



SEAN-CC WORKSHOP REPORT

SEAN-CC Regional Training Workshop on Technical Guidelines and Toolkits for the National Adaptation Plan Preparation

14-16 July 2014

Pattaya, Thailand



Table of Content

1. Opening and Objectives of the Workshop.....	3
2. Panel Discussion on Importance of Mainstreaming the Climate Change Adaptation in National Development Plans	4
3. Work Group 1 on Opportunities and Challenges in Linking NAP with Development Processes	5
4. Introduction to NAP Process and its Technical Guidelines	7
5. Elaboration of LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process Element A, Laying the Groundwork	7
6. Elaboration of LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process Element B, Preparatory Elements	9
7. Work Group 2 on Identifying Starting Points for Countries.....	11
8. Elaboration of LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process Element C, Implementation Strategies	15
9. Elaboration of LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process Element D, Reporting, Monitoring and Review.....	16
10. Panel discussion on six key issues raised during the workshop.....	18
11. Work Group 3 on mapping the existing work in the country and estimating the timeframe, resources and support needed to complete the work.....	20
12. Closing remarks and wrap-up	23
Annex 1: Workshop agenda.....	25
Annex 2: List of participants	29

1. Opening and Objectives of the Workshop

- 1.1. The meeting was facilitated by Mr. Prakesh Bista, Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (ROAP), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP).
- 1.2. Mr. Mozaharul Alam, Regional Climate Change Coordinator, ROAP UNEP welcomed the participants from Indonesia, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Thailand and Vietnam and resource speakers from the Secretariat of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG), UNFCCC Adaptation Committee, Asia Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN) and the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR).
- 1.3. Mr. Alam explained the workshop is organized by the Southeast Asia Network of Climate Change Offices (SEAN-CC) Programme of UNEP. He highlighted the importance of institutionalizing the National Adaptation Plan (NAP) process for its sustainability. He said UNEP and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) are supporting the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) to advance the NAP under the National Adaptation Plan Global Support Programme (NAP-GSP) and are preparing to extend the support to non-LDCs. He introduced the Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process developed by LDC Expert Group (LEG) of UNFCCC as the key document of the workshop. He explained the document covers the entire NAP process and is useful for the non-LDCs although it is primarily aiming to support LDCs for advancing NAP. He suggested participants' active engage in discussions in an informal manner and wished everyone to learn from each other.
- 1.4. Mr. Paul Desanker, Manager of the National Adaptation Plans and Policy, Adaptation Programme, UNFCCC Secretariat, underscored that the purpose of the workshop is to learn from each other: countries from resource people and resource people from countries. He thanked UNEP and APAN for supporting the advance of NAP, an important component of the Convention. He pointed out that defining the NAP process to meet the needs of both the countries and the negotiation process is important. He said the NAP process should be the basis for the countries to assess vulnerabilities, mainstream adaptation in national planning, and formulate and implement the NAP. He encouraged the countries to share their experiences in further completing the definition of the NAP process.
- 1.5. Mr. Juan Hoffmaister, Co-chair of the UNFCCC Adaptation Committee, stated that the landscape of NAP has changed from planning to implementation since the Cancun Climate Change Conference in 2010. He introduced that the UNFCCC Adaptation Committee works to raise importance and ensure coherence of adaptation work in two streams. First by reviewing the technical guidelines. The Committee concluded that the guidelines are self-sufficient and country driven, but more work needs to be done on precise modalities. NAP task force is set up and is working with LDC and non-LDCs on the modalities and he is here to take back the learning from the countries to the task force. The second by better engaging the regional centers and networks which are functioning successfully on the ground, like the Latin American network in disaster reduction and Asian network in technical backstopping.
- 1.6. Mr. Batu Uprety, Chair of LEG, underlined the importance of this workshop to train the non-LDCs and joined the others in highlighting the importance of learning from countries to

develop best practices, exchanging experience between LDCs and non-LDCs and establishing an information centre on adaptation.

- 1.7. Mr. Bista wrapped up the session by explaining the main objectives of the workshop: 1) to enhance the understanding of the NAP process according to the UNFCCC/LEG technical guidelines, 2) to clarify the potential entry points for the NAP process in countries, and 3) to learn from other by sharing experience on the existing adaptation mainstreaming initiatives.

2. Panel Discussion on Importance of Mainstreaming the Climate Change Adaptation in National Development Plans

- 2.1. Ms. Pham Thi Thanh Hang, Programme Officer at the Asia Pacific Secretariat of UNISDR, underlined the need to adapt to climate change and manage disaster risk reduction in the ASEAN region. She shared the findings on growing risk due to flawed development and climate variability. She introduced the Special Report by Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) on Managing the Risk of Extreme Events and Disasters to Advance Climate Change Adaptation which provides common approaches to strengthening climate resilience. She introduced the lessons learned from the Hyogo Framework for Action: while progress is made in disaster risk reduction plans, legislation and institution, challenges still remain in implementation and budget allocation. She suggested recommendations for post-2015: 1) to make integration of disaster risk reduction, response to climate change and development a practice; 2) to reduce known risk, prevent new risk and strengthen resilience; and 3) to strengthen accountability frameworks.¹
- 2.2. Ms. Puja Sawhney, Coordinator at Regional Hub for APAN, discussed how to integrate disaster risk reduction, climate change and development. She briefly explained the components the NAP process and its outputs should include, the difference between the NAP and the National Adaptation Programmes for Action (NAPA) and how to build on the NAPA process. She introduced the four elements of NAP formulation in the initial guidelines adopted at COP17, and issues and challenges in NAP implementation, especially in terms of finance, which will be further reviewed in the next COPs.²
- 2.3. Mr. Hoffmaister emphasized the importance of coherence between the NAP and the national development plan for successful NAP implementation. He cited IPCC's Fifth Assessment Report in saying that there still exists disjunction between the push for adaptation policies and broader economic development plan which impedes progress of adaptation planning. He also mentioned the institutional capacity building at local government level, consideration of specific national situation, identification of co-benefits, linkages and synergies at the planning level as essential factors for successful NAP implementation.
- 2.4. Mr. Jan Verhagen, Member of LEG, echoed that climate change is an all inclusive development issue and that NAP should focus on planning for the medium and long term. He mentioned taking country-driven approach, understanding national context, tapping into regional and national science basis, learning by doing, finding commonalities through information exchange, searching co-benefits between mitigation and adaptation and even outside climate

¹ For more information, please see presentation 'Mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Risk Reduction into Development' on SEAN-CC website.

² For more information, please see presentation 'Putting the NAP Process in Perspective' on SEAN-CC website.

change and making it visible as important ways to mainstream adaptation in national development plans.

- 2.5. Ms. Julie Amoroso of Philippines Climate change Commission explained several important legal and institutional developments in Philippines to deal with climate change and disaster since 1991. She indicated the need for holistic approach, good data, capacity-building at local level, awareness-raising on adaptation mainstreaming, allocation of resources, partnership to engage more people and stakeholders as the challenges Philippines is facing today.
- 2.6. Discussions followed on the topic of risk and early warning. Vietnam asked for an elaboration on the relationship between the growth of risk and climate vulnerability. UNISDR explained that risk is increased by two factors, hazard and the vulnerability of people and said that early warning and disaster risk reduction efforts are focused on strengthening the preparedness. Philippines shared its experience in reducing disaster risk. The government of Philippines prioritized the early warning of disaster and established a structural early warning system. For example, the Office of Civil Defense does the contingency planning and the government works on preparedness and prevention based on the plan and risk assessment.
- 2.7. Indonesia posed a question on how to introduce adaptation indicators at the national level. UNISDR explained that in general, a national platform is built to bring various ministries together and assess the indicators. She said Indonesia is one of the most proactive countries in introducing the indicators and using them to assess local government performances. She said 22 indicators are used by 36 countries so far, and introduced that UNISDR produces a synthesis country report every 2 years to gain a regional picture.
- 2.8. Indonesia asked what instruments already exist for governments to convince private sectors. UNISDR answered that building on corporate social responsibility could be an option to ensure the responsibility of the private sector to not increase the risk of communities, and suggested governments should make regulations to keep private sectors out of hazard born areas, build standards for private sectors to follow, and work on building partnerships and incentives.
- 2.9. Vietnam asked for more information on non-LDC funding. APAN admitted that finance is the main challenge, saying that the issue of bridging the gap between what is needed and how much is pledged still needs to be solved.
- 2.10. Indonesia stressed the importance of science as the basis for adaptation process, saying that in reality adaptation process goes on without science in Indonesia and it is difficult for local governments to have access to climate change scenarios. Mr. Verhagen said in Netherlands scientist input is made at regular intervals to ensure science and facts are reflected correctly.

