



## Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA)

### NAP Regional Workshop



28-30 June 2016

Chisinau, Moldova

## Table of Content

Acronyms .....	3
Executive Summary.....	4
Introduction .....	5
Day 1, Tuesday, June 29.....	7
Session 1 – Introduction to the workshop .....	7
Session 2 – NAP: Mainstreaming adaptation in development planning .....	7
Session 3 – Overview of the NAP Process and adaptation in the context of the Paris Agreement. ..	8
Session 4 – NAP Experiences from the Region .....	9
Regional Stocktaking – Group Discussion .....	10
Day 2 – Wednesday June 29 .....	11
Session 5 – Diving deeper into Element A: Lay the Groundwork and Address Gaps .....	11
Session 6 – Diving deeper into Element B: Preparatory Elements .....	14
Session 7 – Integrating Climate Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction .....	14
Designing integrated risk assessments and information systems – Group Exercise .....	15
Session 8 – Sectoral adaptation strategies and coherence between sectoral and subnational planning .....	15
DAY 3 – Thursday June 30.....	17
Session 9 – Diving deeper into Element C – Implementation Strategies.....	17
Session 10 – Financing adaptation.....	19
Session 11 – Diving deeper into Element D – Reporting, Monitoring and Review.....	20
Session 12 – Synthesis and Wrap up.....	21
Annex 1. EECCA NAP Regional Workshop Agenda .....	23
Annex 2. Breakout Exercise 1 - Regional Stocktaking exercise – Session 4 .....	28
Annex 3. Breakout Exercise 2- An integrated risk assessment for the Republic of Utopia .....	29
Annex 4. Outcomes of Breakout Exercise 1 - Regional Stocktaking exercise – Session 4 .....	32

## Acronyms

<b>ADA</b>	Austrian Development Agency
<b>AF</b>	Adaptation Fund
<b>AMAT</b>	Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool
<b>CBA</b>	Cost Benefit Analysis
<b>CC</b>	Climate Change
<b>CCA</b>	Climate Change Adaptation
<b>COP</b>	Conference of the Parties
<b>DRR</b>	Disaster Risk Reduction
<b>EbA</b>	Ecosystem Based Adaptation
<b>EECCA</b>	Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia
<b>EIA</b>	Environmental impact assessment
<b>EU</b>	European Union
<b>GEF</b>	Global Environment Facility
<b>GHG</b>	Greenhouse Gas
<b>GIS</b>	Geographic information system
<b>GSP</b>	Global Support Programme
<b>INDCs</b>	Intended Nationally Determined Contributions
<b>LEAP</b>	Local Environmental Action Plan
<b>LEG</b>	Least Developed Countries Expert Group
<b>LDCs</b>	Least Developed Countries
<b>MDG</b>	Millennium Development Goals
<b>NAP</b>	National Adaptation Plan
<b>NGOs</b>	Non-governmental organization
<b>SNAP</b>	Stocktaking for National Adaptation Planning
<b>SNC</b>	Second National Communication on Climate Change
<b>UN</b>	United Nations
<b>UNDP</b>	United Nations Development Programme
<b>UNEP</b>	United Nations Environment Programme
<b>UNFCCC</b>	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

## Executive Summary

The Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Regional Workshop was held during 28-30 June 2016 in Chisinau, Republic of Moldova. It was organized by the joint United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) - United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) NAP Global Support Programme (NAP-GSP) and the Government of the Republic of Moldova, and the support of the Austrian Development Agency.

The Workshop was represented by the following countries: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Moldova, Montenegro, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.

The workshop agenda covered NAP process introductory topics in the first day of the workshop. The second and third days of the workshop provided the participants with the opportunity to go deeper into the key elements of the NAP Process (see *Annex 1*).

With the exception of Moldova, most countries in the region are either just starting their NAP or still at the thinking stage (8 countries have initiated their NAP, 3 countries are in the process of starting the NAP and 5 countries have not started yet). The timing of the workshop was therefore opportune as it provided most countries with food for thought on what to consider as they begin to plan for their NAP processes.

Participants identified adaptation finance, and multi-criteria and/or Cost Benefit Analysis (CBA) approaches for selecting adaptation options, as priority areas for receiving additional support, through the development of additional and specific materials, and through capacity-building opportunities.

All in all, the participants perceived the workshop to be well structured, organized and hands-on as it helped them gain knowledge, comprehend and exchange experiences on NAP process. The highly qualified expertise made available during the workshop was much appreciated by participants. Participants also appreciated the possibility to network with their colleagues. In future occasions, it would be desirable for the workshop structure to allow for more networking and interaction time as well as more hands-on exercises.

## Introduction

The national adaptation plan (NAP) process was established under the Cancun Adaptation Framework (CAF). It enables Parties to formulate and implement national adaptation plans (NAPs) as a means of identifying medium- and long-term adaptation needs and developing and implementing strategies and programmes to address those needs. It is a continuous, progressive and iterative process which follows a country-driven, gender-sensitive, participatory and fully transparent approach.

The Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) NAP Regional Workshop was held during 28-30 June 2016 in Chisinau, Republic of Moldova. It was organized by the joint UNDP-UNEP NAP-GSP and the Government of the Republic of Moldova.

The workshop was attended by representatives of the following countries:

- **EECCA countries:** Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, Kazakhstan, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, Ukraine, and Uzbekistan.
- **EU Member States:** Croatia, Bulgaria, and Romania.
- **EU membership candidate countries:** Bosnia and Herzegovina, Montenegro, Serbia and Turkey.

Three invited EECCA countries (i.e. Belarus, Kyrgyzstan and Turkmenistan) could not participate in the workshop.

The **Workshop objectives** are presented below:

- To support countries improve their understanding of the National Adaptation Plans (NAP) process;
- To take stock of what countries have done/are doing on the NAP process and exchange experiences and lessons learned;
- To increase awareness of the existing guidance and tools and methods relevant to the NAPs that can help countries advance in their NAP process;
- To exchange information on the mechanisms and options for financing NAPs.
- To help countries understand the objectives and key deliverables of NAP Global Support Programme (GSP) and the partnerships it leveraged;
- To provide information on UNDP/UNEP support in facilitating access to new sources of funding.

**Key in-depth topics:** In addition to the main elements and steps outlined in the UNFCCC LDC-NAP guidelines, the workshop focused on addressing challenges based on the experiences of countries that have started developing NAPs in the region, and experiences of other countries supported by NAP-GSP.

Topics covered included:

- i) Sectoral NAPs and coherence across sectors,
- ii) CCA/DRR mainstreaming,
- iii) Integration with local planning and
- iv) Finance.

The Workshop Agenda is provided in the *Annex 1*. The participants received electronic versions of all presentations delivered during the workshop.

This report provides an overview of the workshop proceedings focusing mainly on the country presentations and panel discussions held during the event.

## Day 1, Tuesday, June 29

### Session 1 – Introduction to the workshop

**Session objectives:** *Outline the agenda and the work over the 3 days and share participants' expectations*

The session started with remarks on workshop objectives and agenda followed by an ice-breaker exercise. The participants were asked to associate the NAP with one word. The main words enunciated by participants were the following: *regional, challenging, rewarding, resilience, sustainable, political will, survival, awareness, integration, responsibility, etc.* Several countries used the word “*implementable*” highlighting a strong desire for the NAP not to become yet another document, but to be designed realistically leading to concrete results.

The session continued with an exercise on sharing participants' expectations about the workshop outcomes, during which the participants stated the following: understanding and planning the NAP process, how to initiate and to structure the NAP process at the level of the country, common understanding of adaptation, what are the NAP-related challenges and how to overcome them, institutional arrangements, key steps, gender issues in the NAP process, how to link the NAP and development planning, stages of planning, vertical integration of the NAP process (i.e. top-down and bottom-up approaches), sharing the NAP experiences among countries, financial support available to undertake the NAP process, etc.

The second exercise of this session reflected that the topics envisioned to be covered by the workshop shall meet the expectations of participants by contributing to better comprehending the NAP process and by providing practical knowledge how to undertake the process. Also, it revealed that the countries are at different stages of the NAP process.

