

Technical support and guidance to Parties on impact, vulnerability and risk assessments

Information note

Recommended action by the Adaptation Committee

The AC may wish to consider the information contained in this note, including the overview of approaches and lessons on the application of impact, vulnerability and risk assessments across different regions and adaptation contexts, and identify potential additional areas of work for the AC.

I. Background

1. At its 26th meeting (AC26), the Adaptation Committee (AC) initiated consideration of potential activities on impact, vulnerability and risk (IVR) assessment under workstream 1 of its flexible workplan for 2025–2027.¹ At AC27, the AC agreed to continue its consideration of this matter at a subsequent meeting.²
2. At its 28th meeting (AC28), the AC requested the secretariat to prepare an overview note on the application of IVR assessments in different countries, reflecting case studies from different regions and adaptation contexts, with a view to identifying potential additional areas of work by the AC.³
3. At its 29th meeting (AC29), the AC considered the overview note and discussed the diversity of approaches and methodologies used for IVR assessments, their application in adaptation planning, decision-making and implementation, and related challenges, including those associated with data availability, accessibility and quality and the use of forward-looking climate information.⁴
4. The AC also highlighted the value of expanding the evidence base through additional country experiences and practical examples from different regions and adaptation contexts, complemented by a broader global and regional perspective to identify common approaches, lessons, gaps and emerging practices. It further highlighted the importance of drawing on a broad range of sources, including Party-reported information, national analyses, practitioner knowledge and relevant organizations.
5. Accordingly, the AC requested the secretariat to advance the collection of case studies from different regions, taking into account inputs from AC members and information from different sources, including the State of Adaptation Action by Parties portal and relevant external experts and entities, for consideration at AC30, with a view to progressing towards a global overview of approaches and lessons.

¹ Adaptation Committee, flexible workplan for 2025–2027, workstream 1; see also report/outcomes of AC26.

² See outcomes of the 27th meeting of the Adaptation Committee.

³ See outcomes of the 28th meeting of the Adaptation Committee, agenda item on impact, vulnerability and risk assessment.

⁴ Adaptation Committee, AC29/INFO/5, and outcomes of the 29th meeting of the Adaptation Committee, agenda item on impact, vulnerability and risk assessment.

6. In response to this request, and to complement the evidence available from Party-reported information and other sources, the secretariat issued a targeted call for inputs to relevant organizations and experts ahead of AC30. The call sought practical experiences and examples concerning: (a) the application of IVR assessments in different national, subnational, sectoral and local contexts; (b) how assessment findings have informed adaptation planning, prioritization, decision-making and implementation; (c) enabling factors and challenges affecting the use of IVR assessments, including those related to data, methods, institutional arrangements and capacities; and (d) relevant lessons, tools and methodological approaches. The inputs received are listed in annex I.

7. This paper responds to the request of the AC. It brings together available evidence on the application of IVR assessments across different regions and adaptation contexts, including six illustrative country cases⁵ from Rwanda, South Africa, Chile, Bangladesh, Nepal and Fiji. Inputs received through the targeted call provided an additional source of practitioner and organizational experience and are listed in annex I. The analysis considers how IVR assessments are undertaken and used to inform adaptation planning, prioritization, decision-making and implementation, and identifies cross-cutting lessons and gaps for consideration by the AC in identifying potential additional areas of work.

8. The analysis draws primarily on available Party-reported information and relevant national planning documents, including, as applicable, biennial transparency reports, national adaptation plans, adaptation communications and national communications, complemented by information available through the State of Adaptation Action by Parties portal.⁶ These sources are supplemented by a commissioned review of academic and grey literature and a mapping of existing IVR methodologies.⁷ Inputs received through the targeted call for inputs undertaken ahead of AC30 provided an additional source of practitioner and organizational experience. The submissions received are listed in annex I and are made available separately in full.

II. Purpose of the note

9. The present note is intended to:

(a) Provide a global overview of approaches to the application of IVR assessments across different regions and adaptation contexts, drawing on available case studies and other relevant sources of information;

(b) Identify common approaches and emerging practices, as well as methodological, data and other challenges and gaps encountered in undertaking and applying IVR assessments;

(c) Highlight how IVR assessments are used across the adaptation policy cycle, including to inform adaptation planning, prioritization, decision-making, implementation and monitoring, evaluation and learning;

(d) Draw out cross-cutting lessons from the experiences reviewed, while recognizing different national circumstances, capacities and contexts; and

(e) Support the AC in considering the findings and identifying potential additional areas of work, as appropriate.

