



UNITED
NATIONS



**Framework Convention
on Climate Change**

Distr.
GENERAL

FCCC/SBI/2007/32
18 October 2007

Original: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY FOR IMPLEMENTATION

Twenty-seventh session

Bali, 3–11 December 2007

Item 7 (b) of the provisional agenda

Implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention

Matters relating to the least developed countries

**Report on the Least Developed Countries Expert Group stocktaking meeting
on the progress made by Parties in the preparation and implementation of
national adaptation programmes of action**

Note by the secretariat*

Summary

This document provides a summary of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) meeting to take stock of the progress made by Parties in the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs), which was held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 3 to 5 September 2007, as mandated by the Subsidiary Body for Implementation at its twenty-fifth session. Discussions focused on best practices, constraints and barriers related to NAPA preparation and implementation, support from the Global Environment Facility and its agencies, other United Nations agencies and institutions and integration of NAPAs into national planning. This document also includes a list of possible actions for the LEG and other stakeholders in areas of NAPA development and implementation where participants identified a need for support.

* This document was submitted after the due date as a result of the timing of the stocktaking meeting.

CONTENTS

	<i>Paragraphs</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. INTRODUCTION	1–5	3
A. Mandate	1–2	3
B. Background.....	3–5	3
II. PROCEEDINGS	6–11	4
III. SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSIONS	12–52	4
A. Financial and technical support.....	12–22	4
B. Status of preparation of national adaptation programmes of action	23–26	6
C. Status of implementation of national adaptation programmes of action	27–29	7
D. Exchange of experiences in the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action	30–40	8
E. Needs identified for the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action	41–52	10
IV. SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	53–54	12

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. At its twenty-fifth session,¹ the Subsidiary Body for Implementation (SBI) requested the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) to convene a meeting, with the assistance of the secretariat, to take stock of the progress made by Parties in the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs).

2. At its twenty-sixth session,² the SBI invited the LEG to consider, in accordance with decision 3/CP.11 and as part of its stocktaking meeting, views on the experiences gained from the implementation of NAPAs, including those in accessing funds from the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), and report back to the SBI at its twenty-ninth session.

B. Background

3. Article 4, paragraph 9, of the Convention recognizes the specific needs and special situations of the least developed countries (LDCs) in their actions with regard to funding and transfer of technology. In acknowledgment of this, the Conference of the Parties, at its seventh session,³ adopted a package of decisions (decisions 5/CP.7, 7/CP.7, 27/CP.7, 28/CP.7 and 29/CP.7) to support LDCs in their adaptation to climate change. This included establishing the LDC work programme which was to provide, inter alia, support for the development of NAPAs by LDCs. NAPAs provide a process for the LDCs to identify priority activities that respond to their urgent and immediate needs with regard to climate change adaptation. It was hoped that this special approach to addressing the needs of the LDCs would ultimately lead to enhancing their capacity to adapt to current climate variability, which in turn would help to address the adverse effects of climate change.

4. Since its establishment in 2001, the LEG has provided support to Parties in the preparation of NAPAs, such as providing guidance and technical support to LDC Parties; cooperating with other expert groups under the Convention; cooperating with relevant international agencies and regional organizations; promoting increased awareness of climate change; and identifying constraints to NAPA preparation and implementation. Further information on LEG activities, as well as on the status of NAPA preparation and implementation, may be found in a background paper prepared by the LEG,⁴ which had the following objectives:

- (a) To present the achievements of the LEG to date in the NAPA preparation and implementation process;
- (b) To address the needs, concerns and priorities of the LDCs arising from the NAPA process;
- (c) To identify what further support is needed for addressing needs in the future.

5. In preparation for the stocktaking meeting, the LEG examined the NAPAs that had been submitted to the secretariat as at September 2007. The findings of the examination were included in a presentation by the LEG, which gave an overview of submitted NAPAs, strengths, constraints and technical needs in NAPA preparation and implementation, and recommendations thereon.

¹ FCCC/SBI/2006/28, paragraph 84.

² FCCC/SBI/2007/15, paragraph 46.

³ FCCC/CP/2001/13/Add.1.

⁴ <<http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/application/pdf/stocktaking-paper.pdf>>.

