

# Summary of the NORAD/GECHS workshop on climate change and development

Oslo, January 9-10, 2006

By Kirsten Ulsrud and Siri Eriksen

GECHS project and Department of Sociology and Human Geography,  
University of Oslo

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Background	p 3
JANUARY 9 <sup>TH</sup> PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS	p 4
<b>Opening</b>	p 4
<b>Session I: Climate change as a development and poverty issue</b>	p 4
Karen O'Brien: Climate change and human security	p 4
Richard J. T. Klein: Climate change mitigation and adaptation – the role of development institution	p 5
Siri E. H. Eriksen: Climate change – poverty linkages, what do we know?	p 6
Ian Noble: Climate change and poverty – what do we need to know?	p 8
Discussion: What is the advantage of using a contextual vulnerability approach to climate change adaptation?	p 9
Discussion: The need for projections of climate change	p 11
JANUARY 10 <sup>TH</sup> PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS	p 11
<b>Session II: Experiences and institutional challenges</b>	p 11
Richard J. T. Klein: Portfolio screening to support the mainstreaming of adaptation to climate change into development assistance	p 11
Richard T. J. Klein: Adaptation to climate change in German official development assistance	p 12
Lorenz Petersen: GTZ and adaptation	p 13
Frode Neergaard: Climate proofing development cooperation	p 15
Kristinn Einarsson: Climate and energy in development	p 16
Siri E. H. Eriksen: Climate change in NORAD: 2003 study	p 17
Pernille Holtedahl: Climate change and Norwegian Development Cooperation	p 18
Discussion: Climate change, an environmental issue, a development issue or both?	p 19
Discussion: The cost of adaptation	p 20
<b>Session III: Information needs and international collaboration</b>	p 21
Thomas Tanner: National information needs: Climate change and disaster risk assessment in Bangladesh	p 21
Ian Noble: Experiences of international collaboration in climate change	p 21
Discussion: In which kind of institutions should climate change adaptation be managed?	p 23
Closing comments	p 25

## Background

This document summarises the presentations and discussions of the January 2006 NORAD/GECHS workshop on climate change and development. The workshop was hosted by the GECHS Project (Global Environmental Change and Human Security Project at the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo), and sponsored by NORAD (Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation). The workshop took place at the Hotel Opera, Oslo City Centre, and consisted of one session on the 9<sup>th</sup> and two sessions on the 10<sup>th</sup> of January.

This workshop was organized in order to present and discuss a draft report prepared by the Department of Sociology and Human Geography, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Potsdam, Germany (PIK) and Center for International Climate and Environmental Research – Oslo (CICERO) for NORAD on linkages between climate change and poverty, including screening tools for ODA (official development assistance). A second purpose of the workshop was to facilitate dialogue and exchange of experiences between researchers and ODA practitioners both from Norway and other countries.

The workshop had approximately 20 participants, representing The World Bank, Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), Stockholm Environmental Institute (SEI) Oxford, Danida/Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Overseas Development Agencies (ODA) in Germany and Iceland, Institute of Development Studies (IDS) at the University of Sussex, NORAD, Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Norwegian Ministry of the Environment, Norwegian Pollution Control Authority (SFT), Department of Sociology and Human Geography at the University of Oslo, and The Global Environmental Change and Human Security Project (GECHS). The programme and powerpoint presentations can be accessed at [www.gechs.org](http://www.gechs.org). The final report regarding climate change and poverty will be available from GECHS and/or NORAD during 2006.

Many thanks to Anders Underthun and Rebecca Rundle for assistance with language editing of this summary of presentations and discussion.

## JANUARY 9<sup>TH</sup> PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

### Opening

Jon Heikki Aas, NORAD, opened the workshop on behalf of NORAD. Aas emphasized poverty reduction and millennium development goals as longstanding NORAD priorities; at the same time, he acknowledged that climate change has not received this kind of attention. It is, however, likely that climate change will gain importance. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) and NORAD are currently working on an action plan on environment in development cooperation, called “Global environmental challenges”, and the minister for development, Erik Solheim, is also emphasizing the importance of global environmental challenges.

Siri E. H. Eriksen from the Department of Sociology and Human Geography at the University of Oslo welcomed the audience on behalf of GECHS and outlined the objectives of the workshop. She said that there is increasing attention paid to the need to adapt to climate change in developing countries, and a number of critical challenges need to be solved in order to address this need. Those challenges include the integration of climate change concerns into the work of ODA in practice, as well as addressing institutional issues, information needs and needs for international collaboration. Another important question is identifying more specifically the actual linkages are between climate change vulnerability and poverty. Eriksen further emphasised that we need knowledge both about the linkages between poverty reduction measures and adaptation measures, and about requirements for climate change screening tools. These are among the central issues raised in this workshop.

### **Session I: Climate change as a development and poverty issue**

This session included presentations that explained the importance of the contextual vulnerability perspective, the role of development institutions in adaptation, linkages between poverty and adaptation, and specific information needs. During the workshop, the usefulness of the contextual vulnerability approach was discussed several times. A summary of the discussions follows below.

### Karen O’Brien: Climate change and human security

The first presentation was given by Karen O’Brien from the GECHS project and Department for Sociology and Human Geography at the University of Oslo. She presented the GECHS Project, one of the core projects of the International Human Dimensions Programme (IHDP), emphasising social science perspectives on global environmental change. It acknowledges that environmental changes are taking place within the dynamic context of other social changes, and focuses on the science-policy-practitioner interface to increase response capacity and mitigate environmental change. She pointed out that uneven outcomes from climate change can increase existing inequities or create new inequities, and that peoples’ vulnerability to climate change is contextual. Biophysical, social, economic, institutional, political, and technological conditions create the context for vulnerability. The vulnerability is constituted by conditions and processes that shape exposure, responses and outcomes from climate change, and reducing this contextual vulnerability involves altering the context in which climate change occurs. She also mentioned that it stresses the need to mitigate climate change on the basis of equity and justice.

The implications for development pointed out by O'Brien were that development must emphasize measures that change the conditions in which climate change occurs. Mitigation is urgent at a global scale, and technological adaptations are important, but changing the context in which climate change occurs is perhaps the most essential. Growing inequalities related to income and wealth, opportunities, access, political participation and influence have profound implications for development, peace and security (with reference to the UN Report on the World Social Situation, 2005).

### Richard J. T. Klein: Climate change mitigation and adaptation – the role of development institutions

Richard J. T. Klein from PIK/SEI-Oxford, gave an insightful talk on the evolving aspirations of climate policy and the changing roles of institutions. His starting point was the Kyoto Protocol, stating that industrialised countries are to reduce their overall greenhouse gas emissions by an average of 5.2% when comparing 1990 to 2008-2012. However, at least in the next decades, climate change will have severe impacts, urging more immediate adaptation efforts. The aims of climate policy are to control the atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases, but also to prepare for and reduce the adverse impacts of climate change, and to consider development and equity issues. Until recently, climate policy had a primary focus on mitigation. Despite the obvious connections between the two, climate policy and development policy were largely two different worlds.