⁵ The six country cases are illustrative and are not intended to constitute a statistically representative sample of regional or global IVR practice. They were selected to illustrate different regional, sectoral, governance and adaptation contexts on the basis of available evidence.

⁶ See: https://unfccc.int/adaptation_country_portal

⁷ The availability, scope and level of detail of adaptation information vary across reporting instruments and Parties. Absence of information in the sources reviewed should therefore not be interpreted as absence of relevant national approaches or practices.

III. Conceptual framing: from hazard analysis to decision-relevant risk

10. For the purposes of this paper, IVR assessment refers broadly to the structured examination of actual or potential climate-related impacts, vulnerability and risk in order to inform adaptation-related decisions. Consistent with the IPCC AR6 framing, climate risk arises from interactions among climate-related hazards, exposure and vulnerability, while impacts refer to consequences of realized risks for human and natural systems.⁸

11. The evolution from earlier vulnerability-centred framings towards risk-based approaches has contributed to greater conceptual coherence, while variation in practice remains. Assessments may emphasize hazards, impacts, vulnerability, exposure, adaptive capacity, systemic risk or combinations of these. The key requirement is therefore transparency: an assessment should state what it is assessing, for whom, over what time horizon, at what scale and for what decision.⁹

Table 1. Key concepts used in impact, vulnerability and risk assessment

<i>Concept</i>	<i>Definitions</i>	<i>Assessment implication</i>
Hazard	Potential occurrence of a physical event or trend that may cause adverse effects.	Requires appropriate climate observations, projections and treatment of uncertainty.
Exposure	Presence of people, livelihoods, ecosystems, infrastructure and assets in places that could be adversely affected.	Requires spatially explicit information and attention to changing development patterns.
Vulnerability	Propensity or predisposition to be adversely affected, including sensitivity and limited capacity to cope or adapt.	Requires social, institutional and distributional information, not only physical exposure.
Risk	Potential for adverse consequences arising from interactions among hazard, exposure and vulnerability.	Assessment should consider interactions, uncertainty and, where relevant, compound/cascading effects.
Impact	Consequences of realized risks on human and natural systems.	Observed impacts can inform baselines and validation but do not substitute for forward-looking risk analysis.

IV. What IVR assessments are used for

12. Across the illustrative country cases reviewed, IVR assessments serve different functions depending on national circumstances, assessment purpose, scale and institutional context. The cases illustrate applications ranging from national and sectoral planning and prioritization to territorial planning, disaster risk management and subnational decision-making.

⁸ IPCC, 2022, Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability, Working Group II contribution to the Sixth Assessment Report, chap. 1.

⁹ Conceptual framings of IVR assessment should be distinguished from the methodological approaches used to operationalize them. A risk- or vulnerability-based assessment may draw on one or more methodological approaches, including indicator-based, spatial, modelling, participatory or mixed methods. The principal methodological families identified in the evidence reviewed are summarized in section V.

13. The table below summarizes principal decision functions identified in the broader evidence reviewed.

Table 2. Principal decision functions of impact, vulnerability and risk assessments

<i>Decision function</i>	<i>How IVR assessment contributes</i>	<i>Typical outputs</i>
Diagnosis and screening	Identifies hotspots, vulnerable groups, exposed assets and priority risks.	Risk profile; maps; hotspot screening; vulnerability profile.
Planning and prioritization	Supports selection and sequencing of adaptation priorities across sectors and places.	Priority risks; adaptation pathways; territorial or sector priorities.
Programme/project design	Provides evidence for targeting interventions and defining design standards or safeguards.	Design parameters; beneficiary targeting; risk-informed theory of change.
Investment and finance	Helps identify assets and systems at risk and supports appraisal of adaptation investments.	Investment priorities; climate-risk screening; economic or multi-criteria appraisal inputs.
Implementation and governance	Clarifies institutional responsibilities, dependencies and coordination needs.	Governance map; implementation roles; cross-sector coordination actions.
MEL and updating	Provides baselines and repeated risk information to assess whether conditions are changing.	Updated risk profiles; triggers; learning questions; adaptive management signals.

