

SUBMISSION BY LITHUANIA AND THE EUROPEAN COMMISSION ON BEHALF OF THE EUROPEAN UNION AND ITS MEMBER STATES

This submission is supported by Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Iceland, Montenegro and Serbia.

Vilnius, 2 September 2013

Subject: Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change

Views on ways to enhance the relevance and support the objective of Nairobi work programme, taking into account inter alia:

- a) Considering the scope of the work of the Nairobi work programme as agreed in the annex of decision 2/CP.11 through additional cross-cutting issues;
- b) Sequencing activities so that they build on each other, and engaging adaptation practitioners;
- c) Developing linkages with adaptation-related workstreams and bodies under the Convention, including the Subsidiary Body for Implementation, as appropriate.

The EU welcome this opportunity to share its views on this subject.

General comments

The EU welcomes the progress made during the thirty-eight session of the SBSTA in reconsidering the work areas of the Nairobi work programme with a view to make recommendations to the COP at its nineteenth session on how to best support the objective of the Nairobi work programme. In our view, work under the NWP should continue on the basis of decision 2/CP.11 and in line with the catalytic role of the Convention.

The EU also welcomes the significant progress on recent activities under the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change¹ (NWP). The EU is of the view that good progress has been made to develop the NWP into the knowledge hub on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation under the Convention. In order to further enhance the relevance of the NWP for the Parties its activities should be informed through a demand driven approach that helps to address even better the specific needs and requests of groups of Parties as well as of workstreams under The UNFCCC.

¹ FCCC/SBSTA/2013/INF.1

The EU believes that the NWP should continue to collaborate with relevant existing organizations, including through national disseminators, in enhancing generation, access and dissemination of information and targeted NWP knowledge products related to climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaptation, in particular to those parties and stakeholders that do not communicate in English and ensuring a strategic approach in engaging partner organisations, including regional centres and networks. A good example is the joint initiative between RIOCC and the UNFCCC secretariat on the NWP disseminator's network in Iberoamerica².

NWP national focal points should be further encouraged to improve the linkage of the NWP with the subnational and community level adaptation activities.

Specific suggestions

Linkages

In our view, it seems important that in specifying any future activities under the NWP, Parties strive to avoid duplication of effort, make use of available information, knowledge, lessons learned and tools and draw on already established linkages with partner organisations, including the private sector.

The EU sees the NWP as a scientific, technical and socio-economic knowledge hub supporting and complementary to other Workstreams, Groups and Committees under the Convention. The activities under the NWP should be coherent to the activities under the Cancun Adaptation Framework (CAF) and to adaptation activities to be agreed under the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP).

The EU is of the view that workstreams and bodies under the UNFCCC relevant for adaptation (e.g. AC, LEG, TEC, etc.) should be able to request specific activities to be undertaken under the NWP in accordance with its mandate. This could be done through conclusions by the SBSTA and/or the SBI as well as by decisions, e.g. by the COP.

These needs should be collected periodically and addressed after their consideration in the workplan of the Nairobi work programme. Such an approach will allow an efficient and effective response to the scientific, technical and socio-economic knowledge needs raised. The EU would also like to point out that providing recommendations is an appropriate modality to inform other work-streams/bodies under the Convention about information, knowledge and lessons learned gathered under the NWP.

² Further information at www.lariocc.net

Modalities

The EU notes that the modalities as specified in the annex to the decision 2/CP.11 provide sufficient scope for identifying modalities under the NWP as deemed appropriate by Parties.

The EU considers the Nairobi work programme focal point forum as a useful modality; however with room for improvement. It is suggested to better structure it in order to become more focused, e.g. by addressing specific issues/items (e.g. cross-cutting issues as defined in the Annex to FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.9 in para 2 (b)).

From the EU perspective Calls for Action under the NWP also require further development. Information about the actual achievements made in response to Calls for Action is lacking; to date there has been little or no feedback by partner organisations that provides information about their progress in addressing the gaps and needs identified in Calls for Actions, e.g. via action pledges. It is the view of the EU that action pledges should be linked to Calls for Action in order to support the management and demand driven approach of the NWP. Such analysis of Calls for Action should aim to inform Parties and the broader adaptation community about results, and thus help identify good practices and lessons learned in different regions, as well as to which extent gaps have been addressed. Such mapping might be undertaken by the secretariat and needs to be supported by partner organizations that responded to Calls for Action through particular action pledges.

A similar approach related to the NWP private sector initiatives might also be very useful.

The EU also suggests improving the NWP via the use of innovative modalities. E.g. the use of presentation and exchange formats in addition to the main website including the use of social media could be considered. Webinars could be used more often to showcase new NWP knowledge resources or a dedicated electronic message board or forum could be established to allow for a quick exchange of views among practitioners on specific issues. The interaction with other knowledge hubs could be further intensified however potential overlap and duplication with work already being done should be avoided.

With regard to enhancing dissemination of the NWP documents and other relevant information, the NWP website could also be improved, e.g. via better presentation of the NWP's knowledge resources, showcasing the most up-to-date knowledge resources, and user-friendly navigation functions. Monitoring and publishing the number of visits/downloads of individual knowledge products at the NWP website, and information where top downloads took place could direct the user's attention to key knowledge pieces within the vast pool of information the NWP appears to offer.

Cross-cutting issues

The EU is of the view that the 9 work areas of the NWP are still relevant. They seem broad enough and consistent with past, current and future needs of impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change in all countries. Therefore any activities addressed through cross-cutting issues (para 2 (b) of the Annex to FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.9) should be linked to at least one already existing specific work area under the NWP. The EU finds the list of cross-cutting issues as a good starting point for discussion to inform more concrete future activities under the NWP. However, some cross-cutting issues can be interrelated and activities in these areas can reinforce or negatively affect other activities. In order to avoid adverse impacts, all activities need to be thoroughly coordinated, consulted and need to build on each other.

The EU would also like to address issues presented in the Appendix to the Annex to FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.9. This workplan is a useful starting point, which however needs further consideration and development. E.g. the EU is missing a rationale behind and clarification on proposed activities mainly regarding the linkage to the nine work areas under the NWP, timing, the specification of deliverables based on a demand raised by Parties, and the target group (Parties, experts, practitioners, etc.). The EU is open to consider also other specific proposals in this regard.

The EU looks forward to continue with constructive discussions on this matter and agree on a decision in Warsaw that will strengthen the NWP and support its objective.