3. Work Group 1 on Opportunities and Challenges in Linking NAP with Development Processes

- 3.1. The participants divided into country groups and discussed 1) if NAP is a document or a process; and 2) what are the key opportunities and challenges in linking NAP with existing broader development processes, and the solutions to better utilize opportunities and overcome challenges. Below is the summary of the one-hour discussion.

	What is a NAP, a document or a process and why?	a. Opportunities in linking NAP to development processes b. How to approach these opportunities	a. Challenges in linking NAP to development opportunities b. How to overcome these challenges
Indonesia	Both. NAP is a document of policies, programmes, strategies of action, guidelines and implementation instruments, but is also a process to understand and reduce vulnerability and bring in new perspectives and stakeholders.	a. Strong local government ownership and leadership, and strong civil society. b. Increase capacity-building and exchange best practices.	a. Lack of guidelines on financing and mainstreaming for local authorities, coordination among sectors, and measurable indicators. b. Increased role of private sectors.
Malaysia	Both. Should be a policy statement based on national and local political interest. Should also be a list of cross-sectoral, multi-disciplinary processes which include various stakeholders and multi-level action plans for the short to long term period.	a. Existing National Policy on Climate Change, R&D basis, regional and global cooperation mechanisms and government interest. b. Strike a balance between mitigation and adaptation, tap in to the south-south cooperation mechanisms and gather funding based on the political interest.	a. Lack of efforts to gather data, low institutional and technical capacity, low awareness and limitation in funding. b. Utilize National Climate Change Centre, conduct more training, engage and consult civil society and private sector, enforce regulations, tap into international and private funding.
Myanmar	NAP is a process which should be continuous, progressive and interactive at the national level. It is the beginning of a process to take adaptation measures.	a. Existing climate change policy, strategy and adaptation measures. b. Coordination among ministries, integration of sectoral policies, develop project proposals, conduct training.	a. Limitation in institutional structure, human and financial resources and technology. b. Modernizing institutional structure and cooperate with line ministries. Active international participation, i.e. international agreements.
Philippines	Both. NAP is a process that provides guidance in the planning, implementing and monitoring stages. NAP is a document that can be used as a reference for the delivery of adaptation practices and makes the whole process systematic.	a. Existing development processes. b. Make the existing development processes climate sensitive and relate it to sectoral plans for implementation.	a. Lack of common understanding on the impact of climate change, insufficient technical capacity in the government, lack of proper database as reference for development plans and budgetary concerns for implementation. b. Build technical capacity. Enhance understanding of climate change impact. Mainstream climate change in the budget process.
Thailand	Both. NAP is a process as it needs to be implemented by different sectors. NAP is a document that will be used as a reference and for monitoring.	a. The plan to update the NAP. b. Use the NAP updating opportunity to link it with other plans and information.	a. Institution, finance and perception. b. Overcome by co-designing and co-benefiting from the Long Term Master Plan. Build capacity by training.

Vietnam	NAP should ideally be a continuous process, but it seems like it will end up to be one of the multiple documents that already exist.	<p>a. Reconsideration of all existing plans, linking adaptation with disaster risk reduction and development mechanisms.</p> <p>b. Combine existing adaptation options. Develop new mechanisms to optimize resources between adaptation and disaster risk reduction.</p>	<p>a. Difficulty in making all ministries to come to an agreement as they have different responsibilities, accountability and timeframe.</p> <p>b. Change in perspective, for example, understanding that adaptation and risk reduction are indivisible at the ground level. Mobilize resources from private and local people.</p>
---------	--	--	--

4. Introduction to NAP Process and its Technical Guidelines

4.1. Mr. Uprety gave an overview of the NAP process. He explaining the work of LEG; progress on NAPAs and lessons learned; and objectives, guidelines, elements, functions and current status of the NAP process. He emphasized the process is about country ownership, risk management, integration into existing planning system and learning about managing multiple stress factors.³

4.2. Mr. Verhagen introduced the UNFCCC/LEG technical guidelines. He explained approaches and four elements of the guidelines, key questions and indicative activities for each step. He suggested countries use the guidelines to meet country specific needs, and to use and sharpen existing tools rather than reinvent them. He showed a flow chart of the NAP process and a list of resources to support the process. He also explained the planned LEG activities in 2014.⁴

5. Elaboration of LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process Element A, Laying the Groundwork

5.1. Mr. Verhagen went through the objectives, activities, expected outputs and outcomes and key questions in laying the groundwork and addressing gaps of the NAP process. He also explained the vision, mandate, stocktaking of the NAP process, and linkages between NAP process and development plans.⁵

5.2. Mr. Alam first briefly introduced the PROVIA guidance: the needs which it is trying to respond to, objectives, guidance requirements and challenges, how the guidance was developed, and the logical flow map of the NAP process. He underlined the importance of logical thinking in using the guidance. He explained Element A part of the guidance, showing the detailed indicative activities and where the information could be found in each step of the UNFCCC/LEG Guidelines.⁶

5.3. Indonesia presented the experience and lessons learned from developing Indonesia's National Action Plan on Adaptation (RAN-API) since 2012. Indonesia explained the detailed steps it took to prepare and develop the final draft, including responsible parties, timeframe, research areas, approaches and methods, existing policy documents, supporting instruments and shared the activities it will conduct in 2014. Indonesia emphasized that capacity building and

³ For more information, please see presentation 'Introducing the NAP Process' on SEAN-CC website.

⁴ For more information, please see presentation 'Introducing the NAP Technical Guidelines' on SEAN-CC website.

⁵ For more information, please see presentation 'The NAP Technical Guidelines Element A: Laying the Groundwork and Addressing Gaps' on SEAN-CC website.

⁶ For more information, please see presentation 'The PROVIA Guidance on Assessing Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation to Climate Change Element A' on SEAN-CC website.

assistance is needed to enhance 1) detailed knowledge in areas of vulnerability, hazard and risk analysis, cost and benefit assessment; 2) interagency and public communications; and 3) accurate estimates. Indonesia stressed the importance of using currently available knowledge, understanding country needs and taking action considering the ecosystemic, social, economic and cultural aspects of climate change impact.⁷

5.4. Philippines shared how the National Climate Change Action Plan (NCCAP) of Philippines was developed, starting from the enactment of the Climate Change Act, establishment of the Climate Change Commission and adoption of the National Framework Strategy on Climate Change to achieve the climate-smart development objective. Detailed activities and short and long-term outcomes of NCCAP were presented as a diagram. Philippines explained how the Adaptation and Mitigation Initiative in Agriculture and the Integrated Water Resources Management Framework were launched at the sectoral level. Philippines said that enabling policies and laws, creating technical working groups, engaging multi-sectoral stakeholder in the development process and mainstreaming climate change in the national policy planning and budgeting system proved to be especially helpful.⁸

5.5. Malaysia presented its experience in developing the National Policy on Climate Change (NPCC), the Green Technology and Climate Change Council (GTCCC) and its Adaptation Working Committee. Malaysia said the importance of NPCC lies in its all encompassing nature which includes environmental, economic and human well-being aspects and all stakeholders. GTCCC, a high-level decision making forum, has under it the Adaptation Working Committee, which brings together members from numerous government agencies and NGOs to discuss adaptation from health, food security, flood, sea level and building aspects. Malaysia identified lack of a specific agency to handle adaptation, limitation in human and financial resources, low capacity and awareness as the gaps that need to be addressed.⁹

5.6. Questions followed. Thailand asked how difficult it was to engage high level officials in the NAP process. Philippines said as the President of the Philippines heads the Climate Change Commission, there was no difficulty to get the plan approved by the President. Indonesia said it was important to be proactive. For instance, they selected issues that may interest the leaders, brought it to their attention and got commitments during informal meetings and following-up at the technical level. Malaysia echoed Philippines in saying that having Prime Minister as Chair of the GTCCC was helpful. Malaysia also anticipates establishing the National Centre on Climate Change, an entity in charge of climate change would also be helpful.

5.7. UNISDR initiated the discussion on the difference of developing an integrated plan (Malaysia and Philippines) versus two separate plans (Indonesia) for mitigation and adaptation. Indonesia answered they followed the global schemes and differentiated the two plans which proved to be helpful in the negotiations, was difficult to apply on the ground as in reality they are not easy to separate.

5.8. Vietnam asked if countries had any technical guidelines to include the NAP in the local level plans. Philippines said the Climate Change Commission has developed the guidelines that have

⁷ For more information, please see presentation 'Element A: Experience and Lessons Learnt from the Process of Indonesian Action Plan on Adaptation' on SEAN-CC website.

⁸ For more information, please see presentation 'Element A: Experience and Lessons Learnt from the Philippines' on SEAN-CC website.

