

Summary report on the workshop on enhancing adaptation through the 2015 agreement ADP 2, part 2 Bonn, Germany, 6 June 2013

Note by the facilitator

25 July 2013

I. Introduction

A. Mandate

1. In its conclusions agreed at the second part of its first session, held in Doha, Qatar, from 27 November to 7 December 2012, the Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action (ADP) decided to hold in-session round tables and workshops in 2013 under the two workstreams initiated in 2012,¹ and invited the Co-Chairs of the ADP to set out focused questions for those round tables and workshops, taking into account the submissions from Parties and accredited observer organizations.²
2. In response to that decision, during the second part of the second session the Co-Chairs of the ADP made arrangements for a workshop on enhancing adaptation through the 2015 agreement,³ as set out in their informal note on the second part of the session of the ADP.⁴
3. The workshop was held on 6 June 2013 at the Hotel Maritim, Bonn, Germany.

B. General objectives and approach to the workshop

4. As set out in the programme of the workshop,⁵ its general objective was to further advance the discussion, and to widen the common ground on adaptation, building on proposals on adaptation made by Parties, including at the first part of the second session of the ADP.⁶
5. The Co-Chairs suggested focusing the workshop discussion on how to enhance adaptation through the 2015 agreement in a manner that achieves balance between adaptation and mitigation, including through strengthening existing institutions, arrangements, support and enablement. In that context they proposed structuring the discussion around the following four broad themes, which emerged from previous discussions among Parties:
 - (a) Enhancing support, capacity and dissemination of knowledge to enable the scaling-up of adaptation to the level required for an effective response to climate change;
 - (b) Moving towards systematic monitoring and evaluation of adaptation action and the monitoring, reporting and verification of support;
 - (c) Exploring interlinkages between adaptation and mitigation and associated priorities;

¹ FCCC/ADP/2012/3, paragraphs 28 and 30. Workstream 1 relates to a protocol, another legal instrument or an agreed outcome with legal force under the Convention (the 2015 agreement) and workstream 2 relates to pre-2020 ambition.

² FCCC/ADP/2012/3, paragraphs 30–32.

³ The first such workshop was held during the first part of the second session of the ADP. A summary report is contained in ADP.2013.2.InformalSummary.

⁴ Available at <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/adp2/eng/9infnot.pdf>>.

⁵ Available at <http://unfccc.int/files/bodies/awg/application/pdf/ws1_workshop_programme_adaptation.pdf>.

⁶ See the summary of the round tables under workstream 1 (ADP.2013.5.InformalSummary) at <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/adp2/eng/5infsum.pdf>>; and reflections on the first part of the second session (ADP.2013.8.InformalNote) at <<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/adp2/eng/8infnot.pdf>>.

- (d) Incorporating means to assess progress on adaptation in a potential post-2020 review mechanism of the 2015 agreement.

II. Summary of the proceedings

6. The workshop was facilitated by Mr. Burhan Gafoor (Singapore). It was opened by the Co-Chairs of the ADP, Mr. Jayant Moreshver Mauskar (India) and Mr. Harald Dovland (Norway). The Co-Chairs recalled the round table on adaptation that was held during the first part of the second session of the ADP⁷ and explained that this workshop was being held in response to the call from Parties to have a more focused discussion on adaptation in the context of ensuring a balanced consideration of adaptation and mitigation under workstream 1. Subsequently, they recalled the objectives and four broad themes for the workshop and encouraged Parties to take into account information on on-going activities related to finance, technology and capacity-building, which had been provided through the briefings prior to the workshop.

7. The facilitator introduced the structure of the workshop and underlined that the context of the discussions had been well established through the adaptation round table held during ADP 2, part 1, and other round tables held during the previous and the current ADP sessions. He noted further that technical input had been provided through the briefings on the activities related to finance, technology and capacity-building and would continue to be introduced in the briefings by the Adaptation Committee and the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) in the first part of the workshop. He also mentioned the important on-going work on adaptation under the subsidiary bodies, such as in the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change and the work programme on loss and damage.