Klein pointed out how climate policy has evolved from being predominantly linked with energy policy to sharing a large interface with sustainable development. Energy policy was the logical entry point for mitigation, but the role of “sinks” is now increasingly considered. Adaptation is receiving more attention in both science (e.g., IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) and policy (e.g., establishment of funds), both fields recognising the need to link responses to climate change and the management of climate variability.

Have the institutions evolved along with the knowledge about climate change? Klein suggested that the Operational Strategy of the GEF has worked well for mitigation, but attempts at applying the same funding criteria for adaptation have been frustrating, despite the encouragement of new initiatives. The VARG (Vulnerability and Adaptation Resource Group) and the IPCC, amongst other organisations, have been effective in raising awareness of the need to link climate policy and development policy. Relevant organisations that do not consider climate as the primary focus of their operations have been less influential to date, but this may change.

It is increasingly recognised that the capacity to respond (mitigate and adapt) is a crucial factor determining the success of any mitigation or adaptation measure. Response capacity is determined by economic wealth, technology and infrastructure, information, knowledge and skills, institutions, equity, and social capital. Improving response capacity means improving any of these factors.

Klein also said that adaptation, as a concept, has often been seen as installing a technology base on specific knowledge of future climatic conditions. Mainstreaming of climate change into development work under this adaptation paradigm is relatively straightforward. However, adaptation technologies may be only partially effective if they do not address non-climate factors, they may be ineffective if they are not suited to local conditions, and they may be maladaptive if they do not consider relevant social and environmental processes. This makes mainstreaming adaptation a challenge. Mainstreaming adaptation under the traditional regime

only requires development agencies to provide money. But mainstreaming adaptation that addresses the underlying factors of vulnerability requires development agencies to become actively involved and provide expertise as well as money.

Implications of this new insight for the UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) process are that the actual implementation of options is best done by sector planning and management agencies (e.g. energy and water companies, agricultural planners, coastal management agencies), as well as individuals. The UNFCCC process should facilitate the implementation of mitigation and adaptation options in sector and development policies. This requires, among other things, producing relevant information, building mitigative and adaptive capacity, as well as creating mechanisms and incentives for mainstreaming.

It is unclear how adaptation will, or should, become part of the post-2012 climate policy regime. In the meantime, the need for adaptation will increase, highlighting the inadequacy of current levels of funding and funding arrangements. An increasingly important role will be played by organisations, development banks, civil society, and hopefully, development agencies.

### Siri E. H. Eriksen: Climate change – poverty linkages, what do we know?

Siri E. H. Eriksen presented existing knowledge on linkages between climate change and poverty, as well as the draft report on this issue. Her point of departure was the OECD/DAC definition of poverty as the lack of opportunity to earn an income and meet material needs, maintain health and a basic education, speak up for oneself and have rights, and maintain a sense of social and cultural affiliation. She further posed the question of whether climate change adaptation implies merely adding a climate change scenario to thematic areas of aid, or whether more is required?

She pointed to the notion of contextual vulnerability, as explained by Karen O'Brien in the previous presentation. This vulnerability is created by multiple factors and processes which permeate the way the four dimensions of poverty are generated.

Climate change adaptation has been defined as “adjustment in ecological, social, or economic systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli and their effects or impacts” (Smit and Pilifosova 2001, p. 881). Changing the conditions that affect exposure and the capacity to respond to climate change is important, including health reforms, education, and enhanced employment opportunities. This implies that adaptation is more than reducing sector sensitivities through technological adjustments, such as switching to drought-resistant seeds or building flood defences.

According to Eriksen, poverty and vulnerability to climate stresses are not synonymous. Poor people are a diverse group. Not all poor people are necessarily vulnerable or vulnerable in the same ways. Poor people differ in their livelihood strategies, social and political relations and stress to which they are exposed. Processes that lead to a failure to secure dimensions of a decent life, necessarily vary. Moreover, poverty reduction and adaptation are intrinsically linked, as poverty is one of the outcomes of vulnerability in the face of climatic and other stressors, and poverty reduction is unlikely to be sustainable in the long term unless it also involves vulnerability reduction and adaptation.

She presented several examples of how climatic and other stressors influence the way that people secure needs. Climate change may lead to increased migration and need for greater

mobility and flexibility. It may reinforce the need for access to common pool resources and increase the need for local/informal economic opportunities/remittances. Drought and floods may cut people off and increase remoteness, which in turn could lead to remoteness in social and cultural ties, breaking up of families and networks. Climate change can also worsen already poor water supply and sanitation, as well as leading to the loss of lives and livelihoods due to violence/insecurity enforced by climate change. It may also lead to dropping out of school due to no-payment of fees and hunger or coping strategies, for example, during extreme droughts.

Effects of climate change are reinforced by the difficult situations (contextual vulnerability) that are there in the first place, such as weak health conditions exacerbating disease outbreak during droughts and floods, poor education and generation of knowledge inhibiting responses and access to climate information, and barriers to formal markets and employment opportunities inhibiting alternative sources of food and income. Loss of local knowledge could reduce the possibility of coping with climatic changes, and create loss of democratic rights through dependence on aid.

Eriksen also exemplified entry points to reduce vulnerability and poverty within different sectoral areas of ODA. To reduce vulnerability to climate change regarding *income and material needs*, it is important to enhance urban employment opportunities, enhance mobility across regional and international borders and enhance access to common pool resources. Reduction of barriers to non-farm livelihood activities is also needed, as well as enhancement of the market position of economic activities adjusted to local climatic conditions. Barriers to technology access and enhancement of local energy sources can also be addressed.

To reduce vulnerability in terms of *health and basic education*, critical entry points are, for instance, restoration of infrastructure after floods, adjustments in school fee timing or system and adjustment of education to labour needs, and local diversification. Furthermore, promotion of links between indigenous and formal knowledge, improvement of health infrastructure and capacity to deal with climate shocks and change-related illnesses are important tasks. Water supply and sanitation must be enhanced in ways that are suitable to local climatic variations.

To reduce vulnerability to climate change related to *rights and empowerment*, some entry points may include the strengthening of local democratic participation, addressing monopolisation of power by elites, targeting mechanisms that lead to loss of rights and exclude groups, targeting local coping strategies that less powerful groups control, highlighting “non-climatic” drought factors and strengthen customary rights (e.g. to biodiversity).

Entry points in terms of the role of *social and cultural affiliation and security* in vulnerability to climate change are, among others: to take account and preserve social and cultural ties in relocation; active social network building and access by poor; generation of local knowledge related to climate signals/forecasts; and address exclusion to drought or emergency resources based on gender, ethnicity, and class.

Eriksen concluded that although adding projections of climate change *impacts* (based on scenarios) to existing programmes and activities is useful, adding climate change *vulnerability* to existing programmes and activities is also necessary if adaptation is to take place in a way that contributes to poverty eradication.

## Ian Noble: Climate change and poverty – what do we need to know?

The above question was posed by Ian Noble from the World Bank. His first point was that before asking what we need to know about linkages between climate change and poverty, we must first find out what we already know. We do not have to reinvent the wheel. What are the factors contributing to vulnerability? Can we find patterns and systematise and carry forward knowledge to new countries? We have enough studies to try to find patterns. He mentioned an ongoing study expected to give insights from India regarding patterns of vulnerability.