⁹ For more information, please see presentation 'Element A: Experience and Lessons Learnt from Malaysia' on SEAN-CC website.

step by step process and entry points for local governments to follow. Indonesia said it has worked with partners such as GIZ, Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), Asian Development Bank (ADB) and United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and derived lessons learned to use as a benchmark for both the top-down capacity building of local governments and bottom-up coordination approach. Indonesia said evident environmental degradation symptoms, willingness, good NGO and media, direct donor support at the local level proved to be important factors for successful capacity building at the local level.

6. Elaboration of LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process Element B, Preparatory Elements

6.1. Mr. Uprety explained the objectives, activities, expected outputs and outcomes and key questions in developing and integrating the national adaptation plans. He elaborated the vulnerability and risk assessment methods, appraisal and ranking, and how to compile plan documents.¹⁰

6.2. Mr. Bista explained Element B part of the PROVIA guidance, focusing on how to choose the approaches in identifying and appraising adaptation needs and options.¹¹

6.3. Thailand presented the status of its climate change planning. Thailand has the National Strategic Plan on Climate Change for 2008 to 2012, a draft Climate Change Master Plan for 2014-2050 and a Framework Plan. Thailand will start the NAP process in 2015 and will develop an action plan. Thailand is now analyzing current and future climate change scenarios and is in need of a data centre to provide raw and modified data collected from each agency. Thailand is also assessing climate vulnerabilities, and based on the draft Master Plan, food and water security are one of the main priorities of national adaptation among many other issues. Plaichumphol Irrigation Project was a case study that helped Thailand to understand adaptation measures in irrigation operations.¹²

6.4. Myanmar focused on presenting the lessons learned from assessing climate change scenarios and vulnerability as preparatory elements for NAPA. Myanmar explained the model and data used to assess the climate scenario and its observation results; and the formula used to assess vulnerability and impact, the potential hazard levels and vulnerability indices of the key socio-economic sectors for each region of Myanmar. Myanmar shared the learning that data accuracy is crucial, there is a need to update assessment using both the PRECIS and MAGGIC models considering natural climate variables. Myanmar also said the National Climate Centre should be established with dedicated staff to provide immediate climate change information. Myanmar added monitoring systems for flood, drought, water quality, pest and diseases need improvement, response strategies for appropriate socioeconomic sectors need to be mainstreamed, and national regional international coordination system need to be established.¹³

6.5. Vietnam first developed its climate scenario in 2009 and is planning to update it for the second time in 2014. Vietnam shared the criteria it used to select the model and the projections made

¹⁰ For more information, please see presentation 'The NAP Technical Guidelines Element B: Preparatory Elements' on SEAN-CC website.

¹¹ For more information, please see presentation 'The PROVIA Guidance on Assessing Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation to Climate Change Element B' on SEAN-CC website.

¹² For more information, please see presentation 'Element B: Experience and Lessons Learnt from the Thailand' on SEAN-CC website.

¹³ For more information, please see presentation 'Element B: Experience and Lessons Learnt from NAPA of Myanmar' on SEAN-CC website.

using the scenario. The scenario was used by 63 provinces to formulate their climate change action plans as a result of active communication of the information. Vietnam assessed climate variability at national, regional and provincial levels in seven sectors. Vietnam's Decision 1719 ranks and prioritizes risks and vulnerabilities by sector and geography. Vietnam's Decision 1485 provides guidance to select prioritized adaptation options in planning social and economic development plan. The need for improvement in institutional arrangement, budget allocation, climate change database and awareness raising was emphasized as the lessons learned from Vietnam's experience in implementing National Target Program Responding to Climate Change (NTPRCC).¹⁴

- 6.6. In the ensuing questions and answers session, Mr. Alam asked if NAP integration could already be considered in the development stage. Mr. Uprety responded two approaches can be taken: first is integrating NAP in the sectoral process and second is to first prepare NAP and find opportunities for the sectors to integrate NAP into the sectors. Mr. Desanker explained that the guidelines are the outcome of the negotiations and integration work on the ground is flexibility. He suggested that in the first round, countries try to do NAP development first and do integration later, and in the second round, start integration from the beginning. Indonesia recommended involving stakeholders, including the business sector from the beginning gives them an opportunity to learn how to develop the system although they may not be able to understand all the scientific discussion. Indonesia emphasized although this approach takes more time in the beginning but makes integration easier in the longer run.
- 6.7. Malaysia asked to share the experience of the LDCs. Mr. Uprety explained in that Nepal went through an intensive consultation process but it was difficult to internalize the process into the national systems. He said that in general consultation process takes a lot of time and effort in the LDCs. But he added that it differs country by country and the experience from NAPA development may not be adequate for others.
- 6.8. Philippines asked if there is technical assistance in the NAPA process. Mr. Uprety explained that the support is designated for LDCs only for NAPA. For example, 1.3 million USD was provided to Nepal for NAPA preparation. Philippines commented that NAP-GSP has 5 million USD funding for non-LDCs and highlighted the need for technical assistance to do work according to the guidelines in the national and local levels. Mr. Desanker suggested Philippines to first take stock of available resources and identify the needs, such as need of consultants and training. Mr. Hoffmaister noted that there are limitations to fund formulations for non-LDCs under the Special Climate Change Fund and the Global Environment Facility, and added that financing for formulation is under discussion. For example, NAP-GSP for all formulation aspects in elements A and B for non-LDCs is under pipeline, and the Green Climate Fund is considering how to relate to NAP process and will discuss its replenishment process in COP20.
- 6.9. Indonesia asked for the clarification of the meaning of residual impact in terms of appraising adaptation options - if it is unpredicted impact or mal-adaptation. Mr. Alam explained that it is the amount of remaining impacts after reduction made by the intervention as a business as usual through the national strategy to cope with climate change impact. He said all key terminologies are defined in the appendix of the guideline. Philippines asked if residual impact could be understood in terms of current status of technology and what are the existing options

¹⁴ For more information, please see presentation 'Element B: Experience and Lessons Learnt from Implementing NTPRCC in Vietnam' on SEAN-CC website.

to bring minimal residual impact. Mr. Alam responded that countries should look into what options can bring maximum residual impact considering the technological applicability and societal, financial, economic acceptance of the options. Philippines commented as there will be sectors that do not gain from the options, the selection should be based on the priority areas of the development plan. Mr. Alam agreed to the view and suggested countries to check which sector provides highest GDP and supports the local community.

6.10. Indonesia initiated the discussion on how to encourage business and politicians to take part in the process. Philippines suggested forming a partnership with civil society and media to bring in the interest of general public will in turn facilitate the engagement of political and business sector. Thailand said it helped to develop the NAP first to show in details the impact and possible return of investment to the politicians.

6.11. Indonesia asked Thailand how they made prioritization of the options. Thailand answered they made the assessment starting from low to high price to support the decision making.

6.12. Mr. Alam requested Vietnam to share its experience in updating the climate scenarios, focusing on how the process has been institutionalized in Vietnam. Vietnam explained the institutional set up has been done in a comprehensive manner. For example, the Department of Meteorology, Hydrology and Climate Change of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment is in charge of the process. Three agencies within the ministry and leaders from other ministries work together to collect data and such collaboration was shown to be effective. Philippines added that Philippines is also slowly institutionalizing the process and down-scaling the area covered by the climate scenario. Philippines noted that the problem in Philippines is not the in the development of the scenario, rather the utilization of it because every sector needs a tailored approach which the scenario does not provide. Vietnam said it will provide the contact information of the Vietnamese expert who could provide more information on the utilization of the scenario to Philippines.

7. Work Group 2 on Identifying Starting Points for Countries

7.1. All participants divided into country groups and identified the starting points for elements A and B by answering the key questions on each steps. Below is the summary of the discussion.

