



# Global Environment Facility

GEF/R.5/12.Rev.1  
May 29, 2009

---

Second Meeting for the Fifth Replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund  
June 25–26, 2009  
Washington DC

## DRAFT ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE PROGRAMMING STRATEGY

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As a Financial Mechanism of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, the GEF has a unique mandate to assist the developing countries. With respect to adaptation, the role of the GEF has been recently enhanced by the following factors: the scientific evidence on the impacts of climate change has reached an unprecedented level of international consensus and awareness; developing country demand for adaptation funding has grown exponentially as well as the estimated costs of adaptation; and the UNFCCC has provided clear guidance to the GEF on adaptation, underlining its responsibility to assist developing countries to meet the goals of the Convention.

The GEF financial commitments have in turn reflected this guidance: (i) After COP7, during GEF-3, the Council approved the allocation of \$50 million for a pilot program on adaptation under the climate change focal area, the *Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA)*; (ii) the UNFCCC created, and the GEF now manages, the *Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)* and the *Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)*; and (iii) the GEF provides secretariat services on an interim basis to the *Adaptation Fund Board* of the Kyoto Protocol, after being initially invited to carry out this function at the 2007 Bali UNFCCC COP.

The GEF is currently managing under the Climate Convention two independent Funds whose priority is adaptation, in addition to its conventional operations under the GEF Trust Fund. In order to avoid duplication between the GEF and the new Funds, it is proposed to channel all adaptation financing resources through the LDCF and the SCCF. The mandate of the SCCF is broad enough to incorporate the category of projects that were financed thus far under the SPA.

The *Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)* and the *Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)* are currently the only of the existing funds whose mandate has been defined under the Climate Convention. The main rationale for establishing and maintaining these Funds is based on the experience that business-as-usual development, currently financed by multilateral agencies, among others, does not systematically incorporate climate change risks and adaptation measures to reduce vulnerability and increase the adaptive capacity of vulnerable countries and communities. New and additional financing is needed and a different approach to development – to make it climate-resilient – must be implemented. The GEF will therefore continue to play a pivotal role in the multilateral community to trigger climate-resilient development financing and operations.

Finally, based on Convention guidance, responsiveness to developing countries' needs – including predictability of resources – and a commitment to complementarity and maximization of GEF-managed funds and resources, this strategy includes a request for a strong replenishment of the *Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)* and the *Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)*. To fund the LDCF and the SCCF at the appropriate level, it is proposed that these funds be replenished on a four-year cycle concomitant with the replenishment of the GEF Trust Fund.

## Table of Contents

I – BACKGROUND: THE ROLE OF THE GEF ON ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Scientific Consensus on Climate Change Adaptation, Impacts and Vulnerability.....	1
Evolution of UNFCCC Guidance to the GEF on Adaptation.....	2
Adaptation Economics and the Gap between Supply and Demand.....	2
II – FINANCING ADAPTATION ACTION: ADAPTATION PILOT AND CLIMATE CHANGE FUNDS.....	3
Adaptation in Practice.....	4
Climate-Resilient Development.....	4
Additional Costs of Adaptation — the Basis for GEF Financing under the LDCF/SCCF.....	5
Estimating the Costs of Adaptation .....	5
Innovative Features of LDCF and SCCF.....	6
III – GEF ADAPTATION STRATEGY IN 2010–2014 Goal, Impact, Objectives, Outcomes, Scope and Activities .....	6
Proposed Innovative Features of the LDCF and the SCCF .....	7
Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF).....	9
LDCF Activities.....	10
LDCF Financing Needs .....	11
Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) .....	13
SCCF Activities .....	14
SCCF Financing Needs.....	15
IV – RATIONALE FOR STRATEGY.....	16
Responsiveness to UNFCCC Guidance.....	16
Complementarity among Different Adaptation-Related Funds .....	17
V – CONCLUSION.....	18

Annex I: Result-Based Management Framework Adaptation to Climate Change

Annex II: Compilation of UNFCCC Guidance

## **I – BACKGROUND: THE ROLE OF THE GEF ON ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE**

### **Introduction**

1. The recognition that the GEF has a role in financing adaptation to climate change, consistent with its mandate under the Climate Convention, goes back to the early evolution of guidance to the financial mechanism under the UNFCCC. According to the GEF Operational Strategy, approved by the Council in 1995, “*the strategic thrust of GEF-financed climate change activities is to support sustainable measures that minimize climate change damage by reducing the risk, or the adverse effects, of climate change. The GEF will finance agreed and eligible enabling, mitigation, and adaptation activities in eligible recipient countries.*” In particular, the Strategy defines “*adaptation activities*” as those that “*minimize the adverse affects of climate change*”. The Strategy called for a staged process of GEF support: an initial stage to finance studies, assessments and capacity building, followed by an implementation stage to finance adaptation measures. The latter was based on Articles 4.1. and 4.4 of the Convention, which identified the needs for financing specific adaptation measures (e.g., insurance) to assist vulnerable developing countries to meet the costs of adaptation.

