

ADAPTATION COMMITTEE #3

A GERMANWATCH PRE-SESSIONAL
BRIEFING ON THE AC'S THIRD MEETING
(18TH TO 20TH OF JUNE, 2013)

Sönke Kreft, Lisa Junghans & Sven Harmeling

Advance copy



Brief Summary

The Adaptation Committee is the UNFCCC's key adaptation body aiming to increase the coherence and promote coordination on matters related to adaptation. At its third meeting (18 to 20 June, 2013) the AC has to deal with a number of agenda items. Of particular interest may be the modalities and guidelines for National Adaptation Plans for non-LDC developing countries, the preparation of a workshop on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation, the conceptualisation of the overview report and thematic reports, and the annual adaptation forum.

This briefing paper provides background to the issues discussed, mostly based on the Secretariat's preparatory documents, but with additional analyses and comments provided by Germanwatch.

Imprint

Author: Sönke Kreft, Lisa Junghans & Sven Harmeling

Publisher:

Germanwatch e.V.

Office Bonn

Dr. Werner-Schuster-Haus

Kaiserstr. 201

D-53113 Bonn

Phone +49 (0) 228 60492-0, Fax -19

Office Berlin

Schiffbauerdamm 15

D-10117 Berlin

Phone +49 (0) 30 2888 356-0, Fax -1

Internet: <http://www.germanwatch.org>

E-mail: info@germanwatch.org

June 2013

Advance Copy

Purchase order number: 13-5-02e

This publication can be downloaded at:

<http://www.germanwatch.org/en/6989>

The Germanwatch work on the Adaptation Committee and this publication are partially supported by Bread for the World.

Contents

1. Background: Past milestones of the Adaptation Committee.....	4
2. Third meeting: Consolidating the work mode.....	5
3. Update on progress made on adaptation-related matters at SB 38.....	6
4. Coherence and collaboration on adaptation-related issues under the Convention.	8
5. Activities relating to means of implementation for adaptation.....	10
6. Invitation to regional institutions and UN agencies to communicate support.....	11
7. List of adaptation experts.....	12
8. Database or clearing house-type mechanism for information relating to national adaptation planning.....	13
9. Modalities and guidelines for NAPs for non-LDC developing countries.....	15
10. Workshop on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation.....	16
11. Gathering up-to-date information on adaptation with the IPCC – WGII.....	17
12. Work resulting from the work programme on loss and damage.....	17
13. Overview report and thematic report	18
14. Communication, Information and Outreach Strategy	19
15. Annual adaptation forum	20
16. References	21

1. Background: Past milestones of the Adaptation Committee

The establishment of the Adaptation Committee (AC) – the UNFCCC’s primary advisory body on matters related to adaptation – was an important milestone in the last years. Before, the adaptation agenda under the UNFCCC was fragmented over several agenda items and negotiation streams. In order to provide coherence and promote implementation of adaptation under the Convention, COP 16 2010 in Cancun established the AC laying out the following functions.¹

1. Providing technical support to the Conference of the Parties;
2. Enhancing sharing of information on adaptation on all levels;
3. Promote synergies and entry-point for engagement with national, regional and international organizations and networks to advance adaptation action;
4. Provide information and recommendations to the COP on the support of adaptation actions;
5. Stream information by Parties on monitoring and review of adaptation actions for possible needs and gaps to recommend further actions.

At COP17 in Durban, 2011, Parties operationalized the AC, giving it modalities, determining its board representation and linkages, and clarifying reporting pathways. The COP also decided a list of indicative activities, and asked the AC to develop a 3-year work plan.²

In September 2012, the AC met for the first time. The meeting yielded in the development of a work plan, which was subsequently endorsed by the COP in Doha end of 2012.

The 3-year work plan entails a list of different activities – employing a variety of different modalities such as reports, workshops, direct interaction with other technical bodies of the UNFCCC and stakeholders and web-based products. The work programme is certainly an ambitious endeavour, and it will require the leadership of the members of the meeting, the secretariat and contributing experts and observers to consolidate AC’s role towards promoting adaptation worldwide

¹ Compare Para 20 1/CP.16

² Para 92 ff. 2/CP.17

2. Third meeting: Consolidating the work mode

The third meeting of the AC – scheduled for the 18th to the 20th of June – represents a challenging point for the work of the AC, which will show how the AC consolidates its working mode and arrangement, and how it makes headway towards implementing the 3 year work-plan that was mandated by the Conference of the Parties.

The second meeting was a promising development, with very open discussions following a structure of break-outs and individual working groups. Accredited observers could freely interact with the members. While this practice should be applauded it also puts a burden on the observers. Organizations need to send key experts, and observers, like members of the AC, sometimes need to put aside their institutional interests. The call for thorough preparation ahead of the meeting goes both to members and observers.

The webcasting of meetings, as it has become common practice in UNFCCC bodies such as the Standing Committee on Finance or the Technology Executive Committee, is another important element in this regard, even if it cannot be applied for the entire meeting, since the AC works with the modality of break out groups.

In further developing the interactive nature of the work of the AC, the chairs of the Committee included a call in the agenda for a meeting, encouraging the active participation of observers, and requesting to develop and table concrete proposals how the work of the AC could be supported.

After the second meeting, it is also clear how the AC works in terms of transparency and outreach to stakeholder. While the conduct of the meeting is open to observers, however, there is another issue to be criticized. As a matter of transparency, the AC publishes the minutes of the break-out groups. However, it does not publish a report for the meeting. Nevertheless the AC should publicly disclose the state of decision-making, otherwise this offers room for speculation, as some proceedings of the break-out group might be decided differently by the plenary of the AC. Yet the paper trail on the UNFCCC website points differently.

