



GCCA Global Policy Event 2013

Brussels, 18-20 September 2013

Summary of key political and technical conclusions



Photo credit: Catherine Paul

Final – October 2013

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Key messages for climate negotiators.....	3
2.1.	On mainstreaming climate change and disaster risk reduction.....	3
2.1.1.	Stabilising the climate change and DRR planning framework.....	3
2.1.2.	Supporting planning through flexible arrangements.....	3
2.1.3.	Promoting integrated national strategies.....	4
2.2.	On making climate finance more effective.....	4
2.2.1.	Clarifying and simplifying the global climate finance architecture.....	4
2.2.2.	Streamlining accreditation processes.....	4
2.2.3.	Finalising arrangements for the Green Climate Fund.....	4
2.2.4.	Addressing climate-related budget support in the debate on direct access.....	4
2.3.	On fostering adaptation-mitigation synergies, notably in the field of sustainable land management.....	5
2.3.1.	Promoting a long-term perspective that embeds sustainability.....	5
2.3.2.	Breaking the adaptation-mitigation divide.....	5
2.3.3.	Promoting alignment between various international processes and funding streams.....	5
2.3.4.	Balancing the need for harmonised accounting/reporting with consideration of national specificities.....	5
2.4.	On MRV and the M&E of adaptation.....	6
2.4.1.	Acknowledging the differences between adaptation and mitigation.....	6
2.4.2.	Identifying and supporting good practices for the M&E of adaptation actions.....	6
3.	Key messages for the international development community.....	6
3.1.	On mainstreaming climate change and disaster risk reduction.....	6
3.1.1.	Supporting the preparation of integrated, country-owned and country-led LECRDS.....	6
3.1.2.	Incentivising mainstreaming efforts with clear commitments to fund implementation.....	7
3.1.3.	Supporting institutional and capacity development for mainstreaming including implementation.....	7
3.2.	On making climate finance more effective.....	7
3.2.1.	Simplifying access to climate finance.....	7
3.2.2.	Supporting partner countries in identifying and accessing the sources of finance that best meet their needs.....	7
3.2.3.	Delivering climate finance on the basis of aid effectiveness principles.....	8
3.2.4.	Making use of budget support / Promoting readiness for budget support.....	8
3.2.5.	Developing and sharing experience on climate-related budget support.....	8
3.3.	On fostering adaptation-mitigation synergies, notably in the field of sustainable land management.....	8

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013

Summary of technical and political conclusions

3.3.1.	Promoting political and local buy-in for SLM	8
3.3.2.	Supporting capacity building in various areas, with a focus on achieving and demonstrating synergies	9
3.3.3.	Promoting and supporting integrated approaches to SLM.....	9
3.4.	On MRV and the M&E of adaptation	9
3.4.1.	Building on existing systems and structures	9
3.4.2.	Allocating dedicated resources upfront for the M&E of adaptation actions.....	10
3.4.3.	Building capacities for MRV and the M&E of adaptation actions	10
3.4.4.	Building on experience across interventions to identify MRV/M&E good practices	10
4.	Key messages for national governments.....	10
4.1.	On mainstreaming climate change and disaster risk reduction.....	10
4.1.1.	Providing high-level political support for advancing responses to climate change	10
4.1.2.	Integrating adaptation and DRR responses.....	11
4.1.3.	Using consultative, inclusive and transparent processes.....	11
4.1.4.	Strengthening political and technical coordination mechanisms	11
4.1.5.	Engaging the ministries in charge of finance and planning.....	11
4.1.6.	Letting line ministries take ownership of climate-relevant actions	11
4.1.7.	Raising awareness of climate change and the benefits of response measures	12
4.2.	On making climate finance more effective	12
4.2.1.	Strengthening the enabling environment for mobilising and effectively deploying climate finance	12
4.2.2.	Using economic valuation and analysis to make the case and support decision making... ..	13
4.2.3.	Co-investing with donors.....	13
4.3.	On fostering adaptation-mitigation synergies, notably in the field of sustainable land management	14
4.3.1.	Strengthening the policy, institutional and legal framework for SLM	14
4.3.2.	Setting up cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder platforms	14
4.3.3.	Taking a long-term perspective aligned with national and local development priorities... ..	14
4.3.4.	Ensuring fair benefit-sharing of REDD+ results-based payments.....	14
4.4.	On MRV and the M&E of adaptation	14
4.4.1.	Building on existing development monitoring systems	14
4.4.2.	Making adaptation M&E systems relevant to local circumstances	15
4.4.3.	Promoting ownership.....	15
4.4.4.	Building national capacities for MRV and the M&E of adaptation actions.....	15
4.4.5.	Ensuring free in-country access to climate-related data.....	15
4.4.6.	Ensuring the dissemination and use of MRV/M&E data and results	16
4.4.7.	Building bridges between adaptation and DRR-related data and models.....	16

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013
Summary of technical and political conclusions

5.	Cross-cutting aspects.....	16
5.1.	Addressing the fragmentation of capacities	16
5.2.	Building on and strengthening existing coordination mechanisms	16
5.3.	Promoting regional cooperation and approaches	16
6.	Conclusions.....	17



Note: This paper is a working document summarising key outcomes from discussions held during a Global Climate Change Alliance conference. It should not be taken to reflect the views of the European Union.

1. INTRODUCTION

In September 2013, the European Commission hosted a GCCA Global Policy Event that aimed to:

- Extract lessons learned through the GCCA experience to date on various topics of relevance to the current climate negotiation streams.
- Based on experiences from the GCCA across the world, promote dialogue and exchange between practitioners and negotiators involved in the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and related processes, with a view to informing the next Conference of the Parties (COP).

The Global Policy Event explored four topics which are of critical importance to both climate negotiators and practitioners:

1. From NAPAs to NAPs, NAMAs, LEDS and DRR strategies¹: the role of country-led climate and disaster risk reduction mainstreaming.
2. Making climate finance effective: strengthening national public financial management and budgetary systems.
3. From forests to sustainable land management: creating synergies between adaptation and mitigation.
4. Monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV): what are the implications for strengthening climate information and national monitoring systems?

Discussions were organised around these four themes and informed by four related discussion papers² that were distributed ahead of the conference. The summary of technical and political conclusions below presents the key points that emerged from the work of thematic working groups organised around these four topics, also taking account of discussions held in plenary session. While there was no consensus on all issues, the “key messages” proposed below attempt to capture aspects and views raised by multiple participants, on which a “reasonable consensus” seems to exist. They do not aim to capture and faithfully represent all opinions expressed during the conference.