2. The GEF Council, consistent with this guidance, initially envisioned support for the costs of adaptation through the GEF as reflected in the Operational Strategy. The Parties to the UNFCCC, however, subsequently established several dedicated adaptation funds and asked the GEF to manage them, making the financial landscape for adaptation more complex and comprehensive.

### **Scientific Consensus on Climate Change Adaptation, Impacts and Vulnerability**

3. In parallel with the evolution in Convention guidance, scientific understanding of climate impacts also dramatically increased awareness and concern for the need to respond to climate change. The publication of the Fourth Assessment Report of the IPCC in 2007 summarized the increasing scientific evidence of the observed increase in global average temperatures due to the increase in anthropogenic GHG concentrations since mid-20<sup>th</sup> century. In addition, the report emphasized the urgency of actions to avoid irreversible damage to human communities, development sectors and ecosystems based on the scientific consensus that, even if the international community commits to aggressively mitigate GHG emissions, climate change impacts will continue for many decades.

4. More scientific research is expected to further explore the impacts of climate change on the oceans and ocean life, and the possible negative feedbacks on terrestrial life. Early results of research on impacts of climate change on the oceans suggest that even the IPCC thresholds of +2°C temperature change and 450ppm atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration would likely be catastrophic for much marine life.

5. What is certain, so far, is that poorer countries and poorer communities within developing countries will be the ones most adversely affected and least able to respond to the effects of climate change.

### **Evolution of UNFCCC Guidance to the GEF on Adaptation**

6. In response to this increasing scientific concern, recent Convention guidance to the GEF has focused primarily on adaptation. This guidance addresses both the impacts of climate change on human life and development, as well as on vulnerable ecosystems, and also responds to assessments showing the costs of adaptation to developing countries (estimated to amount to several tens of billions of dollars). The GEF has made a series of financial and operational commitments based on this guidance: (i) in 2003 the GEF Council approved the allocation of \$50 million under the climate change focal area for a pilot adaptation program, the *Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA)* during GEF-3; (ii) at COP7 in 2001, the UNFCCC created and asked the GEF to manage two voluntary adaptation Funds, the *Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)* and the *Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)*; and (iii) at the 2007 Bali UNFCCC COP, the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol asked the GEF to provide secretariat services to the Adaptation Fund on an interim basis, and in 2008 in Poznan, the Parties agreed to a Memorandum of Understanding between the COP and the GEF Council regarding secretariat services to the Adaptation Fund Board. The GEF is therefore currently managing under the Climate Convention two independent Funds (LDCF and SCCF) whose priority is adaptation, in addition to its conventional operations under the GEF Trust Fund. In order to avoid duplication between the GEF and the new Funds, it is proposed to channel all adaptation financing resources through the LDCF and the SCCF.

### **Adaptation Economics and the Gap between Supply and Demand**

7. Several studies have recently made preliminary estimates of the costs of adaptation and agree on the following conclusions: climate change is ongoing and further significant impacts are now inevitable; the costs of adaptation are difficult to estimate, as they depend on many factors, including mitigation scenarios and the timing and manner in which adaptation measures are locally implemented; the costs will be high, on the order of tens of billions of dollars per year; and these estimates are still very rough. These figures validate the developing countries' request for a much more significant level as well as predictability of resources for adaptation under the Convention, its Funds and its Financial Mechanism, particularly when combined with findings that the climate change is already affecting the lives of the poorest and most vulnerable.

8. *GEF Research on Adaptation Economics.* To advance the understanding of climate risks and responses, the GEF has embarked on a major study with McKinsey & Company to investigate the economics of climate adaptation (the ECA study), in partnership with UNEP, Swiss Re, and the Rockefeller Foundation. An analytical framework, developed specifically for this study, is being applied in developing and developed countries, through a diverse set of case studies. The framework identifies where and from which type of hazard a country is most at risk, together with the magnitude of the expected loss, and reveals what sets of adaptation measures should be considered, based on the societal costs and benefits of implementing the measures. These, in turn, can readily become primary inputs in adaptation strategies developed by individual countries. The key contributions to the global adaptation challenge being provided by

ECA are: a) the production of a holistic analysis linking climate hazards to adaptation measures; b) results that allow for consistent comparison of adaptation measures across different types of hazards and across different sectors (informing trade-offs of adaptation measures across sectors); and c) outcomes applicable to both the developing and the developed world.

