



Framework Convention on Climate Change

Distr.: General
23 November 2010

Original: English

Subsidiary Body for Implementation

Thirty-third session

Cancun, 30 November to 4 December 2010

Item 7 (b) of the provisional agenda

Matters relating to Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention

Matters relating to the least developed countries

Report on the eighteenth meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

This document reports on the eighteenth meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), held in Kathmandu, Nepal, from 12 to 15 October 2010, and provides an update of the efforts of the LEG to implement its work programme for 2008–2010. The report includes a summary of the status of preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs), as provided by the secretariat of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) during the meeting. There is also a summary of discussions held between the LEG and the GEF and three of its agencies on NAPA implementation. Issues discussed at a meeting between the LEG and Nepal's NAPA team, which was held in order to share experiences in the preparation and implementation of that country's NAPA, are also presented. This report also includes information on the rationale and support needed for updating and revising NAPAs.

* This document was submitted after the due date as a result of the timing of the meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group.

Contents

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Mandate	1–2	3
II. Summary of the eighteenth meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group	3–51	3
A. Proceedings	3–6	3
B. Status of preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action	7–10	4
C. Consideration of the preparation of national adaptation programmes of action	11–12	5
D. Consideration of the implementation of national adaptation programmes of action	13–26	6
E. Review of implementation of the Least Developed Countries work programme	27–28	7
F. Consideration of experiences, best practices and lessons learned	29	8
G. Need for revision and updates of national adaptation programmes of action	30–36	8
H. Discussions with the Global Environment Facility and its agencies	37–43	10
I. Interaction with other organizations	44–48	11
J. Interaction between the Least Developed Countries Expert Group and the Nepalese national adaptation programme of action team	49–51	12
III. Progress in implementation of priority activities of the work programme of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group for 2008–2010	52–53	12
Annexes		
I. Priority activities of the work programme of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, 2008–2010		14
II. Members of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group as at 15 October 2010		17

I. Mandate

1. The Conference of the Parties (COP), by its decision 29/CP.7, established the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) to advise on the preparation and implementation strategy for national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs), and adopted the terms of reference of the LEG. According to these terms of reference, the LEG is to convene twice each year, and report on its work to the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI).

2. In response to the request of the COP at its thirteenth session,¹ the LEG developed, at its thirteenth meeting, a work programme for 2008–2010,² which was considered by the SBI at its twenty-eighth session. The SBI, at its thirtieth session, requested the LEG to keep it informed of the efforts of the LEG in implementing its work programme over the period 2008–2010.³ The LEG further developed, at its sixteenth meeting, a list of priority activities for 2010,⁴ which were considered by the SBI at its thirty-first session.

II. Summary of the eighteenth meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group

A. Proceedings

3. The eighteenth meeting of the LEG was held in Kathmandu, Nepal, from 12 to 15 October 2010.

4. The COP, by its decision 8/CP.13, decided that the LEG may invite, when deemed necessary, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its agencies to its meetings. To this end, representatives of the GEF and three of its agencies – the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) – participated in the eighteenth meeting of the LEG. In addition, in accordance with the conclusions of the SBI at its twenty-ninth session⁵ encouraging the LEG to engage a wide range of organizations to support the implementation of its work programme and the least developed countries (LDC) work programme,⁶ the LEG extended the invitation to the secretariat of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the World Health Organization (WHO) to participate in the meeting.

5. The Minister of Environment and Natural Resources of Nepal, Mr. Thakur Prasad Sharma, opened the meeting. He highlighted the importance of the NAPA in advancing adaptation planning for Nepal and the need for effective implementation to begin immediately upon completion of the preparation phase. A representative of the secretariat gave an overview of NAPAs, emphasizing their usefulness as mechanisms through which LDCs can communicate their urgent and immediate vulnerabilities to climate change; and whose preparation and implementation has resulted in national capacity being built for adaptation to climate change. The representative underscored the important role of NAPAs as a first step in national adaptation efforts in LDCs. The Chair of the LEG, Mr. Fred Machulu Onduri, highlighted the main achievements of the LEG in supporting LDCs since

¹ Decision 8/CP.13.

² FCCC/SBI/2008/6, annex I.

³ FCCC/SBI/2009/8, paragraph 59.

⁴ FCCC/SBI/2009/13, annex I.

⁵ FCCC/SBI/2008/19, paragraph 59.