Also it becomes increasingly clear, that the AC is barely managing its work-load, and that without a third meeting there would be no way to manage the tasks in the three-year work plan. This should be clear for the people involved in the process and should be fixed for 2014 and 14.

This briefing paper lays out all key issues on the agenda at AC#3, and discusses key recommendations for the way ahead.

3. Update on progress made on adaptation-related matters at SB 38

The AC will discuss the advances made at SB 38 and the implications for its own work. Adaptation was scheduled to be discussed under several working streams at the SBs.

SBI: The Subsidiary Body for Implementation included several AC related agenda items. These included a) Least Developed Countries matters, b) National adaptation plans, c) Loss and Damage and to some extent d) 1/CP.10 (Buenos Aires Programme of Work on Adaptation and Response Measures) and also e) administrative, financial and institutional matters, where the secretariat tabled a proposal to finance three AC meetings in 2014 -15 from the core budget.³

Unfortunately and to the regret of many, the SBI 38 was not able to agree on its agenda, so that no discussions on the individual agenda items took place. In discussing the conclusions of SB 38, the AC should also discuss the implications for its work mandate. For instance, a valuable input by the SB on National Adaptation Plans could not take place. Likewise, discussion on Loss and Damage will be rather unfruitful without guidance from the SBs.

Nairobi Work Programme (NWP): The Nairobi Work Programme on Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability undergoes substantive review of its working areas in 2013. More generally, the role of the NWP is under considerations, and ways have to be found to make it more responsive to information and research needs of bodies under the Convention that deal with adaptation. The AC-NWP link is of special relevance in this regard.

Delegates reached substantive conclusions, as well as discussing a draft decision for Warsaw.⁴

In terms of interim activities, Parties decided to initiate a technical paper until Warsaw on the use of indigenous and traditional practice for adaptation, and gender sensitive approaches. In addition the conclusions also mandate the secretariat to undertake a technical expert meeting before June 2014 on the topic.

However, a very similar deliverable has been mandated under the AC 3-year work programme. Therein the AC is requested to hold a workshop and prepare an associated report on best practices and needs of local and indigenous communities in the second half of 2014. Scoping and conceptualization is foreseen to take place in the first half of 2014.⁵

From a perspective of promoting coherence, two very similar events in rapid succession seem questionable. The AC, therefore, should discuss the implication of the NWP conclusions on its work plan.

³ FCCC/SBI/2013/6 Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014–2015

⁴ FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.9

⁵ Item 3 of the AC work plan

In addition, the NWP conclusions also express its readiness to support the Adaptation Committee through the Nairobi work programme. The SBSTA invites therefore the Adaptation Committee to give recommendations in its next report on how such support could be organized. Given the Adaptation Committee could be regarded as the overarching adaptation body it would be reasonable that it would take the lead in this activity, but the workshop itself could well be implemented under the NWP, hosted by the AC.

In terms of the draft decision text, which will provide the basis for the negotiations at the Warsaw SBStA session, the text includes the bracketed proposal to organize outputs on ecosystem services and the water sector, as well as the request to the AC to synthesize best practice regarding the integration of these two issues in adaptation.

Agriculture: After launching agriculture related SBSTA-work at COP 17 in Durban, the SBSTA 38 session in Bonn for the first time reached substantive rather than procedural conclusions. The decision calls for submissions from Parties which would provide the basis for further considerations in November in Warsaw and feeding into an in-session workshop during COP19. Interestingly, the decision is framed from an adaptation angle, while previous elaboration on agriculture e.g. under the AWG-LCA were dominantly framed from a mitigation angle (agriculture featured there together with aviation emission under the item of sectoral approaches to mitigation). This makes sense in so far as approaching agriculture only from a mitigation perspective can lead to adverse effects, while ensuring a climate-resilient agriculture often has mitigation co-benefits. For the Adaptation Committee, however, this means an additional item that it needs to consider in forging ahead the issue of adaptation under the Convention.⁶

ADP 2: The Ad Hoc Working Group on the Durban Platform for Enhanced Action continued its second meeting parallel to the SB session. The co-chairs maintained their format of round-tables that discussed relevant aspects for the 2015 agreement. One roundtable was specifically dedicated to adaptation in this agreement, and included an input on the work of the AC by one of the vice-chairs (see Box 1).

Box 1: ADP adaptation roundtable - ENB report

"Implementing the Cancun Adaptation Framework: Christina Chan, Vice-Chair of the Adaptation Committee, briefed parties on the Committee's work on raising the profile of adaptation and improving coherence. Pepetua Latasi, Chair of the LDC Expert Group (LEG), updated participants on the modalities of LEG support to LDCs.

Interventions by parties on previous or new proposals: BENIN highlighted the need to mainstream adaptation and learn from the implementation of NAPAs. On funding, BOLIVIA lamented the lack of predictability. He said that loss and damage is different from adaptation in that it refers to instances where adaptation is no longer feasible. The COOK ISLANDS proposed a compensation mechanism for loss and damage based on the polluter-pays principle. CANADA said the NWP should serve as a vehicle for adaptation and promote peer-to-peer knowledge transfer. The EU encouraged synergies with activi-

⁶ FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.20

ties outside the UNFCCC, and said that renewable energy and sustainable agricultural practices can contribute to adaptation efforts. GUATEMALA urged taking bottom-up and top-down approaches to increase social and ecosystem resilience, and highlighted the need for synergies with poverty eradication. MEXICO called for improvement of tools to address adaptation needs. Highlighting cities as centers of opportunity, SOUTH AFRICA called for a focus on urban areas.