14. For analytical purposes, IVR assessment can be considered as part of a broader process linking climate information and context with assessment, prioritization, decision-making, implementation, monitoring, evaluation and learning, and reassessment. Effective linkages across these stages can support the use of assessment findings in adaptation decisions and enable reassessment as risks and circumstances evolve.

V. Approaches and methodological families

15. The reviewed evidence does not support a single universally superior IVR methodology. Methods differ because assessment purposes differ. A fit-for-purpose approach starts from the decision question and then selects the scale, methods, indicators, participation and data architecture needed to answer it.¹⁰

16. In practice, these methodological families are not mutually exclusive and are frequently combined within a single assessment. The illustrative country cases reviewed in this paper reflect this diversity: Rwanda combines indicator-based vulnerability assessment with climate and socioeconomic information; South Africa combines climate projections, spatial risk information and sectoral and subnational vulnerability assessment; Chile combines indicator-based and geospatial approaches with climate projections and sectoral and territorial assessment; Bangladesh combines hazard, exposure and vulnerability analysis across multiple climate-related hazards; Nepal combines sectoral and spatial vulnerability and risk analysis using climate and hazard information at different resolutions; and Fiji applies multi-hazard and sectoral vulnerability and risk assessment across national and community contexts. These examples illustrate that the selection and combination of methods

¹⁰ Secretariat synthesis based on the technical review and mapping of existing IVR methodologies.

are shaped by assessment purpose, scale, national circumstances, available information and the decisions that the assessment is intended to inform.¹¹

Table 3. Principal methodological families used in impact, vulnerability and risk assessments

<i>Methodological family</i>	<i>Core logic</i>	<i>Strengths</i>	<i>Key cautions</i>
Indicator/index-based	Combines selected indicators of hazard, exposure, sensitivity and/or vulnerability.	Useful for screening, comparison and visualization; can be repeated.	Sensitive to indicator selection, normalization, weighting and aggregation; may hide local dynamics.
Spatial/GIS and remote sensing	Overlays spatial data to identify exposed assets, hazards and vulnerability patterns.	Strong for territorial targeting and visualization; can integrate high-resolution data.	Data resolution and interoperability can constrain results; social vulnerability may be underrepresented.
Sector-specific impact and risk analysis	Applies climate, exposure, vulnerability and/or impact analysis to specific systems or sectors, such as water, agriculture, health or infrastructure.	Generates decision-relevant evidence for sector planning, investment and standards and can incorporate sector-specific models and indicators.	May underrepresent cross-sector interdependencies, cascading impacts and systemic risks if undertaken in isolation.
Scenario/model-based	Uses climate and socioeconomic scenarios to explore future risks.	Supports forward-looking planning and stress-testing.	Uncertainty and model assumptions must be communicated; downscaling may be limited.
Participatory/community-based	Uses local knowledge, perception, participatory mapping and co-production.	Captures lived experience, local drivers and differentiated vulnerability; supports ownership.	Resource intensive; representation and facilitation quality matter; comparability is limited.
Multi-hazard/systemic risk	Examines interacting hazards, systems and cascading consequences.	Better reflects interconnected infrastructure, ecosystems and socioeconomic systems.	Methodologically demanding; data and institutional coordination needs are high.
Mixed-methods	Combines quantitative, spatial, qualitative and participatory evidence.	Balances comparability with contextual interpretation and triangulation.	Requires explicit integration logic and careful management of different evidence types.

¹¹ For the underlying country examples and sources, see section VIII and footnotes 14–19. The cases are illustrative and are not intended to constitute a statistically representative sample of regional or global IVR practice.

VI. Data, scenarios and forward-looking analysis

17. Data gaps were a recurrent finding in the underlying technical review. They include insufficient granularity, weak disaggregation by relevant socioeconomic characteristics, inconsistent spatial and temporal resolution, limited time series, fragmented institutional ownership, restricted sharing and lack of interoperable repositories.

18. The Nepal example in the underlying review illustrates the importance of scale and spatial resolution: some vulnerability information was available at district level while particular hazard information, such as landslide susceptibility, was available at finer resolution. Differences in spatial resolution are an important consideration when applying assessment information to municipal or community-level decision-making.¹²

19. Forward-looking assessment requires more than adding a climate projection. Scenario choices should correspond to the planning horizon and decision at stake and should be interpreted together with changing exposure and vulnerability.¹³ Socioeconomic development, urbanization, demographic change, ecosystem degradation and institutional change can materially influence future risk alongside changes in climate-related hazards.