⁶ Decision 5/CP.7.

the establishment of the LEG in 2001, and expressed the full support of the LEG to Nepal and all other LDCs as they finalize their NAPAs and prepare to implement priority activities.

6. During the meeting, the LEG focused its work on reviewing the status of NAPA preparation and implementation, and progress made in implementing priority activities of the LEG work programme for 2008–2010. In the interaction with the GEF and its agencies, the LEG reviewed the support being provided to those countries still preparing their NAPAs, the efforts being made to support implementation of NAPAs and the lessons learned and best practices drawn from the NAPA process. The LEG also had discussions with WHO and the secretariat of UNCCD on how to enhance support to LDCs when updating, revising and implementing their NAPAs.

B. Status of preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action

7. As at 11 November 2010, of the 48 LDCs that had received funding for the preparation of NAPAs, 45 had submitted NAPAs to the secretariat and three (Angola, Myanmar and Timor-Leste) had yet to submit completed NAPAs.⁷ Timor-Leste is at an advanced stage of NAPA preparation and is expected to submit its NAPA to the secretariat by the end of 2010. Equatorial Guinea and Somalia have yet to access funding for preparing their NAPAs.

8. On the status of implementation of NAPAs, the GEF reported on NAPA projects under its consideration. As at 15 October 2010, 38 countries had officially submitted one or more NAPA projects to the GEF. Nineteen projects in Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Liberia, Maldives, Mali, Niger, Rwanda, Samoa, Sudan, Tuvalu and Zambia had received endorsement by the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the GEF, and at least four projects in Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Lao People's Democratic Republic and Malawi are expected to have been endorsed by the CEO of the GEF before the end of 2010. In addition to these 19 projects, the CEO of the GEF and the GEF Council had approved 19 project identification forms (PIFs), for projects that are starting to apply for funding, from Afghanistan, Burundi, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Gambia, Haiti, Kiribati, Lesotho, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu and Yemen, and five PIFs from Central African Republic, Haiti, Sao Tome and Principe, Solomon Islands and Togo are pending clearance by the CEO and approval by the GEF Council.

9. To date, the following GEF agencies are currently supporting the implementation of NAPA projects: UNDP (supporting the implementation of 29 NAPA projects), World Bank (four), UNEP (11), the International Fund for Agricultural Development (two), the African Development Bank (three), UNDP and UNEP jointly (two) and FAO (three).

10. As at 4 August 2010, 22 donors had pledged USD 290 million to the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF).⁸ As at 31 May 2010, cumulative net funding allocated, committed or disbursed by the GEF Council and CEO amounted to USD 135 million.⁹ The balance of these sums (USD 155 million) indicates the level of available funds in the LDCF.

⁷ Cape Verde received funds and prepared and submitted a NAPA, but has since graduated from the LDC group. The current total number of LDC Parties to the Convention is 49.

⁸ See the report of the GEF to the COP at its sixteenth session contained in document FCCC/CP/2010/5.

⁹ As footnote 5 above.

C. Consideration of the preparation of national adaptation programmes of action

1. Enhanced support to countries at the preparation stage

11. The LEG discussed the efforts made by the countries that were still preparing NAPAs and took note of their progress since its last meeting. As at 15 October 2010, Nepal had finalized its NAPA, Timor-Leste was at the final stages of NAPA preparation, and both were expected to submit their NAPAs to the secretariat before the end of 2010. Angola and Myanmar had made progress in the preparation of their NAPAs; the LEG will continue to follow these cases until the end of its mandate. The LEG also resumed its discussion on ways of assisting Equatorial Guinea, in collaboration with the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention, in preparing its NAPA alongside its initial national communication.

2. Updates to guidelines

12. The LEG noted several advances in the design and implementation of NAPA projects, and identified the need for updating the “Annotated guidelines for the preparation of national adaptation programmes of action”,¹⁰ which include guidelines for the update and revision of NAPAs. Some areas of the guidelines that could be updated are noted in a LEG technical paper *Least developed countries national adaptation programmes of action: Overview of preparation, design of implementation strategies and submission of revised project lists and profiles*,¹¹ and include:

(a) The integration of the NAPA planning process into broader national-level planning, including the consideration of issues such as gender;

(b) The need to address new information requirements to satisfy new project development guidelines, for example by using the PIF instead of the project development fund window that was being applied when some of the earlier NAPAs were prepared;

(c) The design of implementation strategies to reflect sector-wide approaches and programmatic approaches, as opposed to the original designs centred around individual projects;

