



**ADAPTATION FUND**  
Readiness Programme  
for Climate Finance

# **Webinar 11: Climate change adaptation reasoning to support project development and assessing broader vulnerabilities**

**10-11 November 2020**

**Report**



## **Introduction:**

The Adaptation Fund (the Fund or alternatively, the AF) held its eleventh webinar on climate change adaptation reasoning to support project development and assessing broader vulnerabilities on November 10 and was repeated on November 11 to accommodate national implementing entities (NIEs) in different time zones.

The Fund's Operational Policies and Guidelines (OPGs)<sup>1</sup> require that proposals provide a description of the problem that a proposed project/programme is aiming to solve. This is part of adaptation reasoning which entails that the implementing entity describe how proposed activities and adaptation measures will help with adaptation to climate change, will improve climate resilience, and are suited or adequate for the identified climate threats. Projects have frequently identified the increased intensity of extreme events such as floods, droughts, warming trends and sea level rise, as climate related drivers giving rise to risks in food security and disrupting livelihoods. Projects are typically concerned with reducing vulnerability through the securing of assets, both human and natural. With respect to the broadened definition of vulnerability, the Fund's mandate to finance concrete adaptation projects and programmes is not at the expense of considering the wider social and economic drivers of vulnerability.

All presentations made by the speakers are available on the AF website: <https://www.adaptation-fund.org/readiness/news-seminars/>.

## **Welcome Remarks**

The webinar began with welcome remarks and an introduction from Farayi Madziwa, Team Lead of the Climate Finance Readiness Programme of the Adaptation Fund Board Secretariat (the secretariat). Farayi highlighted that adaptation reasoning looks at how proposed activities improve climate resilience and how proposed activities are best suited to address and identify climate risks. He discussed the goal and importance of assessment and analysis of a project/activity in understanding climate risks and support the adaptation rationale. He stated that the webinar would discuss approaches that NIEs have been following in approaching adaptation reasoning during project design and development and the lessons that can be learnt from these experiences. He said the discussion would also share experiences on how the COVID-19 pandemic had impacted the conceptualization of adaptation reasoning and the context in which adaptation rationale is or will be presented in projects and programmes.

## **Session 1: How adaptation is defined by the AF and expectations for adequately addressing the adaptation reasoning criteria**

Ms. Alyssa Gomes, Climate Change Analyst of the secretariat, gave an overview of how to establish a robust climate rationale; conceptualizing framework adaptation reasoning; presenting adaptation needs focused on climate related drivers, key risks, barriers and responses; AF approach to adaptation reasoning and highlighted a few case studies. She highlighted how vulnerability is a key component of adaptation and further discussed conceptualizing adaptation reasoning, highlighting two key elements, namely adaptation needs and responses.

---

<sup>1</sup> The Fund's OPG can be viewed and downloaded from the Adaptation Fund website: <https://www.adaptationfund.org/documents-publications/operational-policies-guidelines/>

## Discussion and Question and Answer (Q&A)

Question: Is the way the Adaptation Fund is defining adaptation reasoning in the framework similar to others like Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) or is this particular to the Adaptation Fund?

Response: The way adaptation reasoning is defined is in line with other climate funds as well as UNFCCC working papers. The difference is in the way the AF has a results based management framework and there is the mandate to finance concrete adaptation projects so we mention that it is important to have these risk assessment and vulnerability studies at the onset to ensure the purposefulness of the activities that are being proposed and ensuring that they are aligned with the longer time scales of the climate projections in that specific country. We also mentioned that it is important to align these with the eight outcomes we have in the AF results framework to ensure that we are financing concrete adaptation actions. So, it is in the application of the reasoning where AF differs as well as in the proposal template, where AF has various questions that ask about cost effectiveness, sustainability, the full cost of adaptation reasoning, and the objectives of the project that should be based on the resources received from the Fund.

## Session 2: NIE experiences discussing project design, preparation and development experiences in the context of the pandemic

This session shared NIE experiences and lessons learnt from going through project design and development during the COVID-19 pandemic by the National Environment Management Council (NEMC) of Tanzania, Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE) of Uganda, Dominican Institute of Integral Development (IDDI) of the Dominican Republic, Micronesia Conservation Trust (MCT) of the Federated States of Micronesia, Bhutan Trust Fund for Environment Conservation (BTFC) of Bhutan and the Ministry of Finance and Economic Management (MFEM) of the Cook Islands.