¹ NAPAs: national adaptation programmes of action; NAPs: national adaptation plans; NAMAs: nationally appropriate mitigation actions; LEDS: low-emission development strategies; DRR: disaster risk reduction.

² Available from <http://www.gcca.eu/policy-dialogue-and-experience-sharing/global-policy-event>.

Overview of key messages

	For climate negotiators	For the international development community	For national governments
On mainstreaming climate change and disaster risk reduction (DRR)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stabilise the climate change and DRR planning framework Support planning through flexible arrangements Promote integrated national strategies 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the preparation of integrated, country-owned and country-led low-emission, climate-resilient development strategies Incentivise mainstreaming efforts with clear commitments to fund implementation Support institutional and capacity development for mainstreaming including implementation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provide high-level political support for advancing responses to climate change Integrate adaptation and DRR responses Use consultative, inclusive and transparent processes Strengthen political and technical coordination mechanisms Engage the ministries in charge of finance and planning Let line ministries take ownership of climate-relevant actions Raise awareness of climate change and the benefits of response measures
On making climate finance more effective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clarify and simplify the global climate finance architecture Streamline accreditation processes Finalise arrangements for the Green Climate Fund Address climate-related budget support in the debate on direct access 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simplify access to climate finance Support partner countries in identifying and accessing the sources of finance that best meet their needs Deliver climate finance on the basis of aid effectiveness principles Make use of / Promote readiness for budget support Develop and share experience on climate-related budget support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen the enabling environment for mobilising and effectively deploying climate finance Use economic valuation and analysis to make the case and support decision making Co-invest with donors
On fostering adaptation-mitigation synergies and sustainable land management (SLM)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote a long-term perspective that embeds sustainability Break the adaptation-mitigation divide Promote alignment between various international processes and funding streams Balance the need for harmonised accounting/reporting with consideration of national specificities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Promote political and local buy-in for SLM Support capacity building in various areas Promote and support integrated approaches to SLM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthen the policy, institutional and legal framework for SLM Set up cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder platforms Take a long-term perspective aligned with national and local development priorities Ensure fair benefit-sharing of REDD+ results-based payments
On monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) and the monitoring and evaluation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Acknowledge the differences between adaptation and mitigation Identify and support good 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build on existing systems and structures Allocate dedicated resources upfront for the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Build on existing development monitoring systems Make adaptation M&E

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013
Summary of technical and political conclusions

	For climate negotiators	For the international development community	For national governments
(M&E) of adaptation	practices for the M&E of adaptation actions	M&E of adaptation actions <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Build capacities for MRV and the M&E of adaptation actions • Build on experience across interventions to identify MRV/M&E good practices 	systems relevant to local circumstances <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote ownership • Build national capacities for MRV and the M&E of adaptation actions • Ensure free in-country access to climate-related data • Ensure the dissemination and use of MRV/M&E data and results • Build bridges between adaptation and DRR-related data and models
Cross-cutting aspects	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Address the fragmentation of capacities • Build on and strengthen existing coordination mechanisms • Promote regional cooperation and approaches 		

2. KEY MESSAGES FOR CLIMATE NEGOTIATORS

2.1. ON MAINSTREAMING CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

2.1.1. STABILISING THE CLIMATE CHANGE AND DRR PLANNING FRAMEWORK

Many different planning processes coexist under the UNFCCC, including those related to NAPAs, NAPs, NAMAs, REDD+ strategies and LEDS; separate planning processes also exist for disaster risk reduction (notably under the Hyogo Framework for Action) and in relation to other multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. the UN conventions on biodiversity and the fight against desertification). This places a significant burden on countries, in particular least developed countries (LDCs) and small island developing states (SIDS). Participants in the Global Policy Event emphasised the need to stabilise (and if possible streamline) this planning framework, and concentrate on “making it work” before any new planning processes are proposed. SIDS representatives, in particular, stressed that the requirement to develop a growing number of planning documents distracts attention from getting things done on the ground.

2.1.2. SUPPORTING PLANNING THROUGH FLEXIBLE ARRANGEMENTS

UNFCCC-supported planning processes (notably those related to NAPs, NAMAs and LEDS) should be made even more flexible to support nationally-led strategic planning processes for adaptation and mitigation. Funding to support adaptation and mitigation strategy development should be made available according to each country’s current achievements and specific needs. For example, it should be possible to use funding mechanisms to “fill gaps” in existing planning processes and improve existing national strategies and plans (rather than restarting the planning process “from scratch”). Also, existing national strategies and plans – provided they meet a number of agreed criteria – should be officially recognised as a legitimate basis for the provision of climate finance even if they were not (or not fully) developed in the context and on the basis of UNFCCC-supported processes and guidelines.

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013

Summary of technical and political conclusions

2.1.3. PROMOTING INTEGRATED NATIONAL STRATEGIES

The value of integrated climate strategies – both climate-resilient and low-emission development strategies – should be acknowledged, as they can be more effective in equipping countries to holistically respond to climate change in a way that also aligns with their development, natural resource management and environmental priorities.

Currently, UNFCCC-supported planning processes promote a mix of project-based approaches (in the form of NAPAs and project-based NAMAs) and programmatic, more integrated approaches (in the form of NAPs, sector- and economy-wide NAMAs and LEDS). Project-based approaches can be a good start, notably as a way of developing capacities with regard to adaptation and mitigation in countries with limited capacities and resources; however, over time, a gradual move away from project-based approaches should be encouraged, especially as integrated strategies are expected to give developing countries easier access to international climate finance.

In practice, many countries have already developed integrated climate strategies and set up integrated institutional frameworks (involving the ministries of finance, planning, environment and other line ministries) to support their implementation, so experience exists in this regard and should be assessed and shared.

2.2. ON MAKING CLIMATE FINANCE MORE EFFECTIVE

2.2.1. CLARIFYING AND SIMPLIFYING THE GLOBAL CLIMATE FINANCE ARCHITECTURE

The global climate finance architecture remains very complex. Access to international climate finance needs to be simplified, including through more user-friendly application modalities and more streamlined processes for direct access to funding by national implementing entities (see next point).