(d) Greater emphasis on identifying baselines, additional adaptation costs and the monitoring and evaluation of results using project-level indicators as required by the latest GEF/LDCF guidelines;

(e) Approaches to scaling up from concentrating on a small number of target areas (geographically and in terms of sectors covered) to considering the whole country and all sectors, including how to design and sequence implementation so as to facilitate access to additional funding as it becomes available;

(f) How to move from addressing urgent and immediate needs to addressing medium- and long-term adaptation needs, including the ‘climate proofing’ of development and building resilience of communities to the adverse effects of climate change;

(g) Methods for making NAPA preparation and the identification of priorities for implementation a continuous process, with an established NAPA team that could update and revise the NAPA as vulnerabilities and other conditions change.

¹⁰ <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/annguid_e.pdf>.

¹¹ <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/ldc_tp2009.pdf>.

D. Consideration of the implementation of national adaptation programmes of action

1. Training workshops

13. The LEG organized training workshops on implementing NAPAs for lusophone LDCs (on 4–8 September 2010 in Sao Tome, Sao Tome and Principe) and for Pacific LDCs (on 3–6 November 2010 in Apia, Samoa) in the second half of 2010, completing the planned series of five workshops on implementation of NAPAs as part of the LEG work programme for 2008–2010. The LEG discussed the overall design of the workshops and the feedback received from participants. A full report on the workshops is given in a separate report to the SBI.¹² Overall, the LEG and the agencies concluded that the regional workshops had been very useful in improving the awareness of LDC Parties and their NAPA teams of everything to do with the LDCF and NAPA implementation. Participants expressed their appreciation of the workshops, and several countries have requested assistance in developing training materials for use in implementing adaptation at the national level.

14. The issue of language is very important for non-English speaking LDCs. The above-mentioned training workshop for lusophone LDCs was conducted entirely in Portuguese, and participants welcomed the translation into Portuguese of the publication *Step-by-Step Guide for Implementing National Adaptation Programmes of Action*.¹³ and the customization of the training materials.

15. While most LDC Parties would like to implement their NAPAs as programmes, the need exists for clarification of what a programmatic approach is, and information on how to successfully implement it under the LDCF.

16. The LDC Parties referred to their urgent need for assistance in developing negotiation skills in English, to enable them to effectively engage in the climate negotiations that are conducted in English.

2. Design of implementation

17. The LEG discussed the design of NAPA implementation in detail. This included the establishment of baselines, additional cost of adaptation (co-financing) and the coordination of implementation with other programmes and projects on adaptation and development.

18. As the amount of funding available to each LDC Party continues to increase, such Parties will need to carefully design the implementation of their NAPAs and other elements of the LDC work programme in order to circumvent the constraints encountered in the past with regard to project design, institutional arrangements and relationships with agencies.

19. As more funding opportunities become available for adaptation, such as through the Adaptation Fund or the Special Climate Change Fund, or from external programmes such as the UNDP–Japan Africa Adaptation Programme, the World Bank Pilot Program for Climate Resilience and many bilateral programmes, LDC NAPA teams will need to design a strategy to manage and coordinate the pursuit of different funding channels. The active involvement of donors in the design of implementation strategies of NAPAs, such as in the case of Nepal, was seen as a good practice from which other countries can learn.

20. Project management, including procurement, results monitoring and evaluation, is an important consideration for many LDCs.

¹² FCCC/SBI/2010/15.

¹³ <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/lc_napa2009.pdf>.

21. In preparing NAPAs and developing first NAPA projects, national NAPA teams build their own capacity through learning-by-doing, and selected implementing agencies should capitalize on this increasing capacity of national NAPA teams in order to limit the reliance on international consultants to support the implementation of NAPAs. Therefore the LEG continues to recommend that the GEF agencies use local/national experts/consultants during the project design phase. The LEG also discussed the choice of agencies for implementing second and subsequent NAPA projects under the LDCF, and recommended that LDC Parties incorporate lessons learned during the implementation of the first project and the experiences of other countries.

3. Status of review and update of national adaptation programmes of action

22. On the status of revision and update of NAPAs, as at 15 October 2010, the NAPA of Bangladesh had been officially updated and that of Senegal revised. Nepal, on the other hand, has expanded on the NAPA preparation guidelines to include medium- and long-term planning considerations in its NAPA in order to circumvent revisions and updates in the immediate future.