### Session 2 – NAP: Mainstreaming adaptation in development planning

**Session objectives:** *Improve understanding of the importance of considering climate risks in development planning, the key questions to consider and entry points in development planning process.*

The session started with the presentation on *Importance of planning for adaptation and integration in development planning processes* **by Mr. Prakash Bista, NAP-GSP.**

It was followed by the first country presentation delivered by Moldova as the country which is recently undertaking the entire NAP process. The presentation focused on *Understanding the NAP processes and knowledge needs (e.g. climate risks) to inform development planning* and it was presented by **Ms. Ala Druta, Manager of ADA/UNDP Project from Moldova.**

The NAP Process has been undertaken in the framework of the “Supporting Moldova’s National Climate Change Adaptation Planning Process” Project, supported by the Austrian Development Agency (ADA), with funding from the Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and

Water Management of the Republic of Austria. The National Implementer of the project is the Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Moldova, through the Climate Change Office in collaboration with UNDP Moldova. The overall goal of the project is to ensure that Moldova has a system and capacities in place for medium- to long term adaptation planning and budgeting with the overall aim to reduce vulnerability of the population and key sectors to the impacts of climate change.

The NAP Process has been based on the strategic vision of the Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) Strategy of the Republic of Moldova, developed through a country-driven, gender-sensitive and participatory process.

Moldova followed the different elements and steps of the UNFCCC LDCs NAP Technical Guidelines. Based on the guidance provided, an institutional capacity assessment in relation to CCA was carried out.

A variety of approaches to facilitate learning, participatory dialogue and action across decision levels were applied, aimed to build adaptive capacity through stakeholders' cooperation. The project team developed a range of awareness raising and guiding materials.

The development planning at sector and district levels has been approached following the available UNEP-UNDP guidance on mainstreaming CCA into development planning. The most vulnerable sectors were identified, which are: transport, energy, agriculture, water resources, forestry, and health. At sub-national level, the mainstreaming of adaptation measures has been proposed as development strategies of six districts: Floresti, Singerei, Leova, Basarabeasca, Nisporeni, Calarasi.

The "on the ground" implementation of adaptation actions took place by implementing pilot projects in agriculture, water resources and energy areas within the grant scheme of ADA/UNDP Project.

A Monitoring and Evaluation Framework was developed to ensure the measurability of progress across sectors, geographic scales, and time.

During the **plenary discussion**, Armenia asked Moldova for more details about the NAP coordination mechanism and process organization, the tools that were used for the prioritization of adaptation measures and the cost estimation for the identified measures.

Ms. Druta explained that Moldova did not establish a new coordination body. The tasks of the National Climate Change Commission were supplemented with adaptation-related competences. With regards to the tools, the measures have been prioritized on the basis of multi-criteria analysis and consultations within sectoral working groups.

### **Session 3 – Overview of the NAP Process and adaptation in the context of the Paris Agreement.**

**Session objectives:** *Improve understanding of the basics and main steps of the NAP Process as outlined by the UNFCCC and its linkages with regards to implementation of the Paris Agreement.*

The presentation delivered by the the UNFCCC Secretariat (via Skype) covered information about the NAP Process as outlined in the UNFCCC COP decision and the LEG technical guidelines, and information about Adaptation in the context of the Paris Agreement, and INDCs linkages to NAPs.

#### **Session 4 – NAP Experiences from the Region**

**Session objectives:** *Share experiences of advances and challenges in the NAP process in the region*

The session started with the presentation “*Climate change impacts: risk assessment, and adaptation of economy sectors*” delivered by **Ms. Anna Peters, Main Geophysical Observatory in St. Petersburg**, which provided an insight of the steps to undertake a risk estimation and assessment of adverse effects of climate change for elaboration of adaptation measures at sectoral, regional and national levels. A case study of risk assessment carried out for the adaptation of power grid facilities to climate variability and change from the Northwestern Federal District of the Russian Federation was presented as a practical example of undertaken work.

The second presentation focused on the *NAP Process in Turkey*, and was presented by **Ms. Ata Gözde, Project Manager, UNDP Turkey**. Turkey’s National CC Adaptation Strategy was developed as part of the MDG-F Joint Programme on Enhancing the Capacity of Turkey to Adapt to Climate Change, implemented during June 2008-December 2011 by UNDP, UNIDO, UNEP, FAO, and executed by the Ministry of Environment and Urbanization of Turkey. The undertaken stocktaking analysis led to the identification of the most vulnerable sectors, which were: water resource management, agriculture and food security, natural disasters risk management, forestry, biodiversity and ecosystems services, and public health. The National Adaptation Strategy was prepared and submitted to the Turkish Government. The products developed during the preparatory process fed into the Second National Communication to the UNFCCC. The challenges faced during the process were as follows: linking adaptation strategies to adaptation actions at local level, ensuring a participatory development processes supported by scientific knowledge, downscaling national targets to functional landscape levels, accessing and processing of data to be used in scientific studies, lack of reliable climate data, and downscaling of climate models, among others. Several lessons learned were gained during the National Adaptation Strategy development: the need to strengthen institutional and individual capacities for an effective coordination and cooperation among relevant stakeholders, in addition to needs of scientific knowledge to support policy and decision making, the involvement of academic sector in vulnerability and impact assessment studies, ensure a high quality set of indicators and monitoring, and an effective implementation to be based on cost-benefit analysis of actions.

The **panel discussion** revealed that Bosnia and Herzegovina is at the stage of NAP stocktaking, the main challenges faced are how to involve the various sectors and stakeholders, and financing.

Turkey, Croatia and Tajikistan are also in the stage of stocktaking the NAP process. Tajikistan is linking adaptation with disaster management.

Armenia drew the attention that it is important to develop action plans at ecosystem level in trans-boundary contexts taking into consideration the inter-sectoral approach. Also, it is important to involve the territorial development as the projects are implemented at the local level.

### Regional Stocktaking – Group Discussion

The panel discussion was followed by **group discussion on Regional Stocktaking** aimed to explore in more detail where countries are in their NAP processes, the main challenges encountered or expected, and country's support needs. The participants were divided in three working groups and were asked to fill in a table (see *Annex 2 and Annex 4*) indicating the progress of undertaking the NAP key steps, main challenges encountered and expected support needs.

The information provided by countries during the Regional Stocktaking exercise is integrated in an table incorporated in the *Annex 4* of this Report.

The outcomes of the exercise were reported during the last day of the workshop, revealing the following:

1. Initiating and launching of the NAP process: 8 countries (initiated), 3 countries (in the process), 5 countries (have not initiated);
2. Stocktaking: 12 countries (yes), 2 countries (in the process), 2 countries (no);
3. Addressing capacity gaps and weaknesses in undertaking the NAP process: 6 countries (yes), 1 country(in progress), 9 countries (not);
4. Comprehensively and iteratively assessing development needs and climate vulnerabilities: 5 countries (yes), 3 countries (in progress), 8 countries (not);
5. Analyzing current climate and future climate change scenarios. Undertaking Risk assessments:6 countries (yes), 3 countries (in progress), 7 countries (not);
6. Identifying adaptation options at the sector, subnational, national and other appropriate levels: 4 countries (yes), 4 countries (in progress), 8 countries (not);
7. Identifying adaptation options at the sector, subnational, national and other appropriate levels: 3 countries (yes), 3 countries (in progress), 12 countries (not);
8. Compiling and communicating national adaptation plans: 3countries (yes), 13 countries (not);
9. Integrating climate change adaptation into national and subnational development and sectoral planning: 4 countries (yes), 3 countries (in progress), 9 countries (not);
10. Prioritizing climate change adaptation in national planning: 2 countries (yes), 2 countries (in progress), 12 countries (not);
11. Developing a (long-term) national adaptation implementation strategy: 4 countries (yes), 12 countries (not);
12. Enhancing capacity for planning and implementation of adaptation: 3 countries (yes), 1 country (in progress), 12 countries (not);
13. Promoting coordination and synergy at the regional level and with other multilateral environmental: 1 country (yes);
14. Monitoring the NAP process: 2 countries (in progress), 14countries (not);
15. Reviewing the NAP process to assess progress, effectiveness and gaps: 2 countries (in progress), 14countries (not);
16. Iteratively updating the national adaptation plans: 16 countries (not);

17. Outreach on the NAP process and reporting on progress and effectiveness: 2 countries (in progress), 14 countries (not);
18. Gender: 1 country (yes), 1 country (in progress), 14 countries (not).

