

# **Submission by the Republic of Mali on behalf of the African Group of Negotiators**

**On**

## **Call for submissions to Parties and non-Party stakeholders on the Adaptation Committee's (AC) mandates stemming from decision 1/CP.21**

**20 February 2017**

### **Introduction and context setting**

This submission responds to the invitation from the Adaptation Committee for submissions on its mandates stemming from decision 1/CP.21.

This submission should be read alongside previous submissions made by the African Group of Negotiators (AGN), particularly submissions in response to the APA agenda item 4, “Further guidance in relation to the adaptation communication, including, inter alia, as a component of nationally determined contributions, referred to in Article 7, paragraphs 10 and 11, of the Paris Agreement”, which identifies the minimum information for adaptation communications as a component of NDCs or any other vehicle as appropriate<sup>1</sup>, and the joint call for submissions by the Adaptation Committee and the Least Developed Countries Expert Group.<sup>2</sup>

This submission should also be read within the context of the Paris Agreement and its accompanying decisions. In making this submission, the AGN would like to reiterate the following provisions:

- In submitting their adaptation communications, Parties should communicate their implementation and support needs (Article 7.10);
- Under the transparency framework Parties communicate their needs and gaps (Article 13.5 and 13.8); and
- The global stocktake is mandated to enhance the implementation of adaptation action, review the adequacy of support provided against Parties’ needs communicated, and review progress towards the Global Goal for Adaptation (GGA), including ensuring adequate adaptation response in the context of the temperature goal, and to that end sources of input for the global stocktake will include the state of adaptation efforts, support, experiences and priorities from adaptation communications and from reports submitted under transparency (Article 13.8).

Therefore, in reviewing the adaptation-related institutional arrangements under the Convention and in enhancing these, and in developing the methodologies for assessing developing countries’ adaptation needs, it should also be considered which institutional arrangement should support countries in communicating their needs and in ensuring that these are addressed adequately.

---

<sup>1</sup> [See AGN submission on APA agenda item 4](#)

<sup>2</sup> [See AGN submission on the joint mandates of the Adaptation Committee and the LEG](#)

- 1. Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 42 (a): Requests the Adaptation Committee (AC) to review, in 2017, the work of adaptation-related institutional arrangements under the Convention, with a view to identifying ways to enhance the coherence of their work, as appropriate, in order to respond adequately to the needs of Parties, with a view to preparing recommendations for consideration and adoption by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement, at its first session (CMA1).**

While the AGN welcomes the opportunity to share its experience, it also believes that inputs to the review the Adaptation Committee can greatly benefit from countries' experience and practitioners on the ground, e.g. through a survey that could be sent to focal points and observer institutions to solicit their input. In addition, at the next NAP Expo, a similar adaptation-related event that attracts focal points and adaptation practitioners, or at/in conjunction with the intersession UNFCCC meeting in May, the secretariat could dedicate half a day/an additional day to present the mandate and collect countries' views on the institutional arrangements, including, e.g. through break-out groups.

The AGN would like to stress that, in line with the Paris Agreement and its accompanying decisions, the adaptation-related institutional arrangements are separate and distinct from the loss and damage-related institutions. As such, the AGN believes these two distinct sets of institutional arrangements should be treated differently and should not be considered as one set of institutional arrangements.

### **1.1 What are the major needs of Parties to which adaptation-related institutional arrangements under the Convention need to respond?**

One of the most emergent needs of developing countries will be support for the communication, implementation and updating of the adaptation communications as a component of their NDCs or any other vehicle as appropriate. Therefore, in reviewing and strengthening the adaptation-related institutional arrangements, the Adaptation Committee needs to assess whether these institutional arrangements are adequate with respect to the adaptation communications and the GGA.

