

# What the world is waiting for: action on adaptation



**What the world is waiting for: action on adaptation**

Written by Richard Weaver

Front cover photos by Layton Thompson / Tearfund  
and Jim Loring / Tearfund

Back cover photo by Jim Loring / Tearfund

Design: Wingfinger Graphics

With many thanks for comments to: Jane Cacouris, Raju Chhetri,  
Paul Cook, Jessica Faleiro, Emily Hard, Helen Heather, Laura Hughes,  
Jo Khinmaung, Sarah La Trobe, Marcus Oxley, Sara Shaw,  
Nigel Timmins, Laura Webster, Mike Wiggins, Jeff Woodke.

© Tearfund May 2009

Tearfund is a Christian relief and development agency building  
a global network of local churches to help eradicate poverty.

# What the world is waiting for: action on adaptation

## Contents

Executive summary	3
Introduction	7
<b>1 Financing for adaptation</b>	<b>9</b>
1.1 Funding the immediate needs of the Least Developed Countries	9
1.2 Additionality of adaptation finance	9
1.3 The Adaptation Fund as a model for adaptation funding in the post-2012 framework	11
<b>2 Implementing adaptation at the local and national level</b>	<b>12</b>
2.1 Focus on the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable people	12
2.2 Build on and expand disaster risk reduction	12
2.3 Prioritise the water sector for adaptation support	14
2.4 Integration of adaptation into national development plans	15
2.5 Institutional arrangements	16
2.6 Monitoring and evaluation	17
Conclusion	18



## Executive summary

The world is still waiting to see the action needed to avoid a catastrophic change in our climate. Climate change is an environmental, social justice and equity issue. The poorest and most vulnerable communities are already experiencing the impacts of climate change on their lives, livelihoods and food security, and additional potentially devastating impacts are already inevitable. The survival of these communities depends directly on the will of other communities to take action – and particularly the political will of developed countries. Climate change can not be addressed in isolation. Environmental degradation must also be addressed through sustainable resource management as local communities will often not separate environmental issues from climate change. Tearfund recognises that rapid deep cuts in emissions in developed countries are essential to prevent catastrophic climate change – without this, adaptation will be rendered difficult, and in some cases impossible. Ambitious action to reduce emissions is therefore the best form of adaptation. For the more than 1 billion people living in the 100 most vulnerable countries<sup>1</sup> – who are the least responsible for causing climate change – massively scaled-up action on adaptation is key to the success of the Copenhagen agreement.<sup>2</sup>

In solidarity with the poorest and most vulnerable countries and the most vulnerable communities within these countries, Tearfund believes that adaptation must remain a top-level priority in international negotiations for a post-2012 deal. A global Adaptation Framework must be agreed to strengthen international activities and commitments to deal with current and future impacts of climate change in developing countries. This should massively increase support to vulnerable developing countries so that they can adapt to climate change, reduce their vulnerability and build their resilience against the now unavoidable impacts of climate change. There will be no fair global deal if developed countries do not live up to their responsibilities. We must see action that responds to the current financial needs of the poorest and most vulnerable people for adaptation. We must also see commitments for massively scaled-up action on adaptation for the long term, such as new and additional finance and support for implementation at the local and national level in a legally binding manner. These actions will help to demonstrate the level of ambition and the political will of developed countries to act. They will also help build trust between developed and developing country governments, which is so needed for a fair deal in Copenhagen.

**To ensure a comprehensive, equitable, science-based post-2012 framework, the Copenhagen deal must contain the following:**

### **A shared vision on adaptation**

- The shared vision for the future must encompass all elements of the Bali Action Plan. Therefore, massively scaled-up action on adaptation at the national and international level must be part of the shared vision that will guide the post-2012 framework.

### **Funding the immediate needs of the Least Developed Countries**

- To build trust in these negotiations, Annex 1 countries must fulfil the pledges made eight years ago to fully fund the actions addressing the immediate impacts of climate change between now and 2012, as identified in the national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs). The Copenhagen agreement should include a rapid NAPA implementation initiative which would provide about US\$2 billion for rapid implementation of the most urgent actions identified by the Least Developed Countries in the NAPAs.

### **Additionality of adaptation finance**

- Adaptation funding must be new and additional to Official Development Assistance (ODA) commitments of 0.7 per cent of GDP. Funding should be delivered as grants, not loans. Total finance

---

1 Least Developed Countries, Small Island Developing States and vulnerable countries in the Africa Group.

2 The Copenhagen agreement is the term used in this paper to encompass the international post-2012 climate change framework and a package of measures to implement the action needed between now and the implementation of this framework, all of which must be agreed at COP 15 in Copenhagen in December 2009.

provided by developed countries for adaptation in developing countries should be at least US\$50–86 billion (€40–65 billion) per year. This must be part of the deal agreed in Copenhagen for the post-2012 framework, with steadily increasing levels of funding starting before 2013. Funding starting before 2013 must be in addition to the US\$2 billion for urgent actions in the Least Developed Countries.

- A combination of innovative mechanisms will be needed to raise the finance needed for adaptation. The proposed Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) levy should be combined with raising funds through the development of international levies on emissions from aviation and shipping.

#### **The Adaptation Fund as a model for adaptation funding**

- The Adaptation Fund, if successful, can be a channel for future adaptation funding under the Copenhagen agreement. An effective, functioning Adaptation Fund could merge into or provide the model for adaptation financing post-2012, where the focus should increasingly be to support national adaptation plans and adaptation integrated into national development plans.

#### **Focus on the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable people**

- A guiding principle in implementing the Copenhagen deal is that special attention shall be given to the particular needs of the most vulnerable communities in adapting to the unavoidable consequences of climate change. Their perspectives must be incorporated fully into the response to climate change.
- Money should be targeted at the poorest and most vulnerable countries and the most vulnerable communities within these countries. There should be a significant role for civil society in planning, implementation and monitoring.