Among the challenges highlighted by countries, were the following: Lack of political will, financial constraints, lack of data, lack of institutional cooperation, lack of awareness, the difficulty of NAP fitting with the national planning process, lack of expertise on methodological aspects, time consuming, lack of capacity, changes in government, etc.

The support needs towards the Regional NAP Process Stocktaking, emphasized by participants, were: technical and financial support, expertise, institutional and technical support, capacity building, and technical support at sub-national level.

## Day 2 – Wednesday June 29

### Session 5 – Diving deeper into Element A: Lay the Groundwork and Address Gaps

*Session objectives: Improve understanding of some key actions to lay the groundwork for the NAP process, particularly institutional arrangements and key considerations to design effective institutional arrangement for the NAP process.*

This session started with the presentation on *Institutional arrangements for NAP Planning* made by Ms. **Angela Lentisco, NAP-GSP**, where she introduced the Element A of UNFCCC Technical Guidelines, providing an overview of the main steps and questions to be asking during the initial phase of the NAP process. It was then followed by country presentations prompting reflections around key stakeholders, institutional arrangements, and key steps to get organized for the NAP process.

The presentation by **Ms. Ephrat Yovel, IC of ADA/UNDP Project** reflected on the experience of Moldova regarding institutional arrangements in a climate change context. The speaker explained that Moldova undertook the NAP Process when absolutely no background work on NAP process was done before. The National Development Goals already identified the priority sectors. The National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy and the Action Plan was under the review by the Parliament. A strategic decision was made not to focus on climate information needs as it would be not possible to close the gap during the lifetime of the project. The institutional capacity assessment considered the establishment of a system to ensure the correct use of information. A vision how to progress with the NAP process was developed. It was translated into a roadmap, the latter being converted in a Coordination Mechanism through the National Climate Change Commission. The framework assessed the institutional capacity involved at policy, organizational and individual levels. The institutional assessment process started with a survey distributed to 38 agencies and institutions in the 7 priority sectors. It was a combination of a qualitative and semi-quantitative assessment. The collection of responses lasted longer than expected. However, an 80% rate of response was obtained. The next step was individual sector assessments undertaken for the identified focal areas of intervention. Institutional challenges identified in Moldova included the following: fragmented national mandates on climate change, absence of national policies and national strategies,

duplication of functions and agencies, climate not considered a development issue, lack of climate knowledge, limited use of vulnerability and adaptation indicators in national policies, inefficient use of existing capacities, limited cross-sectoral awareness, limited coordination between sectors, limited capacity (time, personnel and funding) to address climate, and a small pool of national (climate) experts. There were identified six focal areas for interventions covering the development of an effective coordination mechanism, development of general and specific climate awareness, institutional change through the introduction and integration of climate considerations into the daily business of departments and institutions, strengthening human resource capacities associated with increasing technical knowledge and skills, developing a more systematic approach to risk management information, tools and technologies and financial resources and budget mainstreaming.

During the *plenary discussion* the topic of the overlap of roles among sectors, referring to data collection was raised. Many times, different institutions collect the same data in a way which is not compatible for sharing, and the question was raised if the coordination mechanisms would be able to address this issue. Ms. Yovel responded that, in general, the coordination mechanism is supposed to ensure that the sectors cooperate and data management is centralized to avoid duplications, so that a system of data collection from the sectors is established and that everybody can access it in a more comprehensive way. Ms. Druta explained that Moldova is still in the process of developing the M&E system, which is part of the coordination mechanism. The data collection and reporting system is also under development. A number of sector-specific indicators were developed to show the degree of adaptation within the sectors. A set of cross-sectoral indicators that will be comparable among the sectors has also been identified.

The participants inquired about how the institutional assessment should describe the will and commitment for adaptation. Ms. Yovel made a parallel between the lack of commitment and a car without a driver. The will and commitment depends on the mandate of institution and country culture. The technical expertise and knowledge is important to feed the decision-making. The management level shall receive the needed information for decision-making.

The second country presentation focused on *NAP drafting in Serbia*, and was presented by **Ms. Ana Repac, Climate Change Division, Ministry of Agriculture and Environment Protection of Serbia**. Serbia submitted INDCs in June last year. Besides communication on mitigation, the country included information on adaptation. The country assessed the material and financial losses caused by extreme weather events. Human losses were also caused. Serbia faced two prominent climate change induced events: floods in 2014 and drought in 2012. Serbia is in the process of preparing its Second National Communication (SNC). The analysis undertaken for the SNC emphasized that Serbia will be highly exposed to climate change events. Within the scope of the SNC was the development of the National Adaptation Plan, including assessment of financial needs and activities. The most vulnerable sectors identified: hydrology, agriculture, forestry and biodiversity. The contribution of agriculture to GDP is 11%. Floods and droughts cause major damages and losses to agriculture. The raise in temperature will extend the vegetation period and move the growing season by 20 days by the end of the century. The Belgrade City developed a Climate Change Adaptation Action Plan and Vulnerability Assessment, which includes a list of measures, responsibilities, and timeframes. In 2017 Serbia plans to start a two-year project for the development of a Comprehensive Climate Change Strategy and Action Plan, which will cover the mitigation and adaptation aspects. In 2013 the

Government established the Climate Change Committee which includes high level representatives of the ministries in charge of environment, health, agriculture, transport, infrastructure, energy, economy, internal affairs, education, foreign affairs and construction as well as of academic and non-governmental community. A technical group was established that is in charge of the development of the National Communications. The main gaps and constraints identified were: lack of awareness on adaptation at national level, lack of data, lack of financial resources for the development and implementation of adaptation measures, lack of administrative capacity and expertise for the development of adaptation policy framework, and lack of mainstreaming of adaptation into sectors.

In the *plenary discussion* Ms. Druta advised the participants to use the potential of the experts involved in the development of National Communications for the NAP process. Moldova developed already the 3<sup>rd</sup> NCC. The national experts knew how to assess the vulnerability of sectors. The UNFCCC Guidelines on NAP Process has a consistent step by step approach.

Questions were raised regarding the financial support of the NAP Process in Moldova. Ms. Druta explained that the main work was done under the ADA Project. However, the knowledge gaining took place also in other projects implemented before. The financial support is needed because a large volume of work was undertaken, while the involvement of international and national consultants has to be remunerated.

The participants asked what was included in the budget for the implementation of adaptation measures. Ms. Druta explained that due to modest financial resources available at national level, the financial support to implement sectoral adaptation measures was provided by international donors. A presentation on financial support for NAP process made available by international donors was delivered later during the workshop.

The representative from Armenia asked why the NAP shall be in line with the Sustainable Development Strategy. He indicated that the ecosystem approach and green economy principles do not fit into the framework of sustainable development, and questioned the need to reference sustainable development. He asked if this was a requirement to receive financial support for the NAP process. Ms. Yovel explained that the NAP shall be in line with national development goals in accordance with the national legal framework and international commitments. Each country shall decide on the development policy the NAP process should be linked with. It could be MDGs, the Sustainable Development Goals, National Development goals etc. Ms. Druta emphasized that the adaptation measures cannot be against the development goals of the country. That is why the NAP process shall take into consideration the national development goals of the country.

Moldova was asked how the water sector was assessed. Ms. Druta informed that the water sector was selected as a priority sector for implementation of projects at local level by regional development councils in Moldova. The pilot projects were implemented at the household level.