### Experience sharing by NEMC, Tanzania

Mr. Fredrick Mulinda presented the NEMC lessons learnt and the impact of the pandemic on project design, preparation and development. He highlighted three categories in the process of designing and developing adaptation interventions to address climate risks namely, analysis of the climate vulnerability data that includes ecosystems and communities in both local and national context; identification and elaboration of the interventions that includes justification of the interventions and funding requested focusing on the cost of adaptation, identification of solution to climate challenges through co-creation process and designing of the concrete adaptations interventions through scientific; and finally elaboration on how the proposed interventions align with national policies and strategies. Finally, he concluded his presentation by highlighting the challenges they met during project design including, lack of data to justify project rationale and delayed or lack of cooperation from local stakeholders and communities.

### Experience sharing by MoWE, Uganda

Mr. Callist Tindimugaya presented the experiences of the MoWE in Uganda in climate change adaptation reasoning to support project development and assessing broader vulnerabilities. He gave an overview of the water related impacts of climate change due to melting of glaciers and how the pandemic has impacted the conceptualization of adaptation reasoning based on four projects. He discussed the steps taken in design and development of proposed adaptation interventions that included understanding the climate variables and projected changes,

presenting climate impact and vulnerabilities on ecosystem and communities, determining how interventions align with national priorities and preparation of a Catchment Management Plan. Finally, he discussed the key lessons from the COVID-19 pandemic that included, ensuring food security at all times; making water and sanitation a necessity; diversifying income and livelihood, enhancing social security and resilience of ecosystems, agricultural landscapes, community livelihood systems and building capacity of communities.

### **Experience sharing by IDDI, Dominican Republic**

Mr. Pedro Zuccarini gave an overview of enhancing climate resilience in integrated water resource management and rural development programme. He highlighted the process roadmap of strengthening the capacities of local key actors to manage climate-related risks which included knowledge of climate change and its effects on pilot communities; communicational strategy aimed at establishing adequate mechanism for training and dissemination of messages to make the beneficiaries understand the importance of their participation; community ownership and valuing local experience for better empowerment and sustainability of initiatives and; follow-up and monitoring to allow exchange of information between local governments and communities to improve resilience. He further focused on the importance of public-private partnerships that achieved a shared benefit between the communities and their key actors.

### **Experience sharing by MCT, Micronesia**

Ms. Shirley Ann Pelep and Ms. Tamara Greenstone-Alefaio presented on the practical solutions for reducing community vulnerability to climate change. They gave an overview of the vulnerability of Micronesia to climate change impacts with over 80% communities exposed to sea level rise and flooding and explained the goal and mission of MCT to improve the quality of life for communities across Micronesia. They highlighted the project components of the climate adaptation intervention for marine protected areas that included establishment of sound fisheries management practices; effective enforcement of rules and regulations; identification of management actions and project components and; defending ecosystems against climate change stressors. They noted the challenges faced including difficulty in information gathering due to geographically isolated communities and islands; past projects not always documented so the data, lessons learned, project successes and interventions become challenging to locate and; communities using own adaptation mechanisms which are not always recorded. They concluded their presentation with some key lessons learnt namely, knowledge Management component sharing lessons learned; reduction in the stressors of climate change on the marine ecosystem; local community empowerment to implement projects and; funding for small scale eco-system based adaptation projects in communities having a positive impact on health and nutrition.

### **Experience sharing by BTFEC, Bhutan**

Mr. Ugyen Lhendup gave an overview of the vulnerability of Bhutan to climate change and the “whole-mountain, top to bottom approach” they used for project design which involved taking into account all the catchment area to have better integration of ecosystem, social and economic production units; having high level of relevance in terms of integrated resilience; identifying solutions that are technically feasible and; proper communication with stakeholders on solutions to be implemented. He highlighted the key challenges namely financial resources, technical expertise and lack of reliable data. He concluded his presentation by discussing the impact of COVID-19 on project proposal formulation which involved collecting input from different stakeholders; review by external experts and; incorporation of the comments in finalization of the project proposal.