Discussion: Parties agreed that adaptation should be an integral part of a new agreement. They also agreed on the need to address adaptation in the context of sustainable development and build on existing institutions. Parties also addressed, inter

alia: the balance between mitigation and adaptation; means of implementation; support for national adaptation strategies and plans; National Adaptation Plans for non-LDCs; and a platform for information exchange. Swaziland, for the AFRICAN GROUP, called for a global goal on adaptation. CAN said that mitigation, adaptation, and loss and damage must exist as parts of a continuum."

Source: ENB, Bonn climate change conference, 6 June 2013.

In regards to adaptation, the co-chairs proposed to the secretariat to prepare "a technical paper synthesizing based on submissions on the costs, benefits and opportunities for adaptation based on different drivers of climate change impacts, including the relationship between adaptation and mitigation".⁷

Secondly, the ADP also requests the secretariat to prepare an overview of different mandates and progress of arrangements under the Convention. Given that the AC does this on an ongoing base under its three year work programme, this could be included e.g. in the report, that the vice-chair gives to the ADP process.⁸

4. Coherence and collaboration on adaptation-related issues under the Convention

It is a standing task of the AC to promote adaptation in a coherent manner under the Convention. The AC responded to this by formulating a management cycle that involves 1. the mapping and screening of adaptation relevant decisions, processes and their mandates, 2. an analysis of the gaps and overlaps, and the identification of concrete activities, and 3. the ongoing implementation of activities such as the establishment of a working relationship with other bodies under the UNFCCC. This work is to be repeated every year, and on an ongoing basis.

At AC#2 a sub-group discussed initial points. Further ideas were developed during the plenary session. In addition, intersessional work resulted in further recommendations that will have to be discussed at the upcoming session of the AC. Document AC/2013/10 summarizes the state of the discussions.

⁷ FCCC/ADP/2013/L.2

⁸ Vice-chair Christina Chan in the ADP 2.2. roundtable on adaptation presented on the progress of the AC so far (5th of June).

The action points can be grouped into 3 categories:

1. Linkages with other processes and institutions

The AC made already headway in building active linkages with other adaptation relevant processes under the Convention.

Between AC#2 and AC#3 members of the AC represented adaptation issues⁹ at the Forum of the Standing Committee for Finance at the Carbon Expo in Barcelona end of May, and the TEC activities. In addition, the AC responded also to the call for submission to the Work Programme of Long-term Finance.

In moving forward, the AC should develop a targeted approach and establish the objectives for linking with each of the bodies. While mainstreaming adaptation in all bodies is an important objective, in an opportunistic fashion the AC should prioritize its attention to the Technology Mechanism, especially its Climate Technology Centre and Networks. The Climate Technology Centre and Network is in the process of operationalization, and it would be important to represent adaptation interests in the process. In terms of the Least Developed Country Expert Group, the immediate link needs to be created in terms of the National Adaptation Planning Process. Generally, the LEG houses an impressive knowledge of adaptation –and through its capacity building leg – a feeling for on the ground adaptation. Therefore, a more systematized exchange with the LEG is certainly desirable. The LEG in its last meeting again also reissued a call to the AC to assist among others in the outreach on NAPs, to nominate an AC member for the advisory group working on the LEG Central, to participate in the review of methodology and to work collaboratively on methods for cost-benefit adaptation.¹⁰

Linkages ought to be created with the Standing Committee on Finance, also because the AC is mandated to provide recommendations on adaptation support. Although the political link shall be routed through the COP, the AC and the SCF ought to establish “soft links” such as the envisaged joint gathering at overlapping meetings, in order to save some time. It would also be important to discuss again the objective of such meetings beforehand.

Lastly, the GCF in 2013 is in the creation of the Business Model Framework, and later on in the year, is expected to decide on the objectives, results and performance indicators of funded adaptation (and mitigation) activities in the GCF. The 4th meeting of the GCF Board, scheduled from 26 to 28 June 2013, will have first substantive discussions on these matters. While it may be more of a priority for the SCF and the TEC to develop a cooperation model with the GCF, the AC should also contribute to quality performance indicators, especially since the AC has scheduled work on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation in autumn 2013. Unfortunately, the relevant GCF meeting might be scheduled very close to the AC#4 meeting, and the planned workshop on adaptation M&E.

2. Providing coherence in the activities that the AC is undertaking

The second area of work for the AC is to critically review its own contribution from an angle of coherence and duplication of work. While the AC mandate asks for a leadership

⁹ AC/2013/10 Updated summary note on coherence and collaboration on adaptation-related issues under the Convention

¹⁰ FCCC/SBI/2013/8, Para 44.

role of the AC in showcasing adaptation generally, it is important that the AC for all its own deliverables ask itself how it relates to ongoing activities of other processes inside and outside of the convention. Providing coherence, therefore, needs to be implemented as guiding principle in the work of the Adaptation Committee.

3. Provide recommendations of how adaptation can be streamlined in the broader UNFCCC process.

Lastly, the AC should contribute to the coherence of decision-making processes regarding to adaptation. Adaptation is scattered on several agenda items, across different work streams in the UNFCCC process. It is becomingly increasingly complex to handle the implementation of certain programmes, with ongoing negotiations on related subjects – so it requires a good understanding on the substance as well as the strategic needs of the Parties. Moreover, increasingly complex timelines for mandated work require better oversight, which the AC is commissioned to work on. The report of the AC to the COP (through the SBs) will have to be structured to give guidance in this regard.