#### **Build on and expand disaster risk reduction (DRR)**

- Adaptation should build on existing capacity and experience to increase the resilience of the most vulnerable communities. Climate change adaptation must build on and expand a DRR approach, making use of the disaster risk management community's transferable, practical experience in addressing hazards, and building on existing policy frameworks such as the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015, agreed by 168 governments in 2005.

#### **Prioritise the water sector for adaptation support**

- Localised adaptive water management approaches must be supported to help develop long-term sustainable solutions.
- Climate risk must be factored into water resource management planning and implementation.

#### **Integration of adaptation into national development plans**

- It is essential that, in the long-term, NAPAs are seen as a transition step towards the sustainable implementation of adaptation activities. Support for adaptation should ultimately move from project-based activities towards the strategic integration of adaptation measures into the design and implementation of national development and poverty reduction plans, sectoral policies and strategies.
- Support must be provided for the development and implementation of comprehensive longer term National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). Where appropriate, adaptation must be integrated into national development planning and ultimately into sectoral plans and strategies. Plans must be developed through inclusive and transparent processes. These must be country-driven processes to define priorities for adaptation funding.
- Strategies for disaster risk reduction, water resource management and food security should all feature highly in national development planning in order to strengthen adaptation and resilience to climatic and economic shocks.
- Access to the latest climate change science and knowledge must also be provided to enable developing countries to develop robust adaptation strategies.

**Institutional arrangements**

- An 'expert' technical panel on adaptation should be set up under the UNFCCC to improve the tools for defining and implementing national adaptation plans.
- Delivery of funding should be guided by the principle of easy and direct access to support the most vulnerable communities. The Framework should guide effective and efficient implementation of adaptation action.
- Adaptation financing and implementation should come under the authority of the COP and be fully accountable to the UNFCCC. Political oversight of the COP is essential to enable effective accountability and to make it acceptable to developing countries.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

- There must be monitoring and evaluation of activities supported through the Adaptation Framework, including external monitoring and evaluation using an independent local-level monitoring framework to ensure transparency and accountability.





## Introduction

*'Recent observations confirm that, given high rates of observed emissions, the worst-case IPCC scenario trajectories (or even worse) are being realised.'*<sup>3</sup>

*'Societies are highly vulnerable to even modest levels of climate change, with poor nations and communities particularly at risk. Temperature rises above two degrees Celsius will be very difficult for societies to cope with, and will increase the level of climate disruption through the rest of the century.'*<sup>4</sup>

Climate change is already having a devastating impact on poor communities, even with current global average temperature rises below two degrees. Governments must respond urgently to the latest science which indicates that, to prevent dangerous climate change and temperature rises over two degrees Celsius, global greenhouse gas emissions must begin to decline from 2015 and must stabilise at around 350ppm CO<sub>2</sub>. Failure to act will have a lasting impact upon the poorest people, who are disproportionately dependent on environmental assets for their development. With a rise of two degrees or more, there will be areas where adaptation is not possible. Most commentators agree that temperatures are almost certain to rise to two degrees higher than the pre-industrial level and may well go even higher. On current trends for reducing emissions, we are heading for a rise of three to four degrees.

A global average temperature rise above two degrees would be catastrophic for developing countries, not only in terms of loss of life and livelihoods, but also economically due to the impact of additional climate-related disasters and sea-level rises. With 94 per cent of disaster-related deaths occurring in developing countries,<sup>5</sup> the outlook for poor people is bleak. According to World Bank estimates, climate change is placing 40 per cent of international poverty reduction at risk. Tackling climate change must therefore be a core component of all national development plans.

Climate change increases disaster risk in a number of ways. It changes the magnitude and frequency of extreme events<sup>6</sup> (meaning that coping and response mechanisms and economic planning for disasters based on past vulnerabilities may no longer suffice).<sup>7</sup> It changes average climatic conditions and climate variability, affecting underlying risk factors, and it generates new threats, which a region may have no experience in dealing with.<sup>8</sup> For example, with sea-level rise, salt water intrusion and rainfall uncertainty, many countries are becoming progressively more vulnerable to floods and droughts and the quality of their water resources is decreasing.

Negotiations on the second commitment period of the Kyoto Protocol that began at COP 13 in Bali with the agreement of the 'Bali Action Plan' must be concluded by COP 15 in Copenhagen in December 2009. Ambitious action to reduce emissions of greenhouse gases remains the best form of adaptation. Without drastic cuts in emissions, adaptation becomes increasingly difficult. In addition, some impacts of climate change are potentially beyond adaptation responses – such as sea-level rise leading to forced migration.<sup>9</sup> The level of adaptation support required will therefore be intimately related to the level of global temperature increase, and the political will harnessed in future mitigation commitments, agreed by countries within the post-2012 framework. The IPCC states that *'delayed emissions reductions lead to investments that lock in more emission-intensive infrastructure and development pathways'*, which *'increases the risk of more severe climate*

---

3 Key messages from the International Scientific Congress on Climate Change, 10–12 March 2009, Copenhagen.

4 *ibid.*

5 Mathur A et al (2004) *An adaptation mosaic: a sample of the emerging World Bank work in climate change adaptation*. World Bank, Washington DC.

6 The IPCC projects increased frequency of heavy precipitation events (*very likely*), increased area affected by drought (*likely*), increased incidence of extreme high sea level (*likely*) and increased intensity of tropical cyclone activity (*likely*). There is no clear evidence for increased frequency of tropical cyclones.

7 Sperling F and Szekely F (2005) *Disaster risk management in a changing climate*. VARG, Washington DC. In many countries, existing mechanisms are already insufficient for the current level of vulnerability.