4. Surveys and country case files

23. To enhance support to LDCs in their NAPA implementation strategies, the LEG conducted surveys of LDC Parties at sessions of the subsidiary bodies and through national focal points in order to collect information on the status of implementation of NAPAs and on any obstacles that Parties may be facing. The LEG initiated these surveys at the twenty-eighth session of the SBI. Sixteen countries responded to the survey (Afghanistan, Benin, Bhutan, Haiti, Lesotho, Malawi, Nepal, Niger, Rwanda, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, United Republic of Tanzania, Vanuatu and Zambia).

24. The LEG, in collaboration with the GEF and its agencies, has addressed many of the obstacles met by the LDCs, which mainly concern capacity at the national and agency levels to design projects, access to funds and exchange of information. In the surveys, LDCs recognized the important role played by the LEG in providing key support through the NAPA process, and all of them wanted to see the continuation of this support.

25. In addition, in 2010 the LEG conducted twelve country case studies (Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Cambodia, Central African Republic, Haiti, Kiribati, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Sudan, Timor-Leste, Uganda and Zambia) as an ongoing contribution to the analysis of the experiences gained from the preparation and implementation of NAPAs at the national and global levels.

26. The surveys are part of the inputs of the LEG to the preparation and review of its work programme, and in particular the NAPA process. They are a means of identifying best practices and lessons learned as well as the remaining obstacles in the NAPA process. The outcomes of this work are contained in the "Synthesis report on the national adaptation programme of action process, including operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund".¹⁴ These outcomes will also be used in a forthcoming LEG publication on lessons learned and best practices in the preparation and implementation of NAPAs.

E. Review of implementation of the Least Developed Countries work programme

27. The LEG examined the status of implementation of the elements of the LDC work programme other than the NAPAs, and observed that no projects have been funded as yet

¹⁴ FCCC/SBI/2010/17.

under the LDCF as stipulated by decision 5/CP.14. The LEG also observed that some elements were being addressed by LDC Parties with support from programmes outside the UNFCCC process, such as programmes for strengthening observational networks through the World Meteorological Organization, or capacity-building efforts designed to help LDCs to participate in the clean development mechanism. A small number of LDC Parties have made institutional arrangements for addressing climate change and NAPAs in particular; however, the LEG acknowledged the critical need for strengthening national focal points and national climate change secretariats or committees, as a useful approach to providing a lasting guide to the design and implementation of climate change programmes.

28. On the question of whether the list of six main areas of the work programme requires updating or revision, the LEG concluded that some further elements could be added to the current list, and that a process could be established by the SBI for such an update and revision. Important steps would include a call for submissions from Parties and organizations, and in the event that the LEG mandate is extended, the LEG could be asked to critically examine the work programme and propose enhancements to the list and their implementation.

F. Consideration of experiences, best practices and lessons learned

29. The LEG discussed a preliminary outline of work to capture and communicate best practices, lessons learned and key conclusions to be drawn from the preparation and implementation of NAPAs and the LDC work programme. The LEG agreed on an overall approach to presenting the lessons learned in a manner that will facilitate application in future areas, allow learning from experience and avoid past mistakes. The LEG also agreed on a set of key themes to guide a report on experiences, lessons learned and best practices, and, subsequently, a publication for wide distribution. Country case studies carried out during the training workshops on the implementation of NAPAs and the surveys conducted by the LEG would provide a basis for formulating information on the key experiences, lessons and best practices.

G. Need for revision and updates of national adaptation programmes of action

30. The SBI, at its thirty-second session, invited the LEG, as part of the implementation of its work programme for 2010,¹⁵ to provide information on the need to revise and update NAPAs, as well as on the resources that would be required to undertake a revision or update if Parties chose to do so.

31. The LEG discussed the rationale for the revision and update of NAPAs, taking into account the views of Parties in their submissions¹⁶ to the secretariat as well as responses to surveys conducted by the LEG and feedback from regional workshops on implementation of NAPAs. The LEG noted the degree of effort that may be required to revise or update a NAPA, from minor changes that may be accomplished very easily and submitted through a simple memo to the secretariat to more comprehensive changes that would require updating the whole NAPA document after a series of steps to integrate new information.

32. The LEG identified the following examples of potential reasons that may warrant the revision and update of NAPAs;:

¹⁵ FCCC/SBI/2010/10, paragraph 87.