Noble presented an overview which showed that in total 0.025 billion dollars was used through GEF for adaptation in developing countries per year. In comparison, GEF (Global Environment Facility) mitigation efforts received 0.15 billion dollars, CDM (Clean Development Mechanism) mitigation efforts 0.5 billion dollars, while total WB (World Bank) grants to developing countries amounted to 8 billion dollars, WB loans to developing countries is 12 billion dollars, ODA 60 billion dollars and net FDI (Foreign Direct Investment) to developing countries 300 billion dollars per year.

40% of the projects where the World Bank is involved per year include climate sensitive components. But only 2 % of project design documents explicitly mention climate variability and change. So GEF funds are small compared to FDI, and they must thus be used in a catalytic way.

The approach to adaptation in the World Bank is a climate risk approach – i.e. tackle vulnerability to current climate variability as a first and most important step in tackling adaptation to climate change. They are attempting to influence the design of projects and thus the flow of Bank lending and granting (also known as mainstreaming, climate proofing and climate resilient development).

Noble also asked what the likely impacts of specified climate change are. He said that this is where the shortfall is and where we can induce a more rapid process. Better projections of climate change (especially regional) will come and go, but they will never satisfy those requesting the projections. There is a need to work on better projections, but expectations are unrealistic regarding what can be achieved, and we cannot wait for the next step. Regional inputs are needed to know the direction of climate change.

Ian Noble also asked how much poor people know about climate variability, and said that communities usually have good ideas about response options. What are the current options? Are they compatible with the current climate and projections? What are major impediments to changing practices and adapting; for example, lacking markets for dryland products? How will people respond to set-backs, such as misleading forecasts? These are questions relating to human behaviour and behaviour economics.

For every degree of temperature change, you can probably go only a few hundred km to the north or south to see how similar climate conditions have been tackled. But what is understood by different parties by the phrase “technology transfer for adaptation”? We need an appropriate mix of efforts on developing new technology, as well as a better distribution system for current technology. In the view of developing countries, adaptation is technology transfer. The question is, what kind of technology? Examples of technology transfer for adaptation are very poor.

Relevant questions are also: what constitutes best practice management of vulnerability to the current climate situation and to what level of vulnerability reduction should developing countries be compensated? The “adaptation deficit” is thus a useful concept.

What is the cost of climate impacts? Reduction in GDP-growth is among the costs. The question of the costs of mitigation versus adaptation will undoubtedly continue to exist. What are the costs of adaptation? There are differing views. We know that numerous livelihoods and substantial investment are at climate risk. We know that the failure to adapt is very costly, and we know that development is costly. But is adaptation costly? If it does not cost “anything”, how will this message be received, especially by developing countries?

Noble also addressed the balance between disaster aid and development. What implications does this balance have for adaptation? Moreover, should enhancing security be seen as a part of adaptation? For example, Chad got money for an oil pipeline, and wants to use the money for security issues. The World Bank is sceptical.

Is there a conflict between money for adaptation and for mitigation? Where will the adaptation negotiations be? In bilateral negotiations? Within the development banks? Will adaptation be a bartering issue in a post 2012-mechanism? There is a 5 years delay for Adaptation Work Program.

Noble also pointed to the need for recognising “strawmen, windmills and mantras” in adaptation research, to avoid too much repetition within adaptation research.

### Discussion: What is the advantage of using a contextual vulnerability approach to climate change adaptation?

This was an issue that generated discussion throughout the workshop. A question raised was what is the difference between using an impacts approach and a vulnerability approach. The answer to this was that in an impacts approach you look at risk (i.e flooding) by adding some climate measures to the water sector, and then ignoring other problems of climate change. In a vulnerability approach, you look at which conditions make people vulnerable. Richard Klein, one of the presenters on the issue, added that Karen O’Brien, E. H. Eriksen and himself are saying almost the same thing in a slightly different way. Climate change does affect the access to water, but there are also other, sometimes more important, factors that determine this vulnerability.

The discussion also generated comments about the idea that vulnerability reduction measures to climate change are in accordance with development work anyway (no regret measures). The discussion further questioned whether this approach represents something new compared to a sustainable project. The answer to this was that some of the vulnerability reduction measures may be done automatically through development projects, but the reduction of vulnerability to climate change must also be addressed more consciously and systematically. Examples of measures that specifically reduce vulnerability may include timing the collection of any school fees to non-drought periods, and improving the market conditions for products that could be sold during droughts.

Furthermore, it was pointed out that we need to have an answer to why it is important to adapt to climate change rather than invest elsewhere. The more focus that is put on contextual vulnerability, the more difficult it is for agencies to justify adaptation measures. Thus it is difficult to make the case for adaptation. We must have a clear idea of what the adaptation can

be, and a broad sustainable development perspective may in fact blur the picture. It would be easier if adaptation is considered to be something separate and more specific than sustainable development. It was also mentioned that adaptation will be a bartering chip for G77 for next round; where developing countries ask for adaptation (=money) to accept mitigation measures. Donors often think mainstreaming, while recipient developing countries think funding for specific adaptation measures.

It was mentioned that technology transfer as adaptation measure can be maladaptive if you do not look at other, contextual factors. The effectiveness of simple, technological solutions such as bigger pipes and drought-resistant crops depends on the context.

It was commented that the contextual vulnerability approach in adaptation work is not simply about adding more development, but about finding specific kinds of development. We must identify these types of developments, and we must do measures that are not only technological in nature. An example that was given was that the cost-benefit of a road could be seen in broader context. Could you have built in a contextual vulnerability concern? Softer social, non-technological, aspects could be built into building a road – but it is more difficult to argue the case for such aspects as they are less tangible.

The discussion expressed the need to make progress in adaptation. In negotiations, this means dollars on the table. We also need headlines and publicity on adaptation. The discussion also commented on the usefulness of the contextual vulnerability approach. Gender and environment are already to be checked in ODA projects; climate change, also, has to be taken into account in the same way on a daily basis. The approach should not be too sophisticated because ODA staff may not have time or be very well informed on climate change. Academic studies are good, and it is good to try to find the best way of doing adaptation. However, recommendations must not be too complicated. Others agreed that it is important to find practical and appropriate tools.

The dichotomy between technology and human (contextual) vulnerability was mentioned as an example of a possible kind of straw man, while others argued that the lack of awareness of human, rather than technological, aspects of adaptation is indeed very real both within development agencies and academia and a barrier to effective adaptation to climate change. We also need to think consciously about the real meaning of terms like “bottom up”, instead of using them as “mantras”.

It was argued that we need to recognize that we need a whole range of information for adaptation purposes. More comprehensive or in-depth, case specific analysis of vulnerability may constitute pre-analysis to other layers of information. Even though simple information is needed to communicate adaptation within development agencies, such information cannot answer all questions and other, more complex information is also needed.

Raising awareness was pointed out as a first step among development personnel. Embassies hire consultants when specific expertise is needed, and we must ensure that embassies are putting consultants on climate change as they do on other issues.

One of the participants expressed that vulnerable people mostly have least influence on national priorities. One of our tasks should be finding ways to address this. It also pointed to the need for looking at how safety nets can be strengthened to adapt to an uncertain climate.

One example is safety nets to food crisis. How can it be managed, and how can people get entry to economic activities?