8 *ibid.*

9 La Trobe S (2007) *Adaptation and the post-2012 framework*. Tearfund.

*change impacts.*<sup>10</sup> The latest science, the existing and predicted impacts of climate change and the current experience and needs of the poorest and most vulnerable communities demand an increased urgency and a massively scaled up response to avoid catastrophic climate change. COP 15 in December this year must deliver a coherent framework which really fast-tracks action on adaptation. This must go beyond support for enabling adaptation: it must bring massively scaled-up funding for implementation of adaptation. Key questions for all countries involved in the negotiations include how to 'scale up' adaptation funding, how to channel it to the countries and people who need it most, and what types of activity should be funded to maximise its effectiveness.<sup>11</sup>

If adaptation is to be addressed effectively within the post-2012 regime, there must be universal understanding of, and agreement on, the definition of adaptation. Tearfund defines adaptation as: *'Re-shaping and redesigning development, social and economic practices in response to the impact of actual or anticipated climate change. Focusing on environmental sustainability, it builds community resilience in order to maintain development gains.'* This is similar to the IPCC's scientific definition of adaptation as *'an adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climate stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits benefit opportunities.'*<sup>12</sup> There are currently two definitions of adaptation in the Convention. There should be an agreed definition of adaptation in the Copenhagen agreement that does not include reference to response measures.

### The Bali Action Plan and adaptation

The Bali Action Plan agreed at COP 13 in December 2007<sup>13</sup> committed parties to the development of a post-2012 framework that prioritises five areas including:

*Enhanced action on adaptation, including, inter alia, consideration of:*

- i International cooperation to support urgent implementation of adaptation actions, including through vulnerability assessments, prioritisation of actions, financial needs assessments, capacity-building and response strategies, integration of adaptation actions into sectoral and national planning, specific projects and programmes, means to incentivise the implementation of adaptation actions, and other ways to enable climate-resilient development and reduce vulnerability of all Parties, taking into account the urgent and immediate needs of developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, especially the least developed countries and Small Island Developing States, and further taking into account the needs of countries in Africa affected by drought, desertification and floods;*
- ii Risk management and risk-reduction strategies, including risk-sharing and transfer mechanisms such as insurance;*
- iii Disaster reduction strategies and means to address loss and damage associated with climate change impacts in developing countries that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change;*
- iv Economic diversification to build resilience;*
- v Ways to strengthen the catalytic role of the Convention in encouraging multilateral bodies, the public and private sectors and civil society, building on synergies among activities and processes, as a means to support adaptation in a coherent and integrated manner.*

In this paper we set out a number of elements that the Copenhagen deal must contain to ensure that adaptation is comprehensively and effectively addressed in a legally binding UNFCCC post-2012 framework. For action on adaptation we believe there are two key areas which must be addressed in order to have an equitable agreement in Copenhagen: financing for adaptation and implementation of adaptation.

10 IPCC (2007) *Working Group II Fourth Assessment Report, summary for policymakers.*

11 WRI (2009) *Adaptation: key questions and answers.* Two-page Q&A on adaptation and how it relates to the international negotiations.

12 La Trobe S (2007) *Adaptation and the post-2012 framework.* Tearfund.

13 UNFCCC COP 13 Decision 1/CP.13, the Bali Action Plan.

# 1 Financing for adaptation

## 1.1 Funding the immediate needs of the Least Developed Countries

At the UNFCCC negotiations in Bonn in March 2009, there were many calls to Annex 1 countries from the most vulnerable countries to 'show us the money'. For poor and vulnerable countries, the need for action on adaptation is pressing. Adaptation finance should be scaled up to meet the urgent need for adaptation in the most vulnerable communities in these countries. The Bali Action Plan talks about adaptation now, up to and beyond 2012. Developing countries need finances for the planning and implementation of adaptation in all three of these timeframes. There are already several funds available for adaptation under the Convention and Kyoto Protocol, but these are under-funded compared to the scale of need, mainly because currently financing the various existing funds is largely voluntary.

The Least Developed Countries (LDCs) were asked to prepare national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs) to identify their most urgent needs for adaptation in the form of projects. Thirty-eight out of 48 LDCs have submitted their NAPAs. The combined cost of implementing all the projects in these NAPAs would be around US\$2 billion. However, existing commitments to fund the most urgent needs have not been fulfilled. There is currently less than \$200 million in the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) for implementation of these plans. **To build trust in these negotiations, Annex 1 countries must fulfil the pledges made eight years ago to fully fund actions addressing the immediate impacts of climate change between now and 2012, as identified in the NAPAs. The Copenhagen agreement should include a rapid NAPA implementation initiative which would provide around US\$2 billion for rapid implementation of the most urgent actions identified in the NAPAs by the Least Developed Countries.** This is essential to build trust into future processes. The Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) must be made to work to respond to the urgent needs of LDCs for adaptation financing. However, the NAPA process needs to be seen as a transition step towards developing a more strategic approach to adaptation. Developing countries need to see the implementation of adaptation on the ground urgently through programmes and projects, but over time implementation should be through integrated sectoral planning for adaptation.

## 1.2 Additionality of adaptation finance

Adaptation is different from development, although there is a great deal of overlap. Climate change exacerbates existing development problems and is therefore an additional burden on developing countries seeking to achieve sustainable development. These challenges will need to be addressed through both short- and long-term approaches to adaptation.