2.2.2. STREAMLINING ACCREDITATION PROCESSES

Until their national implementing agencies are accredited (against a set of agreed fiduciary standards) to gain direct access to sources of funding established under the Convention, developing countries have only indirect access to these sources (typically through accredited regional or international organisations). Multiple, distinct accreditation processes for access to the Adaptation Fund, the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) and the Green Climate Fund constitute a burden and limit direct access to existing resources; they should be streamlined and simplified.

2.2.3. FINALISING ARRANGEMENTS FOR THE GREEN CLIMATE FUND

One way of simplifying the global climate finance architecture is to use the Green Climate Fund as an increasingly important channel for the provision of international climate finance. However, the Fund is not yet operational. It is important for negotiators to finalise management and fiduciary arrangements, allowing it to start operations without further delay.³

2.2.4. ADDRESSING CLIMATE-RELATED BUDGET SUPPORT IN THE DEBATE ON DIRECT ACCESS

Budget support is a financing modality that supports the application of aid effectiveness principles (see sections 3.2.3 and 3.2.4), and many developing countries would like to receive climate-related

³ According to some participants, this will probably not lead to the immediate simplification of the climate finance architecture, as existing multilateral and bilateral financing instruments and initiatives are likely to keep operating for some time. However, as the Fund gains experience and demonstrates it can effectively and efficiently channel resources to developing countries, some participants expressed their expectations that other instruments would be gradually phased out.

support in this form. This should be acknowledged in the international debate on climate finance; a link could notably be made between direct access and access to budget support.

2.3. ON FOSTERING ADAPTATION-MITIGATION SYNERGIES, NOTABLY IN THE FIELD OF SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

2.3.1. PROMOTING A LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVE THAT EMBEDS SUSTAINABILITY

REDD+, which is the most advanced initiative related to land use under the Convention, can act as a catalyst for the adoption of sustainable land and forest management practices that promote both mitigation and adaptation objectives. However, the initiative will realise this potential only if it is conceived to embed features that ensure long-term sustainability. The existence of non-carbon benefits (e.g. in terms of poverty alleviation, livelihoods opportunities, food and energy security, biodiversity conservation, ecosystem resilience) should play an important role in this regard, as they will give countries a stake in the sustained implementation of good land and forest management practices that goes beyond the receipt of payments for achieving mitigation results.

2.3.2. BREAKING THE ADAPTATION-MITIGATION DIVIDE

For historical reasons, a division still exists between adaptation- and mitigation-related processes under the Convention. Although recent work indicates a willingness to break this adaptation-mitigation divide, processes and financing mechanisms inherited from the past can make it difficult to obtain funding for activities that pursue a mix of adaptation and mitigation objectives. Some participants held the view that allowing more flexibility to design, implement and finance joint adaptation-mitigation actions would encourage initiatives in the field of sustainable land and forest management and other fields where synergies exist (e.g. solar-powered water pumps, solar-powered wastewater treatment). Others, however, were not in favour of joint adaptation-mitigation financing mechanisms, based on the concern that this may end up reducing access to funds and the amount of funding available.

2.3.3. PROMOTING ALIGNMENT BETWEEN VARIOUS INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES AND FUNDING STREAMS

The disconnection between various international processes and funding streams, within the “climate sphere” (e.g. REDD+, LULUCF-based NAMAs, CDM) and across multilateral environmental agreements (e.g. climate, biodiversity, desertification, wetlands protection), also sometimes acts as a barrier to the financing of sustainable land management initiatives with a variety of benefits from multiple sources. Such initiatives would gain from the gradual alignment of the various processes and funding streams available (e.g. starting with the definition of clear criteria for accessing funds and blending sources of funding).

2.3.4. BALANCING THE NEED FOR HARMONISED ACCOUNTING/REPORTING WITH CONSIDERATION OF NATIONAL SPECIFICITIES

In REDD+ and other LULUCF⁴-related mitigation activities, a degree of international harmonisation in accounting and reporting procedures is unavoidable and desirable. However, this should be balanced with the need to take account of country specificities.

⁴ Land use, land use change and forestry.

2.4. ON MRV AND THE M&E OF ADAPTATION

2.4.1. ACKNOWLEDGING THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ADAPTATION AND MITIGATION

While there is a case for seeking a degree of international harmonisation for the measurement⁵, reporting and verification (MRV) of mitigation actions and support provided to developing countries, there is no justification for seeking to develop a standard framework for the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of adaptation actions in the context of the UNFCCC. Indeed, countries should be encouraged to monitor, evaluate and report on their adaptation actions on the basis of their specific needs and in light of their national development priorities; these are too specific to allow standardisation.⁶

2.4.2. IDENTIFYING AND SUPPORTING GOOD PRACTICES FOR THE M&E OF ADAPTATION ACTIONS

There is, on the other hand, a case for supporting the identification and sharing of good practices for the M&E of adaptation actions through programmes and initiatives implemented at the level of the Convention. The M&E of adaptation actions is characterised by significant technical challenges, and countries can learn from each other and benefit from the pooling of expertise. The Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation, for example, can provide a suitable framework for knowledge building and experience sharing in this area.

3. KEY MESSAGES FOR THE INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COMMUNITY

3.1. ON MAINSTREAMING CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

3.1.1. SUPPORTING THE PREPARATION OF INTEGRATED, COUNTRY-OWNED AND COUNTRY-LED LECRDS

The international development community should help developing countries prepare low-emission, climate-resilient development strategies (LECRDS) or equivalent that address all climate-related aspects (including disaster risks) in an integrated manner, and provide a strong foundation for mainstreaming climate change and DRR into (sub)national development strategies, budgetary processes and monitoring systems. A stronger emphasis needs to be placed, in particular, on the integration of adaptation and DRR responses.

This can obviously not be imposed from outside: steps must be taken to ensure that the process of preparing an integrated strategy is owned and driven by national stakeholders who understand the value of streamlining planning processes – not by donors and consultants. The international development community can help mobilise national stakeholders and “champions” (see section 4.1.1) by making a strong case⁷, providing evidence of the benefits of integrated strategies (from the

⁵ As outlined by the thematic lead, ‘measurement’ and ‘monitoring’ tend to be used interchangeably but are not the same thing. Measurement involves making quantitative estimates on the basis of an objective metric, such as the tonne of CO₂-equivalent (for measuring mitigation results) or a currency (for measuring international flows of climate finance). Monitoring may encompass more qualitative aspects, and tends to be based a wider range of indicators. When it comes to climate adaptation and resilience, for which no single and universal metrics exist, monitoring is a more appropriate concept than measurement.