9. Some early findings are already generating important insights. In Mali, for instance, ECA focused on climate zone shift hazard (i.e., changes in average temperature and precipitation) to model crop and livestock loss valuations under two economic growth pathway sets of assumptions. In the worst case climate change scenario, the value of five main crops could decrease by 18% and livestock by 7%. The work on the measures builds on Mali's NAPA. Measures can be classified into two main themes: (1) optimizing location and mix of activities; and (2) technical adaptation of the land use system. Implementation of a collection of measures within these themes will likely provide benefits larger than potential loss due to climate zone shift. Without considering additional revenue (e.g., cash crops), low-tech behavioral measures such as low tillage, zai (i.e., planting seeds in holes to force rainwater penetration), level curves and open wells appear the most cost-effective.

10. The analysis suggests vaccines are the most cost-effective way to address impacts on livestock. In Florida, the probabilistic loss assessment from hurricane risk is driven by sea surface temperature and sea level rise assumptions. ECA's preliminary assessment suggests significantly increased risk in 2030, with annual expected loss equivalent to 9.4% of GDP. To address this risk, measures such as beach nourishment, building code bundles, and top layer risk transfer appear the most cost-effective. Considering how these tropical storm lessons apply to the developing world in terms of planned coastal growth in the future, will be a key next step for the ECA analysis.

## **II – FINANCING ADAPTATION ACTION: ADAPTATION PILOT AND CLIMATE CHANGE FUNDS**

11. Through the Adaptation Pilot under the GEF Trust Fund, the LDCF and the SCCF, the GEF has financed the first concrete adaptation measures on the ground, gathered experience, and learned valuable lessons regarding actions to reduce vulnerability in core development sectors such as agriculture, water and health. As of May, 29, 63 adaptation projects have been approved for funding (Work Program/CEO endorsed), including 22 under the SPA, 26 under the LDCF<sup>1</sup>, and 15 under the SCCF<sup>2</sup>. Yet, pledged resources – only \$176.5 and \$121 million so far respectively for the LDCF and the SCCF – remain very limited, and more so in terms of actually available resources. SPA resources have all been committed, and there is currently a large unmet demand from the most vulnerable countries.

12. The experience and lessons learned through these programs and projects have been pivotal to help the GEF and its agencies better understand what adaptation means in practice, e.g., how adaptation can be integrated into development to make it climate-resilient, and how to estimate the costs of adaptation. Based on its broad experience at the operational, technical and

---

<sup>1</sup> Three more projects have been cleared for Work Program inclusion.

<sup>2</sup> Six more full-sized projects have been cleared for the SCCF Work Program for the June 2009 Council, and one medium-sized project has been cleared for CEO endorsement preparation.

policy levels, the GEF remains uniquely qualified to manage a larger amount of adaptation resources to respond to countries' adaptation needs. This strategy focuses on building on the pilot experience and scaling up through a robust replenishment of the funds. Initial evaluations and reactions from both donors and client countries agree on the need to move from a project-based approach to a more programmatic, sectoral or national level, to maximize the impact of the LDCF/SCCF resources and fully mainstream adaptation into development. Another important lesson learned from the initial phase in managing the Funds is that both the amount and predictability of resources are important. The Funds have mainly suffered from the fact that countries and agencies were never able to predict and therefore program the amount of resources available. This strategy is therefore based on the need for sufficient and predictable resources for adaptation.

### **Adaptation in Practice**

13. One of the main accomplishments of the GEF adaptation program has been to test and demonstrate adaptation in practice. The literature is quite exhaustive with respect to defining and measuring different aspects and levels of vulnerabilities, but is less generous in providing examples and guidance on how to plan and implement adaptation actions. This is mostly because the effectiveness of adaptation measures must be tested on the ground and lessons must be learned by doing. In some areas, such as water resources and coastal management, cross-sectoral tools such as Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) and Integrated Coastal Management (ICM) show promise for sustaining protein provisions from fisheries and introducing efficient irrigation for food crops.

14. The LDCF and the SCCF, together with the experience from the pilot projects financed under the SPA, are a unique source of practical operational knowledge. They provided vulnerable countries and communities, as well as the GEF network of agencies who assisted them, initial resources to finance a pioneering adaptation portfolio. This experience has resulted in a much clearer sense of what adaptation means in practice, how to implement it, and how to estimate its costs. The strategy proposed in this document is consistent with these findings, as briefly summarized below.

### **Climate-Resilient Development**

15. The LDCF and the SCCF have been operational for only a few years, however many relevant lessons have already been learned. The Funds were established to support projects aimed at reducing vulnerability and increasing the adaptive capacity to climate change by financing the implementation of adaptation measures as part of efforts to foster *climate-resilient development and ecosystem resiliency*. The first lesson learned was how to put in practice the initial concrete actions on the ground, and to use the available knowledge about vulnerability as the basis for proactive, preventive adaptation actions. GEF agencies and vulnerable governments and communities collaborated together in defining how to protect human needs essential for continued development (e.g., water resources and drinking water supplies, food security and health) when threatened by the adverse impacts of climate change. Adaptation was viewed and applied in the context of development and was not addressed in isolation.