8. The workshop was organized in three parts. Part 1 included two briefings, one by the Vice-Chair of the Adaptation Committee, Ms. Christina Chan, and the other by the Chair of the LEG, Ms. Pepetua Latasi, who both provided an overview of the on-going work on adaptation by the two constituted bodies.⁸

9. During part 2 of the workshop, eight Parties (Benin, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Canada, Cook Islands, European Union, Guatemala, Mexico and South Africa) delivered focused interventions from the floor to elaborate their proposals in relation to the themes identified for the workshop.

10. The third part of the workshop provided an opportunity for all Parties to express their views, considering the four themes laid out by the Co-Chairs and building on the briefings and the focused interventions from the floor. To stimulate the discussion, the facilitator highlighted the following questions:

- (a) How, in concrete terms, can adaptation be made an integral part of the new agreement?
- (b) If Parties were only six months away from the twentieth session of the Conference of the Parties (COP), what would be their priority issue on adaptation that, from their point of view, would need to be included in the new agreement?
- (c) What are the gaps in existing institutions for adaptation that the new agreement needs to close, considering that it will build on those existing arrangements?

11. Twenty Parties and one observer took the floor to share their experiences and views related to the four themes and the questions posed by the facilitator. The workshop was finalized with concluding remarks by the facilitator.

III. Summary of the workshop discussion

Part 1: briefings

12. Ms. Chan briefed Parties on the activities included in the Adaptation Committee's three-year workplan, which was adopted at COP 18. She specifically pointed to the work of the Adaptation Committee on the following: (a) enhancing support for the implementation of adaptation through better coherence among existing bodies and agenda items under the Convention; (b) creating coherence on adaptation finance and exploring

⁷ See summary of the round tables under workstream 1, referred to in footnote 6 above.

⁸ The presentations are available at <<http://unfccc.int/7644>>.

pathways for long-term finance for adaptation; (c) seeking to enhance technology support for adaptation in collaboration with the Climate Technology Centre and Network and the Technology Executive Committee; (d) supporting the national adaptation plan (NAP) process for developing countries that are not least developed countries (LDCs); (e) strengthening the role of regional organizations and United Nations agencies to support country-driven adaptation action; (f) organizing a workshop on monitoring and evaluation in the second half of 2013; and (g) raising the profile of adaptation and enhancing adaptation action through an annual adaptation forum.

13. Ms. Latasi briefed Parties on the current work programme of the LEG, particularly on its activities in supporting the NAP process. Those activities include the following: (a) publication of the technical guidelines for NAPs; (b) identification of support needs and options for the NAP process in the LDCs; (c) incorporation of NAP-relevant components into on-going training workshops; and (d) the organization of a NAP expo to launch the NAP process in the LDCs during the thirty-eighth session of the subsidiary bodies. She also mentioned the strategic building blocks of the LEG's work during the next two to three years, which include the following: (a) the development of supplementary material for the NAP technical guidelines covering specific steps and aspects; (b) the establishment of NAP Central, a common information system to support the NAP process; (c) the development of case studies to capture countries' experience and lessons learned in developing NAPs; (d) the continuation of technical support through workshops and technical papers; and (e) close collaboration with relevant organizations and other partners on support programmes for the LDCs for the NAP process.

Part 2: focused interventions

14. A representative of Benin started off the series of focused interventions by pointing to the progress the country and other LDCs have made on adaptation through the preparation and implementation of their national adaptation programmes of action. He also described several activities the country has undertaken to prepare for more medium- and long-term adaptation under the NAP process and pointed to the need for more financial and capacity-building support in order to successfully carry out the process. He stressed further that capacity-building was required, inter alia, for a comprehensive assessment of the costs of adaptation action, which will also facilitate the identification of further support needs in addition to the support currently provided. The new agreement could add value through the establishment of a system that effectively matches the support required for national adaptation and the support provided. The system could include a more systematic monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of adaptation action at the national level in creating resilience and rigorous monitoring, reporting and verification of support to identify progress and gaps.