Serbia was asked why is it difficult to mainstream adaptation taking into consideration the climate events that took place in the country. Ms. Repac explained that only three persons are working on climate change in the ministry and a lot of work has to be done. However, the main issue perceived with regard to adaptation is lack of awareness.

## Session 6 – Diving deeper into Element B: Preparatory Elements

**Session objectives:** *Improve understanding of some key Preparatory elements for the NAP process, including key considerations, methodology and tools available to support this part of the NAP process.*

The session started with the presentation on *Key steps in the Element B (Preparatory Elements) of the NAP process, outlining methodologies and resources available to countries (CBA, etc.)*, delivered by **Mr. Umberto Labate, NAP-GSP**.

The session continued with the presentation of *WMO and Climate Information*, delivered by **Mr Milan Dacic, WMO Chief of Regional Office for Europe**.

The Q&A and plenary discussion on Element B started with a question on the type of analysis done by countries. For instance, Moldova used the multi-criteria analysis. Mr. Labate answered that, usually, the CBA is advocated. There are experts that are deployed within the NAP portfolio supporting the countries in doing their assessments. One approach is to start with multi-criteria analysis when the criteria are defined. After that, if needed, the country can go for CBA. Globally, the NAP GSP supported Burkina Faso, Benin and Vietnam in undertaking CBA.

Ms. Druta explained that CBA was carried out for the mostly prioritized measures at sector level. It has been not possible to undertake CBA for all measures.

For those participants who would like to see how a CBA looks like, Mr. Labate offered to share examples of undertaken CBAs, which are done in Excel sheets.

The participants also emphasized that it is important to develop and support national hydro-meteorological networks for data collection.

## Session 7 – Integrating Climate Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction

**Session Objectives:** *Improve understanding on risk assessments, particularly on disaster risk reduction strategies*

The session was opened by the presentation *Rethinking comprehensive risk assessments- based on advice from draft guidelines for DRR considerations in NAP*, delivered by **Ms. Imen Meliane – NAP-GSP**

The *country experiences with DRR in NAP* were presented by **Mr. Iftikhor Karimov, Head of International Relations Department/ Agency of Hydrometeorology Tajikistan** and **Mr. George Machavariani, Senior Specialist, Climate Change Service, Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources Protection of Georgia**.

Tajikistan is vulnerable to natural disasters because of its geographical location. The annual damage from natural disasters in Tajikistan is from 10 to 100 million US dollars. Strong rainfall and floods were observed. The country has developed a Strategy for Disaster Reduction for the period 2010-2015, where the main issues addressed in disaster risk reduction without taking into account the possibility of adaptation to climate change. At present, the national strategy to 2030 is at the stage of approval in the Government of the Republic of Tajikistan, where the issues of disaster risk reduction are incorporated at sectoral levels. On this basis, in the development of a national strategy

for adaptation to climate change are also included issues of disaster risk reduction as an inter-sectoral section. At the present time the efforts of the country are mainly focused on the development of adaptation measures to mitigate the impacts of climate change at the community level, especially communities located in mountain regions.

The climate related extremes are common for Georgia, and they include the following natural hazards: flashfloods, droughts, landslides, mudflows, etc. The challenges related to DRR faced by Georgia include: financial constraints, lack of political will, data availability problems (NC does not cover the whole territory of the country), lack of technology capacity (limited access to environmentally sound technologies), lack of awareness (mainly at the local level), lack of long-term vision, communication problems among stakeholders and decision makers. And the main lessons learned include: climate change will be costly, research based policy making is crucial, DRR actions should be part of the overall development process, developing bankable projects (based on CBA) is essential, reforestation/afforestation reduce disaster risks, and other useful measures include: insurance system, early warning systems, construction regulations.

The recently adopted Sendai Framework on Disaster Risk Reduction highlights the need for greater linkages between DRR and Climate adaptation planning. The Sendai Framework mandates the new national strategies on Disaster Risk Management to integrate climate change. It is expected the national disaster risk agencies will continue to evolve their mandates (often focused on civil protection and disaster response) to risk management integrating adaptation. This is a good opportunity to link the NAP with the revision of the DRM strategies.

### **Designing integrated risk assessments and information systems – Group Exercise**

The participants divided in four different groups, and carried out an exercise to try to understand in more detail how to undertake an integrated risk assessment, and how to integrate this information into National Development Plans. The group was asked to discuss:

- What does the climate data and impacts tell you about risks to development goals?
- What is the data not telling you?
- What other information do you need to better evaluate the overall risk and prepare adaptation strategies?
- Which impacts/sectors may interact and need to work together?

More information about the case study “An integrated risk assessment for the Republic of Utopia” is provided in the *Annex 3*.

### **Session 8 – Sectoral adaptation strategies and coherence between sectoral and subnational planning**

***Session objectives:*** *outlining pros and cons in undertaking sectoral adaptation strategies and improved understanding of ways to bring coherence and integration between various sectors, and linkages with sub-national planning.*

The **panel discussion** with countries and organizations that have started sectoral adaptation strategies or plans focused on the experiences of Serbia (***Ms. Ana Repac***) and ***Bosnia and***

***Herzegovina (Mr. Bosko Kenjic, Head of Water Resources Department, Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Relations).***

Ms. Anna Repac explained that a draft National Adaptation Plan was developed following the available methodology. CBA and multi-criteria analysis were applied. She provided examples of adaptation measures identified in the hydrology, agriculture, forestry and biodiversity sectors and provided details why those measures were selected.

Mr. Bosko Kenjic raised the issue whether the NAP is a document or a process. The country adopted the National Adaptation Strategy. A NAP document shall be finalized by the end of 2016. A broad consultation with sectors is planned for 2017, after which, the document shall be sent for adoption. Another issue is whether the existing sectoral strategic documents should be adjusted to NAP or the NAP should be adjusted to existing sectoral strategic documents. Adaptation measures should be identified for each sector, while NAP should not substitute the existing strategic sectoral documents. A NAP document is envisioned to be adopted in the country.

An intervention on vertical integration was made by **Mr. Christopher Kaczmarek** (NAP-GSP): *Challenges and Opportunities in integrating sectoral and subnational planning*. The EECCA region retains a wide and strong position of the central government. The decentralization process is important and level of progress varies. The sectoral strategies and mainstreaming of CCA into national development plans shall be enhanced at the central government level and involve horizontal coordination among line ministries, but the practical implementation requires effective vertical coordination and engagement of sub-national governments. The sectoral strategies and plans developed by line ministries are often not reflected at sub-national level, where the cross-sectoral planning is predominant. The local governments operate based on their key mandates to provide effective services to the citizens and protect their livelihoods and quality of life through formulation of cross sectoral local development plans. Since the highest density of the population exists in the urban areas the most significant climate change-related impacts on humans are observed in the cities. NAPs are typically developed at the central level and have a tendency of using a top down approach. While this is useful to provide high quality technical guidance for expediting on-the-ground implementation the engagement of local governments in coordination and mainstreaming of CCA into integrated local development plans is a must.

Mr. Milan Dacic agreed that there is a disconnection between the central government and sub-nation/municipal level. The municipalities have a tool that could be used to integrate adaptation measures that is the Local Environmental Action Plan (LEAP).

Ms. Druta explained that in order to avoid the confusion of addressing the NAP as a document/plan, the term National Adaptation Framework was used. The sectoral approach set in the National Adaptation Strategy was followed in the NAP. A concept of national adaptation coordination mechanism was developed. The regional development is one of the seven sectors addressed. The Ministry of Regional Development and Constructions and regional development agencies are in charge of regional development. Moldova is divided in three development regions. The regional development agencies helped in the work at district level. There are development plans at district level that follow the sectoral approach. The budget for the measures included in the development plans has to be requested from and included in the national budget by the sectoral ministry. The

project cooperated with regional development agencies and district councils to mainstream adaptation measures and implement pilot projects.