### Discussion: The need for projections of climate change

One opinion on scenarios was that they have been most effective in raising awareness of climate change and the need for mitigation, but also that scenarios may distract from how to reduce vulnerability. We cannot get information regarding how to reduce vulnerability from a climate scenario, only by talking to communities.

One participant had experienced scenario work as a cost effective way of raising awareness about climate change in developing countries, partly because the scenarios have been done by high esteem institutions. It is a good thing that countries proceed with the work on numbers, meteorological organizations etc., because it lifts the climate change issue on the national agenda.

It was recommended that scenarios and projections need to be more sensitive to the particular information demands. We need regional projections in order to have types of climatic changes to relate to at the local level. It was also argued that expectations for projections are unrealistic, and waiting for better projections often leads to failing to take the next step. It is understandable that developing countries want to do their own modelling, but it may block the next step in terms of implementing adaptation. It was also questioned whether they give sufficient geographic resolution to do cost-benefit analysis of different measures. Another participant agreed that too much emphasis is put on projections, but that ACIA (Arctic Climate Impact Assessments) type assessments may be useful for more areas than the Arctic.

## JANUARY 10<sup>TH</sup> PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS

### **Session II: Experiences and institutional challenges**

In this session there were seven presentations, passing on experiences from climate change work in ODA of different development agencies. Future plans and views on screening tools were also discussed.

#### Richard J. T. Klein: Portfolio screening to support the mainstreaming of adaptation to climate change into development assistance

The first presentation in this session was given by Richard J. T. Klein from Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Germany and Stockholm Environment Institute, Oxford, United Kingdom. He presented the tool “portfolio screening”, described as a systematic examination of an agency’s set of policies, programmes or projects, with the aim of identifying links between climate change and an agency’s development priorities, as well as opportunities for the mainstreaming of adaptation to climate change into future activities.

Klein pointed out that the issue of adaptation to climate change is relevant for ODA in three ways. First, climate change poses a risk to an ODA project and its deliverables. Second, it is important to be aware of the vulnerability to climate change of the people who are intended to benefit from the ODA project. Third, the effects of the ODA project and its deliverables could affect the vulnerability of people to climate change.

He presented a review of development agencies screenings, including the World Bank, GTZ, NORAD, OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development) and SDC (Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation), carried out by Richard J. T. Klein, Siri E. H. Eriksen, Lars Otto Næss, Anne Hammill, Carmenza Robledo and Karen L. O'Brien. They found that climate change is relevant to a large share of agencies' activities and that climate change is viewed mainly as a mitigation issue. There is little or no consideration of climate change vulnerability and adaptation, even in areas with high current climate sensitivity, and agency staff are unclear as to whether and how climate relates to their day-to-day work.

For future agency screenings, Klein recommended the following measures:

- Develop practical tools for the "climate proofing of development activities"
- Use current climate risks as a starting point for adaptation to climate change
- Focus on increasing flexibility (adaptive management)
- Integrate climate change into existing planning procedures
- Raise awareness within agencies
- Use pilot activities to demonstrate links between adaptation and development

Among the challenges highlighted by Klein were the need for reframing climate change from a predominantly environmental issue to a development issue, identifying linkages and striking a balance between climate change and other external stressors, relating climate change to local concerns, and evaluating success of past experiences with climate hazards. There is also a need for providing simple tools and guidance to practitioners.

### Richard T. J. Klein: Adaptation to climate change in German official development assistance

In this presentation, Richard T. J. Klein presented his study on Adaptation to Climate Change in German Official Development Assistance: An inventory of activities and opportunities, with a special focus on Africa. Objectives of the study were: first, to identify environment-relevant development projects, including adaptation to climate change; second, to identify opportunities of incorporating adaptation to climate change in future German development projects; and third, to enhance awareness of the need and opportunities for adaptation to climate change within relevant parts of the German government. The study included a literature survey on climate policy and adaptation. It analysed 136 project descriptions in five thematic areas in Africa: agricultural land resources, forest development, environmental policy and management, biodiversity, and rural development. In addition, interviews were carried out with project managers or other relevant experts on five projects.

None of the 136 project descriptions referred explicitly to climate change and only very few referred to economic or environmental stress related to climate variability. The five cases showed that the importance of considering current climate conditions in Africa is generally recognised, but climate change was not a priority and was sometimes viewed as an additional burden on a project. There was significant potential for implementing no-regret adaptation strategies and for generating secondary benefits. Klein pointed out opportunities for German bilateral ODA: such ODA may complement GEF funding; furthermore, adaptation to climate change can be integrated with measures to cope with climate variability. ODA can seek synergies with other environment-development issues. It does not have to apply the incremental-cost principle and, it can focus on enhancing adaptive capacity in these countries.

He ended his talk by pointing out two ways towards mainstreaming climate change measures into development work. The first was the application of risk assessment, vulnerability

assessment, and environmental and social impact assessment tools to evaluate the long-term viability and sustainability of projects in the planning phase. The other was to include relevant performance indicators and criteria in the “target oriented project planning approach”. Alternatively, long-term sustainability can be used as a project-independent criterion (along with target groups, poverty, gender and environment).

Responding to a question from the audience on whether it would have made a big difference if climate change had been considered in the GTZ projects, Klein answered that he thinks some of the projects would not have been carried out, but in general it would have been only small adjustments to ensure that the activities were climate proofed. But in harbours or roads it could make big differences. Climate change was considered under the energy section, not under agriculture, water, etc. It was noted that climate change is usually considered too late in the project process. Lorenz Petersen from GTZ informed those present that they have an evaluation system for project performance review, but not an evaluation department like in the World Bank. Furthermore, the evaluation is not as systematic. GTZ undertakes project performance review after five years to assess whether or not the project shall continue. It is good to integrate climate as an issue there. Awareness in GTZ has increased, but people still do not know enough about how to address climate change. This ‘how’ question is very important. Petersen also mentioned that there are important benefits of integrating climate change. It may help making the project visible and relevant. A project may be seen as an interesting investment because of mitigation and adaptation attention, if we are able to get this message across. We should have a pragmatic approach to how mainstreaming can be done, and consider the logic of the people we want to reach. In addition to awareness, there is a need for simple procedures as well as process design tools. However, getting from the making of tools to practical work, we must reach the people who actually run the projects. They are not completely directed from the head office. GTZ has a decentralised project management approach.

### Lorenz Petersen: GTZ and adaptation

The third and final presentation in this session was by Lorenz Petersen from GTZ (Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit GmbH) in Germany. GTZ is working on roughly 2500 projects in 130 countries. The annual turnover is approximately 1 billion Euro, and there are 2500 international staff and 7000 national staff, out of which 1000 are at the headquarters. Four people specifically focus on climate change within the Climate Change Protection Programme “CaPP”. This group gives support for policy work at the Ministry (COP etc.), conceptual work (Sectoral CDM, post 2012), capacity development and mainstreaming for the German Development Portfolio (CDM, Adaptation). They are also trying to carry out “influencing” activities through organising policy dialogues. They are advising the ministry, working on the mainstreaming task, and trying to get into strategy and conceptual project development.