15. A representative of Bolivia (Plurinational State of) pointed to the need for more clarity on how much of the promised USD 100 billion per year for mitigation and adaptation action will actually be channelled through the Green Climate Fund and the additional finance that will be provided for adaptation. He highlighted the need for such clarity in the light of climate change representing a clear threat to the right to development. He argued that for an effective implementation of NAPs, their integration into development planning, coherence with institutions outside the Convention and the strengthening of national institutional arrangements, more support would be needed. With regard to the question of how to make adaptation an integral part of the new agreement, he suggested that one option would be to integrate NAPs into the new agreement as the principle vehicle through which adaptation needs, assessments and plans are communicated. Furthermore, he suggested that the Nairobi work programme could provide the knowledge required to better inform financial guidance under the Convention, particularly financial guidance for adaptation. He also recognized the important linkages and co-benefits between adaptation and mitigation and noted that institutions currently established under the Convention would not allow a joint approach to both.

16. A representative of Canada spoke on the need for taking adaptation action based on the best available knowledge, which should be readily accessible to decision-makers. He proposed that the Nairobi work programme should be revised in order that it serves as a knowledge hub for adaptation under the Convention. Such a hub would provide for more effective sharing of information, data and practical experience, and would promote peer-to-peer knowledge transfer. Partner organizations of the Nairobi work programme, regional centres and networks, and national governments should be encouraged to share knowledge more effectively through targeted products.

17. After having provided an overview of their particular vulnerability to climate change, a representative of the Cook Islands stated that it is seeking external support and innovative risk management mechanisms for

adaptation. The country sees a large potential in addressing disaster risk management and climate change adaptation jointly as a part of sustainable development planning. It would like the 2015 agreement to address the following issues: (a) the relationship between mitigation and adaptation and how they should be prioritized for vulnerable developing countries; (b) the benefits of adaptation and its limits, recognizing loss and damage as a possible outcome that must be systematically addressed by an international mechanism that provides compensation for permanent losses based on the polluter pays principle; and (c) a formula for calculating adaptation finance obligations and monitoring, reviewing and verifying compliance with them.

18. A representative of the European Union emphasized that adaptation is an integral part of the ADP work programme and will be an important feature in the new agreement, building on and creating strong linkages with existing institutions. The new agreement should therefore continue and enhance the efforts of all Parties to adapt to climate change and to reduce, respond and manage climate-related risks in the wider context of climate-resilient sustainable development. He pointed to the need for continuous monitoring of the implementation of adaptation efforts and of the delivery of support. He also emphasized the need to provide adequate information and knowledge and thereby build on existing structures under the Convention as well as strengthen collaborative efforts with those outside it. Finally, he recognized two important linkages between mitigation and adaptation: on the one hand, successful mitigation implies a higher likelihood for ecosystems, societies and economies to adapt in a timely manner, while a failure in mitigation will increase adverse impacts and adaptation costs; on the other hand, many activities and initiatives undertaken in the context of sustainable development have ancillary benefits for both mitigation and adaptation objectives, which should be enhanced.

19. A representative of Mexico highlighted the high priority it accords to adaptation and outlined some current national activities. He pointed out that in order to be meaningful, ambitious national activities would need to be embedded in a strong international framework in order to address adaptation in its global nature. The new agreement should raise global adaptation capacities to a level consistent with the scale of the adaptation challenge. He proposed the following three directions in that regard: (a) overcoming the current disconnect between adaptation and mitigation by promoting areas of work that bring adaptation and mitigation efforts together; (b) improving tools and approaches to assess adaptation needs and to monitor the implementation of adaptation and the provision of support at the local level; and (c) establishing functional links between the future agreement and existing institutions and processes, such as the Adaptation Committee, the NAP process, the work programme on loss and damage and the Adaptation Fund.

20. A representative of Guatemala recognized the need to involve all government levels as well as indigenous people in the adaptation process. He emphasized the importance of NAPs in strengthening collaboration between the national government and communities and local authorities. The need to create synergies between support for adaptation and actions related to poverty eradication and food security was pointed out in that regard.