According to a selection of current estimates on the overall needs, the **additional investment required for adaptation to the inevitable impacts of climate change in developing countries is in the order of US\$50–86 billion (€40–65 billion) per year by 2020, in addition to existing Official Development Assistance (ODA) commitments.**<sup>14</sup> Public financing must be in the form of grants (not loans) and must be new, additional, adequate, predictable, verifiable, and based on historic responsibility and capacity to pay. To raise finances on this scale, innovative mechanisms will be needed. Finances for climate change should be seen as 'restitution payments', which are developing countries' entitlements, rather than as aid. The provision of these finances must therefore not be voluntary as poor and vulnerable communities should not have to pay for their own adaptation activities. All of the current global estimates of the costs of adaptation have their limitations – none is fully comprehensive of all climate change impacts and adaptation cost factors.

<sup>14</sup> Source for 40 billion Euros (\$50 billion) – Oxfam (2007) *Adapting to climate change: what's needed in poor countries, and who should pay*. Source for 65 billion Euros (\$86 billion) – UNDP (2007) *Human Development Report*.

These costs are expected to increase significantly if efforts to reduce emissions are insufficient. Current estimates for the additional adaptation finance needed are based on a temperature rise of up to two degrees. However, in relation to adaptation, we need to be preparing for a four-degree rise where there will be much-increased costs of adaptation and where in some contexts adaptation will no longer be possible.

If these costs were to be divided up between Annex 1 countries in proportion to their relative responsibility and capability, then the EU would be required to deliver roughly one third of the finance required for adaptation in developing countries. Oxfam estimates the UK's obligation at 5.3 per cent of the total, or US\$2.65 billion (€2 billion) per year if we use the minimum adaptation needs figure of US\$50 billion (€40 billion). Concrete proposals and financial commitments of the appropriate scale are urgently needed from developed countries. These countries must show leadership on climate finance. The EU must commit to concrete quantified financial support for developing countries of the scale needed, in addition to the recent commitment that the EU will contribute its 'fair share'. The EU must show that it is serious about providing a reliable and continuous flow of public climate funds for developing countries. The EU should be as specific as possible about the global share and actual amount of climate finance it is prepared to contribute for action in developing countries. Tearfund believes that the EU's share of the global climate finance responsibility is around one third – meaning a total of at least €35 billion a year for developing country mitigation and adaptation needs by 2020 (additional to ODA commitments of 0.7 per cent and carbon credits), with steadily increasing levels of funding starting before 2013. EU member states and other developed countries need to give a strong signal to developing countries that funding for adaptation will be additional to ODA and allay their fears that climate finance will be taken from existing ODA. This is a real fear with current economic constraints.

There is already a huge gap between what is available and what is needed. This gap needs to be filled so that funds for adaptation in the near term can be substantially increased and so that funding for adaptation in the post-2012 framework matches the scale of need. Recent analysis highlights that developing countries have received less than ten per cent of the money promised by developed (Annex 1) countries to help them adapt to climate change. The failure is fostering deep distrust between countries and is seriously undermining the current UNFCCC negotiations on a global climate deal. Annex 1 countries have together pledged nearly US\$18 billion in the last seven years, but despite world leaders' rhetoric that the finance is vital, less than US\$900 million has been disbursed and long delays are plaguing the current funds. One estimate is that only about US\$500 million is currently available for adaptation.

Significant **new** financing therefore needs to be provided by the mechanisms created by the Copenhagen agreement. A combination of innovative mechanisms will be needed to raise the finance needed for adaptation. Mechanisms that could provide substantial funds for adaptation could include applying the Norwegian 'Assigned Amount Units' (AAUs) auctioning at two per cent,<sup>15</sup> raising around \$14 billion per annum, combined with the International Air Passenger Adaptation Levy, proposed by the Least Developed Country Group, raising \$10 billion per annum, plus the IMERS levy on international shipping, raising \$15 billion a year. Between them, these mechanisms would raise an annual total in the region of \$39 billion. Adding in the Currency Transaction Tax (CTT), which could raise in the region of \$40 billion per annum, this would increase the total generated from the four mechanisms to approximately \$79 billion a year.<sup>16</sup> However, the level of auctioning of AAUs should not be fixed at two per cent. Instead this percentage should be set according to the level of funding needed for adaptation.

---

15 The analysis used in this report has only focused on adaptation financing. The auctioning levy should be raised to cover costs for mitigation.

16 Spratt S (2009) *Assessing the alternatives: financing climate change mitigation and adaptation in developing countries*. Stamp Out Poverty, May 2009.

### 1.3 The Adaptation Fund as a model for adaptation funding in the post-2012 framework

Among the existing funding mechanisms there has been much focus on the Adaptation Fund created under the Kyoto Protocol. The operationalisation of the Adaptation Fund provides a unique opportunity to create an innovative and effective instrument which reflects the specific policy context of climate change adaptation.<sup>17</sup> The Adaptation Fund will fund both adaptation projects and programmes. Decisions on allocations will take into account criteria outlined in the Strategic Priorities and Guidelines of the Adaptation Fund Board, including:

- level of vulnerability
- level of urgency and risks arising from delay
- ensuring access to the Fund in a balanced and equitable manner
- maximising multi-sectoral or cross-sectoral benefits
- adaptive capacity to adverse effects of climate change.

The Adaptation Fund includes a strategic priority *'to give special attention to the particular needs of the most vulnerable communities'*. This is a key provision in order to ensure that the people most vulnerable to climate change are at the heart of adaptation projects and programmes. Both national and international NGOs have gained an increasing wealth of experience in implementing programmes to reduce communities' vulnerability. Drawing on this experience, by involving NGOs as stakeholders in the development of Adaptation Fund projects and programmes, will be crucial to ensuring successful adaptation – where resources reach the community level – and consistency with this strategic priority. In light of this priority, governments should consider entering into partnership with NGOs (local and, where appropriate, international NGOs), in the design of projects and programmes, as executing agencies and in monitoring and evaluation.<sup>18</sup>

The operational policies and guidelines for the Adaptation Fund, once agreed, will enable the Fund's board to invite proposals for funding from developing country parties. It is hoped that the first funding will be disbursed before COP 15. **The Adaptation Fund, if successful, can be a channel for future adaptation funding under the Copenhagen agreement. An effective, functioning Adaptation Fund could merge into or provide the model for adaptation financing post-2012, where the focus should increasingly be to support national adaptation plans and adaptation integrated into national development plans.** The Copenhagen agreement should therefore recognise and strengthen the existing Adaptation Fund and its board and should incorporate the Adaptation Fund into the institutional architecture agreed for the Adaptation Framework.