Recent and current actions include screening of GTZ-supported projects and initiation of pilot projects, and integrating these actions into ongoing larger scale development programmes with the aim to get “full blown projects”. Examples are within watershed management, agriculture, work to combat desertification, and agrometeorology. Disaster management and early warning systems are also among these activities. The group is also doing capacity development and looking for partners for doing “Roadshow”. The CDM and watershed management projects in India are considered to be successful.

GTZ has also carried out a new screening of GTZ-supported projects informed by Richard Klein's study.

The climate group has good connections with the energy people in GTZ, where Holger Liptow is a central figure. Energy is the most critical field in dealing with mitigation, and there is a huge potential for reducing emissions. They do not have the same close contact with rural development and poverty reduction people, partly because adaptation is considered more abstract and less concrete. Even though actions such as introducing drought resistant seeds or new technology are carried out, the approach still seems less systematic. Adaptation needs to be illustrated as something tangible, and aid personell in operation and project management are the most important targets for such information.

Knowledge management is important, for example through formal, electronic and by newsletters on CDM and on climate change. The group is arranging an event after the COP February 16<sup>th</sup> to promote climate as an issue.

There is a negotiation process between projects and the Ministry of Economic Development, since the Ministry pays for many of the projects. The political leadership of the Ministry has recently become interested in CDM, which offers opportunities to talk to business leaders, public-private partnerships, etc. The main discussions with the Ministry are on the size of investments in CDM, how much to invest in adaptation, as well as how to address the Post-Kyoto negotiations. We have not been able to explain how to do adaptation in a similiary concrete and clear way.

Petersen was unsure if NAPAs (National Adaptation Programs of Action) will be informative and useful. Countries have gone through many such exercises, and often nothing happens afterwards. It could be more appropriate to use PRSPs (Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers). Adaptation work should look at how to make people and communities more flexible in reacting to changes, rather than focusing on agencies that prescribe what to do.

At the end of his talk, Petersen mentioned some of the lessons learned, as well as forthcoming strategies. He recommended being practical rather than comprehensive, even if it seems old fashioned. We do not all have to find our own tools. And often we just produce language. We should focus on what we know and what we can do – the “how-questions”. He also stressed the need to be understandable rather than ambitious, to be site specific, process-oriented, and if possible use existing instruments like SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessments) and PRSPs. It is important to think of incentive models to adaptation, popularise a no-nonsense approach to adaptation (Ian Noble) and scale up from pilot to something real and significant. Petersen said that pilot studies should be limited rather than in great abundance. An explanatory “Road show” can be used along with other communication tools. The workshop format could be used to discuss such communication tools in order to express ourselves better, as well as creating condensed information on the how-questions through exchanging experiences.

He thinks the draft paper presented at the workshop is normative, comprehensive and inclusive. But he asks whether it is useful. What can we deliver versus what we should deliver, and what is desirable?

### Frode Neergaard: Climate proofing development cooperation

Frode Neergaard from Danida and the Ministry of foreign affairs (MFA) in Denmark gave the next presentation. In Denmark there are two ministers in the MFA, one for development issues and one for other foreign affairs. The name of Danida is not written DANIDA any more, and it is totally integrated in the MFA. The name Danida is used in the field, but not so much in Denmark. The South group/Danida is under the minister for development cooperation. The budget is 0,7 percent of the Danish GDP, and the minister is responsible for this aid budget. One of the departments under the minister is the Department for Environment and Sustainable Development, where Neergaard works. This department works on climate change, energy (such as renewables, CDM, environment, conventions, GEF, UNEP, and NGOs). They are ten to twelve people. The country departments in the Ministry in Copenhagen are slim; instead, embassies are important. Decentralized authority is given to ambassadors. Frode Neergaard's department forms the link between the Ministry of Foreign Affairs/Danida and the Ministry of Environment.

The new Danish "Climate and Development Action Programme" has been prepared by an intra-ministerial task force. A small fund was given to roll out the action programme. It is a follow-up on the EU action plan on climate change. An intra-ministerial task force was working on it for almost a year. The participants were from all departments in the South group and from embassies in Dar es Salaam and Kathmandu. The programme was launched in August 2005. Initial actions took place in Vietnam, Tanzania and Mozambique. It gives a toolkit rather than funding, but 15 millions D. Kr. will be used for pilot projects.

Five key points about the action programme are: 1. Climate change is seen as a development challenge; 2. At particular risk are poor and vulnerable developing countries, dependent on climate-sensitive sectors; 3. Climate change can lead to economic loss, impeded development opportunities, increased poverty, migration, and puts MDGs at risk; 4. There is a need to move from analysis to action – learning-by-doing. A simple and practical approach is important; 5. Efforts are needed on two paths: adaptation and mitigation.

Neergaard mentioned the danger of waiting for more research and never getting started. We must also do learning by doing. It is difficult to reach out to colleagues, so we must make it simple and possible. We must avoid the trap of letting a lack of information be an excuse for non-action.

Mitigation is important, but adaptation is the first priority when Least Developed Countries are in focus. A sector approach to adaptation is used, building on a sector approach to development and screening tools. The big three sectors are agriculture, water, and health, which are important for Danish development cooperation. They are also the most climate sensitive. Adaptation is more linked to other development challenges than mitigation. The climate screening is likened to environmental screening in general, because environment is well established as cross-cutting issue. This is useful for practitioners. There is a tool box as part of Danida Aid Management Guidelines (mandatory guidelines). It asks simple questions, and has standard headings related to key elements. The results are design modifications, risk management adaptation actions, options for cooperation and targeted sector support, and capacity development.

The Danish Climate and Development Action Programme promotes mitigation of climate change through low-carbon development. Capacity development is done through National Communications, NAPAs and negotiations. To raise the policy profile of climate change is a

part of political and technical dialogue. Mitigation work is done in South Africa, Thailand, Indonesia and others that are not least developed. This work includes CDM.

Who do we want to reach with a screening tool? This is a first level screening which does not go in depth, so reaching colleagues is the first step. It is aimed at reaching generalists like staff and embassies – people rotating between posts and with a very busy agenda. Without reaching this level, nothing gets done. When we reach this level, then we can come further through the experts that these practitioners will use, for example, on good governance and environment. Climate change could be raised to this level as part of environment.

Expected results of climate change screening are, for example, better aid programmes in support of long-term development goals, climate change screening to become “smart policy”, adaptation and mitigation efforts to be mainstreamed, rather than “add on”, and opening up for substantial climate friendly financing through ODA. Expected results are also design modifications of programmes, risk management adaptation actions, options for cooperation and targeted sector support, and capacity development in general.

Electronic version of the Danish Climate & Development Action Programme:

[www.netpublikationer.dk/um/5736/](http://www.netpublikationer.dk/um/5736/)

The toolkit is found on [www.climate.dccd.cursum.net/client/CursumClientViewer.aspx](http://www.climate.dccd.cursum.net/client/CursumClientViewer.aspx)

See also on the website: Danida entry points, multilateral cooperation, country programs, sector programs, mixed credit.

Contact point: Frode Neergaard, Danish MFA

### Kristinn Einarsson: Climate and energy in development

The second presentation in this session was given by Kristinn Einarsson, from ICEIDA, Iceland. ICEIDA works on transfer of knowledge and practical know-how, with a focus in areas where Iceland has special knowledge and experience, helping partner countries towards self-sufficiency. They cooperate with a few countries, including Malawi, Namibia, Mozambique, Uganda, and a few others.

