



Implementation of urgent and immediate adaptation actions - the role of NAPAs

**Commission on Climate Change and Development, 8 October 2009,
Bangkok**

The seminar took place during the UNFCCC negotiations in Bangkok, with the objective to discuss the role of NAPAs and how actions to address the implementation of urgent and immediate adaptation needs can be facilitated with a view to laying the foundation for a process of adaptation integration. The seminar gathered 85 people representing both developing and developed countries, civil society and the UNFCCC secretariat.

Speakers were Ian Noble, Advisor, World Bank, Quamrul Chowdhury, LDC Adaptation Coordinator, Bangladesh, Espen Ronneberg, Climate Change Advisor, Samoa, Tara Shine, Department for Foreign Affairs, Ireland. The seminar was moderated by Johan Schaar, Director of the secretariat of the Commission on Climate Change and Development. This report gives a brief overview of the presentations made and issues raised, and does not give an exhaustive account of the seminar.

Johan Schaar stated that the aim of the seminar was to focus on how national adaptation can be designed at the national level, how the NAPA process has enabled capacity development, and what we can learn from these experiences. The discussion was based on the assumption that financial resources for adaptation would be available so as to avoid another debate about financial mechanisms and modes of mobilizing finance.

Ian Noble focused his address on a draft discussion paper developed by Arun Agrawal, University of Michigan and a member of the World Development Report team, which analyzes the NAPA process and addressed their history, value, criticism, funding sources and how they can be build on for adaptation programming.

NAPAs may include adaptation projects, capacity development, integration of adaptation into development, & policy reform. The value of the NAPAs have been awareness raising and capacity building in the LDCs, and a similar process among supporting agencies and consultants. NAPAs demonstrate the agency of LDCs – they are not just aid recipients. However, NAPAs have,

inter alia, been criticized for being too focused on projects, which has led to a missed opportunity for integration across sectors.

The NAPA process highlights the gaps between the rhetoric on adaptation needs and the reality of commitments to provide adaptation funding. Although NAPAs were not designed to deliver implementation ready projects for immediate LDCF funding, they nevertheless exposed the deficiencies of financial mechanisms and implementing agencies in providing the necessary resources for implementation.

Mr Noble also pointed to the fact that there are several funding sources for adaptation support, including for NAPAs, such as the LDC Fund and the SCC Fund, the GEF TF, the Adaptation Fund, the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR), bilateral arrangements and IDA replenishments. In moving beyond NAPAs it is central to build trust and reduce credibility gaps, reform inefficient funding channels, build skills, capacity and experience. The advice is therefore to start now, selectively and focus on success and visibility.

Mr Quamrul Chowdhury talked about the process of developing the NAPA in Bangladesh, which has resulted in increased knowledge, national ownership, and a cross sectoral approach and awareness raising.

When Bangladesh first began developing the NAPA, there was little knowledge of adaptation needs and actions. However, the knowledge and understanding of adaptation has evolved. The coastal areas have been struck by two cyclones this year. The first did not cause major damage, but the second one made the dykes crack. Chowdhury stated that the cost of damage and reparation is a clear example of an adaptation cost – “it is only now we realize what we are talking about”.

Mr Chowdhury also stressed the need for financial support for adaptation. Today, Bangladesh is already paying from its own budget for adaptation efforts. 10 million dollars have already been allocated from the national budget to finance part of the revised NAPA, which will require 1 billion dollars for the most urgent adaptation actions.

In Bangladesh awareness has been raised in all sectors due to the broad approach taken. The capacity to plan for adaptation actions has been built among policy makers, especially in those ministries that do not normally deal with the environment, including the ministry of planning.

Espen Ronneberg presented regional actions to address adaptation, the capacity built as part of the process, and the lessons learned from the Pacific.

Regional frameworks for the Pacific include both climate change and disaster management, as functions overlap and there is much to gain from cooperation

and identifying linkages. Current activities build on experiences of past climate change programmes and processes, such as the Pacific Island Climate Change Assistance Programme (PICCAP) and the completion of Initial National Communications to UNFCCC.

Ronneberg also presented the regional project Pacific Adaptation to Climate Change (PACC). The project has three focal areas: water resource management, coastal management and infrastructure, food production and food security. Each SIDS identified one project, after national consultations based on the needs and efforts in that country. These priorities were then discussed with communities in light of government priorities as well as expectations of the communities. Examples of PACC projects in countries are: protection of harbour and airport upgrade for climate change and disaster preparedness in Cook Islands, coastal infrastructure management and protection in Samoa, and water management and drainage for better water supply and food security in Fiji.

In his presentation Ronneberg stressed that a consultative, community based approach is necessary to achieve successful adaptation and sustainable development. In the Pacific region, local and national stakeholders have been involved in the process, and the national commitment has been strong. A consultative approach implies that awareness is created and capacity built during the process – it enables and empowers. It also creates sustainability, which is key for informative planning and high public awareness.

Tara Shine stressed that adaptation is a process, whilst unfortunately NAPAs have been perceived as a plan. Experiences need to be shared, south to south, north to south and south to north. The objective is to get everyone involved, from community level to all of government. The NAPA process provides a starting point.

Shine looked at the positive experience from Bangladesh, where there is a broad stakeholder involvement, and from Malawi, where the NAPA was launched by the President.

In Gambia, officials brought the NAPA to donor meetings, in order to find opportunities for support. There, integration took place during the implementation of the NAPA.

In her presentation, Shine also posed central questions on how to become more ambitious and strategic. She mentioned that funding must be easier to access and transaction costs minimized. Awareness must be raised as an integral part of the process and the lessons learned used in building a good future.

Summary of discussion which followed the presentations:

- Participants pointed to the fact that language can be a barrier when it comes to information and knowledge sharing. Language was perceived as a problem

by some francophone countries in Africa in the formulation and implementation of NAPAs, including in the donors dialogues.

- The delay of funds for implementation of NAPA priorities was mentioned. If the disbursement of funds takes too long, there is a risk that the urgent and immediate priorities in the country have changed when they are to be implemented. The experience from Samoa shows that the project formulation took two years, whilst accessing funds from the LDCF took three years. The panel however noted that the procedures to access funds have sped up. It is important to choose the most suitable implementing agencies, it is for e g possible to seek financial support from the PPCR and bilateral ODA.

- Participants commented that the same delay is seen in many parallel processes. In general, too much time is spent on planning, especially considering the overlaps between different processes. How can synergies be enhanced? The panel stated that this is why emphasis is put on mainstreaming – separate plans should not be created. Adaptation should be integrated into development plans and budgets, in that way adaptation becomes the responsibility of those who control the budgets.

- The importance of regional approaches was raised. Experiences should be shared both in regions that share natural resources, and in those who don't but may need similar measures to adapt to the impacts of climate change. It was mentioned that the studies produced by the Nairobi Work Program provided valuable information.

- Implementation of NAPAs, and how to move beyond NAPAs was discussed. The technical paper on the revision of NAPAs produced by the Least Developed Countries Expert Group was mentioned as a useful document. It was suggested NAPAs be seen as a stepping stone, and that the NAPA could be revisited. The panel stressed that this must be done due to the countries own interest and adaptation must be viewed as necessary for survival – that brings ownership of the process and the country's development.