Ms. Ephrat Yovel shared the experience on NAP process and sub-generated local planning. In Turkmenistan an early decision was made that the sectors are not going to change the way these are working, and that sectoral cooperation was not expected. The Ministry of Economy was in charge to ensure budget funding for mitigation and adaptation measures for sectors. Also, it is responsible to ensure the cross-sectoral cooperation, although the sectors themselves were not expected to change their behaviors. Ethiopia had a different approach. The country approved the Climate-Resilient Green Economy Strategy in 2011, which is purely a mitigation document. The paper included very ambitious mitigation targets. The sectors developed strategies how to implement the targets. The timeframe of the strategy is 30 years. The Government gave to the sectors only 15 years to achieve the mitigation targets. Three years after adopting the strategy, the Government realized that the adaptation is not addressed. It was decided not to develop another strategy. Ethiopia is very hierarchical. Hence, the Government asked the sectors to develop strategies to match the mitigation with adaptation within 5 years. The implementation cycles do not match among sectors. Ethiopia is a federation, where the regions are totally independent. They choose to implement or not the national targets. So, there is no a fall down in terms of mitigation and adaptation.

A different approach was used in Florida, USA. Each county has a different set of rules for planning and responsibilities, which makes the cooperation almost impossible. The civil servants of four counties of the South Florida agreed to develop a common approach. It took about three years. The mayors of four counties signed a legal document called Compact, involving the political level of representatives, and it was related the land use planning system of each county integrating mitigation and adaptation measures. The criteria of what was expected to be achieved were developed cooperatively, and each county had to find the way how achieve the targets and how to integrate them into individual development planning.

Ms. Imen Meliane concluded that there is no one way how to undertake the NAP process. It depends on the governing system, national policy development requirements/settings.

Mr. Chris Kaczmarek noted the important to link the central level with the local/regional level. The central level shall filter what information is conveyed to and shall provide guidelines to regional/local (sub-national) level.

Ms. Ephrat Yovel emphasized that in urban areas the land use planning takes into consideration all sectors. Usually the experts are missing at local level, that is why the expertise can be outsourced.

## **DAY 3 – Thursday June 30**

### **Session 9 – Diving deeper into Element C – Implementation Strategies**

***Session objectives:** Key considerations for the implementation for the NAP process with a focus on scaling up successful adaptation experiences. Participants should leave with ideas for key considerations, methodology and tools available to support this part of the NAP process.*

The session started with the *presentation on Element C – tools for prioritizing adaptation options (CBA, multicriteria) by Mr. Prakash Bista NAP-GSP.*

After the presentation, the representative from Armenia asked what would be the principle of funding the adaptation in developing countries.

Mr. Bista answered that if the country approaches the adaptation as a priority, the domestic financing sources will be identified. External financing sources will be available as well.

The first country presentation focusing on implementation/interventions on the ground and example of scaling up some adaptation responses was delivered by **Mr. Vasile Scorpan, Climate Change Office Manager from the Republic of Moldova.** The presentation referred to the *Implementation and replication of adaptation measures at the local level as part of the National Adaptation Plan of the Republic of Moldova.*

Mr. Scorpan made reference to the legal framework on adaptation. The Climate Change Adaptation Strategy until 2020 was adopted by the Government in 2014. Ten criteria were established for the implementation, with replication of measures for adaptation at the local level. Five steps were undertaken to select the districts for the implementation small grant projects as follows: prioritization of districts according to the degree of vulnerability to climate change; validation at the regional level (North, Center, South) of 2 of the most vulnerable districts in each zone undertaken during discussions and seminars at the level of the Regional Development Agencies; validation at the district level to two most vulnerable sectors (out of 6 priority sectors identified at national level) undertaken during the process of discussions and seminars at the level of district councils, private and non-governmental sectors and other stakeholders; announcement of competition for the submission of project proposals; and the selection and implementation of projects. Based on experience of small grant projects implementation, a practical guide for the implementation of adaptation projects at local level was developed, six districts revised the socio-economic development strategies with the purpose of incorporating adaptation measures, a strategy of replication of adaptation measures for the agricultural sector at the local level was developed, and adaptation-related awareness of decision makers at local level was raised.

Following was the presentation on *Implementation Strategies* by **Mr. Djordjije Vulikic, Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism of Montenegro.** A range of climate change adaptation actions were undertaken in Montenegro such as: vulnerability and impact assessments done through two National Communications to UNFCCC (NAP development is required by the National Climate Change Strategy by 2030 and the draft Law on environment, vulnerability assessment of coastal region of Montenegro), the establishment of a Working group on Adaptation to Climate Change under the Environment and Climate Regional Accession Network (ECRAN), and a vulnerability and impact assessment for mountains region was carried out. An example of Climate Change Adaptation actions at local self-government level was provided, which referred to the development of a Strategy for adaptation to climate change for Podgorica Capital city in May 2016, accompanied by a vulnerability and impact assessment for relevant sectors at municipality level, the development of an action plan for adaptation to climate change and implementation of concrete adaptation action by building four drinking fountains across Podgorica. The speaker shared the challenges and lessons learnt for NAP initiation, among which are the following: need for increased public awareness at government administration level and public at large as well as for public

participation in policy development; need to link the science (knowledge) with-policy implementation framework, need of mainstreaming and integrating adaptation actions into sectoral policies and strategies, need for a systemic and not project by project driven adaptation actions; lack of financial support mechanisms for adaptation, and the lack of institutional and administrative capacities for planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

The next presentation of the session focused on *Key consideration for scaling up- tools/capacity needed to scale up/ Readiness discussion* being delivered by **Ms. Nataly Olofinskaya – UNDP Istanbul Regional Hub**.

The plenary discussion focused on linking the central level with sub-national/regional/local level.

## **Session 10 – Financing adaptation**

**Session objectives:** *Improved understanding for integrating adaptation planning in national budgeting, major international funds available for adaptation and opportunities for private sector's involvement*

The main presentations delivered during this session were the following:

*Considerations for financing NAP including private sector opportunities* delivered by **Mr. Christopher Kaczmarek, UNDP**

The presenter provided information about the options and the relevance of domestic and international sources for climate financing, provide an overview of the ways to integrate adaptation in national/sub-national budgeting, and identify possibilities for innovative financing to leverage traditional funding sources. The importance of raising national financial sustainability through facilitating access to supplemental domestically available private sector capital for sub-national governments was emphasized and the recommended approach to capacity building and de-risking of financing transactions was presented.

*International funding for adaptation with focus on most relevant to the region, and opportunities to scale up GEF funding* made by **Ms. Saliha Dobardzic, GEF – Senior Climate Change Specialist**

The speaker presented the sources of funding for adaptation granted by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), particularly the “Special Climate Change Fund” (SCCF), and the “Least Developed Country Fund” (LDCF). The SCCF was presented as a catalyst to leverage additional resources from bilateral and other multilateral sources. There are also other potential opportunities to use other GEF funding (e.g. biodiversity) to fund adaptation initiatives.

*Experiences in adaptation finance from domestic sources, Armenia –Mr. Aram Gabrielyan–Armenia*

The presenter provided an overview of Armenia's experience developing a legislative and institutional framework for adequate financial assistance, recommending the creation of a targeted financial mechanism consisting of two components to finance climate change mitigation and adaptation projects: 1) to have an internal (domestic) climate revolving investment civil fund, to be replenished on permanent base by allocations from environmental fees, ecosystem service fees, including "carbon taxing", and 2) to access external (international) funding, having a financial mechanisms with resource provision following the principle of additionally, such as the Green

Climate Fund, the Adaptation Fund, the Global Environmental Facility, bilateral and multilateral funds and other sources.

The participants showed a much interest for the topic of this session as all countries indicated lack of financial resources as one of main challenges towards NAP process establishment and adaptation actions implementation.

### Session 11 – Diving deeper into Element D – Reporting, Monitoring and Review

**Session objectives:** *Improved awareness and understanding of the importance and challenges of M&E in the NAP process, shared experiences on different approaches and examples for M&E and indicator*

Two presentations were delivered during this session. The first one focused on *Considerations for M&E and updating NAPs* made by **Ms. Angela Lentisco, NAP-GSP**. She highlighted the need to have a Monitoring System at the beginning of the NAP process that would continue throughout, as well as a system in place to capture lessons learned, to facilitate the updating of the NAPs regularly.