⁶ Adaptation needs and responses vary both across countries and within countries, and the consolidation of adaptation indicators at central level may not be possible (see section 4.4.2).

⁷ As discussed in some working groups, in making the case, the challenges should also not be underestimated. Priority setting can be lengthy and complex due to competing agendas and priorities among sectoral ministries and across various groups of stakeholders, as well as limited capacities and institutional weaknesses. Expectations must be realistic, and it must be clear to all protagonists that integrated planning processes take time and resources to achieve results.

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013

Summary of technical and political conclusions

experience of countries that already have one), and making firm commitments to support their implementation (see next section).

3.1.2. INCENTIVISING MAINSTREAMING EFFORTS WITH CLEAR COMMITMENTS TO FUND IMPLEMENTATION

To motivate high-level decision makers to integrate climate change into their development strategies and plans, donors should accelerate the provision of resources for adaptation and mitigation measures. Leaders tend to hesitate to put their weight behind climate change policy development if there is no assurance of funding: they need a certain degree of certainty that they can follow through on their commitments to constituents, and cannot afford, politically, to raise false expectations and lose critical momentum for transformational change.

3.1.3. SUPPORTING INSTITUTIONAL AND CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT FOR MAINSTREAMING INCLUDING IMPLEMENTATION

Limited national capacities remain a barrier to climate change mainstreaming. To support developing countries' mainstreaming efforts, it is thus critical to support individual and institutional capacity development, at all relevant levels, for all key stakeholders and in relation to the various aspects of mainstreaming – including implementation of the priority actions identified through the mainstreaming process. Indeed, capacity building support has so far tended to focus on the planning process and central government, but without support for implementation (extending also to local government and other stakeholders), strategies and plans frequently fail to move to the implementation phase.

In this process, country leadership must be respected and promoted. Institutional and capacity development takes time; this must be recognised and accepted.

3.2. ON MAKING CLIMATE FINANCE MORE EFFECTIVE

3.2.1. SIMPLIFYING ACCESS TO CLIMATE FINANCE

Access to climate finance remains difficult, in particular for LDCs and SIDS. Both bilateral and multilateral donors need to make further efforts to consolidate climate finance mechanisms, with a view to simplifying access. This can be done in various ways, including simplified application modalities and implementation procedures, more harmonisation across donors and financing instruments, better in-country coordination (including the designation of a “lead donor” for climate-related matters), and the joint financing of actions.

3.2.2. SUPPORTING PARTNER COUNTRIES IN IDENTIFYING AND ACCESSING THE SOURCES OF FINANCE THAT BEST MEET THEIR NEEDS

There is a proliferation of climate finance instruments and initiatives, and it is not easy for developing countries to identify which of them are best suited to their specific needs and objectives. Some countries meet multiple needs by accessing multiple sources of funding on an “opportunistic” basis, without an overall strategy for making the most of available funding; others just struggle to access any of the potentially available sources and don't know where to start.

Before promoting their own specific climate finance instrument(s), donors should ensure that partner countries are adequately informed about available options, and if necessary help them understand the specificity and objectives of the various available sources of funding, determine which ones have the best potential to fund national priorities, and focus efforts on accessing the most promising ones. Capacity building support for the preparation of successful applications should be offered according to needs.

3.2.3. DELIVERING CLIMATE FINANCE ON THE BASIS OF AID EFFECTIVENESS PRINCIPLES

In line with the commitments of the Busan partnership for effective development cooperation, climate finance delivery should increasingly be operationalised on the basis of aid and development effectiveness principles, which notably include alignment with national development strategies, and the use of country systems “where appropriate” for financing, delivering and monitoring climate-related actions. Efforts should also be made to ensure the transparency and predictability of climate finance flows, and to stabilise carbon prices.

3.2.4. MAKING USE OF BUDGET SUPPORT / PROMOTING READINESS FOR BUDGET SUPPORT

Budget support exemplifies the application of aid effectiveness principles, and is the preferred modality for international financial support to national governments. When basic technical conditions are met for using this financing modality⁸, and assuming the partner country shows interest, donors are encouraged to use it for delivering climate-related support.

In spite of interest shown on the side of the partner government, technical conditions may not be met for providing budget support. In such cases, donors can help by promoting “budget support readiness”, enabling future access to this type of support.

3.2.5. DEVELOPING AND SHARING EXPERIENCE ON CLIMATE-RELATED BUDGET SUPPORT

The provision of climate finance in the form of budget support is a relatively new development. International development partners (as well as developing country governments) should share experience in this area, notably with regard to the monitoring and evaluation systems required to support fund disbursement.

3.3. ON FOSTERING ADAPTATION-MITIGATION SYNERGIES, NOTABLY IN THE FIELD OF SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

3.3.1. PROMOTING POLITICAL AND LOCAL BUY-IN FOR SLM

Land management is a sensitive, highly political issue; donors that wish to promote more sustainable land management practices must seek to promote political buy-in through evidence-based narratives, and not shy away from discussing the trade-offs involved. Country needs analyses can usefully support dialogue in this area. So do knowledge building and evidence sharing (including the demonstration of the economic benefits of more sustainable practices and their contribution to development).

At the local level, donors (as well as governments) should put more emphasis than has been the case so far on creating incentives for sustainable land and forest management. Small-scale farmers, for example, could benefit a lot from changing their practices – but the transition to more sustainable ways of exploiting land and forests requires more support to test them and demonstrate their benefits. Likewise, if natural resource protection entails opportunity costs for local communities, they need to be adequately compensated or receive incentives for complying with new rules. The provision of adequate incentives is required to support a transition from “triple-lose” situations (in which vulnerable populations jeopardise their livelihoods by degrading their environment, reduce their resilience to climate risks and destroy carbon sinks) to “triple-win” situations (in which livelihoods and food security are improved, ecosystem and population resilience is enhanced, and carbon sinks are protected or enhanced).

⁸ For more information on eligibility criteria for EU budget support, see Section 4.4.1 the background paper entitled *Making climate finance effective: strengthening national public financial management and budgetary systems*.