---

17 CAN International (2009) *Letter to the Adaptation Fund Board*. 20 March 2009.

18 *ibid.*

## 2 Implementing adaptation at the local and national level

### 2.1 Focus on the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable people

The primary objective of adaptation activities must be to strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity in vulnerable communities. We recognise that the impacts of climate change will vary between and within countries, and that responses will have to be based on local impacts, needs and circumstances. Adaptation responses must be relevant to local people and communities.<sup>19</sup> The principal threat to building adaptive communities is institutional – and therefore political – marginalisation.<sup>20</sup> Communities must be able to engage fully in political processes so as to fight for a policy environment that will allow them to continue to adapt in the face of climate change.

Adaptation should focus on responding to the needs of the most vulnerable, building on and complementing local knowledge and coping practices. This will require poor and vulnerable communities to be fully involved in identifying priorities, planning, implementation and monitoring and evaluation at the local and national level. This should increase ownership over planning and implementation and therefore better ensure long-term viability of adaptation activities and help avoid mal-adaptation. National planning is often too remote from vulnerable communities and those most at risk. Therefore planning must emphasise local-level risk assessments and that resources must reach vulnerable communities.

The Adaptation Framework should ensure that the interests of poor people are clearly prioritised.<sup>21</sup> It is very important that climate change knowledge gets to poor and vulnerable communities, and also to local authorities. The Framework must provide governments and the communities and people most vulnerable to climate change with easy and direct access to much-needed resources so they can gather and generate information on the local impacts of climate change, and to take immediate measures to plan, implement and monitor measures to adapt to climate change, reduce vulnerabilities, increase resilience and cope with loss and damage from climate change.<sup>22</sup>

### 2.2 Build on and expand disaster risk reduction (DRR)

A key aim of the Copenhagen agreement should be to reduce communities' vulnerability and build their resilience in the face of the unavoidable impacts of climate change. Global climate change is increasing the risk of floods, droughts and severe storms,<sup>23</sup> and if climate change adaptation policies and measures are to be efficient and effective they must build on and expand existing DRR efforts. The case for the importance of drawing on the experience, tools and methodologies of the DRR community in discussions on adaptation to climate change has been made strongly in the UNFCCC climate change talks. The chair's summary from the AWG-LCA workshop on risk management at COP 14 in December 2008 states

---

19 *ibid.*

20 Ensor J and Berger R (2009) *Understanding climate change adaptation: lessons from community-based approaches*. Practical Action Publishing.

21 Climate Action Network International (2009) *An adaptation action framework of the Copenhagen agreement*. Submission to the UNFCCC secretariat, 24 April, 2009.

22 *ibid.*

23 In its Fourth Assessment Report, the Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) projects that rising global temperature will cause increasing drought in mid-latitudes and semi-arid low latitudes. It will also leave hundreds of millions of people exposed to increased water stress, cause increased damage from storms and leave millions more people experiencing coastal flooding each year.

clearly that DRR provides many useful tools and experience. The importance of institutions in providing information, services and strategies has been highlighted and accepted in the UNFCCC discussions. These discussions have also highlighted the importance of implementing the priorities of the Hyogo Framework for Action in responding to the needs of poor and vulnerable communities already experiencing the impacts of climate change.

Disaster risk reduction and adaptation to climate change are strongly linked.<sup>24</sup> However climate adaptation and DRR strategies are not sufficiently integrated currently. In many countries the climate adaptation agenda is driven by the environment ministry, whereas commitments under the Hyogo Framework for Action are the responsibility of a different ministry. Therefore there must be coordination between ministries, platforms, policies and processes at the national and sub-national level. The Adaptation Framework should build on existing experience and lessons learnt from the Hyogo Framework for Action, when planning and implementing national and local adaptation action.<sup>25</sup>

DRR<sup>26</sup> and climate change adaptation have similar aims and mutual benefits. The relevance of DRR to the design and implementation of adaptation policies and measures cannot be over-emphasised. Climate change adaptation must build on and expand DRR, making use of the disaster risk management community's transferable, practical experience in addressing hazards, and building on existing policy frameworks such as the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015, agreed by 168 governments in 2005. Climate change and DRR policy/decision-makers and experts must communicate and collaborate with each other effectively to develop a comprehensive risk management approach to development at local, national, regional and international levels. Governments negotiating under the UNFCCC should:

- use the Hyogo Framework for Action (HFA) as a key reference point for current and post-2012 adaptation decisions, plans and programmes (the HFA contains a set of goals, activities and policy measures related to DRR which are to be achieved by 2015)
- ensure there is a strong focus on DRR within the adaptation pillar of the post-2012 framework, including an agreement to work with the disaster risk management community to ensure a joined-up approach to mainstreaming adaptation and DRR into development planning and programming
- make DRR in the poorest, most vulnerable countries and communities a priority for funding through the Adaptation Fund and all new financing mechanisms established in the post-2012 framework
- encourage on-going, systematic dialogue, information exchange and joint working between climate change and disaster reduction bodies, focal points and experts.

---

24 Venton P and La Trobe S (2008) *Linking disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation*. Tearfund.

25 Climate Action Network International (2009) An adaptation action framework of the Copenhagen agreement. Submission to the UNFCCC secretariat, 24 April, 2009.