The second presentation was by Ms Ephrat Yovel who outlined the draft M&E system of the NAP process in Moldova. The goal of the M&E System is to ensure the measurability of progress across sectors, geographic scales, time and to be able to determine whether, as a result of its successive plans, Moldova is less vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. The way to achieve this is through assessing and tracking progress under the successive NAPs/SAPs and serve as a basis to design future iterations of each plan, creating a set of overarching adaptation goals to which each sector will contribute, and track and monitor individual sectoral objectives and indicators, allowing for iterative planning and continuous, evidence-based adaptation planning, and enforcing the gradual integration of adaptation priorities in regular development planning. For this, Moldova has developed a set of macro, meso and micro progress indicators (see table below).

Level	Indicator category	Means of Verification	Timeline
<b>Macro level (National)</b>	Objective indicators - sectoral vulnerability - economy-wide vulnerability - MD-specific Index of Resilience	cross-sectoral assessment - monetary value of losses - % GDP in losses - index value	NAP every 4 years
<b>Meso level (Sector)</b>	<b>Outcome indicators</b> - sector-specific indicators - theme-based indicators  <b>Driver indicators</b> - % of national budget targeting - adaptation-related actions - level of IC for adaptation - number of V&A assessments	direct observations - assessments - coding system tracking  SAP/ NAP - actions within the responsible ministries budgets - Capacity score card - periodic sector V&A assessments	NAP/SAPs every 4 years
<b>Micro level (P/A/P)</b>	<b>Output indicators</b> - activity-related reporting	- results of implemented measures and actions	Annual Actions

Moldova M&E Indicators

The discussion focused on M&E, experience sharing on defining key areas for monitoring and identifying indicators and updating adaptation measures as well as integrating gender into development planning.

## **Session 12 – Synthesis and Wrap up**

**Session objectives:** Summary of main learning from the workshop, discussion on knowledge sharing within the country and identification of major support needs that might come up from the region

At the beginning of the session the participants shared the key messages gained during the workshop.

*Uzbekistan* appreciated very much the knowledge gained during the workshop, expressed the hope that the NAP process could start soon in their country, showed increased interest about the financial support available to undertake the NAP process and experience of Armenia in accessing funds.

*Ukraine* emphasized that it is very useful to know what the experience of other countries is at this stage, what are the issues and challenges and how to deal with them. The most useful work was done in groups.

*Montenegro* appreciated the level of organization of the workshop as a very well structured event in line with the expectations. Very useful topics covered during the workshop and resources people available. The workshop contributed to acquire more clarity on NAP process and available support.

*Croatia* recalled the first day “one word” exercise and emphasized that NAP shall be implementable. The participant underlined that the adaptation is a long-term process, while the capacity building is the top issue.

*Bosnia and Herzegovina* appreciated the workshop as a very relevant one. However, the participants showed a lot of open issues. The workshop managed to answer many questions. The workshop was held in a very friendly atmosphere. Good to know about challenges and how to deal with them, how to link sectors, financing options to move forward.

*Romania* underwent an interesting experience during the workshop as the country is at stocktaking stage. The workshop provided a good opportunity to learn about the NAP process.

*Tajikistan* appreciated the experience exchange among the countries and expressed the interest to collaborate with UNDP and UNEP.

*Turkey* highly appreciated the experience and knowledge gained during the workshop.

*Bulgaria* stated that the workshop was really useful as the presentations addressed all issues. The participant indicated that it is good to know other participants for exchange of experience and called for networking.

*Serbia* agreed that the workshop is really useful. Interesting experience gained from Moldova and Armenia.

*Azerbaijan* highly appreciated the workshop and emphasized the importance of developing national adaptation strategies. The country appreciated the availability of external support.

*Armenia* was interested to learn about the global support programme and expressed the hope that NAP will be sustainable, promoting solidarity, networking and integration.

*Russia* stated that the workshop helped to better structure the information, to understand where to start and where to pay special attention. The country thanked for a very well organized and structured event and highlighted the importance of gender in the NAP process.

*Georgia* specified that the workshop contributed to understanding about the stocktaking, challenges, to learning about the domestic and external funding opportunities. Involvement of stakeholders – very important. Important tools to be applied - CBA and multi-criteria analysis. A multidisciplinary team is needed to undertake the NAP process.

*Kazakhstan* much appreciated the event due to gained knowledge and exchange of experience. The event was useful to learn about the problems faced by different countries. It is important to know that the NAP is a process and not a document. Glad to learn about financing sources both domestic and external. In case of domestic sources, a special attention should be paid about the profit if banks will be involved.

*Moldova* stated that the event was very interesting. It was created a good learning environment and experience sharing. Keeping further in touch was encouraged.

In closing remarks Mr. Prakash Bista, NAP-GSP encouraged the continuation of networking as well as information sharing. He informed that E-learning courses can be offered for those interested. Also, the participants were advised to subscribe to E-letters.

## Annex 1. EECCA NAP Regional Workshop Agenda

### Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia (EECCA) NAP Regional Workshop

Organized by the joint UNDP-UNEP NAP-GSP and The Government of the  
Republic of Moldova Chisinau, Moldova  
28-30 June 2016

#### WORKSHOP AGENDA

DAY 1 – Tuesday June 28	
Time	Session
08:30 – 09:00	Registration of participants
09:00 – 10:00	<b>Opening Ceremony</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Mr Valeriu Munteanu, Minister of Environment of Moldova</li><li>- Mr Gerhard Schaumberger, Head of Office – Counselor, Coordination Office for Technical Cooperation, Austrian Embassy in Chisinau</li><li>- Ms Dafina Gerceva, UN Resident Representative – Moldova</li></ul>
<b>10:00 – 10:30</b>	<b>Coffee Break and Photo</b>
<b>Session 1 – Introduction to the workshop</b> <b>Session objectives:</b> Outline the agenda and the work over the 3 days and share participants expectations	
10:30 – 11:30	Remarks on workshop objectives and agenda Ice-breaker Exercise
<b>Session 2 – NAP: Mainstreaming adaptation in development planning</b> <b>Session objectives:</b> Improve understanding of the importance of considering climate risks in development planning, the key questions to consider and entry points in development planning process.	
11:30 – 11:45	The importance of planning for adaptation and integration in development planning processes <i>Presentation by <b>Prakash Bista, NAP-GSP</b></i>
11:45 – 12:00	Understanding the NAP processes and knowledge needs (e.g. climate risks) to inform development planning. <i>Presentation by Moldova - <b>Druta Ala, Manager of ADA/UNDP Project</b></i>
12:00 – 12:30	Plenary discussion
<b>12:30 – 14:00</b>	<b>Lunch</b>

### Session 3 – Overview of the NAP Process and adaptation in the context Paris Agreement.

**Session objectives:** Improve understanding of the basics and main steps of the NAP process as outlined by the UNFCCC and its linkages with regards to implementation of Paris Agreement.

14:00 – 14:30 NAP process as outlined in the UNFCCC COP decision and LEG technical guidelines  
Understanding adaptation in the Paris agreement and iNDCs linkages to NAP  
*Presentation by UNFCCC Secretariat representative (via Skype)*

14:30 – 15:30 Identifying main challenges and support needs of the NAP process  
*Guided Plenary discussion and Q&A Session*

### 15:30 – 16:00 Coffee Break

### Session 4 – NAP Experiences from the Region

**Session objectives:** Share experiences of advances and challenges in the NAP process in the region

16:00 – 16:30 Sharing NAP experiences: process, justification, institutional arrangements, challenges, lessons learned and ways forward,  
*Panel discussion by countries: Turkey, Russia (TBC)*

16:30 – 18:00 **Breakouts group: Regional Stocktaking**  
Stocktaking of where countries are in their NAP processes, the main challenges encountered or expected and their support needs.  
*Working group exercise*

## DAY 2 – Wednesday June 29

### Session 5 – Diving deeper into Element A: Lay the Groundwork and Address Gaps

**Session objectives:** Improve understanding of some key actions to *lay the groundwork* for the NAP process, particularly institutional arrangements and key considerations to design effective institutional arrangement for the NAP process.