¹⁶ FCCC/SBI/2010/MISC.9.

(a) Reformulation of a priority project identified in a NAPA, such as to indicate a shift in the location for the project or to specify simple changes to the list of priority projects;

(b) New risks and vulnerabilities become evident, especially two years or more after a NAPA was completed;

(c) The need to address additional information requirements in order to meet new project programme development guidelines, such as information required under the current guidelines for project development (using the PIF instead of the PDF window that was in use when some of the earlier NAPAs were prepared);

(d) The need to elaborate vulnerabilities and adaptation solutions in a sector that was not covered adequately during the initial NAPA preparation; this could involve integrating NAPA priorities into sector-wide programmes or a national programme on climate change;

(e) The need to comprehensively update and re-prioritize the NAPA activities, such as after a major natural disaster when key vulnerabilities would have changed;

(f) The need to scale up adaptation actions from a pilot project involving a few vulnerable communities to adaptation actions that cover all vulnerable sectors and communities in the country, including through full integration of the NAPA and adaptation activities into national development plans and programmes, including through the development of national climate change strategies;

(g) The need to explore opportunities to integrate lessons learned from the implementation of NAPAs by other LDCs and to incorporate regional synergy.

33. Given the diversity of reasons for updating a NAPA, resource requirements will vary. The LEG surveyed the costs of preparing different plans and noted the costs for preparation of NAPAs. There is no limit to how much a country can access from the LDCF for the preparation of a NAPA, but most LDCs applied for USD 200,000 from the GEF because the process is faster and easier as compared with applications to the LDCF for amounts greater than this sum. Several countries raised additional funding to supplement their NAPA preparation, and in the case of Nepal a total of USD 1.3 million was raised.

34. The LEG also discussed the case of Senegal and Bangladesh, the two LDCs that have officially revised or updated their NAPAs and acknowledged that the minor change made by Senegal to its NAPA did not require the mobilization of significant resources as it was a simple revision of the priority list in the NAPA. On the other hand, Bangladesh conducted a more comprehensive update of its NAPA, at a cost of USD 350,000.

35. In taking stock of the above and an informal discussion with GEF agencies that are involved in providing support to countries in the preparation of national plans, the LEG noted the following:

(a) There are very few examples of revisions and updates of national plans from which to draw substantial conclusions. Those that do exist show that the financial resources needed for the revision and update of NAPAs differ from case to case. In some instances, no external resources would be required, that is, the revision and update would be supported by the national budget only, while in other cases, the revision and update may require the mobilization of significant additional financial support;

(b) The extent of required funding varies depending on the degree of update being planned; for a comprehensive plan with consultations, sectoral assessments and the involvement of all stakeholders, the indicated amount is in the range of USD 0.5 to 1 million, as shown in the case of Nepal and in information from agencies such as UNDP;

(c) It is likely that most LDC Parties embarking on an update to their NAPAs will develop a more programmatic approach to packaging their urgent and immediate adaptation priorities, taking into account the latest national development plans, either at the national level or at the sector-wide level.

36. The LEG also noted that arrangements for updating NAPAs could include the development of a national climate change unit (or other appropriate name), which would oversee the preparation and implementation of NAPAs, and adaptation generally, on a continuous basis rather than as a one-off project that would end after a few months. This would address the main concerns raised by many Parties about the lack of funding to sustain NAPA teams beyond the GEF project for NAPA preparation.

H. Discussions with the Global Environment Facility and its agencies

1. Proceedings

37. The LEG allocated the first two days of its meeting to hold discussions with the GEF and its agencies. The GEF secretariat, FAO, UNDP and UNEP participated in the discussions, which focused on the following: updates on the progress made in NAPA preparation and implementation; feedback from the regional training workshop for lusophone LDCs referred to in paragraph 13 above; the sharing of experiences of the implementation of NAPAs and the LDC work programme; the identification of support needs for implementation; best practices and lessons learned from the NAPA process; the views of different agencies on NAPAs; the review of the Brussels Declaration and the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001–2010 under the United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States; and future collaboration with the GEF and its agencies and other adaptation programmes.

2. Main issues raised

38. The LEG welcomed the contribution made by the GEF and its agencies towards implementation of the LEG work programme for 2008–2010, in particular in supporting the regional workshops on the implementation of NAPAs. The LEG also expressed its appreciation of the efforts made by the GEF and its agencies in improving their communication with LDCs in addressing issues that arise during the preparation and implementation of NAPAs.