VII. Governance, participation and knowledge

20. The evidence reviewed indicates that institutional ownership is an important factor influencing whether and how assessment findings are used. Linking the assessment process with institutions responsible for planning, budgeting, regulation or implementation can support the uptake of assessment findings in policy and decision-making.

21. Fragmentation between climate adaptation, disaster risk reduction, sector ministries and subnational authorities can impede comprehensive risk analysis. Data-sharing constraints and institutional silos can be as consequential as technical data shortages. Cross-agency governance is therefore part of the assessment architecture, not merely an implementation issue after the analysis is complete.

22. Participation also affects analytical validity. Community-based and participatory methods can identify local risk drivers, non-economic impacts, informal institutions, lived experience and priorities that standardized datasets miss. The underlying review also identifies scope for strengthening the integration, where relevant, of gender considerations and diverse knowledge systems, including the knowledge of Indigenous Peoples and local knowledge.

VIII. Application across regions and adaptation contexts

Table 4. Illustrative applications of impact, vulnerability and risk assessments across different adaptation contexts

<i>Cases</i>	<i>Context</i>	<i>Assessment features</i>	<i>Application / analytical value</i>	<i>Cross-cutting lesson</i>
Rwanda	National and sectoral planning; climate-sensitive development ¹⁴	Multi-sector risk and vulnerability evidence linked to national and sector planning; combination of	Illustrates the value of embedding risk evidence in planning institutions and	Institutional ownership and links to planning increase the likelihood that assessment

¹² Ministry of Forests and Environment, Government of Nepal, Vulnerability and Risk Assessment and Identifying Adaptation Options: Summary for Policy Makers (2021); Government of Nepal, National Adaptation Plan 2021–2050 (2021).

¹³ IPCC AR6 WGII.

¹⁴ Government of Rwanda. 2021. Rwanda's Adaptation Communication to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. October 2021, pp. 8–9 and annex 1. The communication reports that the 2019 Climate Change Vulnerability Assessment and Index identified 37 national and subnational indicators grouped under exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity.

		climate information, socioeconomic vulnerability and sector evidence.	using it to identify priority sectors and locations rather than treating assessment as a stand-alone technical product.	results shape priorities.
South Africa	National, provincial/municipal and sectoral adaptation ¹⁵	Strong use of climate projections, spatial risk information and sector/municipal vulnerability work within a mature climate-policy architecture.	Shows how national climate information and subnational assessment can coexist, but also the challenge of maintaining consistency across scales, sectors and municipalities with varying capacities.	Nested assessment architectures need common concepts and data access while preserving local relevance.
Chile	National and subnational/urban risk assessment ¹⁶	Spatial and indicator-based approaches, climate projections and sectoral/territorial assessments; increasing emphasis on localized climate risk information.	Demonstrates the usefulness of geospatial assessment for territorial planning and targeting, while highlighting sensitivity to indicator weighting, data resolution and local interpretation.	Spatial sophistication should be matched by transparent indicator choices and institutional mechanisms for use.
Bangladesh	Highly exposed national and local adaptation contexts ¹⁷	Hazard, exposure and vulnerability assessment for floods, cyclones, salinity, heat and other risks; strong relevance to disaster risk management and adaptation planning.	Illustrates the importance of combining hazard information with social vulnerability and local knowledge in densely populated and climate-exposed settings.	The case illustrates the value of connecting climate adaptation and disaster risk reduction institutions and of considering social vulnerability alongside hazard exposure.
Nepal	Mountain, watershed and	National vulnerability and risk assessment with sectoral	Illustrates the relevance of considering spatial	The case illustrates the importance of aligning the

¹⁵ Government of South Africa, National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy (2020), particularly sects. 5–7, including sect. 6 on the Climate Risk and Vulnerability Assessment Framework.

¹⁶ Ministry of the Environment, Government of Chile, Atlas de Riesgos Climáticos – ARClím: Marco Metodológico (2020); see also the ARClím platform and Chile's National Adaptation Plan.

