

**Submission by Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)
on behalf of Least Developed Countries Group
on the Adaptation Committee (AC) and Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG)
mandates stemming from decision 1/CP.21**

The Least Developed Countries Group (LDC Group) welcomes the Call for submissions on the Adaptation Committee (AC) and Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) mandates stemming from decision 1/CP.21.

1. Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 41: Requests the Adaptation Committee (AC) and the Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) to jointly develop modalities to recognize the adaptation efforts of developing country Parties, as referred to in Article 7, paragraph 3, of the Agreement, and make 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 (CMA 1).

- What is the range and scope of adaptation efforts? How do you define and document adaptation efforts? Do you encounter any difficulties in terms of data sourcing or completeness?
 - Could you provide examples or possible modalities of how adaptation efforts of developing countries could be recognized under the Convention?
 - Do you foresee any challenges or barriers in recognizing adaptation efforts of developing countries?
-

Adaptation to the adverse effects of climate change is vital to reduce the impacts of climate change that are happening now and to increase resilience to future impacts. Any delay in global climate actions will lead to greater adverse effects, increasing needs for adaptation in LDCs and other vulnerable developing countries. The current adaptation actions have on several occasions demonstrated to be inadequate commensurate with the challenge on the challenge.

Scientific studies have shown that the challenge of adaptation can be substantive, especially for the most vulnerable countries. Adaptation potential is limited for many of the observed impacts of climate change, and implementation of adaptation options, if available, comes at very high cost in relation to countries' national budgets.

Compared to process setup for climate change mitigation, calculation or quantification of adaptation efforts is complex. Also available possible options vary in terms of its scope and priorities, **therefore it is recommended that the AC and LEG to initiate dialogue with the scientific community - which could be in a form of a structured expert dialogue - to further brainstorm possible avenues for development of modalities to recognize the adaptation efforts of developing countries.**

While possible ranges and scope of adaptation efforts are discussed, it is important that such actions are linked to assessment of climate change impacts and the related concept of vulnerability. Some of the possible range and scope includes;

- Actions implemented by countries as identified by national plans and policies. i.e. National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) for LDCs, National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and other domestic plans, programmes and strategy.
- Sustainable Development Goals related targets to quantify reach of adaptation action to populations and countries.

Possible modalities for recognition of adaptation efforts of developing countries under the Convention include:

- Documentation of actions implemented as identified by NAPAs for LDCs; NAPs and national communication for all developing countries
- Documentation of range of climate change adaptation actions implemented by mobilizing climate change fund in developing countries
- Regular summaries of success stories and best practices from countries implementing adaptation would be useful for not only recognition of adaptation efforts but also as a means of sharing experiences. The best practices of the NAPA implementation by LDCs as captured by the LEG is an example of this.

Some of the challenges in recognizing adaptation efforts of developing countries include:

- difficulty in reporting adaptation actions,
- lack of data and information related to adaptation action
- Challenges in comparing adaptation efforts between sectors and/or countries
- How to measure resilience
- Weak climate services to inform adaptation options
- There are different strengths in channels and agencies in the support provided and some entities are better at publicizing efforts than others, and this may lead to different levels of recognition.
- The ever increasing scale and frequency of climate change impacts

2. Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 45(a): Also requests the AC and the LEG, in collaboration with the Standing Committee on Finance (SCF) and other relevant institutions, to develop methodologies, and make recommendations for consideration and adoption by CMA 1 on taking the necessary steps to facilitate the mobilization of support for adaptation in developing countries in the context of the limit to global average temperature increase referred to in Article 2 of the Agreement.

- What experiences, including lessons learned and good practices, do you consider valuable in facilitating the mobilization of support for adaptation in developing countries?
 - Which steps would be necessary to facilitate the mobilization of support for adaptation in developing countries in the context of the limit to global average temperature increase referred to in Article 2 of the Agreement?
 - What methodologies can be used to take the above necessary steps?
-

Most developing countries have national strategies and plans that incorporate adapting to the effects of climate change. In addition to that within the UNFCCC process, LDCs have prepared NAPAs, which has assisted them in setting their adaptation priorities. Moreover there are NAPs and other adaptation planning processes and a number of developing countries have included adaptation in their INDCs. These national plans should be taken as good practices that are valuable in identifying the needs of developing countries and mobilization of support for adaptation. However adequate finance could not be mobilized to implement the priorities as set in the NAPAs for LDCs. There has been a historical imbalance between adaptation and mitigation with more finance going to mitigation- it was also reflected during the fast start finance period.