39. In response to growing concern among LDCs about co-financing for LDCF projects, the representative of the GEF announced that the GEF is preparing an information note to explain the concept and clarify its application. The representative explained that co-financing under the LDCF as defined in decision 3/CP.11 is not identical to co-financing requirements under GEF Trust Fund projects. The representative further indicated that under the LDCF, LDC Parties are expected to report only on the existing investments in the sectors relevant to the project being proposed, and that no new financing is required to match the contribution from the GEF. The agencies present at the meeting commented that after a country team has completed one application under the LDCF, the concept of co-financing and its application becomes easier. The GEF representative was reminded about a request by LDC Parties for the GEF CEO to send a letter to agencies to clarify the correct application of co-financing for LDCF projects.

40. The GEF representative mentioned that there are several products and publications at the final stages of preparation for the GEF LDCF Council, including:

(a) A paper on results-based management for LDCF and Special Climate Change Fund projects;

- (b) A paper clarifying access to the LDCF, which includes a simplified explanation of co-financing and additional costs for adaptation;
- (c) New PIF/PPG templates for LDCF projects;
- (d) A template for programme proposals under the GEF, which could also be used under the LDCF.

41. During the meeting, it was acknowledged that operations to assist LDC Parties to develop projects and to access the LDCF are becoming routine. It was noted, however, that the new PIF/PPG templates that are about to be released by the GEF might lead to delays and confusion, similar to what was experienced during the last change from the PDF to the PIF. The GEF representative assured the LEG that every effort will be made to avoid any delays in projects that are already in the pipeline.

42. It was noted that since an increasing number of LDCs are moving towards implementation on the ground of their first NAPA project, additional support would need to be provided to them in the near future, in particular on issues of project management such as procurement procedures, financial management and tools for national-level monitoring and evaluation.

43. All agencies present reaffirmed the value of interacting with the LEG during its meetings. The representatives of UNDP and UNEP explained how these interactions have been instrumental in identifying and addressing many of the difficulties faced by LDCs during the preparation and implementation of their NAPAs. The representative of UNDP added that the participation of UNDP in the LEG meetings has helped to realign UNDP operations in support of LDCs in the context of NAPAs. The representative of FAO mentioned that the participation of FAO in LEG meetings was very useful for developing thinking on climate change adaptation. All stakeholders supported the view that these interactions should continue if the mandate of the LEG was renewed.

I. Interaction with other organizations

1. Proceedings

44. During 2009 to 2010, the LEG gradually increased its collaboration with UNCCD to look at ways of integrating UNCCD national action programmes (NAPs) with NAPAs. In parallel, collaboration with WHO was initiated in recognition of the synergies that could be explored to facilitate implementation of the Libreville Declaration on Health and Environment in Africa,¹⁷ in which African countries agree to establish a strategic alliance between the health and environment sectors. In addition, WHO conducted an analysis of health considerations in NAPAs and has formally submitted it to the secretariat.

45. During the second day of the meeting, the LEG invited UNCCD and WHO to share with the expert group, the GEF and its agencies their views on the NAPA process and to discuss the above-mentioned areas of collaboration.

2. Main issues raised

46. The UNCCD representative explained that synergies between NAPs and NAPAs could be explored through a pilot approach in which selected LDC countries that have listed activities on sustainable land management in both their NAPs and their NAPAs receive coordinated services that are comprehensive and consistent across sectors. The LEG was invited to support this initiative by providing technical advice.

¹⁷ <<http://www.unep.org/health-env/pdfs/libreville-declaration-eng.pdf>>.

47. The WHO representative gave a presentation highlighting the WHO process to strengthen the health components in NAPAs. The contribution of WHO includes: an analysis of current considerations of health aspects in NAPAs; regular feedback to countries, the secretariat and the GEF and its agencies; proposed strategic and operational frameworks for strengthening the health components of NAPAs; the development and dissemination of health-specific technical guidelines and other tools for national-level planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation; and technical support to countries in building capacity for, and the planning, monitoring and evaluation of, health components of adaptation projects.

48. During the follow-up discussion, the LEG and WHO recognized that the revision and update of NAPAs would provide an opportunity for integrating information and data relating to comprehensive sectoral assessments, in particular in the health sector.