II. Proceedings

6. The stocktaking meeting was held in Bangkok, Thailand, from 3 to 5 September 2007. Financial support for the organization of the meeting was provided by the Governments of Belgium, Canada, Ireland, New Zealand and Norway. The Government of Thailand provided logistical support for this meeting.

7. At the opening of the meeting, one minute of silence was observed for Ms. Elizabeth Harvey, the LEG member from Canada, who passed away on 17 August 2007.

8. The workshop was chaired by Mr. Bubu Jallow, Chair of the LEG, who was supported by other LEG members in conducting sessions, making presentations and serving as rapporteurs. The meeting was attended by 86 representatives of 40 LDCs⁵ and eight representatives of the secretariat of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), specialized United Nations agencies and related organizations. Also present were LEG members and resource persons in the fields of vulnerability and adaptation assessment, disaster management and risk assessment.⁶

9. It should be noted that up to two representatives from each LDC Party – one involved in NAPA preparation and the other preferably from the planning, finance or a related ministry – were invited to participate at the meeting. Simultaneous interpretation (English and French) was provided during all sessions.

10. The objectives of the meeting were:

- (a) To undertake a comprehensive assessment of the status of NAPA preparation;
- (b) To facilitate the sharing of experiences in NAPA preparation and implementation;
- (c) To identify best practices in NAPA preparation;
- (d) To guide NAPA project implementation;
- (e) To consider how best to integrate NAPA activities into national development planning.

11. The meeting included a series of discussions on the main issues relating to the preparation and implementation of NAPAs, drawing on the work of the LEG and inputs provided by the secretariat of the GEF and its agencies as well as experiences and insights from LDC Parties. Questionnaires were distributed in French and English, inviting participants to provide: examples of their needs during NAPA preparation and implementation; suggested solutions to address these needs; and best practices that could be replicated in other countries or regions. Forty-two questionnaires were completed and used as input for the LEG at its twelfth meeting.

III. Summary of the discussions

A. Financial and technical support

12. In 2001, the LDCF and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) were established under decisions 5/CP.7 and 7/CP.7. The LDCF in particular is designed to support projects addressing the urgent and immediate adaptation needs of LDCs as identified by their NAPAs. Financing modalities and

⁵ A list of LDCs is available at <<http://www.un.org/special-rep/ohrlls/ldc/list.htm>>. The following 12 LDCs are also small island developing States: Cape Verde, Comoros, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Maldives, Samoa, Sao Tome and Principe, Solomon Islands, Timor-Leste, Tuvalu and Vanuatu.

⁶ The complete list of participants is available at <http://unfccc.int/cooperation_and_support/ldc/items/4055.php>.

rules of procedure for the LDCF have evolved over time, to respond to UNFCCC guidance and to ensure effectiveness at the operational level.

13. According to the presentation given by the representative of the GEF secretariat at the meeting, as at 30 April 2007, 17 donors have pledged contributions to the LDCF. The total amount pledged to date is over USD 150 million, of which USD 12 million has been allocated for NAPA preparation.⁷

14. The GEF representative clarified that there is no limit to the amount of funding that LDCs may receive for adaptation projects, and that under equitable funding, an average of USD 3–4 million may be available for each country. Countries may submit proposals for more than one project in cases where multiple projects will better address the climate risks and implementation capacity in the country than a single project.

15. The issue of clustering NAPA activities or projects that have similar objectives or inputs as components of a comprehensive project package was highlighted as a useful approach for exploiting synergy and optimizing efficiency in implementation. For example, NAPA teams may take this approach for a set of coastal zone management activities.

16. Participants were informed of a new submission process to the LDCF effective in 2007. This process requires the submission of a project identification form (PIF) and, in the case of full-sized projects, a request for a project preparation grant (PPG) that includes a description and budget of proposed activities required to develop the full-sized project (FSP). Although it is possible to proceed directly from PIF approval to submission of an FSP, the GEF and its agencies have found that in most cases countries do not have sufficient information to design an effective project at the time of PIF preparation. Therefore, a PPG is needed, which will secure funding for activities to gather information for a full proposal.

17. Several participants, familiar with the new submission process mentioned in paragraph 16 above, requested more guidance. On the modalities for funding under the LDCF, several participants raised the issue of calculation of baseline and additional costs for proposals. In some of the responses to the questionnaire, Parties remarked that there is still no clear guidance on how to define adaptation components as opposed to baseline development objectives for project profiles.