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013

Summary of technical and political conclusions

3.3.2. SUPPORTING CAPACITY BUILDING IN VARIOUS AREAS, WITH A FOCUS ON ACHIEVING AND DEMONSTRATING SYNERGIES

Multiple capacities are required to implement sustainable land and forest management strategies and realise the associated potential for adaptation-mitigation synergies. These cover areas such as data collection and management (including the use of technologies such as remote imaging and sensing, geographical information systems, GPS tools, information and communication technologies), MRV, but also land and forest governance, integrated land use planning, access to finance, social and environmental impacts, and more. Donors that support capacity building in relation to sustainable land management must help partner countries identify, prioritise and address their needs in these various areas, in a balanced way.

As far as data collection and management is concerned, capacity building support is needed in particular for baseline data collection, for natural resource accounting, and for designing monitoring systems that are capable of producing evidence on the synergistic outcomes (in terms of adaptation, mitigation and development) generated by activities.

3.3.3. PROMOTING AND SUPPORTING INTEGRATED APPROACHES TO SLM

Various integrated approaches, such as ecosystem approaches, livelihood approaches, landscape approaches and integrated coastal zone management, can be used to support sustainable land management. The international development community should promote and support the implementation of these integrated approaches, on the basis of the specific needs and objectives of developing countries.

3.4. ON MRV AND THE M&E OF ADAPTATION

3.4.1. BUILDING ON EXISTING SYSTEMS AND STRUCTURES

When supporting the development of climate-related MRV and M&E systems, an equitable trade-off should be always sought between the need to meet increasingly stringent external reporting requirements (to the UNFCCC and to donors), the need to support domestic accountability, and efficiency considerations. It is particularly important to avoid the proliferation of donor- and project-specific MRV/M&E systems, which tend to be too specific and too disconnected from national mechanisms to be useful decision-making tools.

Using and strengthening national monitoring systems is much more effective, and is a way of supporting their credibility and sustainability. In practice, this involves supporting the development of MRV/M&E frameworks, from the local to the national level, that build on, strengthen and if necessary streamline existing systems, structures and initiatives.⁹ Building on existing systems may involve, for example, enhancing existing development monitoring systems with the addition of climate vulnerability indicators related to key development indicators (preferably at outcome or impact level).

This approach requires a proper needs assessment that takes stock of existing systems, identifies gaps between what they can deliver and what is expected, and defines what is needed to create a suitable enabling environment. Care must be taken to ensure local and national ownership of indicators, targets and other components of monitoring frameworks.

⁹ As raised by some participants, this is particularly important in the field of adaptation, considering the strong links between adaptation and development and therefore the need for alignment of adaptation monitoring with development monitoring systems.

3.4.2. ALLOCATING DEDICATED RESOURCES UPFRONT FOR THE M&E OF ADAPTATION ACTIONS

Too frequently, adaptation actions are undertaken without setting up an adequate M&E system and without providing resources to undertake M&E. This is problematic since M&E needs to be planned in advance and fully integrated into an intervention's design – so that baseline data can be collected prior to the start of activities, data collection and analysis procedures set up from the start, and adequate resources included in the budget. It is thus recommended to enhance the allocation of resources for the M&E of adaptation actions, and make sure these resources are provided upfront rather than as an afterthought. Dedicated resources are needed at programme and project level as well as the level of wider national M&E systems.

3.4.3. BUILDING CAPACITIES FOR MRV AND THE M&E OF ADAPTATION ACTIONS

The MRV of mitigation actions typically requires access to a lot of data and the mastering of potentially complex methodologies and techniques. The M&E of adaptation actions is very different in nature but also involves complex methodological challenges (e.g. shifting baselines as the scale and precision of climate models evolve, long time frames, choice of metrics, causal relationships) and also requires a lot of data (of a different nature). These are areas in which more needs to be done to support capacity building in developing countries – and also areas in which both developed and developing countries are faced with the same technical problems. Strong opportunities thus exist for south-north as well as north-south cooperation, and this is a field in which it should not be taken for granted that developed countries necessarily have an edge.

3.4.4. BUILDING ON EXPERIENCE ACROSS INTERVENTIONS TO IDENTIFY MRV/M&E GOOD PRACTICES

Members of the international community, through their experience across multiple interventions, are in a good position to identify MRV- and M&E-related good practices and on this basis promote their dissemination and scaling up. The GCCA, in particular, should consider launching a study of MRV and M&E across the programmes it supports to identify best practices, lessons learned and gaps in the support provided. This would help improve the design of future programmes, and could be used to develop specific technical expertise and possibly a specific focus on MRV and M&E in the next phase of the initiative.

4. KEY MESSAGES FOR NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS

4.1. ON MAINSTREAMING CLIMATE CHANGE AND DISASTER RISK REDUCTION

4.1.1. PROVIDING HIGH-LEVEL POLITICAL SUPPORT FOR ADVANCING RESPONSES TO CLIMATE CHANGE

Political support from high-level decision makers is critical for advancing climate change responses in national planning processes. The existence of one or several “political champions” who understand the linkages between climate change, environmental degradation and poverty significantly improves chances of success in mainstreaming climate change and DRR-related issues.

Raising the importance of climate change and disaster risk reduction in the political agenda can be achieved by producing credible evidence of the loss and damage induced by climate change, by using economic analysis to make the case for action (see section 4.2.2), and by using the momentum triggered by major climatic disasters to prompt action (“turning a crisis into an opportunity”).

4.1.2. INTEGRATING ADAPTATION AND DRR RESPONSES

There is a strong case for further integration of adaptation and DRR responses, which should increasingly be addressed jointly or at least in a more coordinated manner (see section 4.1.4). Important synergies exist between the two areas, and they should ideally be handled by the same people – for efficiency purposes, and also for better addressing the emerging issue of loss and damage. Pacific countries are the most advanced in this area¹⁰.

4.1.3. USING CONSULTATIVE, INCLUSIVE AND TRANSPARENT PROCESSES

A consultative, inclusive and transparent process is key for designing well-informed, balanced and sustainable climate change policies, strategies and action plans. The development of integrated climate response strategies requires a multi-level, multi-sector and multi-stakeholder consultation and governance framework that includes the grassroots level, and ideally combines bottom-up and top-down approaches. Outreach and involvement of a wide range of stakeholders are also critical to generate public support: buy-in should be sought not just from political leaders and central government, but also from local government and non-state actors.