Providing coherence on the adaptation decision-making processes will be the toughest nut to crack for the AC. However, it will be the eventual indicator for successful work of the AC.

In the meantime, the AC could contribute to the work of the ADP – where the important role of adaptation is uncontested, but the exact way forward still unclear. Since the AC already started mapping different adaptation relevant mandates and bodies, submitting its views to the ADP, e.g. through the briefing of the chair/vice-chair could be an easy positive contribution to the ADP process.

5. Activities relating to means of implementation for adaptation

In the negotiation towards the creation of the AC, the question of means of implementation has been most contested between the different Parties. The function reads

“Providing information and recommendations, drawing on adaptation good practices, for consideration by the Conference of the Parties when providing guidance on means to incentivize the implementation of adaptation actions, including finance, technology and capacity-building and other ways to enable climate-resilient development and reduce vulnerability, including to the operating entities of the financial mechanism of the Convention, as appropriate”¹¹

The work plan of the AC features working areas in this regard.¹² The AC already agreed to convene a workshop (with bilateral, regional and multilateral institutions) how to further promote the implementation of enhanced action in a coherent manner under the Convention.¹³ The workshop would be undertaken early 2014, and contribute to a synthesis report for the COP. The upcoming meeting, and intersessional work has to result in a scoping note for this workshop.

¹¹ 1/CP.16 Para 20 d).

¹² AC/2013/11

¹³ Item 4 on the AC work-plan

In addition item 19 of the work plan requests the AC to decide at AC#3 to consider further action on means of implementation including

- Monitoring adaptation programmes and projects implemented, including the funding provided and received, and providing a synthesis report to the COP
- Inviting a dialogue between adaptation practitioners and financial institutions on funding adaptation
- Improving coherence with regard to monitoring and evaluating adaptation activities.

While means of implementation is essential to the success of adaptation, and a core area of the AC mandate, several other work-streams will deal with similar issues. Evidently, the Standing Committee on Finance has a specific role and will work on the bigger picture of means of implementation. An important element here is the preparation of a biennial assessment report, which is also envisaged for 2014 and will probably be based on inter alia information submitted by the operating entities of the financial mechanism, Parties and other relevant bodies. It will most likely focus on aspects related to support and quantitative figures on provision of finance and needs, and less so on the substance of adaptation. The AC needs to think what its specific niche is, but at the same time it can of course not exclude information on support provided. In any way the Secretariat should ensure a highly efficient preparation of these different reports.

Generally, the SCF will approach means of implementation from a perspective of (upstream) MRV of support. Approaches to deliver such MRV of support, however, are constructed and maintained from a donor country perspective.¹⁴ To deconstruct means of implementation from a bottom-up perspective could be a potential area of work for the AC compatible with the SCF mandate and work. Doing this, however, requires to link the discussion on means of implementation to those of adaptation objectives and hence to monitoring and evaluation. This impacts both on negotiation positions of developed and developing countries, but could make a real contribution in streamlining and aligning adaptation support provided to developing countries.

6. Invitation to regional institutions and UN agencies to communicate current support

The AC aims to also advance adaptation work of the UN agencies and regional entities. As a first step, the AC will undertake an explorative endeavour to 1. collect views by relevant organization, and 2. synthesize these for the COP to determine new approaches especially aimed at strengthening the regional level work.

As a first step, AC#2 discussed a template for UN and regional agencies to respond to the AC. AC#3 will have to finalize this template, and agree on the modalities for reaching out to respective institutions.

Document AC/2013/12 gives both the draft template and an overview about the invitation process, including the necessity of a cover letter.

¹⁴ See Junghans & Harmeling (2012) regarding the problems that exist regarding the OECD adaptation marker

In regards to the template, and the cover letter, the attempt to also get information on how the Cancun Adaptation Framework is applied in the context of the individual organizations should be applauded and might warrant important hints for further guidance by the COP. However, the AC, generally, has to strike balance between the need of information, and feasibility for desk officer and project manager at respective institutions to fill in these forms. Therefore, the template should probably not become bigger, also considering that the actual response time that organization have, is not very long.

In addition, it would be necessary in the cover letter to explain the objectives clearly, so not to be seen as a bureaucratic reporting requirements, but rather a positive contribution of how the international community structures its adaptation response.

In terms of the actual invitation, the suggestion by the secretariat in AC/2013/12 are all good, with the addition maybe to also reach out to regional UN entities (e.g. United Nations Economic Commission for Africa).

7. List of adaptation experts

In order to provide technical expertise to Parties by the AC, as reflected under activity 9 of the work plan, the secretariat finalized the selection criteria for and prepared a review of existing rosters of experts¹⁵, summarized and assessed below. In its 3rd meeting the AC will decide on next steps.

With regard to the selection criteria of adaptation experts the secretariat proposes the following elements to be considered by the AC.

Criteria	Elements
Purpose for which the expertise is sought	Input to publications/expert meetings, technical backstopping upon request
Prior experience	Experts who have supported NAPAs, NCs, or the like
Thematic expertise	Climate science, climate impacts, adaptation planning and practice, adaptation finance and adaptation technology, M&E, and cross-cutting themes
Professional background	Engineers, scientists, public administrators, practitioners, economists, educators
Geographic coverage	Calls for diversity increase the number of experts
Availability/accessibility	

The secretariat's review of existing lists of adaptation experts serves as a basis for selecting suitable experts. However, as the report lines out, the sheer number of already existing expert lists makes it questionable whether a new roster of experts will add value, also considering costs for maintenance. The report therefore suggests to either rely on existing

¹⁵ AC/2013/13 Report on the review of existing lists of adaptation experts

rosters of adaptation experts until it deems those lists to be insufficient for the ACs purpose or/and to call for submissions by regional and UN-institutions to identify experts/organisations that can support the AC or provide technical backstopping upon request.

