

KEY FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Briefing for Participants

Theme 1: How could the INDCs be effectively linked to the other climate change policy processes?

Guiding questions

- What countries have made most progress in the implementation of their (I)NDC this year? Why/how?
- What are the main challenges for LDCs and SIDS to take their (I)NDC forward?
- What actions should be undertaken by GCCA+?

Key findings

- **Importance of climate change mainstreaming:** success stories usually imply climate change mainstreaming into existing strategies (such as national development plans and other multi-annual economic, growth and development plans) supported by high-level political support at national level.
- **From INDCs to NDCs:** INDCs need to be improved to ensure their robustness and coherence with existing knowledge and national circumstances; NDCs should be translated into actionable roadmaps in all relevant sectors, complete with investment plans and budget priorities.
- **Key challenges:**
 - **MRV:** there are significant capacity gaps with regard to the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) of INDCs.
 - **Insufficient awareness of financing options** and processes (but some countries have started to engage with donors to access climate finance for implementation)
 - **Ownership:** difficulties in engaging with local communities and actors from different sectors, including Ministries and private sector.

Key recommendations for the GCCA+

- **Support capacity building:**
 - **In multiple areas:** institutional setup, MRV, climate science, costing of measures, economic analysis in support of prioritisation of options, access to climate finance¹, tracking of climate finance, ...
 - **Across levels** (from national to local to community level) with a view to achieving climate change mainstreaming into coherent and coordinated policy frameworks and strategies

¹ Through direct accreditation to the GCF as well as the preparation of bankable project proposals

- Support improved **governance** of climate change by:
 - **Engaging** national and local governments and civil society
 - Facilitating **policy dialogues** at national and regional level to create coherent policy and regulatory frameworks that integrate and coordinate economy-wide action
- With regard to governance arrangements, recognize the **broad diversity of contexts and approaches** for NDC implementation (no blueprint implementation model).
- Move from project to **programmatic approaches** and **budget support** to enhance impact.
- Facilitate the **sharing of lessons learned** through the development / strengthening of frameworks for tracking and measuring progress, evaluating results and replicating best practices.
- Promote, pilot and test scalable mechanisms to demonstrate technical and financial viability and attract funding (including from development banks and the private sector).

Theme 2: How could we increase the social benefits of climate change policies and interventions?

Guiding questions

- What are key factors contributing to the success of interventions and the ability to scale up? Can you highlight any “transformative initiatives” and key factors characterising such initiatives?
- How can the GCCA+ contribute towards disseminating and scaling-up such initiatives?
- What are the main challenges encountered in the replication and scaling up of successful experiences and the dissemination of good practices? What can be done (in national programmes and through the GCCA+) to address or help address these challenges?

Key findings

- There is broad agreement on the list and order of importance of success factors as derived from an analysis of lessons learned from GCCA(+) projects (see issue paper)². Knowledge sharing and cost-effectiveness should be given more prominence. There are **synergies** between some of these success factors. It is noted that gender and livelihoods dimensions are at the core of ownership and sustainability.
- **Additional success factors** include financial and economic sustainability; as well as solid baseline data collection and investment in preparation (incl. vulnerability assessment).
- **Key challenges** for scaling up include social and cultural resistance to change, lack of harmonisation and coordination between interventions, weak governance systems (largely outside the control of donors), insufficient funding and low capacities at the local level, and land use/land rights issues. New issues can also be raised by scaling up (e.g. large-scale vs. small-scale irrigation).

² “Comprehensive, integrated / multisector actions with good coordination mechanisms”, capacity building, consultation and participatory approaches (noting that communities are not homogeneous and community leaders must be involved), strong ownership and engagement at both national and local level (encompassing various subnational government levels and community level), alignment with clear national policies / strategies, awareness raising and strong political commitment (incl. existence of political champions) are in the top positions. It is noted that ownership operates at many levels and has different meanings for different groups.

Key recommendations for the GCCA+

- Invest more in **project preparation** (longer timeframe, effective participation of multiple stakeholders, data collection and strong baseline, livelihoods zoning, sustainability and exit strategy embedded from the start).
- Adapt **project duration** to the nature of the project (e.g. long timeframe need in agriculture).
- Contribute to **financing the scaling up** of successful projects (follow-up phase).
- **Capacity building (CB)**: support Technical Vocational Education and Training (TVET) on climate change and disaster risk reduction; invest in CB for local communities (e.g. farmer field school approach) and for decentralised technical services.
- **M&E**: define a set of indicators for the GCCA+ initiative as a whole on top of solid M&E / set of indicators / baseline data at intervention-specific level.
- **Knowledge management**: share knowledge at different levels; share not just success but also “un-success” stories; strengthen knowledge sharing across GCCA(+) projects.
- **Awareness raising**: consider support for climate policy advocacy groups; ensure information materials are prepared in accessible formats, languages and media.
- Support **diagnosis of governance structures / mechanisms** (basis for their improvement).
- Promote the uptake of local knowledge and know-how as part of adaptation and mitigation responses.

