

Adaptation Committee: Expert meeting on national adaptation goals/indicators

Session 3

Creating synergy among adaptation, SDGs and Sendai Framework and improving the assessment of progress at national level

Reporting back on break-out groups on integrating adaptation, SDGs and the Sendai Framework indicators

Tokyo, Japan, 25 July 2018



General reflections on integration

- While there is significant overlap between each agenda, there are differences in terms of goals, policy instruments, timing etc. so it would not be feasible to have complete harmonisation
- However, good adaptation should (ultimately) show up in the results framework for all SDGs, and not just 13, and the Sendai Framework

Challenges for integration

- Difficulties in coordination for indicators and monitoring reflecting institutional silos and different responsibilities, accountabilities and budgets
- Development co-operation providers should ensure that their co-operation activities do not end up inadvertently creating silos
- Mainstreaming may constrain receipt of funding for activities

Opportunities for integration

- Taking a sectoral approach, i.e. in the agriculture, health or transportation sector
- Sustained political leadership, especially during the planning stage and not in the monitoring/reporting stage



Contribution of work under SDGs and Sendai Framework to developing adaptation indicators and assessment of progress

- Development of **adaptation policies and activities** has been a **bottom-up process**, reflecting the importance of the local context in the nature of the challenge and appropriate responses reflected in the qualitative rather than quantitative global goal on adaptation.
- Overall **SDG and Sendai indicator frameworks** have been set on a more **top-down basis**.
- Important that attempts to achieve greater integration respect context-specific nature of adaptation

That said, there are **some quick wins**:

- Countries should **map out the indicators for monitoring these frameworks** allowing the identification of potential overlaps and saving effort in creating new indicators but also the identification of mismatches
- Some of the underlying methodological challenges are similar (e.g. producing an operationisable definition of resilience), so there would be **benefits in creating stronger links between practitioners and experts in those communities**.
- May be useful to have a **designated flexible template for adaptation M&E with indicators**
- The Sendai direct monitoring website was cited as a good practice in presenting information – something similar could be developed for adaptation and the SDGs



Extent to which assessment and reporting systems on adaptation be integrated across the three agendas

- **Cons**

- Main challenge remains lack of coordination, including due to a lack of political mandates and as different ministries/agencies have different party affiliations
- The need to demonstrate climate rationale (additionality) when accessing adaptation funding, difficult for integrated projects

- **Pros**

- Reduce reporting burden and avoid duplication of indicators
- Ensure joint political oversight and planning to enhance cost-effectiveness of measures



Thank you

Arigatou Gozaimashita