To date the report is not yet clear on the objectives of a list of adaptation experts. For instance while the AC could use such a list to support its conduct, the list could also serve as a database for countries that wish to employ certain adaptation activities and lack (short-term) human resources. As the latter option might lead to a database that is largely populated by high salary consultants, the first option bears much more potential. It should be possible to run a list to support the work of the AC on a model based "expert pledge" rather than financial remuneration.

The experience of existing adaptation expert lists shows question the usefulness of another expert list for developing countries. For example a spot test "NWP Experts" list puts considerable doubt regarding the value provided for developing countries.. Further, the added value of several existing platforms in not clear. Overall, it therefore seems important to get a more in-depth overview whether existing lists are working properly and decide on an appropriate way forward.

8. Database or clearing house-type mechanism for information relating to national adaptation planning

By activity 12 of its work plan the AC decided to establish a database or clearinghouse-type mechanism for information related to national adaptation planning. For the 3rd AC meeting the secretariat reviewed and evaluated existing databases containing information on national adaptation planning¹⁶, summarized and assessed below, assisting the AC to decide on next steps.

The secretariat's report reviews the functions of a number of existing websites and tools that would be useful to consider when designing the database. The design very much depends on which functions the database and clearing-house type mechanism should primarily fulfil. The report lines out the following desired functions, noting that quality and credibility of data should be more important than quantity and that information should be provided in an accessible manner and standard format to directly support particular NAP elements:

- "filtered" information on current and future threats and how these translate into real life challenges
- proven solutions to reduce vulnerability and best practices in adaptation
- information on experiences with NAPs
- potentially the system could also include an list of existing databases as well as a customized search function streamlining the location of relevant information

¹⁶ AC/2013/14 Report on the review of existing databases and clearing-house type mechanisms for national adaptation planning

In the face of the large number of existing websites and tools that have not necessarily increased knowledge but rather framed information to suit different circumstances, the report underlines that it might be more useful to explore what kind of data is actually needed for adaptation planning and effective NAP processes, using this as a basis when designing the NAPs navigator. Ideally, the knowledge portal then offers a synthesis of information to relieve users of a comprehensive coverage of topics. To offer interoperability with existing information systems the usage of an "application programming interface" (API) should be considered. Given the important role of information in adaptation planning, some kind of peer-review system is recommended. To avoid additional work and overlapping contents, the AC should partner with the LEG in producing the NAPs Central.

To make this database or clearinghouse-type mechanism most effective a policy maker needs assessment is important, particularly because of the range of platforms that already exists. This could include assessments from stakeholders responsible for decision-making also on the sub-national level, e.g. through networks such as the Local Government for Sustainability (ICLEI) or other community-based networks. This assessment should not only include LDCs but also other countries that are interested in developing NAPs, encouraging them to also make use of the knowledge portal. The database can also serve country Parties to track funding available to NAPs in general. To encourage countries to on a continuous basis provide inputs for the portal, e.g. useful methodologies, proven adaptation solutions or positive/negative co-benefits.

There is also the possibility, as outlined by Saudi Arabia during SB38, of framing the platform as a database that addresses planned NAPs and hence fulfil a matching function similar to the NAMA registry in mitigation. So far such a registry type of platform does not exist for climate change adaptation.

Just a few days ago the CDKN "Climate Knowledge Broker" (CKB) group met in Bonn (8-9 June 2013). Participants identified the main barriers of currently existing climate change portals:

- the 'silo effect' (the inability to share information among each other)
- 'the portal proliferation syndrome' (the tendency to create a new portal rather than build capacity in a previously existing one)
- being 'supply driven'
- underfunded'
- being inaccessible for policy makers

Contrary to what the secretariat listed as a desired feature, the CDKN CKBs sees a 'one-stop shop' for the online climate community as undesirable as it is becoming ever clearer that 'innovation comes from the fringes. Generally a collaboration between existing platforms however is a key way of strengthening the knowledge infrastructure. It can happen at many levels, from 'light-touch' collaboration to deep integration. Finally, knowledge brokers could have a lot to gain by bartering information and tools between members, to avoid 'reinventing the wheel'.

9. Modalities and guidelines for NAPs for non-LDC developing countries

In the indicative list of activities, that guided the AC in developing its three year work plan, the AC was asked to work on the modalities and guidelines of the National Adaptation Plans and Planning (NAPs) non-LDCs. For LDCs the LEG developed guidelines for the NAPs process and launched these recently.¹⁷ The AC is tasked to review these guidelines with a view to the applicability to non-LDCs. At AC#2 a group of three AC members, and one member of the Least Developed Country Expert Group was launched, undertaking intersessional work in preparation for the upcoming meeting. The analysis and recommendations of this group can be found under AC/2013/15.

Initial analysis: Guidelines commensurate with non-LDC needs.