Iceland has been working on the new state of variability of climate. They have capacity building and a masters program on geothermal energy (UNU Geothermal Training Programme, since 1979 and master studies at the University of Iceland since 2000). Students have attended from Africa, Asia, Europe, and Central America. In 2004 a strategic decision was taken on giving bilateral aid in the geothermal field. Iceland also has experience on desertification, as it has the largest desert areas in Europe. Iceland has recent geothermal projects in Nicaragua, and is planning further projects in Nicaragua. There is a need for increased general awareness, e.g. in the UN system and at the World Bank, on the importance and usefulness of geothermal solutions in developing countries. Iceland is leading the Nordic research programme “Climate and Energy” from 2003 to 2006.

Einarsson brought attention to how climate change is interacting with terrestrial environmental changes and social change. Soil erosion is a major problem. This leads to less sequestration of carbon in soils and by plants; is related to forest degradation; and leads to flash runoff, less percolation, and water scarcity. It also leads to a reduction of agricultural land for a growing population. Further possibilities based on special knowledge from Iceland include an integrated regional approach to climate change impact assessment, e.g. in the field of hydrology and energy resources, and soil conservation methods. Iceland has been working

on soil conservation for a hundred years to combat soil erosion and regenerate the vegetation cover.

Within climate change and energy, there are positive experiences with matrix co-operation structure, including cross-cutting analysis of subjects adapted to studies of specific problems. Impact analysis is based on regional water cycle and climate scenarios, consistent with global scenarios. Iceland could share experiences and help with establishing similar programs.

Multilateral and bilateral development aid could be combined. Regional scenarios for climate and water may lead to useful regional cooperation in a number of fields. Einarsson asked the question about possibilities for coordination of Nordic development efforts. There is, for example, an urgent need for strengthening the network of climate stations and water gauges in developing countries, as there is a scarcity of relevant data in an ever-changing environment.

### Siri E. H. Eriksen: Climate change in NORAD: 2003 study

This session continued with Siri E. H. Eriksen's presentation of a study from 2003 on the relevance of climate change in NORAD's work. The goals of the study, carried out by Siri Eriksen and Lars Otto Næss, was to assess current levels of climate change consideration in NORAD, identify links between climate and development, and recommend future strategies. The analysis was done by reviewing policy documents for development cooperation and strategy documents of key priority sectors.

Trends in Norwegian development cooperation has been a move from project to programme assistance, integration of ODA into national PRSP, a stronger emphasis on results and efficiency, and coordination and synergies.

The general vulnerability of the poor was emphasised in the poverty strategy. Climate change, however, is not explicitly mentioned in sectoral or thematic strategies for environment, gender, governance, research and education, health, or HIV/AIDS, but there are indirect linkages.

Key findings included the following: there were negligible references to climate change, and where mentioned, climate change was framed as a mitigation issue; many potential entry points for adaptation into current activities were found; key strategic areas within which adaptation to climate change may take place are poverty reduction, natural resources management, and humanitarian aid. Measures can be carried out within the interfaces between these three areas identified as livelihoods; local capacity and sensitivity; and risk management and early warning. Opportunities to reduce vulnerability can be found within a broad range of activities within these entry points, including programmes targeted at education and health.

Operational entry points pointed out in the study were the following:

- Support, through the GEF, of assessments of vulnerability and adaptation in developing countries.
- Potential support to the Clean Development Mechanism under the Kyoto Protocol
- Strengthen linkages between Norwegian support for these in climate negotiations and Norwegian development cooperation.
- Attention paid to climate change (and synergies with other environmental conventions) in support for national development planning in:
  - o PRSPs, including local level/decentralised planning processes

- National Strategies for Sustainable Development
- National Environmental Action Plans
- Integrate climate concerns into environmental impact assessments and strategic environmental assessments.
- Disaster management and long-term development strengthened (in addition to emergency aid)
- Global public goods processes

### Pernille Holtedahl: Climate change and Norwegian Development Cooperation

The final presentation in session II was given by Pernille Holtedahl from NORAD. She explained that NORAD is an agency under the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) that provides technical advice in the development policy area for the MFA and foreign missions. It also assists the MFA and foreign missions in assuring the quality of Norwegian development cooperation, and initiates and implements independent evaluations of development cooperation. Embassies carry out the projects. Norway provides approximately 1.75 billion Euro per year in assistance to developing countries. The main recipient countries are Afghanistan, Mozambique, Tanzania, Sudan, the Palestinian Administration Area, Uganda and Zambia. The funds are channelled 50% bilaterally (government, NGO) and 50% multilaterally.

Pernille Holtedahl mentioned linkages between climate change and development. Climate change affects livelihoods through flooding, drought and reduced agricultural productivity. The poorest segments of society have the fewest possibilities for protection against climate change. Projects funded by development assistance can affect the climate, and climate change affects aid-funded projects. Predicted precipitation amounts affect road construction and hydropower projects. Other channels of influence include temperature and wind direction.

She brought attention to the two themes within climate change: mitigation and adaptation. The focus in the media and elsewhere has been on mitigation. For NORAD/Norwegian Development Cooperation, mitigation signifies the Clean Development Mechanism, capacity building and technology transfer. It became clear only relatively recently that ODA can be used on CDM projects. According to OECD/DAC guidelines, ODA can be spent on capacity building and pilot studies. Norway is a passive CDM supporter compared to other countries.

There is now a new administration, and the precise policy focus not yet well known. But the draft environmental strategy makes *climate change and energy* one out of three prioritised areas. China and India are mentioned in particular in regards to mitigation. Support to adaptation and adaptation strategies in least developed countries is also suggested. Focus on the poorest countries is a tradition in Norwegian Development Cooperation.

Some CDM studies have been undertaken (South Africa, Central America). One project that is underway is a forestation project in Nicaragua (a feasibility study). The activity level is likely to increase as the political go-ahead has been given for a power sector task force. It outlines how to improve Norwegian support to the power sector.

Adaptation has not been a prioritised area in the Norwegian Development Cooperation. There are different reasons for this. In Norway, climate change in general has not been prioritised the past few years due to lack of political mandate. Moreover, in NORAD there is a trend towards focusing assistance on a few sectors per country. Adaptation is also internationally

still a new area. It is not prioritised by developing countries, as it is not urgent enough as a development priority, although G77 are active in climate negotiations. Instead, developing countries prioritise, for example, electricity and roads.

NORAD's goals with regard to adaptation are to increase awareness of climate change in general for NORAD, MFA, and embassies, and to promote mainstreaming of climate in evaluations. For example, in the petroleum sector assistance, they would like to promote climate change in environmental capacity building. Another goal is also to promote adaptation by seeing climate change as a risk factor in ODA-funded projects. Activities have been to fund the 2003 study on adaptation and now the present study presented in draft at this workshop. Norway also channels money through UNFCCC funds.

A comment on Høltedahl's presentation was that the recipient country's agenda is important, and that development cooperation is led by partners. But donors are also part of the agenda setting, and there is a dialogue. Donors have an obligation to be part of that agenda setting, or else the agenda would be one we would not wish to support. It was suggested that we must promote environment like we promote democracy, fight corruption, work for good governance etc. There is an element of dialog within the issue of country ownership. It was pointed out that although moving the agenda forward is important, there is often little time, they must prioritize, and sometimes, the two first issues on the priority list take precedence.