26 Disaster risk reduction is a preventative approach to disaster management that includes the technical, social or economic actions or measures used to reduce direct, indirect and intangible disaster losses.

### Poverty reduction and underlying risk

Both climate change and disaster risk management communities recognise and accept that poor people are disproportionately affected by hazards. This is because they lack access to the means by which they could improve their resilience, whether this is in economic, social, physical, or environmental terms. So for both adaptation and DRR, poverty reduction and sustainable natural resource management are essential components of reducing vulnerability to hazards and climate change. Addressing underlying risk factors is critical for effective poverty and vulnerability reduction. Underlying risk relates to the interaction of a range of factors including globalisation processes, demographic trends, economic development and trade patterns, urbanisation, discrimination and limited local and national government capacity, which have an impact on exposure and vulnerability to hazards. In this context, all local and global issues that change risk patterns and increase vulnerabilities are relevant to adaptation – and to DRR. In principle, both adaptation and DRR aim to address such macro-level influences. However, in practice, perspectives on underlying risk do not yet go deep enough into the social, economic and political realms where risk is generated for the poor and most vulnerable people. As such, a shared challenge for the development, humanitarian and climate change communities is ensuring that poverty reduction strategies are designed around a concern to address root causes of risk, not merely symptoms, by taking adaptation and DRR approaches.

## 2.3 Prioritise the water sector for adaptation support

Water security is a key element for ensuring food security, health, dignity and livelihoods. However, the world is currently in the midst of a global water crisis, with around 700 million people facing water scarcity<sup>27</sup> and 900 million people lacking access to safe drinking water.<sup>28</sup> Climate change threatens to worsen this situation significantly. The poorest members of society, who often live in more fragile, less productive environments, are highly vulnerable to climatic impacts on water resources, and are hit first and hardest. Water stress could affect half of the countries in the world by 2025, and 75 per cent of the world's population by 2050,<sup>29</sup> unless major changes are made to water management strategies in water-stressed areas. Climate change is also a major threat to food security and sustainable economic growth.

By the 2020s, yield from rain-fed agriculture in some African countries could be reduced by as much as 50 per cent.<sup>30</sup> Agriculture will need to strengthen its resilience to changes in temperature and rainfall, resulting in changes to water availability, flood risk, incidence of storms and increased likelihood of pests and diseases. Tearfund believes that as water is a key sector, underpinning all other development sectors including agriculture and rural development, it should be prioritised for climate change adaptation funding to increase resilience.

As an adaptation response, Tearfund recommends that donors and national governments should:<sup>31</sup>

- integrate climate risk-based approaches, which address climate variability and climate change, within water policy frameworks. Climate change adaptation should not be viewed as a separate 'sector' from water, with separate frameworks, tools and approaches.
- focus on 'linked-up' cross-sectoral approaches to water resources planning, systematically considering climate risk within these approaches on a systematic basis. Synergy and integration – e.g. with land, agricultural, energy and mining sectors – should be the ultimate aim in water policy planning and implementation.

27 Glen JC et al (2008) *State of the future*. UN.

28 WHO/Unicef (2008) *Meeting the MDG drinking water and sanitation targets*. Joint Monitoring Programme Report. WHO, Geneva.

29 IPCC (2007) *Climate change 2007: synthesis report, contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Report on Climate Change*. IPCC, Geneva.

30 *ibid.*

31 Hedger M and Cacouris J (2008) *Separate streams? Adapting water resources management to climate change*. Tearfund.



- support the decentralisation process for managing water resources. This should include supporting efforts to strengthen related institutional, legal and regulatory components, and technical and financial capacity at the local level.
- target differentiated solutions to water resources management according to the needs of different groups. Communities that are particularly vulnerable to climate change should be targeted, and appropriate sustainable solutions that reflect their needs and interests should be prioritised over stand-alone infrastructure investments.
- ensure that climate risk information, where available, is made widely accessible and is used to inform water planning strategies. The establishment of regional research centres that collate relevant information from all relevant sources could be a potential way forward.
- strengthen local adaptive capacity by supporting localised water resources approaches, and looking at options for how to replicate them at scale. Technical and financial support is needed to help develop long-term sustainable adaptation solutions by building on current local approaches.
- empower communities to participate in water resources planning and management. This must encompass a two-way flow of information between government and communities.
- plan for change as livelihoods and cultures alter as a result of climate change and water scarcity. For example, ensure availability of information and learning opportunities on income diversification in semi-arid environments.
- develop national strategies which prioritise food security and integrate disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation approaches in order to prevent food crises in the future and to strengthen resilience to economic and climactic shocks. These strategies should be based on risk analyses and tackle the political and social drivers behind people's vulnerability.
- ensure better coordination and policy coherence between the agendas of climate change adaptation, disaster risk reduction and food security. For example, actors across departments of donors, the UN, different government ministries, civil society, and the private sector must coordinate their plans and work together to agreed outputs to ensure food security .

## 2.4 Integration of adaptation into national development plans

Adaptation must be a locally-driven process. The primary objective of adaptation activities must be to build resilience and adaptive capacity in vulnerable local communities. Communities are already seeking to adapt to climate change. Their approaches can be built on, and learning from these strategies can be used to inform local and national planning. To address the impacts of climate change on poor and vulnerable countries and communities within these countries, there is a need to move from support for projects, such as those that form part of the NAPAs for LDCs, to support for the development of national adaptation plans (NAPs) or strategies. Over time, support will need to move towards the strategic integration of climate change adaptation measures into the design and implementation of national development plans, poverty reduction strategies and sectoral policies and strategies, if these are to be sustainable in the face of climate change. Capacity building and sharing of best practices will be important in this process. Adaptation should not be viewed as a separate 'sector' with separate structures, frameworks, tools and approaches, but as an integral component of sustainable development.<sup>32</sup> Adaptation is needed in sectors that are crucial for wider development issues and for poverty reduction. Coordination between institutions and between different ministries will therefore be important. A critical test for development programmes and projects is: are they increasing or decreasing human vulnerability in the face of climate change?<sup>33</sup> Adaptation needs at the local and national level will also change over time and therefore flexibility in planning is important.