The analysis shows that the general elements in the NAP process are applicable in an LDC, and non-LDC context because they are broad and flexible enough. Differences exist however mostly in relationship to the focussed mandate of the LEG, in the capacity building support, that LDCs receive through the LEG and in analysis on funding needs through the LEG. Likewise, non-developing countries do not have the NAPA process to draw from. In addition non-LDCs cannot access the LDCF fund, and the SSCF has clearly not enough means to implement NAPs in all developing countries

Current shortcomings: The dichotomy between descriptive and flexible

One contested area is the degree of prescription that the NAPs process foresees, especially when it comes to reporting of NAPS. While it is clear that a one size fits all for countries does not work, owing to different experience, expertise and states of implementation in the countries, the background document asks to review the guidance to report on NAPs according to certain protocol – for the sake of comparability. Likewise, the background document raises the need for funding institutions to exert the same degree of flexibility in undertaking the NAPs as suggested by the LEG.

One additional point, not yet brought up in the AC is the issue function of matching needs and support. This is not an explicit element of the existing guidelines, and would probably have to be achieved through different means than the national application of the NAPs process. The guidelines contain very little information how to ensure the finance of the NAP implementation, be it from public sources (international from climate finance or development cooperation, or domestic) or how to best incentivise private sector investments in adaptation and climate-resilience.

Another area, which appears relatively weak, is conceptual guidance on participatory stakeholder consultations. Although this aspect has been an explicit part of the COP decision from COP17, in the area of preparatory elements, it is difficult to find any substantial information on that matter in the guidelines. However, decent participatory processes not just happen by themselves, but need to be incorporated early-on in the process. This is also important to identify the needs of the most vulnerable and adequately address them, in line with the principles contained in the Cancún Adaptation Framework.

¹⁷ Least Developed Country Expert Group (2012)

Collaborative effort: Work with the LEG

The LEG issued an invitation to the member of the AC to advance issues where further guidance is necessary (e.g. cost benefit analysis), and also asks AC members to contribute to working groups that work on further aspects of NAP (e.g. on synthesizing good practice). In undertaking the review, it should be guided by the principle that NAPs need to improve for everybody. The LEG is the technical body that invested most efforts in developing the issue. In advancing the NAP guidelines, the AC therefore should work with the LEG, and possible use identified entry points, such as the review of the NAPs guidelines.

10. Workshop on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation

As reflected in activity 14 of its work plan, the AC decided to conduct a workshop on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation. Postponed to the 2nd half of 2013 the AC at the 3rd meeting will have to consider a draft concept note by the secretariat¹⁸, summarized and assessed below, to agree on scope, focus, target audience and a draft workshop agenda.

The draft concept note identifies themes for the workshop and a target audience. It also gives a brief overview of:

- common concepts and approaches
- methodological challenges
- ongoing efforts relating to the M&E of adaptation actions

The draft concept note by the secretariat gives a technical overview on the issue largely referring to donor organisation work or to national level approaches. National level M&E approaches provide insights on the performance related to the overarching principles contained in the CAF, namely to provide "gender-sensitive, participatory and fully transparent approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems; and be based on and guided by the best available science and, as appropriate, traditional and indigenous knowledge".¹⁹

However, the AC should also look into developing country approaches that have set-up some framework itself as part of their national climate strategies (if available). The overall focus should be on M&E of adaptation action, but it needs to be followed by a conversation process together with the Standing Committee on Finance on enhancing M&E for adaptation support.

We think that methodologies for **participatory monitoring** on the local level should be considered in the framing of the workshop as well, since governments will aim to incentivise and also benefit from participatory monitoring. Understanding and addressing the

¹⁸ AC/2013/16 Draft concept note on a workshop on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation

¹⁹ Cancun Adaptation Framework FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1

needs and capacities of the most vulnerable communities, in line with the principles of the CAF, is also important to target adaptation funding where it is most needed. In this context it is interesting that the GCF governing instrument contains the provision that participatory monitoring shall be used. One example is the participatory monitoring, evaluation, reflection and learning (PMERL) framework which presents a participatory methodology for developing and monitoring against community-based adaptation, applied *inter alia* by CARE.²⁰

Also the AC should issue a call in the report of the meeting especially to southern institutions to get their academics and practitioner perspectives.

11. Gathering up-to-date information on adaptation with the IPCC – WGII

The AC in its three years work plan envisages a joint meeting with IPCC WG 2 authors in Q2/Q3 2014. At AC#3 the committee has to develop a scoping note for such meeting.

Background document AC/2013/17 gives the overview of the nature and objective of such meeting.

Besides high-level outreach, and the education of the AC member themselves, the document gives different options of what can be achieved through such meeting. One area could be limits to adaptation, which is featured in chapter 16 of the IPCC WG2.

The Committee has to review the modalities for such meeting. As mentioned by the background document, one idea could be to couple it with the traditional SB side-event that is undertaken by the IPCC after launch of the document (which is scheduled for spring 2014). Another possibility is to couple it with the Research Dialogue, that is an SBStA outreach at each Bonn SB session.

Generally, the meeting should encourage the participation of other stakeholders to increase the reach of such event.

12. Work resulting from the work programme on loss and damage

At AC#2 the Committee decided to postpone discussion on L&D to wait for further guidance from the SBI 38 L&D discussions. Since there has been no substantial progress on loss and damage, however, it is likely that the AC will refer the issue to a later session.

²⁰ http://www.careclimatechange.org/files/adaptation/CARE_PMERL_Manual_2012.pdf

13. Overview report and thematic report

The AC per its work programme is mandated to undertake one overview (“state of adaptation” report) during the 3 year period, as well as annual thematic reports.

The topic was discussed already during a breakout session at AC#2 which resulted in small group taking the idea forward in intersessional work. Background document AC/2013/18 shows the recommendation for decision at AC#3.