### Discussion: Climate change, an environmental issue, a development issue or both?

It was expressed that many people are treating climate change as a development issue, while others have experienced that it is mostly seen as a purely environmental issue. Therefore, people involved in development projects are not thinking much about climate change adaptation. It was also noted that in natural scientific communities and in biophysical disciplines, climate change is often not seen as a development issue.

A question was raised regarding why people do not take climate change seriously? Is it because of a lack of tools? A representative for ODA answered that awareness is spreading. It spreads out from the environmental ministers for example, but it is still environmental ministries who have the ownership of the issue, and financial ministries must also take ownership. Delegations to climate change conferences are led by environmental ministers. But the UK and G8 have handled it well by taking it to a higher political level. The British prime minister himself took personal interest in climate change.

In ODA, the agenda is development, not environment. People are therefore not very interested in environmental issues, according to one of the participants from ODA. Another said that typically, an environmental team in ODA is doing climate change work, and that the environmental part is not prioritized within development agencies. When putting climate change through environment, you fight a difficult battle. This institutional placement of climate change is a challenge, therefore. The idea of linkages between poverty and climate change needs to be fostered.

It was argued that climate change is a big issue, so therefore it is not necessarily a problem that it is seen as environmental issue. Mitigation is on all energy agendas. We should make adaptation visible for people who do not know it, and communicate it in a simple way. We must explain what adaptation is, what is clearly known, what can be done, and what we do not know but need to find out".

A question raised was how to achieve the same with adaptation as with mitigation, which is already mainstreamed. Does it make more sense to look at what adaptation means for each sector – for the health sector, for the energy sector, for the agricultural sector?

### Discussion: The cost of adaptation

Is there a good answer to the cost of adaptation? Trying to determine benefits of adaptation is more difficult than determining benefits of mitigation. And such knowledge is needed to assess costs and investments. What adaptation would have been done anyway? How can we measure how much damage is avoided by adaptation measures? In the tsunami in south Asia in 2004, there was lack of early warning. A good early warning system could perhaps have halved the number of deaths, but how can we really know how many lives could have been saved? In any particular case, there could be enormous benefits from adaptation that we cannot know about in advance. We also cannot precisely know what would have happened in the same case without adaptation investments.

It was pointed out that variable climatic conditions are giving variable baselines from which to measure benefits of action. In addition, we want to justify use of money by measuring the costs and benefits of adaptation, but after 50 years of development cooperation, for example how do we know the real impact? We do not know what the world would have looked like without aid.

It was asked whether or not it would be better to use qualitative and quantitative indicators for vulnerability, rather than disasters? It was suggested that we can look at case studies and identify common factors of vulnerability.

A question was raised regarding what is meant by ‘the cost of adaptation’? And what is the ‘adaptation deficit’? The latter includes measures that have not been done that could have been done, but refers only to adaptation to climate change and not adaptation to climate variability. Support for adaptation would go only to the former, thus raising an equity issue. It was argued that some cost-benefit analysis could be useful. For example, in the aftermath the tsunami, when doing infrastructure reconstruction, it is possible to assess additional costs of taking climate change into consideration. It is necessary to argue that there is a cost for inaction. Too much focus on defining costs may lead nowhere. But figures for illustrative purposes are useful, e.g. infrastructure projects damaged, added cost of rebuilding, and climate proofing. We can include climate change aspects of cost in tenders for road construction. Once you move away from hard infrastructure to more social development figures are not useful, e.g. it is difficult to assign costs to institution building and capacity building.

The Paris-declaration on aid effectiveness from March 2005 was brought up as a relevant publication. It was expressed that there is a strong need for more aid effectiveness. Sometimes, when budget support is given to developing countries, the countries choose to use money on arms instead of other purposes.

It was pointed out that ODA is not treated as private investment, so metrics are more important as attention grabbers. There is no great focus on costs. Others also mentioned that there is not same cost-benefit-thinking in ODA as in private investments. Denmark puts money for example into NAPA, GEF and other adaptation channels without getting hard figures on results.

### **Session III: Information needs and international collaboration**

#### Thomas Tanner: National information needs: Climate change and disaster risk assessment in Bangladesh

Thomas Tanner from the Institute of Development Studies in Sussex and Department for International Development (DFID) in the United Kingdom opened this session. The context of DFID climate change work is that poverty reduction is at risk, and that policy coherence is important. Environmental screening was not having much effect. There is currently a move from emergency aid to disaster risk reduction. A study from 2001-2002 was done to improve understanding of linkages between poverty and climate change. It is important to develop information within country staff, and avoid the hurdle mentality in seeing climate change as another load. It is also important to appeal to current activities, and resource the follow-up. Information should therefore be kept simple and short. Keysheets on climate change are made by DFI, and portfolio risk assessments are undertaken.

Information needs within risk assessment are hazard data by sector or region, vulnerability by poverty proxy, and local data. Risk is made up of hazard, vulnerability and coping capacity.

A checklist approach is used with questions about whether the sector is climate sensitive, if it is previously affected by disasters, what are potential hazards, and existing risk management.

Tanner underlined that adaptation is absolutely not resource neutral. And it is important to take care of disaster risks, but it is not enough to reduce vulnerability. Technology-based adaptation retains appeal. Tackling vulnerability involves more than screening projects for climate change impacts and disaster risk.

We must learn by doing – for example, risk assessments. A checklist approach is a start. Can you do a checklist but include more than disaster risk, for example, like looking at vulnerability factors? Capacity and underlying vulnerability must be more frequently targeted. Technology-based adaptation should be used where appropriate. It is important to continue dialogs within institutions, and because staff leave often, we must maintain momentum and awareness.

#### Ian Noble: Experiences of international collaboration in climate change

The final presentation of the workshop was given by Ian Noble from the World Bank and VARG (Vulnerability and Adaptation Resource Group) about experiences of international collaboration in climate change. He started by mentioning that there are different layers of risk analysis as well as different types of vulnerability information, both simple and more complex.

- Basic “primer on climate change”, such as the DFID key sheets
- Simple checklist (broad project concept of Danida)
- Simple expert system (such as the World Banks Screening Tool – pointer to resources)
- Basic risk analysis tools (projections, impacts)
- “Engineering quality” risk assessment tools (specialist consultants – for specific projects)

Noble presented a list of institutions involved in climate change adaptation work, and commented on their role:

IIED/IISD/SEI – as knowledge broker between academics and policy makers (International Institute of Environment and Development, London, International Institute for Sustainable Development, Geneva, Switzerland and Stockholm Environment Institute).

UNFCCC- at least some adaptation needs to stay here.

OECD – the ministerial level

GEF – implementing agencies like UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) and UNDP (United Nations Development Programme) interact in GEF.

UNEP is also a collaborating centre.

VARG – bilateral and multilateral agencies

IFI meetings (International Financial Institution meetings)

IPCC research

Collaboration institutions (SEI/UNEP)

Informal meetings (Adaptation days at the COP, UNFCCC Conference of Parties)

NGO fora

Ad hoc meetings (like the current workshop)

Private sector (experience risk)

Munic Re foundation (organisation)

Insurance as useful tool in adaptation?