21. A representative of South Africa pointed to the need for climate efforts to focus strongly on urban areas. She described the high vulnerability of cities but also their many opportunities and special characteristics that make them particularly effective as platforms for transformative and sustainable adaptation action. She called on the ADP to maximize ambitious local-level adaptation action. She further suggested that it be done through the following: (a) ensuring that the NAP process include consultation with local governments as a key element of the pre- and post-2020 period; (b) providing local governments with direct access to funding from the adaptation window under the Green Climate Fund; (c) emphasizing the importance of natural ecosystems to create resilience in cities through the inclusion of the valuation, restoration and payment of ecosystem services in urban landscapes as a thematic area of work under the Nairobi work programme; and (d) maximizing the potential of local governments to contribute to the implementation of the Convention by including a decision on a plan of action on subnational governments, cities and other local authorities in the new agreement.

Part 3: open discussion

22. During the open discussion Parties and one observer expressed their views on how adaptation could be enhanced through the new agreement, building on the previous interventions and discussions.

23. As in previous deliberations under the ADP, Parties demonstrated a broad understanding that adaptation should not only be an integral part of the new agreement but should also be balanced with mitigation. Parties explored the concept of such a balance in several aspects, as described below.

24. The importance of linkages between mitigation and adaptation was noted, in the sense that a higher level of one reduces the required level for the other. Several Parties underlined that priority should be given to a high level of mitigation, in order to minimize the costs of adaptation. At the same time, some Parties cautioned that more resources would need to be made available if mitigation efforts would fail to reach the required level to prevent dangerous climate change. In that regard, one Party called for a comprehensive approach to climate risk management that would consist of an appropriate combination of mitigation and adaptation.

25. A group of Parties suggested establishing an adaptation goal that would be directly linked to the global temperature goal, towards which adaptation measures could be mapped. For that purpose, it was requested that an estimate of climate impacts and their costs under different global temperature scenarios be made. One Party added that the costs of the impacts of response measures and economic diversification would need to be calculated.

26. In addition to a goal for adaptation, one Party mentioned the need for stronger commitments to transformative and comprehensive adaptation planning by all Parties under the new agreement and for enhanced obligations of States to protect their people from the impacts of climate change, particularly the most vulnerable. Those commitments were suggested to be accompanied by a new type of a monitoring and evaluation system. However, another Party was of the view that, other than on a conceptual or principle-based level, it would be difficult to design a legally binding outcome on adaptation that would be applicable to all Parties, owing to their heterogeneous vulnerabilities and the diverse adaptation strategies and priorities that they will adopt.

27. In more concrete terms, one Party suggested that in order to allow for a better exploration of the linkages, an institutional connection between mitigation and adaptation would be required in the design of the new agreement.

28. In general, some innovative ideas were presented to accelerate global efforts on adaptation implementation and to put adequate monitoring systems in place. Two Parties proposed including in the new agreement a platform or registry through which Parties could present and highlight their national adaptation efforts and which could serve as a monitoring tool to identify progress and gaps in adaptation from a global perspective. A similar approach was suggested by another Party, which called for a review mechanism that would enable the regular review of the adequacy of global efforts to meet the challenge of adaptation. Several Parties called for effective national and local monitoring and evaluation systems to measure the effectiveness of adaptation action on the ground.

29. Regarding knowledge, several Parties pointed to the need for enhanced capturing of lessons learned on adaptation activities through the new agreement and the sharing of knowledge and the latest scientific evidence through various channels, such as a revised Nairobi work programme and an enhanced involvement of regional centres and networks.

30. With regard to finance, technology and capacity-building, Parties emphasized the need for sufficient support for adaptation under the new agreement, particularly for advancing from planning to full-scale implementation. Therefore, existing institutions for adaptation under the Convention, such as those established under the Cancun Adaptation Framework, should be strengthened and built upon. Some Parties went a step further and suggested including a mechanism in the new agreement that would provide new, additional, predictable, adequate and accessible funding for adaptation in developing countries in the event that the level of mitigation would not be high enough to prevent dangerous climate change. Another Party suggested including a mechanism for technology transfer.

Part 4: concluding remarks

31. The facilitator concluded the workshop by thanking all the participants for their contributions and active participation. He noted that the discussion was very rich, and that several new ideas were explored and some commonalities became more apparent. In the end, the facilitator provided initial summary points that were made available on the UNFCCC website.⁹

⁹ <<http://unfccc.int/7644>>.