32 Some specific impacts of climate change, such as sea level rise, may require separate adaptation strategies.

33 La Trobe S (2007) *Adaptation and the post-2012 framework*. Tearfund.

The Copenhagen agreement should launch a process through which all governments commit to implementing an enhanced national adaptation planning process. This process should follow a framework that addresses a key set of shared national adaptation functions, and would be informed by lessons learnt from the existing national adaptation programs of action (NAPAs).<sup>34</sup> National plans should benefit from experience in developing NAPAs, but go beyond the concept of urgent and immediate needs and the project approach toward a long-term programmatic approach to adaptation. Knowledge, experiences and lessons learnt from existing activities, including those carried out at the community level as well as activities from ongoing initiatives such as the Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, should be integrated into adaptation planning. Access to the latest climate change science and knowledge must also be provided to enable developing countries to develop robust adaptation strategies.

Vulnerability assessment tools should be used in the development of national development plans that seek to reduce risk and thus build resilience to climate change. Tearfund has developed a tool (CEDRA – Climate change and Environmental Degradation Risk and Adaptation assessment<sup>35</sup>) to help agencies working in developing countries to access and understand the science of climate change and environmental degradation and compare this with local community experience of environmental change. Using CEDRA, civil society organisations can prioritise which environmental hazards may pose a risk to their existing project locations, enabling them to make decisions to adapt some projects, stop doing some projects or start new ones. Adaptation options are discussed, and decision-making tools are provided to help organisations plan their responses to the hazards identified.

## 2.5 Institutional arrangements

The institutional architecture for adaptation (including financial mechanisms) must be established in a legally binding manner. It is very important to reach agreement on an institutional architecture that can deliver the finance needed in ways that respond to the needs of both local authorities and the poorest and most vulnerable communities. It is essential that developing countries have direct access to the funding mechanism. The governance structure must be fair, representative and transparent. Against these criteria, the current Adaptation Fund and its board could provide a model for further financing instruments and financial governance and could become the adaptation funding mechanism in the post-2012 framework. The Adaptation Fund is operationalising direct access to funding for developing countries. In addition, developing countries are in the majority on the Adaptation Fund board and civil society involvement should help to keep the Fund accountable in terms of fund disbursement. Civil society organisations should be fully involved in any in-country coordinating mechanisms used to develop plans for adaptation. The capacity of civil society to engage will often need to be enhanced. Funding will be needed to provide civil society organisations with the information, knowledge and tools to keep their own governments accountable to their own populations.

In a post-2012 world, both existing and new institutions will be involved in providing funding for adaptation. Coordination between the different mechanisms and coherence at the national level will therefore be important. Many existing institutions will have a steep learning curve to ensure that they are able to support adaptation to climate change at the national and local level in ways that address local and national needs for adaptation.

The Adaptation Framework should include an 'expert' technical panel on adaptation to improve the tools to define and implement national adaptation plans. The technical panel would consist of experts from government, civil society and research institutes and should have balanced representation from both developed and developing countries. The Adaptation Framework should also establish and strengthen

---

34 *ibid.*

35 Wiggins S and Wiggins M (2009) *CEDRA – climate change and environmental degradation risk and adaptation assessment*. Tearfund.

existing regional adaptation centres and initiatives for adaptation planning, forecasting and information-sharing on projected climate change impacts.<sup>36</sup>

Finally, adaptation financing and implementation should come under the authority of the COP and be fully accountable to the UNFCCC. Political oversight of the COP is essential to enable effective accountability and to make it acceptable to developing countries.

## 2.6 Monitoring and evaluation

There must be monitoring and evaluation of adaptation actions supported through the Adaptation Framework, including external monitoring and evaluation using an independent local-level monitoring framework to ensure transparency and accountability. Accountability runs both ways. Systems of accountability are needed to hold developed countries accountable to their responsibility and commitments to provide adaptation funds, as well as to enable local people to hold developing country governments responsible for a reduction in vulnerability among the poorest and most vulnerable communities. In the long term, it is the capacity of civil society to hold its national government accountable that needs to be strengthened.

The perceived 'fairness' of the level of additional adaptation finance provided may well determine to what extent developing countries are willing to be subject to external monitoring and evaluation. There will be a need to invest in monitoring and evaluation systems that can show the provision and use of additional finance for adaptation to support NAPAs and national adaptation plans, as well as the use of development aid (Official Development Assistance) at the national and local level.

Capacity for monitoring and evaluation is weak in many countries. The capacity of civil society to engage will therefore need to be enhanced in many cases. The involvement of civil society actors at the local and national level in monitoring and evaluation is very important to ensure that there is accountability downwards to local communities on the use of adaptation funds. Adaptation indicators should also be developed at the local level to measure increases in resilience among communities. Monitoring and evaluation should also support countries in assessing their progress towards developing effective adaptation strategies and facilitate exchange between countries on their learning and experience in implementing adaptation, including information on unintended outcomes and mal-adaptation.

---

36 *ibid.*

## Conclusion

In solidarity with the poorest and most vulnerable countries and the most vulnerable communities within these countries, Tearfund believes that adaptation must remain a top-level priority in the negotiations – not an add-on. COP 15 in Copenhagen must deliver a coherent framework which really scales up action on implementing adaptation. Evaluation of the success or otherwise of the Copenhagen deal, and in particular the adaptation component, must be based on what it means for those people who are already the world's poorest and the most vulnerable to climate change.