09:00 – 09:15 Institutional arrangements for NAP Planning,  
*Presentation by Angela Lentisco, NAP-GSP*

09:15 – 9:45 Country presentations prompting reflections around key stakeholders, institutional arrangements, and key steps to get organized for the NAP process.

*Presentation by:*

- *Moldova, Ephrat Yovel, IC of ADA/UNDP Project*
- *Serbia, TBC*

9:45 – 10:30 Plenary discussion

### 10:30 – 11:00 Coffee Break

### Session 6 – Diving deeper into Element B: Preparatory Elements

**Session objectives:** Improve understanding of some key *Preparatory elements* for the NAP process, including key considerations, methodology and tools available to support this part of the NAP process.

11:00 – 11:10 Key steps in the Element B (Preparatory Elements) of the NAP process, outlining methodologies and resources available to countries (CBA, etc.),  
*Presentation by Umberto Labate, NAP-GSP*

- 11:10 – 11:30 WMO and Climate Information  
*Presentation by Mr Milan Dacic, WMO Chief of Regional Office for Europe*
- 11:30 – 12:00 Q&A and plenary discussion on Element B (with a focus on information services and vulnerability assessments)

### Session 7 – Integrating Climate Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction

**Session Objectives:** Improve understanding on risk assessments, particularly on disaster risk reduction strategies

- 12:00 – 12:10 Rethinking comprehensive risk assessments- based on advice from draft guidelines for DRR considerations in NAP  
*Presentation by Ms. Imen Meliane, NAP-GSP*
- 12:10 – 12:25 Country experience with DRR in NAP  
*Presentations by Tajikistan - Iftikhor Karimov, Agency of Hydrometeorology  
Georgia - Giorgi Machavariani, Climate Change Office of Georgia*
- 12:25 – 12:40 Q&A
- 12:40 – 13:00 Designing integrated risk assessments / integrated information systems  
*Breakout group exercise*

### 13:00 – 14:30 Lunch (Breakout group exercise continues)

- 14:30 – 15:15 **Continuing Session 7 – Integrating CCA and DRR**  
Continuing breakout group exercises.

### 15:15 – 15:30 Coffee Break

### Session 8 – Sectoral adaptation strategies and coherence between sectoral and subnational planning.

**Session objectives:** outlining pros and cons in undertaking sectoral adaptation strategies and improved understanding of ways to bring coherence and integration between various sectors, and linkages with sub-national planning.

- 15:30 – 17:00 Panel discussion with countries and organizations that have started sectoral adaptation strategies or plans:
- **Bosnia and Herzegovina** (TBC)
  - **FAO: Lessons learned from Agriculture/Fisheries Adaptation strategies** (TBC)
  - **Chris Kaczmarek, NAP-GSP: Challenges and Opportunities in integrating sectoral and subnational planning.**

Q&A and input from the floor, focusing on key guidance and consideration for sectoral NAPs, ensuring coherence between sectors and integration with subnational planning.

- 17:00 **Field visit and Dinner**

## DAY 3 – Thursday June 30

### Session 9 Diving deeper into Element C – Implementation Strategies

**Session objectives:** Key considerations for *the implementation* for the NAP process with a focus on scaling up successful adaptation experiences. Participants should leave with ideas for key considerations, methodology and tools available to support this part of the NAP process.

- 09:00 – 09:10 Element C – tools for prioritizing adaptation options (CBA, multicriteria).  
*Presentation by Prakash Bista NAP-GSP.*
- 09:10 – 09:30 Implementation/interventions on the ground and example of scaling up some adaptation responses.  
*Presentation by:*
- **Moldova - Vasile Scorpan, CCO Manager, Ministry of Environment**
  - **Montenegro**
- 09:30 – 09:40 Key consideration for scaling up- tools/capacity needed to scale up/ Readiness discussion.  
*Presentation by Nataly Olofinskaya –UNDP*
- 09:40 – 10:30 *Plenary discussion*  
Sharing experiences in prioritizing adaptation intervention. Scaling up implementation: What are we learning from the ground. Capacity and readiness needs and access to funding for climate adaptive development planning

### **10:30 – 11:00 Coffee Break**

#### **Session 10 – Financing adaptation**

**Session objectives:** Improved understanding for integrating adaptation planning in national budgeting, major international funds available for adaptation and opportunities for private sector’s involvement

- 11:00 – 11:10 Considerations for financing NAP including private sector opportunities  
*Presentation by Chris Kaczmarek, NAP-GSP*
- 11:10 – 11:20 International funding for adaptation with focus on most relevant to the region, and opportunities to scale up GEF funding  
*Presentation by Saliha Dobardzic, GEF – Senior Climate Change Specialist*
- 11:20 – 11:30 Building readiness for climate finance – readiness support by UNDP and UNEP  
*Presentation by NAP-GSP (TBC)*
- 11:30 – 13:00 Breakout groups – facilitated discussion, experience sharing on work by finance ministries on integrating adaptation in national budgeting/ readiness / opportunities in international adaptation funding

### **13:00 – 14:30 Lunch**

#### **Session 11 – Diving deeper into Element D – Reporting, Monitoring and Review**

**Session objectives:** Improved awareness and understanding of the importance and challenges of M&E in the NAP process, shared experiences on different approaches and examples for M&E and indicator

- 14:30 – 14:45 Considerations for M&E and updating NAPs  
*Presentation by Angela Lentisco, NAP-GSP*
- 14:45 – 15:00 Linking NAP process with SDG indicators.  
*Presentation by Prakash Bista, NAP-GSP*
- 15:00 – 16:00 Q&A and Facilitated discussion, experience sharing on defining key areas for monitoring and identifying indicators.

### **16:00 – 16:30 Coffee Break**

## **Session 12 – Synthesis and Wrap up**

**Session objectives:** Summary of main learning from the workshop, discussion on knowledge sharing within the country and identification of major support needs that might come up from the region

16:30 – 18:00

- Identification of main recommendations and challenges.
- Key learning messages of the workshop, expectations overview and identification of major areas of support needed.

## Annex 2. Breakout Exercise 1 - Regional Stocktaking exercise – Session 4

Key steps in NAP	Advances in countries				Main challenges encountered or expected	Support Needs
	Country 1	Country 2	Country 3	Country 4 ...		
Initiating and launching of the NAP process						
Stocktaking: identifying available information on climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaptation and assessing gaps and needs of the enabling environment for the NAP process						
Addressing capacity gaps and weaknesses in undertaking the NAP process						
Comprehensively and iteratively assessing development needs and climate vulnerabilities						
Analyzing current climate and future climate change scenarios Undertaking Risk assessments						
Identifying adaptation options at the sector, subnational, national and other appropriate levels						
Reviewing and appraising adaptation options						
Compiling and communicating national adaptation plans						
Integrating climate change adaptation into national and subnational development and sectoral planning						
Prioritizing climate change adaptation in national planning						
Developing a (long-term) national adaptation implementation strategy						
Enhancing capacity for planning and implementation of adaptation						
Promoting coordination and synergy at the regional level and with other multilateral environmental agreements						
Monitoring the NAP process						
Reviewing the NAP process to assess progress, effectiveness and gaps						
Iteratively updating the national adaptation plans						
Outreach on the NAP process and reporting on progress and effectiveness						

## Annex 3. Breakout Exercise 2- An integrated risk assessment for the Republic of Utopia

### Group to discuss

- What does the climate data and impacts tell you about risks to development goals?
- What is the data not telling you?
- What other information do you need to better evaluate the overall risk and prepare adaptation strategies?
- Which impacts/sectors may interact and need to work together?