Element A: Lay the groundwork and address gaps				
	Initiate launch NAP: a. What institutional arrangements are required at the national level to coordinate, lead and monitor the NAP process? b. Which should be the leading/coordinating agency?	Stocktaking NAP: a. What barriers exist to effectively plan for, design and implement adaptation? b. Which should be the leading/coordinating agency?	Address capacity gaps: a. How can enabling institutional and technical capacity gaps best be addressed, which resources are needed? b. Which should be the leading/coordinating agency?	Address development needs: a. What institutions would be best placed for the assessing of climate risks to devilmment needs? b. Which should be the leading/coordinating agency?
Indonesia	a. Legal framework, mechanism and roles/functions, program and operational budget, financial mechanism. b. BAPPENAS, MOE, DNPI, BMKG.	a. Too many documents and approaches. Well established sectoral programs but lack of downscaled nation wide vulnerability and cost-benefit assessments. b. BAPPENAS and all implementing agencies.	a. Enhance coordination through working groups. Involve scientists and experts. Conduct capacity building and research. b. BAPPENAS, MOE, DNPI, BMKG.	a. MOE and BNPB. b. BAPPENAS, MOE, DNPI, BNPB.
Malaysia	a. National steering committee on NAP. b. NRE.	a. Gathering new data and centralizing existing data, coordinating multiple initiatives from different ministries, finance. b. EPU	a. Integration among experts, training technical aspects of NAP. b. NRE.	a. EPU as it is the leading agency for sustainable development. b. EPU.
Myanmar	a. Formulation of national climate change committee and national environment conservation committee. b. MOECAAF with the support of UNEP, EU, GCCA, UNHABITAT.	a. Both funding and technical support. b. UNEP, GEF.	a. Modifying institutional structure, capacity building. b. Line Ministries and UN agencies.	a. ECD, DMH, UN agencies and universities. b. EDC
Philippines	a. Harmonization and clear definition of legal frames and terms of references. b. CCC, NGA.	a. Resources, technical capacity including tools, understanding and application. b. CCC, NGA.	a. Enhanced financial and technical expertise and human resources. b. CCC, NGA.	a. Planning, science and technology departments. Oversight for NDRRMC. b. CCC, OCD, NEDA.
Thailand	a. Law and regulations. b. All organizations	a. Awareness and perception. b. All organizations.	a. Research and development. b. University and experts.	a. Research and development. b. University and experts.
Vietnam	a. NCCC b. NCCC, Climate Change Adaptation group under the Climate Change Working Group of Vietnam	a. Mainstreaming and data synchronizing.	a. Develop regulation of the government to stipulate the coordination among the concerned agencies and ministries.	a. DMHCC

Element B: Preparatory elements					
	Analyze climate scenarios: a. Is there a national institution undertaking climate change scenarios? b. Which should be the leading/ coordinating agency?	Assess vulnerabilities: a. Which institutions would be best placed to identify available information on climate change impacts and vulnerabilities? b. Which should be the leading/ coordinating agency?	Appraise adaptation options: a. what are the main barriers for systematically appraising adaptation options? b. Which institutions are best placed?	Compile NAP: a. How will priority sectoral and subnational adaptation options be aggregated into national adaptation plans? b. Which should be the leading/ coordinating agency?	Integrate climate change adaptation: a. Where are the opportunities for integrating climate change adaptation into development planning? b. How can the process of integration be facilitated? c. Which should be the leading/ coordinating agency?
Indonesia	a. BMKG and universities. b. BMKG.	a. MOE, BNPB and sectoral ministries. b. MOE. * Indonesian Geospatial Information Agency is developing geospatial information.	a. Cost-benefit analysis, sensitivities of adaptation options, contradicting benefits between sectors. b. BAPPENAS, DNPI.	a. Coordination among related sectors and high level meetings under the Coordinating Ministry or President. B. Coordinating Minister for Public Welfare and for Economics.	a. Integration into the Mid-term and Long-term National Development Planning. b. Coordination meeting among ministerial sectors, national agencies and stakeholders. c. BAPPENAS.
Malaysia	a. NAHRIM, IMR, MARDI, MET FRIM, DID and NSC. a. NRE.	a. NAHRIM, IMR, MARDI, MET, FRIM, DID and NSC. b. NRE.	a. Overlap of mandate and functions of the ministries and agencies. b. EPU.	a. Technical working group must incorporate involvement of local authorities. b. National Steering Committee of NAP.	a. Malaysia already began integrating climate change into plans. b. By including NAP into the national development plan and conducting stakeholder consultations. c. EPU.
Myanmar	a. Need to update the scenarios. b. DMH, ECD.	a. MOECAF, MOAI, MLFRD. b. MOECAF with the support of UNEP, EU, FAO, GCCA and UNHABITAT.	a. Policy, awareness, technical and financial resources. b. MCCA.	a. National level workshops. b. MOECAF with the support of UNEP, EU, FAO, GCCA and UNHABITAT.	a. Higher level political will. b. Through Cabinet. c. MOECAF with the support of UNEP, EU, FAO, GCCA and UNHABITAT.

Philippines	a. Yes. b. PAGASA.	a. Sectoral agencies, science and technology agency. For mapping, NAMRIA and MGB. b. CCC and DOST.	a. Lack of vulnerability assessment guidelines and tools. Need to provide decision support system to local governments. b. NGA.	a. Through local development planning and regulatory processes that include incentives for adaptation. b. CCC and other mandated agencies.	a. b. Making enabling environment such as legal basis, indentifying strategies to do mainstreaming and doing institutional adjustment. c. CCC and NGA.
Thailand	a. Not yet. b. Need to establish an organization.	a. ONEP, OAE.	a. Capacity building. b. All organizations.	a. Human or labour impacts.	b. Through NCCC.
Vietnam	a. IMHEN.	a. DMHCC.	a. Indicators. b. DMHCC.	a. Identify priorities by consulting with stakeholders.	a. Regularly updating and revising development plans to integrate the NAP. b. Stakeholder consultations.

Abbreviations and Acronyms:

BAPPENAS: Ministry of National Development Planning of Indonesia
BMKG: Indonesian Agency for Meteorological, Climatological and Geophysics
BNPb: National Agency for Disaster Management of Indonesia
CCC: Climate Change Commission of Philippines
DID: Department of Irrigation and Drainage of Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Malaysia
DMH: Department of Meteorology and Hydrology of Myanmar
DMHCC: Department of Meteorology, Hydrology and Climate Change, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Vietnam
DNPI: National Council on Climate Change of Indonesia
DOST: Department of Science and Technology of Philippines
ECD: Environmental Conservation Department, Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry of Myanmar
EPU: Economic Planning Unit, Prime Minister's Department of Malaysia
FRIM: Malaysia Forest Research Institute Malaysia
GCCA: Global Climate Change Alliance
IMHEN: Vietnam Institute of Meteorology, Hydrology and Environment
IMR: Institute For Medical Research of Malaysia
MARDI: Malaysian Agricultural Research and Development Institute
MCCA: Myanmar Climate Change Alliance
MET: Malaysian Meteorological Department, Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation
MGB: Mines and Geosciences Bureau, Department of Environment and Natural Resources of Philippines
MLFRD: Ministry of Livestocks, Fisheries and Rural Development of Myanmar
MOAI: Ministry of Agriculture and Irrigation of Myanmar
MOE: Ministry of Environment of Indonesia
MOECAF: Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry of Myanmar
NAHRIM: National Hydraulic Research Institute of Malaysia
NAMRIA: The National Mapping and Resource Information Authority of Philippines
NCCC: National Climate Change Committee of Thailand
NCCC: National Committee for Climate Change of Vietnam

NDRRMC: National Disaster Risk Reduction and Management Council of Philippines
NEDA: National Economic and Development Authority of Philippines
NGA: National Government Agency of Philippines
NRE: Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Malaysia
NSC: National Security Council of Malaysia
OAE: Office of Agricultural Economics, Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives of Thailand
OCD: Office of Civil Defense of Philippines
ONEP: Office of Natural Resources and Environmental Policy and Planning, Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment of Thailand
PAGASA: Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration, Department of Science and Technology, Scientific and Technical Services Institutes

8. Elaboration of LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process Element C, Implementation Strategies

8.1. Mr. Verhagen briefed the objectives, activities, expected outputs and outcomes and key questions in developing a long-term adaptation implementation strategy. He explained the elements and goals for the implementation plan and elaborated the four activities that need to be conducted to implement concrete adaptation measures.¹⁵

8.2. Mr. Alam added to Mr. Verhagen's presentation, focusing on the decision making process to choose and appraise adaptation options for identified adaptation problems and the objectives of stakeholder engagement at this stage.¹⁶

8.3. Indonesia presented its experience from developing online climate change vulnerability index. Indonesia is establishing the National Policy on Performance Monitoring and Evaluation System (MONEV) to monitor and evaluate the achievements of the national action plan on climate change adaptation and mitigation. Indonesia also has the Climate Change Risk and Adaptation Assessment Process (KRAPI) to identify vulnerable sectors and integrate adaptation strategies into medium and long-term development policy. Vulnerability index, also called the Climate Change Vulnerability Index Inventory System (SIDIK), is developed based on biophysics and socio-economic indicators, and is used to estimate magnitude of impact due to climate hazards taking into factors such as exposure, sensitivity, capacity and implementation of adaptation actions. It is also used to monitor level of vulnerability at local and national levels, to compare vulnerability levels across time and location, and to check the effectiveness of a development policy. Also, the index is able to assist a country to understand the main drivers of vulnerability, to know relative positions and commonalities of different local communities, to define key policies to support the community, and to understand the factors that inhibit the effectiveness of adaptation actions.¹⁷

8.4. Myanmar shared its experience from its NAPA and Myanmar Climate Change Alliance (MCCA) projects. NAPA in Myanmar was established in June 2013 with the support of UNEP for 8 main sectors. A project is being implemented, called Adapting Community Forestry Landscapes and Associated Community Livelihoods, with the collaboration of environment, forestry and

¹⁵ For more information, please see presentation 'The NAP Technical Guidelines Element C: Implementation Strategies' on SEAN-CC website.