18. It was also highlighted by several agencies that linking adaptation with development efforts will increase the sustainability of a NAPA project and provide for ease of implementation, since activities will operate within existing institutional channels, communication lines and project mechanisms.

19. The GEF secretariat has prepared guidance⁸ on the comparative advantages of the 10 GEF agencies. Representatives from six of the agencies (the Asian Development Bank, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the International Fund for Agriculture and Development, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme and the World Bank) presented the types of technical assistance they could offer to countries in adaptation, which includes the following:

- (a) Support to complete NAPAs and prepare follow-up projects, including the provision of tools and programming frameworks;
- (b) Technical expertise in development, disaster risk management, agriculture, water resources, land degradation and other fields;

⁷ Additional information is available at

<http://www.gefweb.org/interior.aspx?id=194&ekmensel=c580fa7b_48_62_btnlink>.

⁸ <<http://www.gefweb.org>>.

- (c) Operational support through regional or national agency offices.

20. Participants welcomed information from the GEF secretariat on the possibility of collaboration with more than one GEF agency on the development of NAPA projects. Some participants noted that there are cases of integrated projects with sector-specific components where the expertise and experience of a GEF agency may be lacking or weak and that there should be strengthened efforts among agencies to partner with other agencies in establishing clear complementary roles to ensure more efficient project management and implementation.

21. The LDC representatives were encouraged to seek assistance from organizations with expertise in adaptation. This includes other United Nations agencies, regional or national organizations, research institutes and international non-governmental organizations. The United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (ISDR), although not a GEF agency, expressed its availability to provide technical support and capacity-building to strengthen early warning and disaster risk reduction components of NAPA proposals. ISDR has also cooperated with organizations such as the Asian Disaster Preparedness Center to provide training and other support on disaster management in Asia. Some LDC representatives, and the Chair of the Expert Group on Technology Transfer (EGTT), noted that regional economic and social commissions (such as the United Nations Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean, the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific and the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa) can provide support drawing on their extensive experience in regional development issues.

22. The LEG has been collaborating with the United Nations Institute for Training and Research (UNITAR) in the execution of its NAPA-related activities. In 2003, under LEG guidance, UNITAR assisted in organizing four training workshops on NAPA preparation for LDC Parties and prepared a document that includes a synthesis of the training materials used. UNITAR continues its support to the LDCs through a NAPA Internet platform,⁹ available in English and French, which gives an opportunity for dialogue between all actors involved in the NAPA process. Most participants expressed their satisfaction with the work being developed between the LEG and UNITAR.

B. Status of preparation of national adaptation programmes of action

23. According to the LDCF Programming Update published by the GEF secretariat in June 2007,¹⁰ 44 of the 49 eligible LDCs have received full-cost funding for preparing their NAPAs. As at 30 September 2007, the following 22 LDCs have completed and officially submitted their NAPAs to the UNFCCC secretariat: Bangladesh, Bhutan, Burundi, Cambodia, Comoros, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Eritrea, Haiti, Kiribati, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger, Rwanda, Samoa, Senegal, Sao Tome and Principe, Sudan, the United Republic of Tanzania, and Tuvalu.

24. In its programming update, the GEF secretariat also noted that NAPAs from six further countries are at an advanced draft stage, including Burkina Faso, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Maldives, Mozambique, Sierra Leone and Yemen. Of the remaining five eligible LDCs that have not received LDCF funding for NAPA preparation, Nepal and Timor-Leste have submitted proposals via UNDP to the November 2007 LDCF work programme, as per LDCF guidelines, and Angola, Equatorial Guinea and Myanmar are expected to finalize project proposals to finance the preparation of their NAPAs.

25. The examination by the LEG of submitted NAPAs found that countries generally followed preparation guidelines, incorporating a consultative, participatory approach, and that the NAPAs are integrated with national planning and development frameworks (e.g. poverty reduction strategy papers and the United Nations Millennium Development Goals). The examination also found that most NAPAs

⁹ <<http://www.napa-pana.org>>.