4.1.4. STRENGTHENING POLITICAL AND TECHNICAL COORDINATION MECHANISMS

Mainstreaming efforts must be supported by a flexible national coordination mechanism, operating at the political as well as the technical level, involving key sectors and government departments as well as the private sector and civil society.¹¹ Having a group of technical experts in charge of coordination and of issuing technical recommendations to policy makers supports progress and can ensure some continuity through changes of government. Coordination mechanisms also need to be set up at the regional/provincial and local levels, to support climate change mainstreaming into subnational and local development plans.

4.1.5. ENGAGING THE MINISTRIES IN CHARGE OF FINANCE AND PLANNING

Climate change policy making and mainstreaming into policies and strategies will not be effective unless climate-related actions are prioritised in overall national planning processes and budget resources are actually dedicated to their implementation. Ministries of environment do not, on their own, have the clout needed to achieve such outcomes. It is thus essential to engage the ministries of finance and planning in climate change coordination structures – preferably from the very beginning. For this engagement to be effective, the ministries of finance and planning should appoint a climate change focal point to participate in national coordination meetings as well as international working groups and negotiation processes. This is likely to require capacity strengthening at the level of these key ministries.

4.1.6. LETTING LINE MINISTRIES TAKE OWNERSHIP OF CLIMATE-RELEVANT ACTIONS

Ministries of environment, which are frequently in charge of ensuring coordination of climate-related actions and/or act as focal points for climate-related matters and access to climate finance, can play a useful role in advising other ministries on technical aspects and foster coordination – but should not seek to dominate decisions on climate-related actions, systematically lead their implementation or channel all climate-related resources. Successful climate change mainstreaming requires, under a strong coordination mechanism, the various sector ministries concerned to take ownership of climate-relevant actions within their remit, and exercise leadership over their implementation.

¹⁰ Several of them have now prepared joint national action plans (JNAPs) on climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction.

¹¹ As raised in the working groups, coordination is needed at both levels – knowing that political coordination is sometimes more prone to blockages than technical coordination.

4.1.7. RAISING AWARENESS OF CLIMATE CHANGE AND THE BENEFITS OF RESPONSE MEASURES

Awareness raising (at the level of policy makers but also among the general public) and public education on the impacts of climate change and the benefits that can be derived from adaptation (or joint adaptation-mitigation actions) can incentivise mainstreaming efforts. Tangible demonstrations of the benefits of adopting new techniques and practices are needed to motivate action at the community level and upwards.

4.2. ON MAKING CLIMATE FINANCE MORE EFFECTIVE

4.2.1. STRENGTHENING THE ENABLING ENVIRONMENT FOR MOBILISING AND EFFECTIVELY DEPLOYING CLIMATE FINANCE

Both public and private funding of climate-related actions requires a strong “enabling environment” of national policies, strategies and legal instruments supported by adequate institutional arrangements and capacities. There are various ways in which developing countries can create a supportive environment for mobilising climate finance on a larger scale and effectively deploying it:

- Defining clear national policies, strategies, objectives and clearly articulated priorities for adaptation and mitigation is a key starting point for attracting climate finance and then making effective, efficient use of it through a rational allocation of resources.
- Once national priorities have been clearly established, mainstreaming climate change into key sectors may be the best way of channelling climate finance to these priorities. Climate change should be mainstreamed into (sub)national policies and strategies, but also into budgetary processes and monitoring and evaluation systems. Strong national coordination mechanisms involving key ministries such as those in charge of finance and planning (see section 4.1.5) are required to make this work.
- National institutional financial frameworks such as public financial management systems and national climate change trust funds should be reinforced and used to channel funds in a coordinated manner.
- Those countries that already have budget support arrangements with development partners should build on them to secure the “fast-track” delivery of programmatic funding – with clear rules and processes defined internally to ensure actual access to budget support resources by the departments in charge of implementing the supported policy, strategy or plan.¹² Those that do not and wish to gain access to this financing modality should work with development partners towards the achievement of basic eligibility conditions.
- The legal framework should be adapted so that it supports implementation of the proposed adaptation and mitigation strategies.
- Monitoring and evaluation systems also need to be strengthened (see section 4.4.1).
- Technical capacities for effectively deploying climate-related resources should be strengthened, without forgetting the local level which is where most actions end up being implemented.
- Clear roles need to be defined for the mobilisation of climate finance across government, with the ministry of finance taking the lead.
- Setting up a national centre of competence (“one-stop shop” facility) on climate finance is a useful way of helping all national stakeholders (public and private, at central and local levels) gain access to the climate finance instruments that best meet their needs.

¹² This is especially important in the case of general budget support; one participant reported initial difficulties in accessing EU funding provided through this modality, as no provision had been made to ensure the internal transfer of funds from the treasury account to support programme implementation.

The *Pacific Climate Change Finance Assessment Framework* recently developed in Nauru with support from the Pacific Islands Forum Secretariat and the Australian Government provides an interesting example of structured efforts to improve access to climate finance, taking account of the constraints met by SIDS. This framework guides the assessment of a country's ability to access and manage climate change resources across six interrelated dimensions, namely funding sources, policies and plans, institutions, public financial management and expenditure, human capacity and development effectiveness. The assessment provides a basis for the development of well-informed national climate finance action plans.

4.2.2. USING ECONOMIC VALUATION AND ANALYSIS TO MAKE THE CASE AND SUPPORT DECISION MAKING

Economic valuation and analysis can provide strong arguments to convince political champions and the ministries in charge of finance and planning of the value of dedicating budget resources to climate-relevant actions.

The resource allocation process should be informed by reliable cost estimates for key adaptation and mitigation measures – and the prioritisation of such measures by cost-benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis. For example, the efficiency of proposed adaptation and disaster risk reduction measures should be determined by comparing their cost with the estimated costs of failing to adapt (costs of environmental degradation, disaster-induced economic damage, etc.); and the case for adopting sustainable land and forest management practices can be made by demonstrating that benefits (including non-carbon benefits) exceed costs (including opportunity costs).

4.2.3. CO-INVESTING WITH DONORS

While developed countries are expected to provide adequate resources to enable developing countries to implement adaptation and mitigation actions, developing countries also invest part of their national resources in “climate-relevant” actions. These are typically actions that support a mix of development and adaptation and/or mitigation objectives; such actions are not necessarily “labelled” as climate-relevant when they are approved, especially as some governments are still reluctant to finance the “climate change response” with national resources.