J. Interaction between the Least Developed Countries Expert Group and the Nepalese national adaptation programme of action team

49. In keeping with its practice of interacting with the NAPA team of the country hosting the LEG meeting, the LEG conducted an interactive session with representatives of Nepal's NAPA team. Nepal informed the LEG that it had completed its NAPA and that it was due to be launched nationally very soon. The NAPA had been approved by the cabinet and an official submission to the UNFCCC secretariat would be made before the end of 2010.

50. Nepal's NAPA team presented an overview of the NAPA process, its institutional arrangements and stakeholder consultations, and plans for implementation. The presentation showed how Nepal has built on experiences from other LDCs that have completed NAPAs to conduct comprehensive participatory and multidisciplinary activities and integrate inputs from various sectors, including cross-cutting sectors. Nepal's NAPA preparation process resulted in the identification of the following sectors as most vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change: water and energy; agriculture and food security; forestry and biodiversity; urban settlement and infrastructure; public health; and climate induced disasters. Nepal identified a number of priority projects in this list, the implementation of which will involve six ministries and two cross-cutting sectors.

51. The team highlighted their close collaboration with bilateral donor programmes, non-governmental organizations and others during the preparation phase, in addition to different government ministries. They expressed the hope that implementation would be carried out swiftly, given the active involvement of all stakeholders during the preparation phase. The additional funding that was sought to complement the LDCF contribution made it possible to develop a NAPA that was more comprehensive than would have been achievable with the LDCF funding alone, and one that included some references to medium- and long-term strategies, as well as localized plans for implementation.

III. Progress in implementation of priority activities of the work programme of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group for 2008–2010

52. During the meeting, the LEG reviewed progress made in implementing its work programme for 2008–2010. A summary of progress made and results is contained in annex I. The LEG noted that it had addressed all of the activities in its work programme for this period. It also noted that support to countries in preparing, revising and updating, and

implementing NAPAs is ongoing, and in the event of a renewed mandate, these core activities would need to be continued.

53. In addition, the LEG identified the following needs and challenges that could be addressed under an extended mandate for the group through the provision of guidance, training or technical support, along with activities identified in other documents available for consideration under this agenda item:¹⁸

- (a) Development of programmatic approaches in the implementation strategies of NAPAs;
- (b) Integration of gender-related consideration into NAPA projects;
- (c) Mainstreaming of NAPAs into regular development planning in the context of sustainable development;
- (d) Revision, implementation and monitoring of the LDC work programme;
- (e) Capacity-building for the preparation, update and implementation of NAPAs and the implementation of the other elements of the LDC work programme;
- (f) Promotion of synergy with other multilateral environmental conventions and programmes of relevant organizations in the preparation, update and implementation of NAPAs and the LDC work programme.

¹⁸ FCCC/SBI/2010/12 and FCCC/SBI/2010/15.

Annex I

Priority activities of the work programme of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, 2008–2010

Priority activities of the work programme of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, 2008–2010

<i>Activity^a</i>	<i>Main deliverables and results</i>
Enhance efforts to support least developed countries (LDCs) with special needs in the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs)	Ongoing case files with regular updates on progress made by countries that are still preparing their NAPAs, with all countries in this group being actively assisted to advance in their NAPA preparation
Provide further support for NAPA preparation and implementation through the distribution of a technical paper on NAPA preparation and the development of implementation strategies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The technical paper was prepared and distributed to LDC Parties at the thirtieth session of the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI)^b • Provision in the reports of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) and the publication^c of additional information on implementation through the elaboration of some of the steps in the preparation and implementation of NAPAs • Provision in the LEG report to the SBI on its sixteenth meeting^d and LEG publications^e of information on the updating and revision of NAPAs, a programmatic approach and the design of implementation strategies for the full implementation of NAPAs
Prepare and disseminate a step-by-step guide for implementing NAPA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The <i>Step-by-Step Guide for Implementing National Adaptation Programmes of Action</i>^f was completed and made available in hard copy as well as electronically in English, French and Portuguese • In addition, training materials on NAPA implementation were developed in all three languages
Organize training on the design of NAPA implementation strategies and the preparation of projects based on the information contained in the step-by-step guide	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Five regional training workshops were conducted • A report of these workshops^g highlights the main issues covered by the workshop, the emerging issues identified and issues for follow-up and further consideration
Conduct a survey of LDC Parties, United Nations agencies and other relevant actors to collect information on the status of implementation of NAPAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The survey was completed and results integrated into LEG reports and products, including the step-by-step guide referred to above • Case studies from LDC Parties on experiences in the preparation and implementation of NAPAs, including on accessing funds from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) were also