¹⁷ Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Government of Bangladesh, National Adaptation Plan of Bangladesh (2023–2050) (2022).

	municipal risk contexts ¹⁸	and spatial analysis; use of climate and hazard information at different resolutions.	resolution when using vulnerability and hazard information for adaptation decision-making at different scales.	spatial resolution of assessment information with the scale at which adaptation decisions are made.
Fiji	Small-island national and community contexts ¹⁹	Multi-hazard and sectoral vulnerability/risk assessment with strong relevance to coastal systems, infrastructure, settlements and community resilience.	Shows the importance of interconnected risks, limited land and infrastructure systems, and the need to integrate local/community knowledge with national planning.	The Fiji case highlights the salience, in a small-island context, of systemic and cascading risks, data constraints and linkages between national planning and community-level realities.

IX. Cross-cutting observations from the illustrative cases

23. The illustrative country cases, complemented by the broader evidence reviewed, highlight recurring considerations in the design and application of IVR assessments. While the evidence reflects different purposes, scales and adaptation contexts and is not intended to be representative of all Parties or regions, several common considerations emerge regarding the practical application of IVR assessment.

Table 5. Cross-cutting observations from the illustrative country cases

<i>Cross-cutting observation</i>	<i>Illustration from the cases</i>	<i>Analytical implication</i>
Assessment approaches reflect their purpose and context	Rwanda applies vulnerability assessment in national and sectoral planning; South Africa combines national, sectoral and subnational approaches; Chile uses spatial and indicator-based approaches for sectoral and territorial assessment; and Bangladesh, Nepal and Fiji apply approaches shaped by their respective hazard, geographic and development contexts.	The cases do not indicate a single preferred assessment approach. Assessment design varies with the decision context, scale, hazards, sectors and available information.
The scale and resolution of information affect its application	Nepal illustrates the use of vulnerability and hazard information available at different spatial resolutions. South Africa combines assessment across national, sectoral and municipal levels, while Chile applies increasingly localized spatial risk information.	Alignment between the scale of assessment information and the scale of decision-making is an important consideration in the practical application of IVR results.

¹⁸ See footnote 12.

¹⁹ Government of Fiji, Republic of Fiji National Adaptation Plan: A pathway towards climate resilience (2018).

Institutional linkages support the use of assessment evidence	Rwanda links multi-sector vulnerability evidence with national and sectoral planning. South Africa integrates climate-risk and vulnerability assessment across national, sectoral and subnational adaptation arrangements.	The cases illustrate the importance of connecting assessment processes with the institutions and planning processes expected to use their findings.
Risk assessment extends beyond climate hazards alone	Bangladesh combines information on multiple hazards with social vulnerability and local knowledge. Fiji considers multi-hazard and sectoral risks across coastal systems, infrastructure, settlements and community contexts. Rwanda's assessment also considers exposure, sensitivity and adaptive capacity.	The cases illustrate the value of considering vulnerability and contextual conditions alongside climate hazards and exposure, and of considering interactions across systems where relevant.

24. Inputs received through the targeted call provided an additional source of practitioner and organizational experience on the application of IVR assessments. The inputs are listed in annex I and the full submissions are made available separately.

X. Potential areas for future work by the Adaptation Committee

25. At AC29, the AC highlighted the diversity of approaches to IVR assessment and challenges related, inter alia, to data availability, accessibility and quality and the use of forward-looking climate information. It also called for additional country experiences and a broader perspective to identify common approaches, lessons, gaps and emerging practices. The illustrative cases and broader evidence reviewed in this paper provide a basis for the AC to consider whether additional work would add value, taking into account existing guidance and avoiding duplication.

Table 6. Potential areas for future work by the Adaptation Committee on impact, vulnerability and risk assessment

Option	Possible focus	Potential added value	Considerations
A. No dedicated additional work at this stage	Take note of the findings and continue considering IVR-related issues through relevant AC work, as appropriate.	Allows the AC to draw on the findings without initiating a separate activity or product.	The AC could revisit the matter as further Party and practitioner experience becomes available.
B. Practical principles for fit-for-purpose IVR assessment	Develop a concise set of considerations and decision questions on assessment purpose, scale, methods, evidence and participation.	Could support Parties and practitioners in selecting and applying approaches appropriate to their circumstances without prescribing a single methodology.	Should build on and direct users to existing methodologies, tools and guidance.
C. Navigator of existing IVR approaches and guidance	Organize existing methodologies, tools and guidance by purpose, scale, sector, data requirements and methodological approach.	Could facilitate access to and navigation of the range of existing IVR resources.	Would require a clearly defined scope and should facilitate access rather than endorse particular approaches.
D. Compendium of IVR application in	Compile documented Party and practitioner experiences of how	Could strengthen the evidence base and facilitate exchange of	Would benefit from a broader set of