Commonwealth, G8

Sectoral organisations – WHO (World Health Organisation), FAO (Food and Agriculture Organisation of the UN)

Developing countries – G 77

- parties to the UNFCCC
- consulted in OECD
- are disengaging with the GEF
- invited to VARG
- participate in the IPCC
- participate in the adaptation days at the COP

VARG is an informal collaboration between bilateral/multilateral agencies. They work increasingly with development agencies. The secretariat is housed in the WB. VARG meets in connection with UNFCCC meetings (SBSTA and COP) but it is difficult to meet due to the pressure at meetings. Two core publications by Frank Sperling have been produced in connection with the VARG.

After the presentation, Noble was asked where possibilities exist for interaction between practitioners and academics in this structure. Noble answered that IPCC is one possibility, but practitioners are not included to a great extent here. There is a little bit of such interaction in UNEP. The NGOs and informal adaptation days were mentioned, as they reach into development communities. IIED, IISD, and SEI are important in such interaction and formation of coalitions. It was said that there is no structured way of facilitating such interaction, as here is not the money nor time for it. But what kind of interaction do we need? It was noted that it is important to limit the amount of meetings. And we must make sure that there are meeting points where developing countries' actors come into the implementation

level. It can be useful to split up the interaction into working groups. Developing countries' representatives can not participate in too many meetings either.

A question was asked whether Nordic meetings about environment are useful for interaction regarding adaptation. The meeting for development ministers from Nordic countries and a few others (Nordic plus) was mentioned. This meeting is held at least once a year. It is worth considering how we can use this forum and try to include climate change there. Development ministers are more important than environmental ministers. There is a Nordic environmental meeting that is probably also a relevant forum to add on climate change adaptation. In Australia, environment and development ministers have been brought together on this – and this is an interesting move.

Ian Noble mentioned steps needed for VARG, for example to set it up in a more formalized way, and for longer term. In addition to meeting briefly within UNFCCC forums, VARG would have to meet outside UNFCCC fora because too much is happening during UNFCCC meetings,.. An ODA-representative mentioned that some institutions are more relevant and others have more potential to implement adaptation than others. All kinds of meetings can be used, including EU and Nordic forums. Our task is to ensure that climate change appears more often on the agenda. There is also a Nordic 8 agencies meeting on biannual basis. As the list of forums grows, we should consider where climate change is already part of the agenda, and where we should bring it to the table. There are some forums where you “speak to the converted” (already aware of climate change), but others where it is important to get climate change included. OECD is developing guidelines, similar to VARG, perhaps. It was said that it would be good if OECD DAC comes up with guidelines for adaptation. This is important politically, to set the agenda for many of the other organizations. There is a draft declaration which will be put forward the 4<sup>th</sup> of April at an OECD joint meeting between environment and development committees, focusing on the integration of adaptation and mitigation into ODA, and the screening of ODA activities. The draft declaration will probably be passed, and it will probably be followed up as well. A Chiang Mai meeting next year will have a session on climate change adaptation. GECHS (Global Environmental Change and Human Security) project of the IHDP (International Human Dimensions Programme) is specifically targeting the science-policy interface.

### Discussion: In which kind of institutions should climate change adaptation be managed?

One of the central issues of discussion during the workshop was whether climate change adaptation should be managed within UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) or not. According to some, it is not so fruitful because it takes long time with contentious negotiations. There is too much micromanagement and stringent constraints. There are also negative experiences from CDM carbon sequestration projects. Adaptation is a contentious issue. In addition, it is difficult to establish an “adaptation baseline” and determine the benefits. The need for money specifically for adaptation is a critical issue.

One opinion was that adaptation work through UNFCCC gives a narrow way of discussing these issues. Also, the fact that developed countries' representatives are often climatologists contributes to a narrow view. Developing country representatives are mainly concerned with securing more funding in negotiations. The lack of funding in specific climate funds leads to disappointment among developing countries. However, there are funds within development aid that can be used. The development aid community must therefore be brought together

along with the environmental community. Many developing country representatives fear that mainstreaming entails no extra funding. This is not necessarily correct, but the money is flowing within development rather than through the UNFCCC. If we bring climate change into the country plans, will this give new opportunities? We must look outside the UNFCCC process. Is an adaptation protocol an alternative? It was expressed that it is unlikely that funding would be put into an adaptation protocol.

It would also be useful to look at human security – at individuals and local communities' ability to react. Human security highlights what the poor are not able to do when confronted with stresses, and thus there is a clear link with climate change. PRSP (Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers) are the basis for cooperation within development aid. Can we see climate change in those plans? So far, the papers include little about the environment, and far less about climate change. Input is needed on how to include climate change in the PRSPs. Development agencies do climate projects. But the Norwegian policy is to integrate climate policy into every project that is funded.

It was stated that good PRSPs are more important than good NAPAs (National Adaptation Programme of Action). NAPAs do not say much about development. Considerations for short-term adaptation versus long-term adaptation were mentioned. For example, at low-lying islands, adaptation must happen quickly. In other contexts, long-term mainstreaming is more relevant. First track is to do the immediate adaptation needed, and then second track can be negotiation in UNFCCC for the longer term.

It was argued that it is important that the adaptation issue stays in UNFCCC because of the developing countries. Unless it stays there, developing countries will not be willing to participate in the climate change issue. It is also necessary to use ODA money for adaptation.

It was suggested that creating new institutions is not a good idea. New institutions create more travel and transaction costs. Instead, existing institutions, such as FAO, WTO, sectoral institutions, UNDP, and the World Bank, should be used to promote adaptation. In order for this to happen, knowledge among development agencies themselves must be increased, including at the embassy and country office level.

A need for links between negotiations and development was mentioned. Vulnerable people are by definition not in powerful positions. Can biased power structures be reinforced by some types of adaptation measures, thereby increasing vulnerability of the poor? How can pro-poor adaptation be effectively implemented despite power structures biased against the poor?

It was contemplated how we can bridge the gap between the UNFCCC agenda and ODA, and it was seen as doubtful that the UNFCCC, which is a negotiation forum, is a good implementation forum. It is, in fact, not intended as an implementation forum, and we do not have an international forum where implementation of adaptation is addressed. The question is, is such an institution needed or can existing institutions be developed to address the implementation of adaptation? VARG is useful as a resource group, and the OECD is also important in this regard.

### Closing comments

Karen O'Brien from GECHS informed about a Workshop in Chiang Mai in Thailand next January, for interaction between practitioners and academics. We could do something on adaptation there, and GECHS has sent a proposal to hold a session. GECHS and IHDP focus on the science-policy interface. O'Brien invited the participants of the workshop to contribute to a session at Chiang Mai with developing country partners.

It was expressed by several participants that the current workshop was useful. It was also mentioned that we must look for more concrete ideas for implementation, and cooperation for implementation, and that we should copy from each other. We should pursue, in more detail, the 'how to adapt' question. We should find instruments, methods and tools. We also need proposals on where we can work together on how-questions.

The report which was distributed in draft form for this workshop, will be made available through the GECHS or Department of Sociology and Human Geography, University of Oslo website.