## Experience sharing by MFEM, Cook Islands

Mr. Mani Jeremiah Mate presented on the integrated approach to further increase the adaptive capacity of remote islands communities and ecosystems to disaster risk and climate change impacts. He highlighted the three project components namely, strengthening disaster risk governance to manage risk and enhance preparedness for effective response to “Build Back Better” in recovery; integrated water security management planning and; revitalized agricultural production systems strengthening island food sources and livelihoods. He focused on the process used in developing the proposed adaptation interventions that included identifying and confirming the problem; review of existing interventions and identifying gaps from previous projects; formulating adaptation initiatives; identifying key barriers to proposed initiatives and; outlining the key results of the initiative and alignment with national priorities. They highlighted the main challenge was the transition from project design to implementation and ongoing dialogue with stakeholders was an important lesson learnt for the project design.

## Discussion and Question and Answer (Q&A)

Question to NEMC: Did you receive any funding from the AF to develop the project rationale? From experiences in South Africa, working with climate data and ground truthing can be resource intensive and expensive.

Response by NEMC: The standard set by the AF really requires resources. Even right from the concept note, you have to have seed money to do that because you need climate information, downscaling those models, quantifying climate risks related data at grassroots level, and analyzing the ecological systems. So, resources from AF might not be enough and additional resources may be needed to make sure you have the required information.

Question to NEMC: How easy was it to secure this seed money? Were there hurdles you had to overcome and was it from a single source? And was the source local or international?

Response by NEMC: NEMC worked from their own resources to develop the concept notes and after the concept notes were approved, they were supplemented with project formulation grants from the AF.

Question to NEMC: I would like to know how long did it take to develop the project until you got approved for funding and how did you manage the expectation of the community and change in the government officers, if any?

Response by NEMC: We started the process of calling for concept notes towards the end of 2018 and two project proposals were approved in the middle of this year (2020) and the last one just a few weeks ago. So, I would say it is nearly a year and a half, close to two years. We had no change in government officers, only the director general has changed but everything else remained the same. We updated the community on every step that was ongoing, so close communication was very useful among the executing entities and communities and the AF.

Question to MoWE: You mentioned the issue of managing stakeholder expectations and I was wondering how you managed to address that? Is this simply an issue of telling beneficiaries don't worry or you had to address it in a different way or prepare some plan to manage that?

Response by MoWE: We already have a program in Uganda where we are preparing a catchment management plan, so we integrated all water related resources in that framework

where we have coordination structures by stakeholders. We also have the committees that meet regularly but most importantly each catchment has a plan developed in a highly consultative manner with stakeholders and identifies the issues that need to be addressed, identifies the causes and solutions and actions. So, these committees meet regularly, and we have been providing them with updates every time we are meeting, give them a progress report and concept note and kept them engaged even though there are delays. Within the catchment there are many activities going on, so they are busy looking at many activities and not just one.

Question to MoWE: In terms of resources to support the project preparation design, did the ministry also have to seek for additional funding outside the government?

Response by MoWE: Yes, this process is resource intensive. So, in our project management framework, we promoted the partnership principle and took advantage of human resources and financial resources through partnerships. Yes, we use resources from within and also partners, some NGOs are working with us and also regional entities.

Question to IDDI: How did you fund the capacities of the field teams for the water basins to guarantee project sustainability?

Response by IDDI: The implementation and structuring of the follow up teams on the ground self-manage the operations. Some do voluntarily and some receive remuneration for professional services they are providing to the community. This reduces the cost and allows them to have more empowerment in their activity.

Question to MCT: When going through the effort and exercise of collecting data and trying to find regional and community data, was there help in funding?

Response by MCT: Most of our funding is acquired by private funding and private donors and some US federal grants, so we have been used to gathering this information. Justifying this to the larger international community such as the GCF, is where we had to better organize it and try to find scientific data to raise the level of small community projects.

Question to MFEM: Regarding the consultants you used in your project design, I am wondering if you had a database you consulted or experts, or was it difficult to find an expert/consultant?

Response by MFEM: No, it was not difficult to find a consultant. We do have a register of consultants/experts and UNDP also has a roster of experts we can draw from.

## **Session 6: Closing Remarks**

The webinar closed with concluding remarks from Farayi Madziwa, who thanked everyone for their participation and their engagement in the webinar, despite joining from different time zones. He reiterated the importance of adaptation reasoning in the design and development of concrete projects and acknowledged the need to continue this conversation through the community of practice for direct access entities (CPDAE), which is a platform to continue to engage and reach out to other NIEs. As a last word, he urged everyone to continue to stay safe during these unprecedented times.