adaptation decision-making	IVR findings have informed adaptation planning, prioritization, decision-making and implementation, including relevant institutional arrangements.	practical experience on the application of IVR assessments across different contexts.	documented Party and practitioner experiences across regions and adaptation contexts.
E. Focused technical product on selected IVR issues	Develop a focused product on an issue identified by the AC, such as data and assessment scale, forward-looking climate information and uncertainty, or interconnected risks.	Could address a specific issue emerging from AC29 discussions and the evidence reviewed in this paper.	Any product should have a clearly defined need, audience and scope and complement existing technical work and guidance.
F. Targeted exchange of experiences	Convene Parties, practitioners, relevant constituted bodies and organizations to exchange experiences on selected IVR approaches, challenges and applications.	Could support peer learning, broaden the evidence base and inform the AC's consideration of whether further work would add value.	Should have a clearly defined purpose and expected output and build, where appropriate, on existing forums and partnerships.

26. The AC may wish to consider whether additional work on IVR assessment is warranted and, if so, which of the above options could provide added value, taking into account the needs of Parties and other intended users, the available evidence, existing work and guidance, opportunities for collaboration and potential resource implications.

XI. Issues for consideration by the Adaptation Committee

27. The AC may wish to consider:

- (a) Whether additional work on IVR assessment is warranted at this stage and, if so, which area or option identified in this paper should be prioritized;
- (b) The intended users and purpose of any further work, including the specific planning, decision-making or implementation needs it should support;
- (c) Whether further Party and practitioner experience should be gathered before developing a dedicated AC product, and which sources or contexts should be prioritized;
- (d) How any further work could build on existing methodologies, tools, data and guidance, including relevant information available through the SoA portal, while avoiding duplication;
- (e) Opportunities for collaboration with relevant constituted bodies, NWP partners and other relevant organizations and experts; and
- (f) Any guidance to the secretariat on next steps, including the scope, timing and potential resource implications of any agreed work.

Documentation information

Version	Date	Description
1.0	14 September 2026	AC 30 This note including possible next steps is for consideration by the AC.

Keywords: Impact, Vulnerability, Risk assessment, Adaptation, Resilience

Annex I

Inputs received through the targeted call on the application of impact, vulnerability and risk assessments

1. In preparation for AC30, and in response to the request of the Adaptation Committee to advance the collection of experiences from different regions and adaptation contexts, the secretariat issued a targeted call for inputs to relevant organizations and experts on 27 August 2026. The call invited concise inputs based on existing work addressing one or more of the following:
 - (a) a practical example or case of the application of an impact, vulnerability and risk assessment and the country, region or adaptation context concerned;
 - (b) what the assessment was intended to inform and how its findings were used in adaptation planning, prioritization, implementation, investment or other decision-making;
 - (c) principal enabling factors and challenges encountered in moving from assessment to practical application; and
 - (d) transferable lessons and relevant existing methodologies, tools or guidance that the AC may wish to consider.
2. Five inputs were received by the secretariat. The table below lists the submitting entities and the materials received. The submissions are made available as received from the submitting entities and reflect the views and experiences of their respective authors. Their inclusion does not imply endorsement by the Adaptation Committee or the secretariat of the information, views, methodologies or tools contained therein.

Inputs received

<i>Submitting entity</i>	<i>Material received</i>	<i>Date received</i>
International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD)	Input on impact, vulnerability and risk assessments for AC30	4 September 2026
NAP Global Network	Input on impact, vulnerability and risk assessments for AC30	4 September 2026
United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR)	Input on impact, vulnerability and risk assessments	4 September 2026
United Nations University (UNU)	Submission on the application of impact, vulnerability and risk assessments	4 September 2026
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	Briefing note on developing climate risk assessments	4 September 2026

3. The inputs received constitute a supplementary source of information alongside Party-reported information, national planning documents, information available through the State of Adaptation Action by Parties portal and the broader technical literature reviewed. The submissions should not be considered representative of all Parties, regions or adaptation contexts.
4. The full submissions received are available on the AC30 webpage: <https://unfccc.int/event/AC-30>