¹⁰ GEF/LDCF.SCCF.2/Inf.2 and GEF/LDCF.SCCF.2/Inf.3.

have effectively incorporated national vulnerability assessments and responses. While projects contained in NAPAs address actual needs and describe benefits in terms of reducing climate change vulnerability, the contributions of projects to development goals were highlighted in some more than in others.

26. The examination of NAPAs revealed that the total cost for priority adaptation projects identified in the submitted NAPAs so far amounts to USD 341.3 million. With regard to sectoral priorities, the majority of proposed NAPA projects are in the areas of agriculture, forestry and fisheries. This is followed by water resources and disaster risk reduction activities related to extreme events. Priority activities by sector are summarized below:

- (a) **Agriculture and forestry:** Developing resistant crop and livestock varieties, promoting diversification of activities for rural communities, advancing food security (seed and food banks), community-based forest management and afforestation projects, improving veterinary services and promoting agricultural techniques and irrigation methods to fight salinity in coastal countries;
- (b) **Fisheries:** Developing cultures of salt-tolerant fish and fish conservation;
- (c) **Water resources:** Protecting water supply infrastructure, improving management of surface water, constructing storage facilities, water harvesting, improving watershed management, improving water monitoring systems, raising community awareness of sustainable use of water resources and slowing down salinization of water in coastal countries stemming from sea level rise;
- (d) **Disaster risk reduction and preparedness for extreme events:** Installing early warning systems, measures for flood prevention (e.g. construction of flood dykes) and coping with droughts, and strengthening community disaster preparedness and response capacity;
- (e) **Coastal zone protection:** Integrated management of coastal zones, constructing and upgrading coastal defences and causeways, and mangrove planting. NAPA activities to protect natural ecosystems include establishing conservation programmes for terrestrial and marine ecosystems, coral reef restoration and sustainable use of natural resources;
- (f) **Health:** Developing health infrastructures, increasing immunization against common diseases, various measures to combat the spread of malaria (e.g. disseminating bed nets), and training and raising awareness among medical personnel.

C. Status of implementation of national adaptation programmes of action

27. According to the LDCF Programming Update, of the submitted NAPAs, 10 NAPA implementation projects had been officially submitted as at 5 September 2007 to the GEF under the LDCF, from Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Djibouti, Eritrea, Malawi, Mauritania, Niger, Samoa and Sudan. Seven of these projects have been “PIF-approved”, which means that they have been entered into the LDCF pipeline, while details are being clarified on the remaining three projects.

28. The 10 proposed NAPA implementation projects have an expected LDCF grant component of USD 28.4 million, which is around 18 per cent of the remaining pledged LDCF resources for NAPA implementation. Funding for the implementation projects to date is divided by sector as follows: agriculture and water management (USD 16.50 million, 58 per cent); disaster management (USD 3.98 million, 14 per cent); coastal zone management (USD 2.27 million, 8 per cent); and cross-sectoral (USD 5.69 million, 20 per cent).

29. Projects for seven more countries (Burundi, Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Haiti, Liberia, Rwanda and Zambia) are expected to be submitted before the next LDCF–SCCF council meeting in November 2007.

D. Exchange of experiences in the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action

1. Cycle for submissions

30. In providing feedback to LDC Parties on their draft NAPAs, the LEG observed that initially approved project documents indicated an average time of three years to complete and submit the reports. All of the NAPAs had an initial target of the first quarter of 2008 for submission. Further analysis of completed NAPAs indicates that this cycle can be as long as five years, and longer in the case of the countries that have yet to complete their NAPA. This indicates that initially, it took some time (an average of 13 months) for countries to submit requests to the implementing agencies for NAPA preparation proposals to be developed after the first global NAPA launch workshop in Bangladesh in September 2002. However, in the past two years, the GEF and its agencies have been able to process proposals quickly, taking on average three months, and in some cases less than a month.

31. After GEF approval, some countries took nearly 40 months (just over three years) to complete a NAPA. This is double the planned duration of 18 months for each NAPA project. Some participants explained that this may be due in part to the time needed to make money available to country NAPA teams after GEF approval by the implementing agencies, as well as delays in waiting for NAPAs to be formally endorsed at the national level before submission.