As a matter of course, adaptation-related institutions should enable the implementation of the Paris Agreement, and rules currently under development, and help countries' access to

- **Adequate finance:** As adaptation finance has only made up one fifth of the initial allocation of fast-start funding, much of which was allocated for capacity-building and pilot programmes. Thus, there is an urgent need to fund adaptation projects and programmes. One of the policies of the GCF was to address this imbalance in finance, though it is currently stated as aiming to achieve a 50:50 balance between adaptation and mitigation. Looking at the current pipeline of approved projects, it is evident that, as of now, this balance is not achieved.

In its survey, the Adaptation Committee could ask countries whether they believe that currently existing adaptation programmes and institutions are available and

adequate to help countries access adequate adaptation funding, including preparation (e.g. planning) and particularly implementation (beyond capacity-building projects and pilot programmes), and what current gaps exist, and how these gaps can be filled. The survey could also try to identify the barriers and enablers, influencing countries in accessing finance for adaptation. In undertaking the review, and building on the joint mandate with the LEG and the SCF, the Adaptation Committee should also consider whether the existing institutional arrangements are adequate to support developing countries in determining adaptation costs and needs, enable recognition of the efforts of developing countries, and determine methodologies and guidance for indicative levels of support provided from developed to developing countries.

- **Technology for adaptation:** As part of the Technology Needs Assessments (TNAs), countries identify technologies necessary for both adaptation and mitigation. As such, countries can be asked whether adaptation-related programmes (e.g. TNAs) and institutions are available and adequate to help countries access adequate adaptation technologies, again including preparation (e.g. planning) and implementation. Are countries able to implement the TNAs and access technologies? What are some of the challenges they perceive and how can adaptation-related institutional arrangements help overcome these challenges?
- **Capacity/knowledge:** Capacity and knowledge – including access to information to enable impact assessments, climate modelling and socio-economic scenarios, and means to use given information, e.g. by tailoring or translating information to country-specific context – is indispensable for developing adaptation plans and actions and determine implementation and support needs. As such, it is important to identify from countries whether or not there are adaptation-related programmes and institutions available and adequate to help countries access adequate information, including preparation and implementation. Also, what can the Paris Committee for Capacity Building (PCCB) do to help adaptation-related institutions in increasing adaptation-related knowledge and capacities? Is the Nairobi Work Programme (NWP) helping countries in accessing information, and how has that information been used in the development and implementation of the NAPs and other adaptation actions? What are challenges and how can these be overcome? Are NAPs adequate to help countries with climate modelling? Can countries access support (financial and technical) to undertake vulnerability assessments and modelling? Are existing institutional arrangements, including regional centres, the CGE, the LEG and the Adaptation Committee adequate in supporting countries with adaptation work relevant to the NAPs, e.g. vulnerability and adaptation assessments and social and climate modelling? If not, how can these gaps be addressed?

**1.2 Are there gaps and/or overlaps in the work of existing adaptation-related institutional arrangements under the Convention that may need to be addressed to adequately respond to the needs of Parties? If so, how could these gaps and/or overlaps be addressed?**

The Adaptation Committee and the LEG could undertake a tabular exercise to answer these questions by listing the mandates of the different adaptation-related bodies and the aims of the adaptation-related programmes, and identify whether the aims and the mandates are achieved, what gaps/overlaps there are and how these can be addressed and whether or not the existing institutions and programmes are adequate to implement the adaptation-related provisions of the Paris Agreement. In addition, in relation to the needs identified, it can also be assessed whether the committees and programmes address these areas, including potential problems/challenges.

The table can be populated through the survey and the half/one-day consultations and should enable streamlining mandates of institutions and objectives of existing programmes to identify gaps and overlaps and present these to the Parties to be addressed.

	<b>Mandates/ aims (incl. from the Paris Agreement)</b>	<b>Finance</b>	<b>Technology</b>	<b>Capacity/ knowledge</b>	<b>Other needs as identified</b>
<b>Committees/groups</b>					
AC					
LEG					
Regional centres					
SCF					
TEC					
GEF					
GCF					
CGE					
...					
<b>Programmes</b>					
NWP					
NAPA					
NAPs					
TNA					
...					