Much more action on adaptation will be needed beyond COP 15. In many ways, the Copenhagen deal is just the start. It will not deliver all the changes needed for long-term sustained action. However, the Copenhagen deal must signal strongly the willingness of developed countries to see justice done. Developed countries' response to people suffering the injustices of the impact of climate change should be proportionate not to the means of developed countries but to the needs of the most vulnerable people and communities and the causes of their needs.<sup>37</sup> Developed countries must lead by providing the assistance for adaptation that the most vulnerable countries so desperately need. The survival of poor and vulnerable communities depends directly on the will of other communities. Climate change again reveals clearly people's interdependence in the context of a rapidly changing environment. Strengthening social networks and communities are both key to successful adaptation. Living in 'community' relationship with our 'neighbours' in places all around the world means a response to climate change that is appropriate, proportionate, generous and just. This is what the world is waiting for: the time for action on adaptation is now!

**To ensure a comprehensive, equitable, science-based post-2012 framework, the Copenhagen deal must contain the following:**

### A shared vision on adaptation

- The shared vision for the future must encompass all elements of the Bali Action Plan. Therefore, massively scaled-up action on adaptation at the national and international level must be part of the shared vision that will guide the post-2012 framework.

### Funding the immediate needs of the Least Developed Countries

- To build trust in these negotiations, Annex 1 countries must fulfil the pledges made eight years ago to fully fund the actions addressing the immediate impacts of climate change between now and 2012, as identified in the national adaptation programmes of action (NAPAs). The Copenhagen agreement should include a rapid NAPA implementation initiative which would provide about US\$2 billion for rapid implementation of the most urgent actions identified by the Least Developed Countries in the NAPAs.

### Additionality of adaptation finance

- Adaptation funding must be new and additional to Official Development Assistance (ODA) commitments of 0.7 per cent of GDP. Funding should be delivered as grants, not loans. Total finance provided by developed countries for adaptation in developing countries should be at least US\$50–86 billion (€40–65 billion) per year. This must be part of the deal agreed in Copenhagen for the post-2012 framework, with steadily increasing levels of funding starting before 2013. Funding starting before 2013 must be in addition to the US\$2 billion for urgent actions in the Least Developed Countries.
- A combination of innovative mechanisms will be needed to raise the finance needed for adaptation. The proposed Assigned Amount Units (AAUs) levy should be combined with raising funds through the development of international levies on emissions from aviation and shipping.

---

37 Clifford P (2009) *Angels with trumpets: the church in a time of global warming*. Christian Aid with Darton, Longman and Todd.

**The Adaptation Fund as a model for adaptation funding**

- The Adaptation Fund, if successful, can be a channel for future adaptation funding under the Copenhagen agreement. An effective, functioning Adaptation Fund could merge into or provide the model for adaptation financing post-2012, where the focus should increasingly be to support national adaptation plans and adaptation integrated into national development plans.

**Focus on the needs of the poorest and most vulnerable people**

- A guiding principle in implementing the Copenhagen deal is that special attention shall be given to the particular needs of the most vulnerable communities in adapting to the unavoidable consequences of climate change. Their perspectives must be incorporated fully into the response to climate change.
- Money should be targeted at the poorest and most vulnerable countries and the most vulnerable communities within these countries. There should be a significant role for civil society in planning, implementation and monitoring.

**Build on and expand disaster risk reduction (DRR)**

- Adaptation should build on existing capacity and experience to increase the resilience of the most vulnerable communities. Climate change adaptation must build on and expand a DRR approach, making use of the disaster risk management community's transferable, practical experience in addressing hazards, and building on existing policy frameworks such as the Hyogo Framework for Action 2005–2015, agreed by 168 governments in 2005.

**Prioritise the water sector for adaptation support**

- Localised adaptive water management approaches must be supported to help develop long-term sustainable solutions.
- Climate risk must be factored into water resource management planning and implementation.

**Integration of adaptation into national development plans**

- It is essential that, in the long-term, NAPAs are seen as a transition step towards the sustainable implementation of adaptation activities. Support for adaptation should ultimately move from project-based activities towards the strategic integration of adaptation measures into the design and implementation of national development and poverty reduction plans, sectoral policies and strategies.
- Support must be provided for the development and implementation of comprehensive longer term National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). Where appropriate, adaptation must be integrated into national development planning and ultimately into sectoral plans and strategies. Plans must be developed through inclusive and transparent processes. These must be country-driven processes to define priorities for adaptation funding.
- Strategies for disaster risk reduction, water resource management and food security should all feature highly in national development planning in order to strengthen adaptation and resilience to climatic and economic shocks.
- Access to the latest climate change science and knowledge must also be provided to enable developing countries to develop robust adaptation strategies.

**Institutional arrangements**

- An 'expert' technical panel on adaptation should be set up under the UNFCCC to improve the tools for defining and implementing national adaptation plans.
- Delivery of funding should be guided by the principle of easy and direct access to support the most vulnerable communities. The Framework should guide effective and efficient implementation of adaptation action.

- Adaptation financing and implementation should come under the authority of the COP and be fully accountable to the UNFCCC. Political oversight of the COP is essential to enable effective accountability and to make it acceptable to developing countries.

**Monitoring and evaluation**

- There must be monitoring and evaluation of activities supported through the Adaptation Framework, including external monitoring and evaluation using an independent local-level monitoring framework to ensure transparency and accountability.





**tearfund**

**[www.tearfund.org](http://www.tearfund.org)**

100 Church Road, Teddington, TW11 8QE, United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0)20 8977 9144

Registered Charity No. 265464 (England and Wales)

Registered Charity No. SC037624 (Scotland)

19437-(0509)