2. Stakeholder participation

32. All participants agreed that the NAPA process has given rise to institutional strengthening at the national level and improved the ability of LDCs to respond to adaptation concerns in general. The direct involvement of national stakeholders in NAPA preparation and implementation contributes to a country-driven approach and this was highlighted as an important condition for the success of the NAPAs. Several key lessons learned related to broad participation in the NAPA process and the composition of NAPA teams. Some of these include the following:

- (a) It is extremely important to establish a cohesive team for developing the NAPA and planning for the implementation of projects;
- (b) The composition of a NAPA team should reflect a broad range of stakeholders, and the NAPA process will benefit from identifying those members who can act as champions of climate change adaptation both within and beyond their respective sector;
- (c) Engaging national experts who have in-depth understanding of the country's needs and circumstances will improve the quality of the NAPA. This also helps to build capacity within the country for undertaking adaptation activities across all sectors;
- (d) The involvement of local communities through the application of the bottom-up approach of the NAPA is a good practice for adaptation in LDCs.

33. Forming sectoral working groups was found to be very useful in some countries for drafting sections of the NAPA and also for developing projects.

3. Indigenous knowledge

34. As a result of the NAPA process, policymakers have acknowledged that local communities have a significant amount of indigenous knowledge of local climate histories, environment–climate

interactions, mechanisms for coping with climate-related disasters and potential actions that could promote adaptation. However, NAPA teams must determine which types of indigenous knowledge provide reliable information, as much of it is anecdotal and difficult to analyse rigorously. In addition, there may be language barriers between NAPA teams and people in local communities, presenting another challenge to fully understanding how indigenous knowledge is developed.

4. Disasters and early warning

35. It was suggested that systems to warn of hazards such as heavy rainfall and cyclones that may lead to disasters in areas with vulnerable populations do not need to be technologically sophisticated. Several participants called for simple, inexpensive measures to improve early warning systems, such as awareness campaigns or community disaster preparedness. For example, schoolchildren who are educated about flood safety may then help to disseminate information further to their families. There were also calls for institutional strengthening and coordination with a range of agencies to improve warning dissemination.

36. On the establishment and maintenance of national warning centres, participants were encouraged to take advantage of regional warning centres for hazards such as floods, drought and cyclones. These centres provide bulletins, alerts and seasonal climate outlooks, as well as training and partnerships to build capacity in national warning centres. Participants were also informed that disaster risk reduction activities could make up part of the baseline for NAPA implementation and that any LDC that may be preparing a project to reduce climate change-induced disaster risks could include its ongoing work on establishing a disaster risk management framework and early warning systems as a baseline cost in its proposal for funding under the LDCF.

5. Climate risk insurance

37. Financial and insurance arrangements were underlined as important adaptation tools to alleviate the negative impacts of climate change and extreme events. Pilot insurance projects have been undertaken in Africa and Asia by several agencies. The benefits of climate insurance for those directly affected by climate change and climate-related hazards, such as farmers, the role of disaster relief and how insurance could be used to complement, rather than undermine, adaptive practices, were all considered as areas for further investigation by the international and regional agencies.

6. Integration of national adaptation programmes of action into national planning

38. Several participants pointed out that the NAPA has been receiving political endorsement by high-level policymakers, and reported active engagement of all relevant institutions in its preparation and its acceptance by local communities and other stakeholders through awareness building. However, others suggested that stronger political will is required for the implementation of adaptation activities. As the NAPA process has provided an entry point for climate change considerations into planning processes in many countries, it is important that the implementation of NAPAs is intensified so that its role in the national planning process is strengthened.

39. During the discussions, all participants agreed that the NAPA has provided a unique opportunity to align adaptation projects with the development priorities of a country. This is important because if actions proposed under the NAPA do not support sectoral strategies, they are not likely to be taken up by relevant stakeholders. At the same time, if priorities are aligned, then stakeholders in various sectors can use the NAPA and the identified adaptation needs as additional justification for their proposed activities.

7. National adaptation programmes of action and national communications

40. The LEG, having collaborated with the Consultative Group of Experts on National Communications from Parties not included in Annex I to the Convention (CGE) on providing advice to the SBI on integrating information contained in NAPAs into national communications, believes that further work is needed in this area to ensure that NAPAs become fully integrated. To this end the LEG is working closely with the CGE in preparing a document for consideration at SBI 27. Several participants explained that in preparing their NAPA, they were able to obtain more localized information for integration into their national communication.