¹⁶ For more information, please see presentation 'The PROVIA Guidance on Assessing Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation to Climate Change Element C' on SEAN-CC website.

¹⁷ For more information, please see presentation 'Element C: Experience and Lessons Learnt from Indonesia's Online Climate Change Vulnerability Index' on SEAN-CC website.

meteorology agencies. As a step up from NAPA, MCCA has been formed with 28 members from 22 ministries and offices. It is chaired by the Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry of Myanmar (MOECAF) and is mandated to mainstream climate change into Myanmar's development policy and reform agenda and prepare national climate change strategy and action plan. Lessons were learned that it is important to build capacity, streamline internal process to make decisions and provide comments, strengthen cooperation and coordination among line ministries, establish climate change unit within departments, strengthen international and regional cooperation and raise awareness.¹⁸

8.5. Malaysia shared its experience with NAHRIM Technical Guide. The guide summarizes climate change projection data into a simple method to calculate future rainfall hence helping the designing of future water infrastructures to endure climate change influence and extreme climate events. It also helps decision makers to estimate the extent of climate change impacts on water resources, thus enabling them to plan and implement appropriate adaptation actions. The calculation is done by multiplying the current rainfall with climate change factor (CCF). Department of Irrigation and Drainage (DID) supports incorporation of CCF in all flood mitigation projects, and maintains web-based public information application on flood and drought which helps communities to develop awareness and resilience and understand actions to take. However, there is a need for more structured approach to enforce laws and guidelines on emphasizing climate change adaptation plans. It could be done in the form of joint enforcement actions, data and information sharing, and delegation of powers to departments. Malaysia concluded that stakeholder participation is vital in adopting, implementing and enforcing policies and laws effectively.¹⁹

9. Elaboration of LEG Technical Guidelines for the NAP Process Element D, Reporting, Monitoring and Review.

9.1. Mr. Uprety explained the objectives, activities, expected outputs and outcomes, and key questions related to the reporting, monitoring and review of the NAP process. He explained how to develop the metrics and gather information on each metrics to measure progress in selected areas. He elaborated the steps to take to monitor, review, update, report and outreach on the NAP process.²⁰

9.2. Mr. Bista, referring to the PROVIA Guidance, elaborated on the purpose of the reporting, monitoring and review, emphasizing that the importance of assessing if the process fulfills the initial aims, engages the team and stakeholders, captures the learning and improve future interventions.²¹

9.3. Thailand presented a case study from its climate change plan in the agricultural sector. Thailand has established Climate Change Alleviation Plan for Agriculture for 2008-2010 and Agriculture Strategic Plan for Climate Change for 2006-2013 with the aim to promote

¹⁸ For more information, please see presentation 'Element C: Experience and Lessons Learnt from Climate Change Tackling Measures Including NAPA and MCCA in Myanmar' on SEAN-CC website.

¹⁹ For more information, please see presentation 'Element C: Experience and Lessons Learnt from NAHRIM Technical Guidance No.1 in Malaysia' on SEAN-CC website.

²⁰ For more information, please see presentation 'The NAP Technical Guidelines Element D: Reporting, Monitoring and Review' on SEAN-CC website.

²¹ For more information, please see presentation 'The PROVIA Guidance on Assessing Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation to Climate Change Element D' on SEAN-CC website.

readiness for climate change adaptation. Thailand monitors on a yearly basis the quality and quantity of projects using Key Performance Indicators (KPI). Plans are reviewed at mid-term or final-term, internally by the planning and evaluation bureau, and externally by the national budget bureau. Review reports are developed and submitted. The plans are updated following the review. SWOT analysis is used at mid-term to identify gaps, while the plans are updated or renewed at the end of the term.²²

9.4. Philippines explained the experience of using Results-Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (RBMES) for NCCAP. RBMES covers all major climate change actions in the Philippines. It has the implementation period of 15 years, and will have an information system which will be managed by the Climate Change Commission. Philippines used a case study from food security sector. RBMES has indicators to evaluate the process, output, outcome and impact, which are used to assess if a specific action is conducive to meeting the ultimate, intermediate and immediate outcomes in various output areas. Based on its experience, Philippines suggested that a monitoring and evaluation systems should be developed in parallel with the plan, and said NCCAP and RBMES still need to be improved to better analyze the evidence of climate change adaptation.²³

9.5. Vietnam shared the lessons learned from implementing the National Target Program Responding to Climate Change (NTPRCC). The Standing Office of NTPRCC formed a monitoring team and performed field trips to monitor and evaluate the implementation of NTPRCC. As a result of two case studies conducted in Quang Nam and Ben Tre provinces, Vietnam formulated a set of indicators. The indicators, which were issued as a Decision by MONRE Minister, are used to evaluate if the objectives of the programs implemented at provincial levels are fulfilled. Vietnam used a four-step method to review the NAPs process: 1) review international experiences in developing action plans, 2) select six good practice to formulate 21 indicators, 3) select nine provinces and evaluate their action plans based on the 21 indicators, 4) conduct field trip to verify the methodology and collect additional information. Vietnam learned that it is important to use climate science effectively, interact with stakeholders, conduct vulnerability and risk assessments, implement recommendations and have a good organization and governance for planning.²⁴

9.6. During the questions and answers session, Vietnam emphasized that monitoring and review is a process that needs a concrete budget plan taking into account stakeholder consultation processes. Vietnam also asked what level of stakeholder engagement is appropriate. Mr. Verhagen said Netherlands put importance in public awareness to find out the needs of the people. Mr. Uprety agreed that it is practically not easy to engage all stakeholders and suggested developing a certain criteria to help identify the group to engage. Mr. Hoffmaister noted that this question is currently being discussed at the negotiations.

9.7. To the question on timescale, Mr. Verhagen highlighted the importance of aligning NAP and National Communication schedules with national planning schedules, and incorporating the annual budget into long term planning.

²² For more information, please see presentation 'Element D: Experience and Lessons Learnt from Agriculture Sector Case Study in Thailand' on SEAN-CC website.

²³ For more information, please see presentation 'Element D: Experience and Lessons Learnt from the Philippines' on SEAN-CC website.

²⁴ For more information, please see presentation 'Element D: Experience and Lessons Learnt from Implementing NTPRCC in Vietnam' on SEAN-CC website.

- 9.8. Philippines asked which NAP processes the Convention includes. Mr. Hoffmaister responded it is up to interpretation, but it should include monitoring, review and evaluation, and mentioned that in practice, some countries take it further than others. Mr. Desanker explained the initial definition in 1996 meant the process to formulate and implement, but current guidelines focus on formation and more guidelines on implementation are expected to be developed.
- 9.9. Myanmar asked for advice if there is better solution than adding monitoring component in every project. Mr. Bista highlighted that NAP should contain the monitoring process as a whole and not on a project basis.
- 9.10. Intense discussions continued on the topic of indicators. Vietnam, noting that Philippines set up indicators for each theme and not for sectors, asked if and how Philippines will combine the indicators. Philippines answered that it aims to aggregate indicators from 2015 so it is useful to assess overall impact of adaptation. Indonesia asked Philippines to clarify the objective and focus of food security indicators. Philippines said the aim is to enhance productivity and resilience, which is further specified as ultimate, intermediate and immediate outcomes. Mr. Alam asked if national data are generated to automatically feed into indicators. Philippines said as current indicators used by departments are not climate change sensitive, it aims to add climate change components to existing indicators and make sectoral level indicators climate change sensitive. Philippines asked Vietnam who does the scoring of the indicators. Vietnam said it sent out questionnaires to all provincial government, conducted interviews in the field with local people, and invited experts to review the scores. Vietnam clarified that low scoring groups have high adaptability regardless whether the group feels the impact of climate change or not. Vietnam admitted the scores in certain regions are not perfectly reliable.