**1.3 Which institutional arrangements could be strengthened or given greater priority to enhance the coherence and implementation of their work?**

The Adaptation Committee and the LEG are fundamental institutions related to adaptation. The LEG has a long history and experience and necessary technical knowledge and expertise of promoting adaptation and supporting least developed countries. The Adaptation Committee is a comparatively newer body. Different from the LEG, the Adaptation Committee is also restricted in its mandate as it is limited to policy-related work that promotes coherence rather than technical and practical work with countries.

The Adaptation Committee is tasked with very important work, e.g. the mandates from the Paris Agreement and the TEP-A. Despite its importance for adaptation, the Adaptation Committee repeatedly communicated to the COP about its lack of resources to implement its work plan which is a great concern to the African Group. The African Group envisages the Adaptation Committee to take on further responsibilities, particularly related to the adaptation communications, the adaptation-related outcomes of the global stocktake, such as ensuring enhanced implementation of adaptation action, adequacy of provision of support for adaptation, overseeing progress towards the GGA, and adequate adaptation response in the context of the temperature goal. As such, it is imperative that the Adaptation Committee is strengthened and has the necessary resources available to allow it to implement these tasks.

The African Group, like many other countries, appreciates the work that the NWP undertakes and the outcomes it produces. However, one limitation of the NWP is that it is currently placed under the SBSTA, to facilitate and catalyze the development and dissemination of information and knowledge that would inform and support adaptation policies and practices. This makes it difficult to implement its outcomes because it is not directly linked to an implementation body. To address this, the NWP could be requested to periodically report to the Adaptation Committee on identified implementable activity areas and enable coordination of work with related institutional arrangements such as the TEC, the SCF and the PCCB on such implementation using existing arrangements.

#### **1.4 What modalities for cooperation and collaboration exist between the adaptation-related institutional arrangements? Which of them should be strengthened, and what new ones should be developed?**

While adaptation-related institutions seem to be working more effectively together, the challenge lies in bringing together adaptation-related institutions with finance, technology, and capacity (knowledge) institutions. Several mechanisms like joint meetings or round-table discussions seem to be undertaken occasionally, while, for example, committee meetings are mostly held individually with only representatives joining those meetings, upon invitation, and if a matter is taken up that directly deals with adaptation. Other examples of modalities for interaction and joint action to facilitate cooperation and collaboration include, amongst others:

- NAP Expo;
- Joint meetings to address joint mandates;
- The annual GCF meetings to enhance cooperation and coherence of engagement between the GCF and Convention thematic bodies; which has only taken place in Marrakesh and thus it is yet to be seen how effective it is;
- The PCCB which invited thematic bodies, including the Adaptation Committee and the LEG to attend the meetings of the PCCB;
- Task forces like the NAP Task force, the CGE task force on adaptation and V&A, or the TEC adaptation task force;
- Thematic workshops;

- Regular meetings of co-chairs to share ongoing work between bodies;
- The TEP-A which brings together different institutions to enhance adaptation action pre-2020; and
- IPCC meetings for methodological issues on understanding impacts, vulnerability and needs.

**2. Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 42 (b): Also requests the AC consider methodologies for assessing adaptation needs with a view to assisting developing country Parties, without placing an undue burden on them, with a view to preparing recommendations for consideration and adoption by CMA1.**

**2.1 How could adaptation needs be defined?**

The Fifth Assessment Report (AR5) of the IPCC defines adaptation needs as: “the gap between what might happen as the climate changes and what we would desire to happen”. A definition under the context of the UNFCCC could build on this definition to include the resources countries require to achieve the desired outcome. In determining the needs, i.e. the resources required, these should be classified around the needs as identified by the IPCC, namely

- information, including data for climate modelling;
- institutional and individual capacity;
- financial needs, and
- technological needs.

In defining adaptation needs, it should also be considered that adaptation needs are dynamic and that they depend on the mitigation pathway that is taken as recognized in Article 2 and 7.4 of the Paris Agreement. It should also be recognised that there are constraints and limits to adaptation, i.e. there is often going to be a gap between adaptation needs and the effectiveness of adaptation options implemented even though they might be well resourced and well implemented.