### Structure and goals for the Draft National Development Plan 2012 - 2022

#### (i) Income and Poverty

- Average GDP growth rate of 9% per year in the NDP period.
- Agricultural GDP growth rate at 4% per year on the average.
- Increase and diversify agricultural production and rural incomes.
- Generation of 6 million new work opportunities.
- Reduction of unemployment among the educated to less than 5%.
- 20% rise in the real wage rate of unskilled workers.
- Reduction in the head-count ratio of consumption poverty by 10 percentage points.

#### (ii) Education

- Reduction in the dropout rates of children at the elementary level from 52.2% in 2003–04 to 20% by 2011–12.
- Developing minimum standards of educational attainment in elementary schools to ensure quality education.
- Increasing the literacy rate for those aged 7 and above to 85% by 2011–12.
- Reducing the gender gap in literacy to 10 percentage points by 2011–12.
- Increasing the percentage of each cohort going to higher education from the present 10% to 15% by 2011–12.

#### (iii) Health

- Infant mortality rate (IMR) to be reduced to 28 and maternal mortality ratio (MMR) to 1 per 1,000 live births by the end of the Eleventh Plan.
- Total Fertility Rate to be reduced to 2.1 by the end of the Eleventh Plan.
- Safe drinking water supply and sanitation to be available for 80% of population by 2020
- Malnutrition among children aged between 0–3 to be reduced to half its present level by the end of the Eleventh Plan.

#### (iv) Women and Children

- Sex ratio for age group 0–6 to be raised to 935 by 2011–12 and to 950 by 2016–17.
- Ensuring that at least 33% of the direct and indirect beneficiaries of all government schemes are women and girls.
- Ensuring that all children enjoy a safe childhood without any compulsion to work.

#### (v) Infrastructure

- To ensure electricity connection to all villages and BPL (Below Poverty Line) households by 2020.
- Increase the percentage of hydropower from 15 to 25% by 2020
- To ensure all-weather road connection to all habitations with populations of 1,000 and
- To connect every village by telephone and provide broadband connectivity to all villages by 2020.
- To provide homestead sites to all by 2015 and step-up the pace of house construction for rural poor to cover all the poor by 2016–17

(vi) Water and Environment

- To increase forest and tree cover by 5 percentage points.
- To attain WHO standards of air quality in all major cities by 2015.
- To treat all urban waste water by 2015 to clean river waters.
- To maintain minimum flows of all rivers to meet the needs of agriculture, municipal water supply, transport and industry.
- To increase energy efficiency by 20% by 2016–17.
- To reduce groundwater withdrawals by 2015.

## Exhibit 2: Climate change information and projected impacts for the Republic of Utopia

### Climate information

#### Temperature

- 1 Rising by 2 to 4 degrees C in the Khorus Mountains by the 2050s.
- 2 On the plains, expected rises of between 1.4 and 2.0 degrees C by the 2050s (compared with 1940-60 average).

#### Precipitation

- 1 On average only a slight increase in annual precipitation by the 2050s compared with the 1970 to 2000 average.
- 2 More autumn and late winter precipitation in mountains to fall as rain rather than snow.
- 3 Higher intensity rainfall events with longer periods between events.
- 4 Later arrival, shorter duration of seasonal heavy rains

#### Sea Level

- 1 Rise in sea level of 0.2 to 0.4 metres expected by the 2050s.
- 2 Warmer sea surface temperatures.

### Projected impacts

#### Surface hydrology

- 1 Snowmelt runoff begins 2 to 4 weeks earlier by the 2050s.
- 2 More variable river flows.
- 3 More frequent floods during summer.
- 4 Longer periods without significant precipitation.
- 5 Lower late summer river flows.
- 6 Higher reservoir evaporation losses.
- 7 Increased erosion of sloping land and reservoir catchments.
- 8 Larger sediment loads in lower Alph.

#### Groundwater hydrology

- 1 Recharge to shallow groundwater reduced by 15 to 25% by the 2050s.

#### Coastal areas

- 1 Submergence of about 10% of the Alph river delta by the 2050s.
- 2 Increased incidence of tidal inundation and storm surges in Delta.
- 3 Shallow coastal aquifers become more saline.
- 4 Saline tidal bores push further up.
- 5 Less frequent but more intense cyclone impacts.

#### Agriculture

- 1 Cotton yields not affected by 1-2°C temperature rise.

- 2 Maize and wheat yields depressed by 1-2°C temperature rise.
- 3 Rice threatened with sterility by higher temperatures during flowering.
- 4 Plantation crop yields enhanced by warmer temperatures (assuming water availability).
- 5 Crop water requirements increase by 3-5% by 2050.
- 6 More frequent crop failures due to floods and droughts.

## Annex 4. Outcomes of Breakout Exercise 1 - Regional Stocktaking exercise – Session 4

Breakout Exercise 1 - Regional Stocktaking exercise – Session 4																					
Key steps in NAP	Advances in countries																-	+/-	+	CHALLENGES	SUPPORT NEEDS
	Arm	Rus	MD	Tadj	Mon	Bulg	Geo	Ro	Tur	Ser	BH	Cr	Az	Kz	Uz	Uk					
Initiating and launching of the NAP process	+/-	+/-	+	+/-	-	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	5	3	8	POLITICAL WILL - FINANCE- DEFINITION IN NATIONAL LEGISLATION - AWARENESS - NAP DOES NOT FIT WITH NATIONAL PLANNING SYSTEMS	FINANCE
Stocktaking: identifying available information on climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaptation and assessing gaps and needs of the enabling environment for the NAP process	+	+	+	+	+/-	+	-	+	+	+	+/-	-	+	+	+	+	2	2	12	LACK OF DATA, SYSTEMIC INFO AND INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION	EXPERTISE. INSTITUTIONAL AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT

Addressing capacity gaps and weaknesses in undertaking the NAP process	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	+/-	-	-	-				9	1	6	INSUFFICIENT KNOWLEDGE OF DECISION MAKERS	CAPACITY BUILDING
Comprehensively and iteratively assessing development needs and climate vulnerabilities	-	+/-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+/-	-	-	-	+/-		8	3	5	METHODOLOGICAL ASPECTS	TECHNICAL SUPPORT AT SUBNATIONAL LEVEL
Analyzing current climate and future climate change scenarios Undertaking Risk assessments	+	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	+	+	+	+/-	-	-	-	-		7	3	6	LACK OF QUALITATIVE DATA	
Identifying adaptation options at the sector, subnational, national and other appropriate levels	-	+	+/-	+	-	-	-	-	+	+	+/-	+/-	-	+/-	-	-		8	4	4	INSUFFICIENT COOPERATION	
Reviewing and appraising adaptation options	-	+	+/-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	-		10	3	3	LACK OF EXPERTISE AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	
Compiling and communicating national adaptation plans	-	-	+	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		13	0	3	TIME CONSUMING	

Integrating climate change adaptation into national and subnational development and sectoral planning	-	-	+/-	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+/-	-	-	+/-	-	-	9	3	4	LACK OF CAPACITY	
Prioritizing climate change adaptation in national planning	-	-	+/-	+	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+/-	-	-	12	2	2	LACK OF EXPERTISE AND METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH. CHANGE OF GOV	
Developing a (long-term) national adaptation implementation strategy	-	-	+	+	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12	0	4	LACK OF POLITICAL WILL	
Enhancing capacity for planning and implementation of adaptation	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	-	+	-	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	12	1	3	EXPERTISE NEEDED	
Promoting coordination and synergy at the regional level and with other multilateral environmental agreements	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	1		LACK OF INSTITUTIONAL COOPERATION	
Monitoring the NAP process	-	-	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	2	0	METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS	TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT
Reviewing the NAP process to assess progress, effectiveness and gaps	-	-	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	2	0	METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS	TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT
Iteratively updating the national adaptation plans	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16	0	0	METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS	TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT

Outreach on the NAP process and reporting on progress and effectiveness	-	-	+/-	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	2	0	METHODOLOGIES AND TOOLS	TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL SUPPORT
GENDER	-	-	+	+/-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14	1	1		