Activity ^a	Main deliverables and results
Conduct capacity-building and outreach activities as requested by Parties at the 2007 stocktaking meeting of the LEG and through surveys	<p>compiled as a contribution to the assessment of the LDC work programme</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The results of the survey and case studies will be integrated into the forthcoming LEG publication on lessons learned and best practice in the NAPA process
Summarize key aspects of NAPAs with a view to identifying key vulnerabilities, adaptation options by sector and opportunities for regional synergy, and in order to show evidence of alignment with, and integration of NAPA activities into, national development priorities and plans	<p>Ongoing. Continuous response to requests from LDC Parties through training activities, workshops and other forms of support</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing analysis of NAPAs and NAPA projects to identify the degree of mainstreaming Outreach materials made available through the Least Developed Countries portal described below^h
Conduct activities to promote synergy during implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initiation of collaboration with the secretariat of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) for synergetic implementation of NAPAs and national action plans on sustainable land management Ongoing interaction with other organizations and agencies on NAPA implementation
Catalyse action by United Nations organizations and bilateral and multilateral agencies in support of NAPA implementation and implementation of the LEG work programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing collaboration with the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and its agencies, including on training workshops on NAPA implementation Collaboration with UNCCD and the World Health Organization (WHO). An overview of the interaction is included in paragraphs 45–48 of this document
Raise awareness of the NAPA process with a view to advancing adaptation and encouraging effective implementation of NAPAs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The LDC website was expanded and renamed the Least Developed Countries portal. It includes detailed information on NAPA projects, project profiles and information on the implementation of NAPAs Participation in collaborative efforts and initiatives by partner organizations, including the GEF and its agencies, UNCCD and WHO
Develop an approach paper on the collection of information for assessing the effectiveness of the NAPA programme and NAPA projects at the national and global levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information was collected based on the terms of reference endorsed by the SBI at its thirtieth session to support the assessment and review of the LDC work programme and the LDCFⁱ A template for submissions was developed and shared with the LDC Parties and agencies to facilitate the submission of information
Estimate the support needed to fully implement NAPAs, including costs, capacity-building, technology and institutional arrangements	<p>An information paper was published and disseminated electronically^j</p>

<i>Activity^a</i>	<i>Main deliverables and results</i>
Respond to requests by LDC Parties	Ongoing. The LEG continues to respond to requests for information and technical support from LDC Parties, including through the review of draft NAPAs, and other needs
Contribute to the 10-year review of the Brussels Declaration and the Programme of Action for the Least Developed Countries for the Decade 2001–2010 under the United Nations Office of the High Representative for the Least Developed Countries, Landlocked Developing Countries and Small Island Developing States	Ongoing. The LEG is preparing a written contribution to a preparatory meeting for the review of the implementation of the LDC work programme under the Convention
Provide input to the work of the GEF on facilitating the implementation of the remaining elements of the LDC work programme	The LEG, in its report to the SBI on its seventeenth meeting, ^k proposed options for ways in which the GEF could implement the remaining elements of the LDC work programme

^a Summarized from document FCCC/SBI/2008/6, annex I.

^b <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/ldc_tp2009.pdf>.

^c <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/ldc_tp2009.pdf>.

^d FCCC/SBI/2009/13.

^e <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/ldc_tp2009.pdf> and <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/ldc_tp2009.pdf>.

^f <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/ldc_napa2009.pdf>.

^g FCCC/SBI/2010/15.

^h <<http://unfccc.int/ldc>>.

ⁱ FCCC/SBI/2009/13, annex III.

^j <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/09_ldc_sn_napa.pdf>.

^k FCCC/SBI/2010/5.

Annex II

Members of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group as at 15 October 2010

Mr. Mirza Shawkat Ali	Bangladesh
Mr. Ibila Djibril	Benin
Mr. Pa Ousman Jarju	Gambia
Mr. Benjamin Karmorh	Liberia
Mr. Erwin Künzi	Austria
Ms. Beth Lavender	Canada
Mr. Fred Machulu Onduri	Uganda
Mr. Adérito Manuel Fernandes Santana	Sao Tome and Principe
Mr. Ali Shareef	Maldives
Mr. Batu Krishna Uprety	Nepal
Mr. Jan Verhagen	Netherlands
Mr. Douglas Yee	Solomon Islands