E. Needs identified for the preparation and implementation of national adaptation programmes of action

1. Teams and recruitment

41. Many NAPA teams faced challenges in forming the teams and recruiting the appropriate technical experts. Many countries experienced a high turnover of staff; in some cases, the departures occurred in key positions such as team leader. A commonly cited need among LDCs is for know-how to motivate national teams to produce quality reports. It was also noted that there is a limited number of national climate change experts to assist in the NAPA process. Delays were sometimes caused by lengthy searches for technical experts who have a comprehensive understanding of the local context and targeted sector as well as of adaptation.

42. LDCs, especially those that are small island developing States, stated they have limited human resources and require assistance for project preparation so that they can build local capacity in this area and rely less on external consultancy.

2. Institutional strengthening

43. Participants pointed to a need to strengthen national institutions to ensure early delivery of NAPAs. Those NAPA teams that face institutional barriers, such as internal bureaucracy, bottlenecks, delays in disbursements of funds and delays in project approvals, called for more capacity-building for institutions and national focal points to address these issues.

44. LDCs that have recently emerged from conflict must overcome additional barriers to begin their NAPA preparation. The LEG identified these countries as being in need of special support. It was mentioned that, in these LDCs, most of the relevant data have been destroyed and several government institutions that may participate in the NAPA process have only recently been re-established or created. Project development procedures are often especially slow in these LDCs, and securing approval for funds continues to be a very lengthy process. A call was made for action to be taken to shorten the time to approve the submitted NAPA projects by the GEF and its agencies.

3. Language support

45. The representatives of French- and Portuguese-speaking LDCs noted that they face additional challenges in preparing their NAPAs and translating them into English. The LEG produced a paper on ways to support Portuguese-speaking LDCs, established a post of Lusophone Rapporteur and acknowledged that those countries in this group that have yet to advance in their NAPA process will need special support from the LEG and other supporting organizations for producing documentation in English for submission to the GEF agencies as well as making available technical documents on the NAPA process in French and Portuguese.

4. Support and coordination

46. Several participants observed that GEF agencies, particularly the country offices, which are the first point of contact, sometimes provide inadequate support during the NAPA process. Some respondents to the questionnaire indicated an urgent need for harmonization and simplification of the procedures of GEF agencies regarding NAPA preparation and implementation, which are cumbersome for LDCs with limited capacity. Other participants stated that the different requirements and project development procedures for each agency have led to duplication of efforts. Harmonizing their rules and procedures would enhance efficiency in the process. In addition, the frequent changes in procedure hinder countries in trying to stay updated, using the correct forms and compiling the required information.

47. Countries requested clear guidance on the procedures for working with different agencies or for changing agency. They stated that more assistance is needed from agencies, and suggested that sometimes projects were designed to suit the comparative advantage and capacity of the agency rather than the adaptation needs outlined by the country. In other cases, the agency that assisted the country in developing the NAPA did not have the strongest capacity available for implementing a NAPA project.

48. Several Parties reported a lack of capacity at the country level to respond in a timely manner on NAPA implementation issues, especially with regard to sector-specific adaptation projects.

49. The slow disbursement of funds in several cases and delays in receiving feedback from agencies on NAPAs and project proposals have also hindered progress. This was discussed during the meeting and also mentioned in the questionnaire responses. In addition to the slow disbursement of funds, other factors such as slow administrative procedures of GEF agencies, lack of adequate staff at the level of the agencies and inadequate capacity of national teams to deal with all the NAPA steps contributed to several LDCs having to revise their estimate of the date of NAPA completion.

50. LDC representatives requested clear guidance on how to access adaptation funds under the GEF, including the LDCF, the SCCF and the Strategic Priority for Adaptation of the GEF Trust Fund, as well as other funds from bilateral donors (which target adaptation activities specifically). Some LDCs also described difficulties in moving from the NAPA to the PIF.

51. Although the projects are eligible for funding by virtue of their prioritization in NAPAs, some LDCs have received feedback that some of the projects may not be funded. A request was made to the GEF agencies to provide early feedback on funding so that NAPA teams may seek funding from other sources that may not specifically target adaptation but may cover those NAPA projects that have a strong development component.