Overview report:

The group suggested to develop an overview report in the year 2015. While this can be understood from the perspective of finishing the AC 3 year workplan with a flagship publication, it delineates from the recommendations from the discussions at AC#2, where 2014 was identified as the appropriate timing – based on the evaluation of the usefulness to impact the 2015 UNFCCC negotiations and other processes with a similar timeline (e.g. Hyogo Framework, MDG/SDG process).²¹ By end of 2015, the ADP negotiations will probably not be able to take up new issues, in case they may arise, in order to be able to finalise the negotiations on a new legally-binding agreement. The timing of the overview report, therefore, and its implications should be discussed in the plenary session of the AC#3.

Furthermore the merits of different working arrangements – an in-house model whereby the AC, the secretariat and a consultant prepare the document, or a collaborative model with different UN agencies inputting in the document, are discussed. On ground of practicality, the group recommends to follow the first approach.

At AC#3 members will also be requested to provide initial views on the structure and content of such overview report. Here, members should look at the overall implementation of the Cancun Adaptation Framework, in and outside of the Convention, including the status quo of the implementation of the guiding principles.

Thematic report:

In terms of the annual thematic reports, it is suggested to develop a fibula of the state of adaptation under the convention – pointing to landmark decision and processes. The timeline would include the preparation of a draft until AC#4 in autumn 2013.

No concrete topic has been proposed for 2014, which is probably a sensible approach, because it allows for political guidance through the COP. Otherwise, the AC can decide early 2014 on a relevant topic. One potential topic could be the collection of best practice that the LEG is undertaking on the NAPs. Since the LEG has only a focused mandate, the AC could elevate such a report and supplement non-LDC experience and publish it in the form of the thematic review.

For 2015 the background document suggests not to undertake a thematic review.

²¹ Compare notes of the working group at AC#2
(http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/report_s.pdf)

14. Communication, Information and Outreach Strategy

By activity 22 of its work plan the AC decided to develop and implement a communication, information and outreach strategy. On the basis of a paper²², which is summarized and assessed below, the AC is invited to consider and finalize the strategy at its 3rd meeting.

Current effects of climate change and a growing awareness of the "adaptation deficit" push for a future-oriented vision as well as an output oriented mission. To make adaptation visible it is suggested that the AC explicitly showcases that adaptation measures are a fundamental part of all projects relevant to climate resilient development. In this regard, awareness-raising elements, *inter alia* through branding and reframing adaptation in a more positive connotation, will have to be an essential part of the ACs strategy.

To address different information needs and ensure effective use of information the paper suggests to differentiate between "internal" and "external" communication. While the former is directed towards the Convention, its bodies, and closely related organizations, providing them with latest information on adaptation, *inter alia* on extreme or slow-onset events, without acknowledging them to climate or climate change, the latter targets groups with no direct connection to the UNFCCC, e.g. communities, companies and NGOs. Here the strategy is suggested to aim at "image-building" and awareness-raising of adaptation as well as to influence decision making within external groups. Raising the attention for business opportunities for the private sector is also an issue under consideration. Forums (Adaptation Forum), workshops and press conferences will be the main communication channel, potentially facilitated by a calendar indicating relevant timelines for public communication.

To go ahead with an effective communication, information and outreach strategy the AC will have to identify and connect with communication officers/projects and identify target groups and tailored key messages. Specific activities include the Adaptation Forum at COP19, publication of factsheets on the effects of climate change on water, health, and food security (2013-2014), outreach activities to the private sector (2013-2014), and a push for integrating an evaluation of adaptation actions in national communications (2014).

To increase outreach and make effective use of the ACs mandate it is proposed to take the following aspects under consideration²³:

- Establish an AC quarterly newsletter that *inter alia* provides new scientific findings on adaptation, stories of success, etc.
- Select AC "Ambassadors" who can do peer to peer communications. Developed as well as developing countries' "Ambassadors" should in a comprehensive manner explain intentions and future undertakings of the AC.
- It would be useful to have spokespeople from other organizations (SBI chair, civil society) who can validate the need and the opportunity of the AC to produce results.
- Build momentum on the issue of adaptation and educate key stakeholders at international events.

²² AC/2013/19 Paper on a communication, information and outreach strategy

²³ Partially taken from AFB/B.11/8 Communications Strategy for the Adaptation Fund Board

15. Annual adaptation forum

The annual adaptation forum is part of the agenda of the work-plan of the AC. There is guidance through decision 1/CP.18, which requests “the AC to consider the establishment of an annual adaptation forum, to be held in conjunction with the COP, to maintain a high profile for adaptation”. Background documents AC/2013/20 and AC/2013/21 prepare for the discussion on this subject.

For 2013 a break-out group at AC#2 developed a draft concept. However, some members already mentioned reservation towards the concept when it was presented to the plenary. The concept so far includes to showcase the experience of Hurricane Sandy in the US and Typhoon Bopha in the Philippines, with other countries supplementing their recent experience.

Taking serious the guidance through the COP to organize an event that allows for high profile, however, hints already to the possibility to organize a ministerial or high-level events.

Since ministers might not have the full understanding on the extent of adaptation action under the UNFCCC to date, the event should start from a framing of showing the positive contribution that the UNFCCC (including the AC) has provided on adaptation. High-level representatives, e.g. ministers from developing and developed countries and eminent persons with an adaptation profile such as Michael Bloomberg could set the scene. At the same time, the event should not shy away from discussing the implications of delay on mitigation for the adaptation response. World Bank’s “turn down the heat” report could be a useful presentation. In addition the technical paper from the ADP process “synthesizing based on submissions on the costs, benefits and opportunities for adaptation based on different drivers of climate change impacts, including the relationship between adaptation and mitigation” could be highlighted too.

