



Date: 13 March 2014
Reference: YN/OP/AM
Direct line: +49 228 815-1476

Mr. Jose Maria Clemente Sarte Salceda and Mr. Manfred Konukiewitz
Co-Chairs of the Board of the Green Climate Fund

Dear Colleagues,

The Adaptation Committee, at its 5th meeting (5-7 March 2014, Bonn, Germany), discussed several of the draft documents under consideration by the Board of the Green Climate Fund (GCF Board) in the context of its consideration of issues relating to financing for National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) as well as financing for concrete adaptation projects and programmes in developing countries, and would like to provide you with some reflections on those documents from the perspective of the Adaptation Committee.

The Conference of the Parties (COP) in its decision 2/CP.17, paragraph 99, requested the Adaptation Committee to engage and develop linkages through the COP with all adaptation-related work programmes, bodies and institutions under the Convention, including, inter alia, the operating entities of the financial mechanism of the Convention, as appropriate.

In the light of ongoing work on documents under consideration prior to the next meeting of the GCF Board, the Adaptation Committee would like to take this opportunity to provide input to the GCF Board on two of those documents in particular: “Additional Result Areas and Indicators for Adaptation Activities” and “Initial Results Management Framework of the Fund”:

1. Adaptation cannot be measured and quantified in the same manner as mitigation – results and success are observed over a very different period of time, and adaptation interventions are deeply linked to processes of development and disaster risk reduction, for example.
2. Significant work undertaken under the Cancun Adaptation Framework and in the NAP process and technical guidelines is relevant to the work of the GCF and should be integrated in the re-drafting of the documents.
3. The NAP Technical Guidelines state that “the structure and form of these national adaptation plans will vary by country”. There needs to be a prioritisation of support of local action, where adaptation will happen. Adaptation benefits must be understood in their local and national context, following a country-driven, gender-sensitive, participatory and fully transparent approach. Countries should have sufficient flexibility to define their indicators in line with national and local plans and objectives. A decision to measure adaptation results in accordance with other expectations is inconsistent with the Convention and its subsequent decisions.



4. An over-prescription on sectors should be avoided. While the existing guidelines for NAPs and the framework set forward in paragraph 14 of decision 1/CP.16 do not exclude a sector-based approach for adaptation, it should not be assumed that this is most appropriate for all countries, or that the request for financial support could be packaged in a manner that matches the current draft Results Management Framework. The assumption that adaptation will require use of sector-specific targets heightens the risk of inserting biases in planning for adaptation and of pursuing a path potentially leading to maladaptation.

5. At present, there are too many results areas and associated indicators. We suggest keeping the Results Management Framework simple. It is likely that 14 results areas for adaptation would be overly burdensome, as was the experience of developing countries in the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR). Core indicators in the PPCR were subsequently reduced from 22 indicators to 5, based on overwhelming feedback from developing countries that 22 indicators was overly burdensome.

6. Indicators should be designed to be qualitative rather than quantitative, outcome-based rather than activity- or sector-based, and should remain at the policy level and global “paradigm shift” level. Indicators should be able, for example, to capture resilience outcomes. In this context, we would like to invite the Board to look into the results of the Adaptation Committee’s Workshop on Monitoring and Evaluation of Adaptation, which took place last September in Nadi, Fiji.¹ Developing countries are increasingly developing joint strategies on disaster risk reduction and climate change. Indicators should be designed in a way that can capture progress that countries are able to make in integrating adaptation into development and sectoral planning, policies, and action.

The Adaptation Committee stands ready to provide further input into the revision of the documents on adaptation results areas and the Results Management Framework prior to the GCF Board’s May meeting.

Finally, the Adaptation Committee understands the need for greater communication and technical interaction between the Adaptation Committee and the GCF Board, particularly in the light of relevant COP decisions (decision 3/CP.17, reiterated in decision 6/CP.18), which direct the GCF Board to initiate a process to collaborate with the Adaptation Committee and other relevant bodies such as the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), to define linkages between the Fund and those bodies, as appropriate.

As an example of the need for, and benefits of, such linkages, the Adaptation Committee and the LEG have both been working extensively in the development of logical models and on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation – experience and expertise that would be of great value to the GCF Board in the development of its Results Management Framework. It is highly advisable that the GCF Board engages with these Convention adaptation bodies in order to develop the Results Management Framework in a manner that is compatible with adaptation processes underway, in particular the NAP process.

¹ Information is available at <unfccc.int/7744>.



In order to facilitate greater interaction, we propose the GCF secretariat and the UNFCCC Secretariat to communicate and to facilitate contact between the Co-Chairs of Adaptation Committee and the GCF Board with a view to providing technical advice on the documents.

In addition, the Adaptation Committee extends, once again, an invitation to the GCF-Board to nominate one of its members to contribute to the work of the Adaptation Committee's NAP task force. The Adaptation Committee would also very much welcome a member of the GCF Board to participate in the sixth meeting of the Adaptation Committee, which is planned to take place from 28 to 30 September 2014 in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Looking forward to a fruitful collaboration between the Adaptation Committee and the GCF Board.

Yours sincerely,

(signed by)

Christina Chan
Co-Chair of the Adaptation Committee

(signed by)

Juan Pablo Hoffmaister
Co-Chair of the Adaptation Committee

CC:

- H.E. Mr. Marcin Korolec, President of COP19/CMP9
- H.E. Mr. Manuel Pulgar Vidal Otálora, the President Designate of COP20/CMP10