10. Panel discussion on six key issues raised during the workshop

- 10.1. Mr. Alam invited Mr. Desanker, Mr. Hoffmaister, Ms. Uprety, and Mr. Verhagen to help initiate the brainstorming with countries to clarify collectively six key questions raised during the workshop. The key issues are: 1) Distinction between NAPA and NAP: Will financial support continue for planning and implementing both? 2) How to monitor progress of adaptation while it is mainstreamed into national planning, budgeting and implementation processes? 3) How to avoid mal-adaptation while integrating climate change adaptation at sectoral level? 4) How to make case for adaptation and convince the policymakers? 5) What are the co-benefits at different levels and within country and outside country? 6) How to design sustainable technical capacity-building?
- 10.2. Mr. Desanker underlined the importance of understanding why the NAP process is created under the Convention by looking into the negotiation discussions and decisions on NAP and NAPA. The purpose of the NAP process is to reduce vulnerability and integrate climate change into development planning and to ensure it by letting countries to access support under the Convention. Since UNFCCC COP7 in 2001 provided clear guidelines to prepare NAPA, learning took place for almost 15 years and the Least Development Countries Fund (LDCF) was established during this process. LDCF initially supported only the formulation of NAPA but Decisions were soon adopted to support its implementation. As NAPA was intended to meet

the urgent needs of LDCs, the need for more comprehensive and longer term assessment was recognized. The NAP process was established by a Decision in COP16 in 2010 and its details including financial support mechanisms are being worked out every year. Mr. Alam emphasized that both NAPA and NAP process can continue, and countries need to decide how they want to use the instruments in the Convention.

- 10.3. Mr. Uprety suggested countries to explore possibilities of bilateral financial support in addition to multilateral channels to bring in the pledged money, and to monitor finance by tracking through the national expenditure tracking system. Regarding mal-adaptation, he highlighted the need for a guidance that includes its definition and suggested actions. He said developing policy brief documents that include successful case studies and applicable technology could help to convince politicians.
- 10.4. Mr. Verhagen expressed that mal-adaptation is not a good term to use in communication with other communities. He said it is important to correct things while undertaking the process, and monitoring and flexibility is the key. For successful monitoring, countries need to be clear on their target and budget, establish common practices, and revise and use existing system rather than reinvent new ones. He emphasized the importance of setting clear targets and sending a message of co-benefit when engaging private sectors.
- 10.5. Mr. Hoffmaister highlighted coherence between the existing policies and the NAP process as the most important. He echoed integrated national-wide adaptation, although more effective, is harder than standalone projects to monitor, and the common insight gained is that it is important to monitor progress and not only final outputs. He also emphasized it is important to learn from failure, and to do so, the challenge is to make people comfortable to discuss failure, especially as ideas such as mal-adaptation are new and may need few years of learning process. In terms of co-benefit, it is important to identify and drive multiple objectives. The Adaptation Committee views regional collaboration important to technical capacity building.
- 10.6. Mr. Alam opened the floor for countries and individuals. Mr. Heru Santoso of Indonesia echoed convincing politicians is critical, and the key is to find the right person, right issue at the right time. In his experience with an Asian Development Bank project where a Mayor was invited as a reviewer outside of his authority, additional and unexpected co-benefits occurred, for example the mayor got inspirations from this project for his job as Mayor.
- 10.7. Mr. Pongsak Suttinon of Thailand said the NAP is generally a top-down process, but asked if other countries have experience in taking the bottom-up approach at the beginning and co-designing the NAP with the local and public. Mr. Verhagen explained although NAPA was based on a bottom-up approach, NAP is based on a top-down approach as it is linked to national planning. Preparatory Elements in Element B which let countries prioritize adaptation options could be the part to go to the field and get bottom-up approach. Mr. Hoffmaister added it is not only possible, but is also encouraged to engage the public, but the challenge is to maintain the ultimate, long-term goal pertinent to scientific view while bringing together different interests. Mr. Uprety said top-down decision is needed to initiate the bottom-up process, and the right person must be brought in to start the bottom-up process at the right time. Mr. Desanker underlined that the whole process is country driven and the decision is up to the countries. The challenge is rather within the country, to convince the policy makers, develop mandates and drive the action in the country. Ms. Julie Amoroso of Philippines said

Philippines took the participatory approach when developing the NCCAP, including all government agencies and civil society. The challenge Philippines faced was cascading the action down to the local level and building sustained capacity of local participants. Ms. Alicia Ilaga said movement of people could be put in good use if the trained people that move to other agencies could work as champions or focus persons to see that climate change is mainstreamed in the work of their new organizations. Mr. Verhagen and Mr. Hoffmaister underlined that to ensure sustained capacity at the local level, focus of capacity building should not only be on persons, but also on institutions as local participants may not be consistent. Mr. Alam concluded the discussion by highlighting the importance of institutionalizing the NAP process rather than relying only on individual capacity.

11. Work Group 3 on mapping the existing work in the country and estimating the timeframe, resources and support needed to complete the work.

11.1. Please see below table summarizing the response from countries.

* Note: a. Status / b. Timeframe to initiate or improve activities / c. Support or resources required.

Element A: Lay the groundwork and address gaps				
	Step A.1. Initiating and launching	Step A.2. Stocktaking	Step A.3. Addressing capacity gaps	Step A.4. Addressing development needs
Indonesia	a. Improvement needed. b. 5 years. c. Enhanced coordination through working groups, capacity building roadmap, capacity building and research, and financial support.			
Malaysia	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 year. c. National mandate (national steering committee), financial support (national development budget, international funding)	a. Improvement needed. b. 6 months – 1 year. c. Gather all available policies and plans, gather all existing initiatives nationwide.	a. Improvement needed. b. Continuous throughout NAP development process (1-5 years). c. Technical training support and regional and international technical cooperation.	a. Improvement needed. b. 6 months – 1 year. c. Inter-ministry and inter-agency cooperation.
Myanmar	a. Need to initiate. b. 6 months. c. Financial and technical support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year. c. Financial and technical support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 6 months. c. Technical support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year. c. Financial and technical support.
Philippines	a. Adequate.			
Thailand	a. Improvement needed. b. 3 ½ years. c. International and domestic technical support.	a. Improvement needed. b. 6 months. c. Information support.	a. Improvement needed. b. 3 months. c. Support from multi-discipline experts.	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 year. c. Support from multi-discipline experts.

Vietnam	a. Adequate. b. 6 months. c. Finance to formulate NAP.	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 year. c. Technical assistance on vulnerability assessment methodology, workshop to reconcile vulnerability studies.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year. c. Capacity building and training programs for government staff.	a. Adequate. b. 1 year.	
Element B: Lay the groundwork and address gaps					
	Step B.1. Analyzing climate scenarios	Step B.2. Assessing vulnerabilities and identifying adaptation options	Step B.3. Reviewing and appraising adaptation options	Step B.4. Compiling and communicating NAPs	Step B.5. Integrating NAPs into development plans
Indonesia	a. Improvement needed. b. 5 years. c. High resolution climate scenarios, national wide high resolution vulnerability assessment (capturing vulnerability of locals), cost and benefit analysis of adaptation options, technology assessment availability, and financial support.				
Malaysia	a. Improvement needed. b. 6 - 12 months. c. Gather and integrate all climate scenarios and findings.	a. Improvement needed. b. 6 - 12 months. c. Gather and integrate all climate change adaptation and vulnerabilities findings.	a. Improvement needed. b. 6 months. c. One leading agency in national level for coordinating adaptation.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year. c. One leading agency in national level for coordinating NAP preparation.	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 – 5 years. c. National mandate (national steering committee) and financial support (national development budget, international funding).
Myanmar	a. Improvement needed. b. 6 months. c. Technical support.	a. Improvement needed. b. 12 months. c. Technical and financial support.	a. Improvement needed. b. 6 months. c. Technical support.	a. Improvement needed. b. 3 months. c. Technical support.	a. Improvement needed. b. 12 months. c. Technical support.
Philippines	a. Improvement needed. b. Urgent, within 6 months. c. Technical (scientific knowledge and expertise) and financial support, domestic and external sources.	Vulnerability assessment: a. Improvement needed. b. 2014 – 2017. c. Technical and financial support. Identifying options: a. Improvement needed. b. 2014 – 2019. c. Complete Vulnerability assessment for various levels and sectors.	a. Improvement needed. b. 2014 – 2019. c. Scoping of technologies, practices, tools. Domestic and external sources.	a. Improvement needed. b. 2014 – 2019. c. Technical and financial support. Accomplish previous steps. Domestic sources.	a. Improvement needed. b. 2014 – 2019. c. Technical and financial support. Accomplish previous steps. Domestic sources.