Theme 3: Linking gender, poverty and climate change mainstreaming – Challenges and opportunities

Guiding questions

- *Areas of support*: Are there any positive experiences in policies and practices related to gender and climate change that you would like to see replicated or scaled-up? What tools or strategies can facilitate the participation of women and their active role in decision-making on climate change at different levels?
- *Financing gender and climate change*: Could it be relevant to include gender as one of the main sectors of action of the GCCA+? Should quantified targets be set for the allocation of GCCA+ resources to gender and women? If so, at which level?
- *M&E*: What key gender-sensitive indicators could be used? Where gender-disaggregated indicators are not available or unaffordable, how can we ensure tracking of gender-sensitive climate actions?

Key recommendations for the GCCA+

General:

- Make **gender a requirement and core area** for GCCA+, providing guidance (e.g. clear direction and definitions on gender terminology and expectations), tools, case studies, ...
- Dedicate **more resources and time to policies and project design** so that effective gender integration is possible: specialised expertise to support sector-specific expertise, systematic use of **gender analysis** (supporting project design and implementation as well as M&E based on meaningful indicators), collection of gender disaggregated data, effective participation of women and their representative associations in the design of activities³, ...
- Ensure any policy dialogue related to GCCA+ incorporates gender concerns and issues, and highlights potential gaps in national level gender policy and practice.

³ And further on in their implementation and monitoring.

- Identify and mobilise gender champions (ideally not just women!).

Areas of support:

- Promote increased **integration of gender in (I)NDCs** (incl. increasing benefits for women).
- Support activities that give women access to **income-generating activities**.
- Promote the use of **technologies** that are gender-designed and/or gender-accepted and may contribute to alleviating women's work burden.
- **Access to finance**: promote access to microfinance; make sure women have equal chances of accessing GCCA+ funding (e.g. through support for drafting project proposals).
- **Capacity building**: invest in education for girls and women, and in "confidence training" (e.g. training in leadership, in approaches that increase productivity) => more voice and ability to influence environmental and climate decision-making.
- **Quotas / Quantified gender targets** at project level and in decision-making bodies: can be useful if accompanied by sensitisation and capacity building measures – but counterproductive if poorly implemented.

Financing:

- At GCCA+ level, assess performance so far (**baseline**), then **monitor progress**.
- *Possibly* adopt quantified targets but then need clear methodology for measuring outcomes.

M&E:

- Integrate, quantify and qualify gender aspects in the **logical framework** from the very beginning (meaningful gender-disaggregated indicators).
- Try to capture the **various dimensions** of gender equality and impacts through indicators.

Theme 4: Risk management solutions and tools as a response to the adverse effects of climate change

Guiding questions

- How to bridge the gaps still existing between science-based climate data and risk management tools on the one hand and end-users and decision-makers on the other hand?
- What should be done more to effectively promote lessons from successful research and pilot projects on climate risk management and make them available for different levels of decision making?
- What mechanisms can be used to ensure the available data: 1) are translated into user-friendly, locally-accepted information; 2) reach the appropriate users; 3) support investment-related decision making?

Key findings

- **Risk assessment**:
 - Unpacking complex issues is a necessary step.
 - Understanding key drivers of risk (closely related to drivers of vulnerability) and components of risk assessment is critical; specific capacity building is likely to be needed for using risk assessment models
 - Users should be aware of the limitations of / challenges and biases associated with specific models, data sets or risk metrics.
- **Knowledge** is not all about climate science, models and projections; part of it is based on practice (e.g. traditional knowledge should be better known and harnessed).

- Sound investment planning implies **risk-informed planning** (e.g. stronger climate risk assessment and management / climate-proofing required in the financing of infrastructure).
- In the face of uncertainty, “**robust**” and “**no regret**” climate adaptation options⁴ and the **mainstreaming of climate change risks** into sector and local planning can be sound risk mitigation strategies.
- **Risk monitoring** during project implementation needs to be strengthened – but should remain based on manageable tools and practices.

Key recommendations for the GCCA+

- Enhance the use, quality and dissemination of **climate vulnerability assessments**; in their preparation, use participatory approaches (also involving communities) and combine local knowledge with scientific knowledge.
- Promote a **two-way exchange** between scientists and data infrastructure specialists on one hand, and the community of users (incl. decision makers) and beneficiaries (incl. local communities and actors) on the other hand.
- Embed **risk information in national decision making**, and to this effect support capacity building on climate risk management at the central institutional level (e.g. Min. of Finance).
- In the choice of risk management options, use good practices, and promote **multi-benefit** (e.g. conservation agriculture, ecosystem-based approaches) or **multi-stakeholder** approaches.
- Make a more robust **review of risk mitigation strategies** at intervention design level, to be updated on a regular basis during implementation.

⁴ Robust options are those anticipated to deliver net benefits under a range of assumptions and scenarios. No-regret options are those anticipated to deliver net benefits under any predicted climate scenario (including a “no climate change” scenario).