16. References

Background documents for the 3rd Adaptation Committee meeting

AC/2013/9 Provisional agenda and annotations

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac_3_annotated_agenda_v_21_may.pdf

AC/2013/10 Updated summary note on coherence and collaboration on adaptation-related issues under the Convention

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/application/pdf/coherence_and_collaboration_3_june.pdf

AC/2013/11 Background note on AC activities relating to means of implementation for adaptation

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/application/pdf/means_of_implementation_31_may.pdf

AC/2013/12 Revised draft note on submissions by regional institutions and United Nations agencies on current support for adaptation in developing countries

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/application/pdf/draft_template_for_submissions_21_may.pdf

AC/2013/13 Report on the review of existing lists of adaptation experts

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/review_of_existing_rosters_28may.pdf

AC/2013/14 Report on the review of existing databases and clearing-house type mechanisms for national adaptation planning

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/application/pdf/nap_databases_31_may.pdf

AC/2013/15 Report on the review of existing guidelines for national adaptation planning

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/review_guidelines_naps_6june.pdf

AC/2013/16 Draft concept note on a workshop on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac3_m_and_e_11june_5pm.pdf

AC/2013/17 Draft scoping paper on a meeting to gather up-to-date information on adaptation, including the limits of adaptation, in collaboration with IPCC Working Group II

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/application/pdf/scoping_paper_on_meeting_with_ipcc_wg_ii_15_may.pdf

AC/2013/18 Concept note on the preparation of an overview report and annual thematic reports on adaptation http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/application/pdf/note_on_reports_31_may.pdf

AC/2013/19 Paper on a communication, information and outreach strategy
http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/communications_strategy_31_may1.pdf

AC/2013/20 Revised concept note on an adaptation forum to be held in 2013
http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/aaf1_version_28_may.pdf

AC/2013/21 Draft concept note on adaptation forums to be held in 2014 and 2015
http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/aaf_2_and_3_version_28_may.pdf

Additional UNFCCC resources

FCCC/SBI/2013/6 Proposed programme budget for the biennium 2014–2015, available at
<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/sbi/eng/06.pdf>

FCCC/SBI/2013/8: Report on the 23rd meeting of the Least Developed Countries Expert Group, available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/sbi/eng/08.pdf>

FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.9: Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change. Draft conclusions proposed by the Chair, available at
<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/sbsta/eng/109.pdf>

FCCC/SBSTA/2013/L.20: Issues relating to agriculture, available at
<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/sbsta/eng/120.pdf>

FCCC/ADP/2013/L.2: Implementation of all the elements of decision 1/CP.17. Draft conclusions proposed by the Co-Chairs, available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/adp2/eng/102.pdf>

Least Developed Country Expert Group 2012: NATIONAL ADAPTATION PLANS Technical guidelines for the national adaptation plan process, available at
http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/cancun_adaptation_framework/national_adaptation_plans/application/pdf/naptechguidelines_eng_low_res.pdf

Others

CARE (2012): PMERL Manual. A Manual for local Practitioners. Available at http://www.careclimatechange.org/files/adaptation/CARE_PMERL_Manual_2012.pdf

Harmeling, S. (2013): Adaptation Committee: Head start towards implementation of the three year's work programme, available at <http://germanwatch.org/de/download/7522.pdf>

Junghans, L. & Harmeling, S. (2012): Different Tales from different Countries. Germanwatch Briefing Paper, available at <https://germanwatch.org/de/download/7083.pdf>

Kreft, S & Harmeling S. (2013): Adaptation Committee #2: A Germanwatch Pre-sessional Briefing on the AC's 2nd Meeting, available at <http://germanwatch.org/de/download/7499.pdf>

... did you find this publication interesting and helpful?

You can support the work of Germanwatch with a donation to:

Bank fuer Sozialwirtschaft AG
BIC/Swift: BFSWDE33BER
IBAN: DE33 1002 0500 0003 212300

Thank you for your support!

Germanwatch

Following the motto "Observing, Analysing, Acting", Germanwatch has been actively promoting global equity and the preservation of livelihoods since 1991. In doing so, we focus on the politics and economics of the North with their worldwide consequences. The situation of marginalised people in the South is the starting point of our work. Together with our members and supporters as well as with other actors in civil society, we intend to represent a strong lobby for sustainable development. We endeavour to approach our aims by advocating food security, responsible financial markets, compliance with human rights and the prevention of dangerous climate change.

Germanwatch is funded by membership fees, donations, grants from the "Stiftung Zukunftsfähigkeit" (Foundation for Sustainability), and by grants from a number of other public and private donors.

You can also help to achieve the goals of Germanwatch and become a member or support our work with your donation:

Bank fuer Sozialwirtschaft AG
BIC/Swift: BFSWDE33BER
IBAN: DE33 1002 0500 0003 212300

For further information, please contact one of our offices

Germanwatch – Bonn Office

Dr. Werner-Schuster-Haus
Kaiserstraße 201
53113 Bonn, Germany
Ph.: +49 (0) 228 - 60492-0
Fax: +49 (0) 228 - 60492-19

Germanwatch – Berlin Office

Schiffbauerdamm 15
10117 Berlin, Germany
Ph.: +49 (0) 30 - 28 88 356-0
Fax: +49 (0) 30 - 28 88 356-1

E-mail: info@germanwatch.org

or visit our website:

www.germanwatch.org