Therefore, acknowledging that adaptation is a priority for developing countries as expressed in NAPAs, NAPs and INDCs, more attention should be given to mobilizing adaptation finance.

Steps to be taken:

- Initially Funds such as LDCF, AF that support adaptation should have adequate resources so that they can support adaptation activities in developing countries.
- Additionally, the operating entities of the Financial Mechanism that will serve the Paris Agreement i.e. the GEF and the GCF (that aims to balance adaptation and mitigation support) should be replenished adequately.
- A process should be set up at the global stocktake to regularly assess cost for adaptation action in relation to adequacy of mitigation effort. This should include the assessment of support provided and action achieved on the ground to address vulnerability and risk to climate change. The stocktake should be informed by the best available science in terms of the state of climate change and potential impacts on developing countries.
- It is equally important that access to financial support is facilitated to capacity constrained countries such as LDCs.
- Starts steps and discussion on how to operationalize the global goal on adaptation in post 2020 regime

3. Decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 45(b): Also requests the AC and the LEG, in collaboration with the SCF and other relevant institutions, to develop methodologies, and make recommendations for consideration and adoption by CMA 1 on reviewing the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support referred to in Article 7, paragraph 14(c), of the Agreement.

- What information/data or metrics are needed for the review of adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support for adaptation?
 - Which lessons learned, good practices, challenges and barriers have been encountered in such reviews?
 - What methods can be used to review the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support for adaptation?
-

A universal assessment metric to evaluate the effectiveness and adequacy of measures in strengthening resilience, reducing vulnerabilities and increasing the understanding and

implementation of adaptation actions is not available and scientifically also not feasible in a meaningful way. However, some work has been done in relation to some for identifying best practices. For example, in the case of NAPAs, the LEG captured and shared best practices and lessons learned in addressing adaptation in the LDCs through the NAPAs. References from these and other projects, programmes and policies will therefore need to be accompanied by a universal review process to evaluate effectiveness and adequacy, which will help in arriving at possible best practices. The technical examination process on adaptation to some extent has attempted to initiate this in the context of enhanced action prior to 2020. However, it is important to have methods to be developed also to feed the global stocktake process which is mandated to review the adequacy and effectiveness of adaptation and support provided for adaptation.

The NAP process also already includes a means for assessing progress and effectiveness. The M&E process under NAP process happens at the national level within individual countries, and there is also an M&E process to review progress in the process to formulate and implement NAPs at the international level under the SBI. It should however be noted that this process of monitoring progress and effectiveness is limited to the process elements of adaptation planning and implementation and not in terms of achieving the objectives of the NAP process in reducing vulnerability and building resilience. There is a need to also focus on the reviewing achievement of objective to reduce vulnerability.

The nature of adaptation requires metrics that allow to assess different aspects across different scales, therefore not one universal metric can cover all important aspects. Several approaches have been proposed, which provide good starting points to cover important aspects, however, each also has caveats and likely combinations of metrics will prove most promising

- Number of people supported in a certain sector or region: a people-centered metric, though it is disputed if/how a comparable and useful definition of 'supported' can allow to measure the success of a measure
- \$ spent on adaptation in a sector or region: though it is likely that higher spending also implies more adaptation, the actual amount does not give insights into the quality
- Promising approaches to describe and track adaptation include also more qualitative description of the type and form of adaptation
- Periodic Vulnerability and risk assessments can provide useful ways of tracking success of adaptation for specific sectors or region, if comparable assessments are conducted over time (baseline to outcome)

Close collaboration with the scientific community (e.g. the IPCC) is essential, as this is an evolving field and much remains to be understood and metrics accordingly developed. Such a close collaboration is essential in order to inform the scientific community in identifying the most urgent research needs in the field, so results can effectively feed back into the policy process. The collaboration with the scientific community should also help in predicting future levels of adaptation needs and the support needed to address the same. As the scientific community is getting ready to work on the 6th Assessment report starting from May 2017, a timely contribution to the process would be highly beneficial.