Thailand	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 year. c. Information support (General Circulation Models)	a. Improvement needed. b. 2 years. c. Technical and financial, international and domestic support. Multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 3 months. c. Multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year + c. Technical and financial, international and domestic support. Multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 2 year + c. Capacity building.
Vietnam	a. Adequate. b. 2 years. c. Funding to update climate scenarios regularly.	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 year. c. Vulnerability assessment methodology, indicators to evaluate effectiveness of adaptation options.	a. Need to initiate. b. 2 years. c. Indicators to evaluate effectiveness of adaptation options.	a. Not available.	a. Improvement needed. b. 3 years. c. Mainstreaming guidance.
Element C: Implementation strategies.					
Step C.1. Prioritizing adaptation in national planning.		Step C.2. Developing a long-term national implementation strategy.	Step C.3. Enhancing capacity for planning and implementing.	Step C.4. Promoting coordination and synergy at regional level.	
Indonesia	a. Improvement needed. b. 5 years. c. Promote coordination across sector and themes, develop appraisal instrument (economic and socio-environmental tools), and improve technology needs assessment on adaptation.				
Malaysia	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 – 5 years. c. National mandate (national steering committee) and financial support (national development budget, international funding).	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 – 5 years. c. Integrate, evaluate and prioritize implementation strategies in all local governments, department and ministries.	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 – 5 years. c. Assess and identify training needs at sectoral and sub-national level on NAP.	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 – 5 years. c. One leading agency in national level for coordinating NAP implementation, one resource agency focusing on NAP outreach programme and seeking international support.	
Myanmar	a. Need to initiate. b. 12 months. c. Technical support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 24 months. c. Financial and technical support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 18 months. c. Financial and technical support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 24 months. c. Financial and technical support.	
Philippines	a. Improvement needed. b. 2014 – 2017. c. Mainstream and integrate various levels across government. Technical and financial support.	a. Adequate.	a. Improvement needed. b. Continuing. c. Technical and financial, international and domestic support.	a. Improvement needed. b. Continuing. c. Technical and financial, international and domestic support. Peer to peer learning process.	

Thailand	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year. c. Support from multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year. c. Technical and financial, international and domestic support. Multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year + c. Technical and financial, international and domestic support. Multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 2 year + c. Technical and financial, international and domestic support. Multidisciplinary experts.
Vietnam	a. Adequate. b. 1 year.	a. Need to initiate. b. 2 year. c. Solution for resource mobilization.	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 year.	a. Improvement needed. b. 3 years.
Element D: Reporting, monitoring and review.				
Step D.1. Monitoring.		Step D.2. Reviewing.	Step D.3. Updating.	Step D.4. Reporting.
Indonesia	a. Improvement needed (SIDIK, social and economic stage). b. 5 years. c. Economic instrument to support impact evaluation (cost and benefit) at the national level, enhance government system.			
Malaysia	a. Need to initiate. b. Periodical review and update of NAP (1-2 years / 1-3 years) c. Integrate existing monitoring processes in ministries and agencies.	a. Need to initiate. b. Periodical review and update of NAP (1-2 years / 1-3 years) c. Integrate existing monitoring processes in ministries and agencies.	a. Need to initiate. b. Periodical review and update of NAP (1-2 years / 1-3 years) c. Monitoring and evaluation.	a. Need to initiate. b. Continuous process after NAP development (1-5 years). c. National focal point on NAP to submit and disseminate NAP to stakeholders.
Myanmar	a. Need to initiate. b. 24 months. c. Technical and financial support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 9 months. c. Technical and financial support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 9 months. c. Technical support.	a. Need to initiate. b. 30 months. c. Technical support.
Philippines	a. Improvement needed. b. By end of 2015. c. Technical in terms of refining and identifying metrics vis a vis the development plan. Domestic support.	a. Improvement needed. b. By end of 2016. c. Technical, domestic support.	a. Need to initiate. b. By end of 2015. c. Technical, domestic support.	a. Need to initiate. b. By end of 2016. c. In the pipeline (creation of an online platform to engage key stakeholders). International and domestic support.
Thailand	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year + c. Technical support. Multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year + c. Technical support. Multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 3-5 years. c. Technical support. Multidisciplinary experts.	a. Need to initiate. b. 1 year. c. Technical support. Multidisciplinary experts.
Vietnam	a. Improvement needed. b. 3 years.	a. Improvement needed. b. 1 year.	a. Need to initiate. b. 2 years.	

12. Closing remarks and wrap-up

- 12.1. Mr. Alam remarked huge amount of information has been produced during the three days which provided a good learning experience for both the country and resource people sides. Mr. Verhagen agreed that information and data are important, and solutions can be found in

other country experiences, especially from the North. Mr. Desanker stated that doing work through consultants is not sustainable and it is important to have a plan in place for sustainability. He expressed the progress in Southeast Asia was impressive. Mr. Uprety encouraged the continuation of such LDC and Non-LDC forums as it is a good example of South-South cooperation and good opportunity for LDCs to learn from Non-LDCs and vice versa.

12.2. Malaysia commented that Malaysia benefited greatly from other country presentations, learned the strengths and benefits of work that has already been done, and got a better understanding of the future work that needs to be done in Malaysia. Thailand added that it was good to have this workshop before Thailand developed the NAP as now Thailand is better aware of the options to choose from.

12.3. Mr. Alam invited the participants to evaluate the workshop via the evaluation questionnaire that has been distributed, thanked the country participants, resource people, Finland the donor and closed the meeting hoping the participants keep in touch with partners and continue the sharing of ideas.

Annex 1: Workshop agenda

DAY 1 - 14 July 2014	
9:00-9:30	Registration
SESSION 1	Inauguration and opening
9:30-10:00	<p>Welcome and introduction Mozaharul Alam, UNEP Paul Desanker, UNFCCC Juan Hoffmaister, UNFCCC Adaptation Committee Batu Uprety, LEG</p>
10:00-10:15	<p>Training workshop objectives, ground rules, participants introduction Prakash Bista, UNEP</p>
10:15-10:45	<i>Group Photo and tea/coffee break</i>
SESSION 2	Putting the NAP process in perspective
10:45-11:15	<p>Panel Discussion - Importance of mainstreaming CC Adaptation in National Development Plans Pham Thi Thanh Hang, UNISDR Jan Verhagen, LEG Puja Sawhney, APAN Julie Amoroso, Philippines Juan Hoffmaister, UNFCCC Adaptation Committee</p>
11:15-12:30	<p>Table Work Group Challenge - Participants will carry out discussions at their tables on the key opportunities and challenges anticipated in linking NAP to existing broader development processes, as well as their proposed solutions for overcoming these challenges. They will write the challenges and solutions on worksheets that will be distributed to feed into 'Way forward', Session 7. Outcomes of this discussion will be used throughout the training workshop during panel discussion and group works.</p>
12:30-13:30	<i>Lunch break</i>
13:30-14:00	<p>Presentation on NAP process Batu Uprety, LEG</p>
14:00-14:30	<p>Introduction to the UNFCCC/LEG technical guidelines Jan Verhagen, LEG</p>
14:30-15:00	<i>Tea/coffee break</i>
SESSION 3	Elaboration of Element A of the LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process
15:00-15:45	<p><i>(FORMAT: A 'LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process' presentation sets the stage and a follow up presentation by providing principles, approaches, methods, and tools for the each element/steps. Country discussions then support or provide examples of how those or other strategies and/or tools were applied, etc.)</i></p> <p>Elaboration of LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process - Element A: 'Laying the groundwork' Jan Verhagen, LEG</p> <p>Connecting Element A: 'Laying the groundwork' with principles, approaches, methods and tools Mozaharul Alam, UNEP (for PROVIA)</p>
15:45-16:45	<p>Experiences followed by Q&A Discussant 1: Indonesia Discussant 2: Philippines Discussant 3: Malaysia</p>
16:45-17:00	<p>Take stock of the day's activities - what have we learnt, what went well, what can be improved etc.</p>
19:30-	Reception dinner