**2.2 What should be the goal(s) when assessing adaptation needs?**

Having set the context in the beginning of the submission, assessing adaptation needs requires ensuring that countries are able to 1), identify what might happen to them, including their ecosystems, their economies, and their people as the climate is changing; 2) what actions are necessary to adapt to these changes, and 3) what resources, i.e. means of implementation, are needed to enable adaptation actions.

Assessing adaptation requires action not only at the national level, but also at the collective level, to 1) understand what the adaptation needs of countries are, 2) identify whether or not these needs have been addressed or are likely going to be addressed based on information around indicative levels of support, including as envisaged in Article 9.5 of the Paris Agreement; and 3) identify options and actions to address any gaps in failing to address these adaptation needs. This is particularly important for enabling the process of adaptation

communications, for setting the GGA and assessing Parties' efforts towards achieving it, and for a meaningful stocktake.

### **2.3 What are examples of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs? What are the strengths and/or limitations of these methodologies?**

There are several methodologies available to assess adaptation needs, and different countries use different methodologies based on their circumstances and their different capacities. Some of these are related to programme/project-based economic costing/identification of needs; use of computable general equilibrium (CGE)-types of models; projections of climate extremes and associated costs; or sector-based assessments of needs and costs. Many of these methodologies and approaches are listed in the IPCC AR5 report. But it should be noted that many of the existing relevant methodologies are not accessible as some might encounter significant costs because of the ownership of the methodologies by certain bodies, as well as the costs of required training to enable their use. In fact, many developing countries faced that challenge during NAPs preparation. For developing and least developing countries, the use of methodologies such as those associated with modelling and projections of medium and long term-impacts represent a great challenge that need to be considered as this limits accessibility of existing relevant methodologies.

Therefore, the Adaptation Committee together with the LEG should invite submissions from Parties and admitted observer organisations on methodologies they are using and their experience with using these methodologies, including challenges and opportunities with respect to the adaptation needs and goals identified above, and collate that information, e.g. in a comprehensive report. In doing to, Parties should agree on the purpose of the methodologies in the context of Paris Agreement obligations and processes so as to provide guidance on how the methodologies might need to be adjusted accordingly. Then the Adaptation Committee and the LEG, ideally with the support of the IPCC, should identify opportunities to adjust the different methodologies, thereby ensuring that they address all identified types of needs and different national circumstances and capacities. This exercise would enable countries to choose the methodologies they prefer, while ensuring they all serve the same purpose.

### **2.4 What barriers and gaps exist with respect to the development and application of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs? What actions are needed to address these barriers and gaps, particularly within the context of the Convention and the Paris Agreement?**

One of the main challenges lies in keeping the balance between reflecting different capacity needs and national circumstances while trying to identify methodologies that would ensure consistency and coherence of these methodologies. Another challenge is the lack of an agreed goal because different types of climate change assessments differ in that they pursue different goals; are underpinned by different theoretical frameworks, and rely on different forms of data. This could, or could not create difficulties in aggregating information communicated.

In terms of actions needed, the African Group believes it is important to, firstly, get a sense of what methodologies and approaches countries are using to identify their adaptation needs, and their experience with using different methodologies in general, meaning what other methodologies/approaches they have been using, what worked for them, what did not work for them, and why? This information should be collected by the Adaptation Committee and the LEG and published in a comprehensive report. The Adaptation Committee, the LEG and ideally the IPCC should identify how these different sets of methodologies can be aligned to meet different experiences, challenges and gaps, and identify a suite of methodologies that can be used by Parties as appropriate.

Further, the AC/LEG could open a window for responding for Parties specific requests for assistance on methodologies that are sector specific or region specific that could then be adjusted at the national level – this will be of great value and needed for the Global Stocktake and for assessing the GGA. It is imperative that countries are comfortable in using and applying them through capacity-building activities such as training materials and training programmes.