V. REVISING THE NAPA PROJECTS AND PROFILES

75. The main steps in developing a NAPA as given in the LEG *annotated guidelines for NAPA preparation* include a step to periodically review risks and prioritization of activities. Given the passage of time since the first NAPAs were completed, the LEG has identified the following reasons for revising of the NAPA projects and profiles, including, inter alia,

(a) Some of the stated priority NAPA activities would have been implemented under bilateral or other sources of funding and technical cooperation, given their urgent nature, requiring a revision of the priorities for which funding would be sought under the LDCF Fund;

(b) In cases where only brief information was provided on costs and details for implementation, an LDC Party may decide to provide updated cost information and/or additional project profile information;

(c) In some cases, new risks and vulnerabilities would have become evident, and so the urgent and immediate priorities in the NAPA would need to be updated, especially in those cases where the NAPA would have been completed a year or more ago;

(d) The need to incorporate lessons learned in the implementation of NAPAs by other LDCs in the design of an implementation strategy for the NAPA;

(e) The need to address new information requirements to satisfy new project development guidelines, such as information required under the current and new guidelines for project development (using the project identification form versus the previous project development fund window that was being applied when some of the earlier NAPAs were prepared);

(f) The need to provide simple updates to the NAPA, such as details on revised costing of project activities, taking into account new information. Information that would facilitate preparation of PIFs for implementation could also be added. Some may also choose to elaborate on how a major project activity would be integrated into sector-wide plans.

76. The LEG proposes the following process and simple steps to be used by LDC Parties as may be desired, in revising previously submitted NAPAs:

(a) *Review the NAPA and identify need and starting point for the NAPA update:* LDC Parties to review the NAPA using a country-driven approach and assess whether a revision is warranted, and if yes, then to identify an entry or starting point for the process of revising their NAPA;

(b) *Re-convene a multi-stakeholder steering group to develop revisions:* It is likely that most countries would re-convene the NAPA steering committee to assemble updated information on risks and status of implementation of existing NAPA priorities, then would go through a process of re-ranking the priorities and coming up with a new list of priority activities, and revised project profiles as appropriate. The NAPA team would prepare an implementation strategy.

(c) *Endorsement of the NAPA and submission of the revisions to the secretariat:* Once the necessary revisions have been prepared, it will be necessary for a formal submission to be endorsed by the relevant authorities at the national level, such as the national climate change coordination committee, and then the revision would be submitted to the secretariat by the UNFCCC focal point, clearly indicating the nature of the revisions in the submittal letter. The submittal letter plus the document with the revisions, would thus become an addendum to the NAPA;

(d) *Post-processing of the revised NAPA projects and profiles:* Upon receipt, the secretariat would update the records on the web and would inform the GEF and its agencies. The secretariat would then update the online database of NAPA projects, reflecting those activities and projects that have been retired or revised. A database of NAPA activities under implementation through the LDCF and other sources would also be used to verify the NAPA updates in cases where some activities are retired due to past implementation.