support at time of implementation. These modalities could be useful to non-LDCs. Further, there could be potential to develop supplementary material through the NWP as plans and planning is one of the integral steps in the iterative process of the programme.

Follow-up on technical support

An AC task-force on NAPs

As noted in section 2, non-LDCs do not have a group under the Convention nor anywhere to promote or provide support as they embark on NAP-related activities. This gap in the AC has also implications for the work of the LEG as the AC is only able to collaborate in ad hoc activities as the LEG embarks in their mandate to support LDCs. Therefore, a dedicated group under the AC, with appropriate engagement of outside experts looking at the NAPs process for all Parties and working closely with the LEG to consider technical and financial issues, including those identified through this work so far and those issues that may arise as the NAPs processes go underway, could be first step in addressing gaps and issues. A proposal for terms of reference (ToRs) for such a group is included in the annex, in accordance with decision 2/CP.17.

Global support programme

The GEF Council meeting on 15 November 2012 proposed the establishment of a global support program (GSP) for national adaptation plans for LDCs and other interested non-LDCs. According to the GEF:

“The GSP could serve as a vehicle for introducing and disseminating the technical guidelines for the NAP process, as well as other relevant guidance, methodologies, tools and resources that assist developing countries in carrying out the subsequent stages of the NAP process in an effective and timely manner. For other, non-LDC developing countries, recognizing their diverse needs and capacities in the area of adaptation planning and implementation, the GSP would place considerable emphasis on taking stock of prior and ongoing initiatives; carried out by national governments, multi-lateral or bilateral agencies, NGOs or other institutions; to strengthen technical and institutional capacities for medium and long-term adaptation planning. Moreover, in non-LDCs, the GSP would focus more on laying the foundation for effective, private sector involvement in climate change adaptation. Any training provided under the GSP would recognize that the technical guidelines for the NAP process [...], while relevant for any developing country, are developed with the specific needs and context of LDCs in mind.”

A GSP for non-LDCs for the elaboration and implementation of NAPs could be developed and implemented in collaboration with UN Agencies, but it is necessary to recognize that such an effort would require financial support. Similar to the established GSP for LDCs for the NAPs process, a GSP for non-LDCs could assist countries in pursuing their country priorities and identify cost-effective options for key adaptation interventions. Further, a GSP could help assist countries in efforts, initiatives and investments happening at the sub-national level, where activities that generate co-benefits and the mobilization of multiple stakeholders is happening. The AC could further consider this as part of the set of modalities for support to be presented to the COP.

NAPs Central

NAP Central is under active development by the LEG, and there is potential for the AC to provide input. The LEG has decided to set up a support group on the establishment of the NAP Central,

and in response to the invitation of the LEG, the AC nominated a member to be part of this group. Every opportunity will be explored to enrich the content of NAP Central based on any inputs from the AC.

Follow-up on financial support

Financial needs and engagement with the Standing Committee on Finance and other bodies under the Convention:

As the LEG only considered support needs of LDCs as per its mandate, the AC could consider identifying the support needs of non-LDCs. The technical guidelines produced by the LEG only respond to the formulation of the NAP process, and there is need for additional guidance to the operating entities of the financial mechanism of the Convention on how the NAPs could be implemented (through policies, projects and programmes). Those needs could then be transmitted as part of the AC's annual report to the COP so as to invite Annex II Parties, the GEF and other relevant agencies to increase their financial support to the SCCF. At a later stage, the AC could also monitor how the GEF supports non-LDCs in pursuing NAPs with a view to identifying any problems regarding access. This work could also be done as part of AC activities on means of implementation. The question of modalities for financial support for non-LDCs, in particular for implementation, will need to be revisited, including in the context of the larger financial architecture, i.e. once the Green Climate Fund (GCF) is operational. The current guidelines stemming from COP decisions are for formulating NAPs only regardless whether it is NAPs by LDCs or non-LDCs. Implementation will require additional COP decisions to guide the financial mechanism; the AC may wish to guide the COP in this regard. There has been no consideration of matters related specifically to NAPs for LDCs nor non-LDCs in the work undertaken by the AC with the SCF, the Technology Executive Committee (TEC) or others.

Consideration of this matter, including on considering and providing recommendations on challenges arising from the formulation and implementation of NAPs could be an activity to be undertaken by the AC as part of the workstream on means of implementation with technical input by the dedicated group under the AC with engagement of outside experts looking at the NAPs process.

Support through the financial mechanism, including through the GEF:

As discussed in section 2, there are multiple problems from the proposed approach for the national adaptation plan process in eligible developing countries. In particular, considering "Operationalizing support to the preparation of the national adaptation plan process in response to guidance from the UNFCCC COP",⁷ support for funding non-LDCs is provided through the SCCF. However this will as usual depend on the contributions to the LDCF and SCCF that have over the years been inadequate. Similarly, LDCs have been advised by implementing agencies that the GEF guidelines are now sufficient for a country to propose a proposal for funding to start the formulation process for NAPs. In the case of LDCs, the difference this time from NAPA preparation is that NAP formulation funding will cover regular medium-sized or full-sized project and, like with the SCCF, the LDCF has received pledges but they have not yet materialize at the scale necessary.

The AC, in collaboration with the LEG and SCF, could consider proposing activities to look at the current challenges facing financing NAPs as part of a workplan considering the multiple issues related to financing of the NAPs for both LDCs and non-LDCs.

5. Issues for consideration and decisions at AC4

The AC may wish to:

- Discuss matters requiring further clarification with regards to finance for NAPs,

⁷ GEF/LDCF.SCCF.14/06 May 23, 2013.

including those in section 2, such as guiding principles stated in the GEF paper relationship between the paper itself and the existing operational policies and guidelines for both funds, as well as other matters included in that section of this paper, and possible further follow-up actions that could arise from such discussion, including distinguishing issues related to adequacy of resources vs technical issues that pose a challenge for developing countries in accessing resources;

- Consider the conclusions for the AC report in response to the mandate from COP 18 on this issue;
- Consider and agree on modalities to be recommended for consideration by the COP;
- Consider and agree on the establishment of a taskforce on NAPS and its terms of reference (see annex).

Annex - Elements for terms of reference for a Taskforce on NAPs**Objective**

- To serve as the panel within the AC that continuously looks at issues related to NAPs;
- To continuously liaise with the LEG in support of their work in relationship to NAPs in LDCs ensuring consistency and complementarity of mandates;
- To identify opportunities where activities can also be employed by non-LDCs;
- To report to the AC at every meeting with issues identified and proposed activities to support the NAP process for all eligible developing countries.

Scope of the work

(Development of an action plan to be presented and endorsed at AC5 to meet the objectives, considering, inter alia, activities and suggestions in section 4 above)

Composition

X members of the AC

X members of the LEG

X members of the SCF

X members of the TEC

Relationship with external experts. External members and experts could be actively engaged and support this taskforce as necessary. These experts could include representatives from UN Agencies, research and training institutions, regional centres, civil society and other stakeholders according to the specific need the task-force is trying to address.

(Other Elements)