Considering the strong interactions between development and climate-related actions, national governments (as well as some private sector organisations and even individuals) invest in climate-relevant actions. Developing country governments should therefore seek opportunities to attract external climate finance to “top up” what they already invest in implementing their national priorities.¹³ Joint domestic and external financing of climate-related actions supports ownership and thus efficiency in the use of resources, as well as long-term financial stability (through reduced dependence on external funding).

Assuming national governments accept the principle of co-investment with international sources of funding on some climate-relevant actions (which some do), climate negotiators can help by supporting financing mechanisms that promote the blending of domestic and external resources – and the international development community by incentivising joint domestic-external financing and providing assistance for improved national resource mobilisation (e.g. through environmental fiscal instruments) as a complement to external support.

¹³ Examples of joint domestic-external investment in the non-climate sphere shared in the working groups include, for example, the topping up of government payments into road maintenance funds by EU funding: this system has proved successful in ensuring an adequate level of funding is made available for key infrastructure maintenance.

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013

Summary of technical and political conclusions

4.3. ON FOSTERING ADAPTATION-MITIGATION SYNERGIES, NOTABLY IN THE FIELD OF SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT

4.3.1. STRENGTHENING THE POLICY, INSTITUTIONAL AND LEGAL FRAMEWORK FOR SLM

Strengthening the policy, institutional and legal framework (e.g. on aspects such as land tenure, land law enforcement, governance, land use planning) is a pre-requisite for realising adaptation-mitigation strategies in the field of sustainable land and forest management.

4.3.2. SETTING UP CROSS-SECTORAL, MULTI-STAKEHOLDER PLATFORMS

Considering the many drivers of land and forest degradation, the large number of sectors involved and the variety of stakeholders (public and private, from the local to the national level) concerned, the setting up of cross-sectoral, multi-stakeholder platforms at various levels is required to support sustainable land management.

4.3.3. TAKING A LONG-TERM PERSPECTIVE ALIGNED WITH NATIONAL AND LOCAL DEVELOPMENT PRIORITIES

To make sustainable land and forest management strategies politically acceptable, national governments must align them with country development strategies and livelihood strategies. The costs of adopting more sustainable land and forest management practices may sometimes appear to be high, notably if short- to medium-term opportunity costs (such as those associated with the non-conversion of forest land to cropland, or the non-development of some pieces of infrastructure) are considered. However, these costs should always be compared with the costs of not taking action (i.e. pursuing development-as-usual without specific consideration of medium- to long-term sustainability).

To ensure the sustainability and success of activities, it is particularly important to take local needs and perspectives into account, and to strike the right balance between short-term and long-term benefits. Consideration of local perspectives, the tapping of local knowledge and community involvement in the planning and implementation of climate response measures support trust building, the delivery of “triple-win” outcomes (from the point of view of adaptation, mitigation and development) and sustainability.

4.3.4. ENSURING FAIR BENEFIT-SHARING OF REDD+ RESULTS-BASED PAYMENTS

When designing their REDD+ strategies, countries need to pay specific attention to ensuring a fair distribution of benefits among the state (whose primary responsibility is to create a supportive policy, institutional and legal framework), local actors and the private sector (whose role is to implement concrete actions that together contribute to the achievement of national objectives). This will be particularly important when the initiative enters “phase 3”, i.e. the phase when REDD+ payments are made against demonstrated emission reductions/absorptions against the pre-defined national reference level.

4.4. ON MRV AND THE M&E OF ADAPTATION

4.4.1. BUILDING ON EXISTING DEVELOPMENT MONITORING SYSTEMS

While the international development community is encouraged to support the development of climate-related MRV and M&E systems that build on and strengthen existing national systems (see section 3.4.1), it is equally important that developing countries take the lead in ensuring that this happens, and that enhanced monitoring systems serve their development and domestic

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013

Summary of technical and political conclusions

accountability objectives as well as external reporting requirements. Climate-related monitoring needs to be integrated and feed into national and local development planning processes.

4.4.2. MAKING ADAPTATION M&E SYSTEMS RELEVANT TO LOCAL CIRCUMSTANCES

Adaptation is generally a location-specific business, as circumstances, needs and responses vary across geographical areas and ecosystems. Accordingly, systems set up for the M&E of adaptation actions should be allowed to vary. The choice of adaptation indicators should be linked to the identification of local vulnerability factors – hence the importance of scientifically sound vulnerability and adaptation assessments. The consolidation of adaptation indicators from the local to the central level is not usually possible, as different adaptation responses addressing different concerns may be used (e.g. different adaptation indicators used in different agroecological zones).

Even if the use of different metrics prevents the production of consolidated adaptation indicators at the national level, local adaptation indicators and monitoring results should be reported to the central level, where they can be analysed to identify trends in vulnerability and adaptation and good adaptation (monitoring) practices.

4.4.3. PROMOTING OWNERSHIP

Ownership of climate-related monitoring systems at the level at which they are implemented is key to their successful implementation. Building on existing development monitoring systems is one way of promoting such ownership. Involving stakeholders in the planning of activities and the design and implementation of related monitoring systems, through appropriate coordination and collaboration arrangements, is another way of ensuring an appropriate degree of ownership. This approach should prevail in the development of all monitoring systems, including those set up at the local level.

4.4.4. BUILDING NATIONAL CAPACITIES FOR MRV AND THE M&E OF ADAPTATION ACTIONS

With the support of developed countries (see section 2.4.3.), developing countries must build national capacities with a view to improving the credibility and reliability of data collection and management processes and the resulting indicators, making MRV and M&E more sustainable, and phasing out their dependence on individual projects. In some cases and as relevant, this may involve turning MRV and M&E systems initially set up to meet the needs of a specific project into permanent, nationally owned and managed monitoring systems.

4.4.5. ENSURING FREE IN-COUNTRY ACCESS TO CLIMATE-RELATED DATA

Lack of access to climate-related data remains a problem in many countries, as a result of institutional attitudes and procedures that discourage sharing and dissemination, or sometimes simply fail to recognise the value of data for other uses than the limited one for which they were initially collected.¹⁴ This restricts the use of available data to a small subset of potential users and is a source of great inefficiencies. A (radical) solution to this problem is the adoption of national legislation to mandate free in-country access to all data that can be relevant to climate change responses and disaster risk reduction. Data sharing can also be encouraged through advocacy (rather than made compulsory); in Senegal, for example, work is under way to collect dispersed data from a variety of sources and make them available to public and private stakeholders involved in coastal zone management. Climate-relevant data can be made available on national as well as regional platforms.