5. Project design

52. Capacity-building and support for designing adaptation projects emerged as important needs of LDCs during the meeting and in the questionnaire responses. These needs span several stages in project design, as summarized below:

- (a) Identifying appropriate funding partners, including partners in government, civil society and the private sector;
- (b) Clustering of projects;
- (c) Assessing vulnerability, and identifying the root causes of vulnerability and activities to address them. GEF agencies noted that projects would benefit from clearer links drawn between the climate change risks and the activities proposed.

IV. Summary of recommendations

53. While it was generally agreed that many of the needs of the LDCs in NAPA preparation have been met effectively and quickly, more work is needed in NAPA implementation and in ensuring the early submission of NAPAs by the remaining LDCs.

54. An assessment of where countries now stand in the NAPA preparation and implementation process has resulted in the identification of actions that can help address the needs highlighted by LDCs at the stocktaking meeting. These actions that could be addressed by several organizations and stakeholders, NAPA teams and the LEG include the following:

- (a) Providing support to LDCs for integrating climate change adaptation related activities into national sustainable development planning and for building capacity to ensure continuity of work on NAPAs in the future;
- (b) Providing further guidance to LDC Parties on developing an implementation strategy for NAPAs;
- (c) In providing feedback on draft NAPAs or project proposals, the LEG can also advise countries on how to link adaptation and national planning priorities;
- (d) Disseminating syntheses, guidance documents, directories and other publications at meetings and through the UNFCCC website. Specific documents that the LEG in collaboration with other relevant actors could provide to LDCs (in several languages) include the following:
 - (i) A synthesis of good and best practices, as well as practices to avoid;
 - (ii) Summaries of success stories in preparing and implementing NAPAs;
 - (iii) A synthesis of NAPA projects that other countries could replicate;
 - (iv) A compilation of thematic issues contained in NAPAs including regional synergies and opportunities for jointly implemented projects (e.g. early warning systems, river basin management or integrated coastal zone management);
 - (v) A directory of GEF agencies, regional institutes, other relevant organizations and experts;
- (e) Promoting knowledge sharing through regional workshops to discuss NAPA implementation, support, best practices and technologies;
- (f) Encouraging and assisting NAPA teams to identify champions for adaptation in finance and planning ministries, parliaments, the media and other relevant institutions;
- (g) Advising NAPA teams on the formation of sectoral working groups at the country level for preparing sectoral input for NAPAs and for NAPA project development and implementation;
- (h) Assisting NAPA teams to identify potential regional and sectoral experts to alleviate delays caused by lengthy recruitment searches and to support the building of capacity for national and regional experts in the NAPA preparation and implementation process;

- (i) Encouraging NAPA teams to approach GEF agencies on a case-by-case basis for the translation of NAPAs into English and exploring whether organizations could provide support on an ad hoc or continuous basis in this regard;
- (j) Supporting LDCs in identifying possible funding for projects, recognizing that the resources of the LDCF may be limited. To this end, NAPA teams could also work with donors to identify funding opportunities for adaptation activities that are part of broader development initiatives;
- (k) Encouraging NAPA teams to evaluate GEF agencies based on their comparative advantages (i.e. technical expertise, regional expertise, field presence and network, etc.) to identify the most appropriate agency for both NAPA preparation and implementation, using as a guide the documentation prepared by the GEF secretariat on the comparative advantages of the 10 GEF agencies;
- (l) Ensuring that NAPA teams are provided with information on GEF agency focal points for NAPAs in the country office or regional office or at the agency headquarters so that, should they be dissatisfied with the agency support for NAPA preparation or implementation, they are able to provide feedback;
- (m) Providing training for staff at the country offices of the GEF agencies in the procedures for accessing the LDCF for NAPA preparation and implementation so that all agencies adopt a consistent approach;
- (n) Advising GEF agencies to prepare PIFs and PPGs in full collaboration and involvement of NAPA teams. During project design, NAPA teams should identify institutions that will be directly involved in the implementation projects, following open forums including a range of stakeholders;
- (o) Establishing a feedback mechanism for all stakeholders to monitor the status of projects, bottlenecks and feedback to countries (through questionnaires or other appropriate methods) on the status of projects in the LDCF pipeline.