Day 2, 15 July 2014	
9:00-9:15	Objectives of the day and housekeeping (any changes in plans, etc.)
SESSION 4	Elaboration of Element B of the LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process
9:15-10:00	<p><i>(FORMAT: A 'LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process' presentation sets the stage and a follow up presentation by providing principles, approaches, methods, and tools for the each element/steps. Country discussions then support or provide examples of how those or other strategies and/or tools were applied, etc.)</i></p> <p>Elaboration of LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process - Element B: 'Preparatory elements' Batu Uprety, LEG</p> <p>Connecting Element B: 'Preparatory elements' with principles, approaches, methods and tools Prakash Bista, UNEP (for PROVIA)</p>
10:00-10:30	<i>Tea/coffee break</i>
10:30-11:30	<p>Country experiences followed by Q&A (focus on needs and challenges to undertake VIA for assessing long term impacts)</p> <p>Discussant 1: Thailand Discussant 2: Myanmar Discussant 3: Vietnam</p>
11:30-12:45	<p>Group work 1: Identifying starting points for countries <i>Facilitator provides overall guidance on the group work activities and lays the objectives: - Identification of entry points for NAPs, - Identification of key national development strategies, ministries and champion and mechanisms to promote NAPs. Participants will be provided with guiding questions on a worksheet to identify current country setup. These, in addition to the worksheets from Day 1 will serve as a basis for 'Way forward' group work in Session 7.</i></p> <p><i>A rapporteur will be assigned per group who will record the results from the discussions on a flipchart and present in plenary at the end of the session.</i></p>
12:45-13:45	<i>Lunch break</i>
SESSION 5	Elaboration of Element C of the LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process
13:45-14:30	<p><i>(FORMAT: A 'LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process' presentation sets the stage and a follow up presentation by providing principles, approaches, methods, and tools for the each element/steps. Country discussions then support or provide examples of how those or other strategies and/or tools were applied, etc.)</i></p> <p>Elaboration of LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process - Element C: 'Implementation strategies' Jan Verhagen, LEG</p> <p>Connecting Element C: 'Implementation strategies' with principles, approaches, methods and tools Mozaharul Alam, UNEP (for PROVIA)</p>
14:30-15:00	<i>Tea/coffee break</i>
15:00-16:00	<p>Country experiences followed by Q&A (focus on prioritizing climate change adaptation in national planning and coordination at regional level and with MEAs)</p> <p>Discussant 1: Indonesia Discussant 2: Myanmar Discussant 3: Malaysia</p>
16:00-16:15	Take stock of the day's activities - what have we learnt, what went well, what can be improved

Day 3, 16 July 2014	
9:00-9:15	Objectives of the day and housekeeping (any changes in plans, etc.)
SESSION 6	Elaboration of Element D of the LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process
9:15-10:15	<p><i>Session Objective - Participants have greater understanding of the NAP Technical guidelines as it relates to 'Reporting, Monitoring and Review' element. In particular, Monitoring the NAP process; Reviewing and assessing progress, effectiveness and gaps; Iteratively updating the NAP process; and Outreach and reporting on progress and effectiveness.</i></p> <p><i>(FORMAT: A 'LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process' presentation sets the stage and a follow up presentation by providing principles, approaches, methods, and tools for the each element/steps. Country discussions then support or provide examples of how those or other strategies and/or tools were applied, etc.)</i></p> <p>Elaboration of LEG technical guidelines for the NAP process - Element D: 'Reporting, Monitoring and Review' Batu Uprety, LEG</p> <p>Connecting Element D: 'Reporting, Monitoring and Review' with principles, approaches, methods and tools Prakash Bista, UNEP (for PROVIA)</p>
10:15-10:30	<i>Tea/coffee break</i>
10:30-11:30	<p>Country experiences followed by Q&A (focus on M&E systems and iteratively updating NAPs) Discussant 1: Thailand Discussant 2: Philippines Discussant 3: Vietnam</p>
SESSION 7	Addressing the key issues raised
11:30-12:30	<p>Panel discussion</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Distinction between NAPA and NAP: Will financial support continue for planning and implementing both? How to monitor progress of adaptation while it mainstreamed into national planning, budgeting and implementation processes? How to avoid maladaptation while integrating climate change adaptation at sectoral level? How to make case for adaptation and convincing to the policymakers? What are the co-benefits at different levels and within country and outside country? How to design sustainable technical capacity-building? <p>Panel Members Paul Desanker, UNFCCC Juan Hoffmaister, UNFCCC Adaptation Committee Batu Uprety, LEG Jan Verhagen, LEG</p> <p>Q&A: All participants</p>
12:30-13:30	<i>Lunch break</i>

SESSION 8	Way forward
13:30-14:45	<p>Group work 2: Way Forward - NAP process in the national context <i>Brainstorm on identifying actions to advance NAP process in country; identification of actions that can be undertaken with countries' own resources (technical and financial), and those that need external resources, and development of a timetable.</i></p> <p><i>(FORMAT: Participants will remain in country groups; a resource person will be assigned as a rapporteur for each table. Rapporteurs will go over the worksheets from Day 1 for each country and record discussions on actions. Action matrix template will be distributed for compilation. Rapporteurs or country representatives will present their work in plenary - approximately 5 minutes each - at the end of the session and take questions)</i></p>
14:45-15:00	<i>Tea/coffee break</i>
15:00-15:45	Group work 2: Way Forward - continued
15:45-16:00	Closing Country perspectives on what went well and what could have been improved, Closing remarks from Mozaharul Alam, UNEP
16:00-16:15	Workshop evaluation - feedback via questionnaire

Annex 2: List of participants

Indonesia

Mr. Ari Mochamad Arif
Secretary
Working Group on Adaptation, National Council on Climate Change
Email: arimocha@dnpi.go.id, arimocha71@gmail.com

Mr. Arif Wibowo
Head
Division for Climate Change Vulnerability, Ministry of Environment
Email: arifwibowo2020@gmail.com

Mr. Heru Santoso
Head
Division on Earth and Spatial Planning, Geotechnology Research Centre
Indonesian Institute of Sciences
Email: therunoff.gm@gmail.com

Malaysia

Mr. Muhammad Ridzwan Bin Ali
Environmental Management and Climate Change
Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment
Email: ridzwan@nre.gov.my

Ms. Intirani Suppramaniam
Assistant Director
Department of Irrigation and drainage
Email: intirani.water@1govuc.gov.my

Ms. Nur Aiza Binti Mohamad
National Hydraulic Research Institute of Malaysia (NAHRIM)
Email: nuraiza@nahrim.gov.my

Myanmar

Mr. Hlaing Min Maung
Deputy Director
Environment Division, Planning and Statistics Department
Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry
Email: dgpsmof@mptmail.net.mm, hminmaung@gmail.com

Mr. San Win
Assistant Director
Environmental Conservation Department
Ministry of Environment Conservation and Forestry
Email: sanwin.fd@gmail.com, env.myan@mptmail.net.mm

Ms. Nyunt Khaing
Assistant Lecturer, PhD
University of Forestry
Ministry of Environmental Conservation and Forestry
Email: nyuntkhaing@gmail.com

Philippines

Ms. Julie Amoroso
Climate Change Commission
Email: amoroso.julie@gmail.com, julie.amoroso@climate.gov.ph

Ms. Alicia Ilaga
Director
Systems -wide Climate Change Office
Department of Agriculture
Email: dappo_climatechange@yahoo.com, aliceilaga@gmail.com

Mr. Lev Nikko M. Macalintal
Department of Agriculture
Email: nixmacalintal@gmail.com

Ms. Jesusa Roque
Engineer III
Policy and Program Division of the National Water Resources Board
Email: jessy_1221@yahoo.com

Thailand

Mr. Pongsak Suttinon
Department of Water Resources Engineering
Faculty of Engineering
Chulalongkorn University
Email: pongsak_suttinon@yahoo.com, pongsak.su@chula.ac.th

Mr. Napat Ouichaoren
Economist Practitioner Level
Office of Agricultural Economics
Email: napatoui@outlook.com

Vietnam

Mr. Nguyen Khanh Toan

Official

Adaptation Division, Department of Meteorology, Hydrology and Climate Change

Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

Email: toan.nk99@gmail.com

Mr. Pham Vinh Phong

Deputy Director

Planning and Finance Division, Department of Meteorology

Hydrology and Climate Change

Ministry of Natural Resources and Environment

Email: vinhphong@gmail.com

Mr. Nguyen Van Huy

Email: nguyenvantue.hms@gmail.com, nguyenvantue.hms@gmail.com, nvhuy.monre@gmail.com

Resource Person

Mr. Paul Desanker

Manager

National Adaptation Plans and Policy, Adaptation Programme

United Nations Climate Change Secretariat

Email: pdesanker@unfccc.int

Mr. Batu Krishna Uprety

Expert Member, Climate Change Council &

Chair, LDC Expert Group

Email: upretybk@gmail.com

Mr. Adrianus Verhagen

Wageningen University

Plant Research International Business Unit Agrosystems Research

Member, LDC Expert Group

Email: jan.verhagen@wur.nl

Ms. Puja Sawhney

Coordinator

Regional Hub for Asia Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN)

Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, Bangkok Regional Center

Bangkok, Thailand

Email: sawhney@iges.or.jp

Ms. Pham Thanh Hang
Programme Officer
United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR)
Asia Pacific Secretariat
Bangkok, Thailand
Email: phamh@un.org

Mr. Juan Hoffmaister
Co-chair of the UNFCCC Adaptation Committee
Email: juan.hoffmaister@me.com

UNEP

Mr. Mozaharul Alam
Regional Climate Change Coordinator
UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Email: mozaharul.alam@unep.org

Mr. Prakash Bista
Consultant
UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Email: bista5@un.org

Ms. Jiwon Rhee
Consultant
UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Email: rheej@un.org

Ms. Krittika Kleesuwan
Secretary
UNEP Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific
Email: krittika.kleesuwan@unep.org