¹⁴ According to a number of participants, many data collected in the context of donor-funded projects fail to be shared or even used in the planning processes for which they were intended, so this is not just a problem at the level of national stakeholders.

GCCA Global Policy Event 2013

Summary of technical and political conclusions

Even if data are in theory publicly available, the use of proprietary standards can restrict their effective use. Using or developing open data standards that support accessibility and comparability can further promote their use by a wide range of stakeholders.

4.4.6. ENSURING THE DISSEMINATION AND USE OF MRV/M&E DATA AND RESULTS

Collecting data in the framework of improved monitoring systems, and ensuring free access to data, are important steps but must be completed by positive steps to ensure data and results from their analysis are disseminated and used for decision making. Feedback should be systematically organised to (sub)national planning systems, but also to local communities (e.g. through public meetings).

One particularly appreciated use of weather- and climate-related data is their use for “forward-looking” purposes that meet the immediate needs of the population, such as early warning systems for climate-related disasters or the use of agro-meteorological statistics combined with weather forecasts to produce advice for farmers on the most appropriate time for sowing, planting and harvesting.

4.4.7. BUILDING BRIDGES BETWEEN ADAPTATION AND DRR-RELATED DATA AND MODELS

Data relevant to climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction are frequently collected and stored separately, even though they can be useful to both the adaptation and the DRR communities and could have multiple uses. Building (two-way) bridges between adaptation and DRR-related data and models, allowing their use for both purposes according to needs, is another way of enhancing access to existing data, promoting efficiency in the design of monitoring systems and supporting the convergence of adaptation and DRR responses.

5. CROSS-CUTTING ASPECTS

5.1. ADDRESSING THE FRAGMENTATION OF CAPACITIES

When supporting capacity development, donors should keep in mind that capacity issues can originate both from a lack of national capacities and from their fragmentation. The issue of the fragmentation of capacities needs to be recognised and addressed. A proper assessment of capacity development needs, by identifying existing capacities as well as gaps, can help address this.

5.2. BUILDING ON AND STRENGTHENING EXISTING COORDINATION MECHANISMS

Coordination is a major challenge faced in planning the response to and in mainstreaming climate change and disaster risks, which are cross-cutting issues rather than “sectors”. Experience from developing countries shows that it is important to build on and reinforce existing coordination mechanisms (including those that involve donors), rather than seeking to develop new ones – and more generally to strengthen the institutional framework on the basis of a good understanding of its characteristics, strengths and weaknesses. It is noted that there is no “blueprint” for climate-related coordination mechanisms and institutional structures – and that they require continuous improvements as experience is gained and new issues arise.

5.3. PROMOTING REGIONAL COOPERATION AND APPROACHES

Regional cooperation can help realise synergies and economies of scale in many areas of the response to climate change. For example, individual countries (especially if they are small or have

low income) can benefit from the pooling of expertise or the establishment of regional databases, competence centres, research centres and universities – and all countries can benefit from the exchange of experience with countries faced with similar conditions and from south-south cooperation. The international development community should recognise the value of such initiatives and finance their implementation – and national governments support active participation.

6. CONCLUSIONS

A number of key themes and conclusions emerge from the discussions held during the three days of the GCCA Global Policy Event, in the context of thematic working groups and in plenary sessions. They can be summarised as follows:

- Further efforts need to be made, at the level of the UNFCCC and the international development community, to streamline the global climate finance architecture and simplify access, in particular for LDCs and SIDS. In parallel, developing countries must take steps to strengthen the enabling environment for mobilising and effectively deploying climate finance. Aid and development effectiveness principles should be more systematically applied in the provision and use of climate finance.
- With adequate external support, but under strong national leadership, developing countries need to move from project-based to programme-based and increasingly integrated climate change and DRR strategies, which can in turn provide a strong foundation for mainstreaming these themes into national development strategies, budgetary processes and monitoring systems. This is one of the ways in which they can get prepared to access and effectively deploy larger amounts of climate finance.
- Synergies exist between adaptation and mitigation, in the field of sustainable land and forest management and in other areas. Exploiting them can deliver “triple-win” benefits (in terms of adaptation, mitigation and development) as well as increased sustainability of climate response actions. Planning processes set up under the Convention (as well as under other multilateral environmental agreements) and support mechanisms both under and outside the Convention’s financial mechanism need to be adapted to break the adaptation-mitigation divide and encourage joint adaptation-mitigation actions – while ensuring that this enhances access to finance and the overall availability of funding.
- Developing countries are invited to set up MRV systems (for mitigation actions/aspects) and M&E systems (for adaptation actions/aspects) that build on and strengthen their national development monitoring systems, and can simultaneously support external reporting requirements and domestic decision making and accountability needs. To achieve this, more support from the international development community is needed. National ownership and leadership are also essential.
- Institutional and capacity strengthening (at various levels including the local one) is required across the board to support developing countries’ response to climate change and disaster risks. Here too, scaled up support from developed countries is needed, but lasting results require strong national leadership. All efforts must be driven by strong capacity needs assessments. Donors and national governments alike should acknowledge that institutional and capacity building processes take time, and plan and prioritise related activities accordingly.
- In addition, a number of other cross-cutting areas of work emerged from the various working group discussions:
 - Evidence and knowledge building, lessons learning and the sharing of experience are very valuable and should be more systematically encouraged and supported, across interventions, at the national, regional and international levels. In particular, economic valuation and

economic analysis should be used more systematically to make the case for climate action and prioritise adaptation and mitigation responses on the basis of efficiency criteria.

- To advance climate change and disaster risk reduction responses, multi-level, multi-sector, multi-stakeholder consultation, coordination and governance platforms need to be established. At the national level, the active engagement of key “central” ministries such as those in charge of finance and planning is essential. Participatory and bottom-up processes are required to ensure appropriate ownership and the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of proposed actions.
- Regional cooperation is a useful complement to efforts undertaken at the national level. It supports economies of scale, the realisation of synergies and the exchange of experience across countries facing similar challenges.