16. To achieve the objective of climate-resilient development, climate change adaptation

interventions (i.e., climate change risk-response measures) were integrated into national development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions. In the case of the LDCF, the proposed approach for effective implementation of NAPAs was to integrate urgent and immediate adaptation measures into the development activities of each LDC, taking into account national circumstances and economic and social priorities.

17. For example, in Bhutan, where river valleys are prone to massive floods when Himalayan glaciers reach critical thresholds, an LDCF project has helped to finance adaptation measures to increase disaster risk management capacity in affected valleys (including the integration of climate change risks), and to implement artificial lowering of water level in glacial lakes and creating early warning systems. The integration of all these measures into existing development plans resulted in a decreased risk of expected significant destruction of agricultural areas, and prevention/ limitation of human and economic losses.

18. In Cambodia, an LDCF project addresses vulnerabilities shared by many countries around the world. As the country's agriculture sector is prone to both drought and floods, adaptation measures include: training of 'adaptation experts' in agricultural extension teams; implementation of pilot projects in local communities; rainwater harvesting techniques; measures to decrease soil erosion and preserve genetic diversity in rice agriculture; changed design of reservoirs and irrigation channels to prevent risks from increased peak flows; and lessons learned disseminated to national and international levels. Both projects are being implemented by UNDP.

### **Additional Costs of Adaptation — the Basis for GEF Financing under the LDCF/SCCF**

19. Addressing the adverse impacts of climate change imposes an additional cost on vulnerable countries in their effort to achieve their development goals. In the context of the Funds, the term *additional costs* was adopted and defined to mean the costs imposed on vulnerable countries to meet their adaptation needs due to the adverse impacts of climate change<sup>3</sup>. Access to LDCF/SCCF resources is justified by identifying and meeting the costs of adaptation defined as *additional costs over business as usual*. Activities that would be implemented in the absence of climate change constitute a project *baseline*, (*or business-as-usual*) and the costs of achieving this development scenario are referred to as baseline costs or *baseline/business-as-usual financing*. The altered plan of action required to implement adaptation measures needed to reduce vulnerability, build adaptive capacity, and an overall increase of resilience to climate change comprises the LDCF/SCCF financed *adaptation project or program*.

### **Estimating the Costs of Adaptation**

20. In practice, it may be difficult to assess *ex-ante* the additional cost of adaptation, as the construction of detailed baseline and adaptation scenarios can be quite complex, time-consuming, and imprecise. Consequently, to simplify the estimate of the additional costs, vulnerable countries have successfully used the option of a sliding scale or proportional scale –

---

<sup>3</sup> In Decision 3/CP.11 "... LDCF... a specific definition of *additional costs* is provided to be used in the context of the LDCF."



proposed by the GEF as a streamlining tool – which takes into account the size and nature of projects. If the project’s financing structure fits within the limits set by this scale, the project’s requested funding shall be considered an acceptable approximation of the project’s additional costs. As studies on the costs of adaptation are still ongoing, LDCF and SCCF projects can currently be financed using these practical methodologies as an initial basis for financing. These portfolios will retroactively provide hard data on the costs of adaptation after project completion to contribute to the broader and longer term discussion on the costs of adaptation worldwide.

### **Innovative Features of LDCF and SCCF**

21. Programming under the LDCF and the SCCF has several innovative features, which have been tested on the ground with positive feedback from stakeholders. These include:

- ⇒ *The application of the Additional Cost principle:* As highlighted above, the concept of additional costs has been applied to determine the level of LDCF/SCCF funding. In both the LDCF and the SCCF, eligible adaptation funding is defined in the context of development, and is not based on generating global benefits as defined for conventional operations in GEF focal areas.
- ⇒ *Sliding Scale:* A sliding scale is proposed as a simplified approach to estimating additional costs. If the co-financing for a given proposal falls within acceptable limits given the requested size of the LDCF/SCCF grant, the proposal will be deemed acceptable without requiring any further additional cost reasoning (the sliding scales of the LDCF and the SCCF differ).
- ⇒ *Allowance for Full-cost Funding:* In those rare cases where no baseline of activities can be identified, the LDCF (this is a case for LDCF only) will pay the full-costs of the adaptation project, provided that it targets an urgent and immediate need as defined in the NAPA.
- ⇒ *Expedited Project Cycle:* All pipeline and project reviews and approvals have been undertaken on a rolling basis. Full projects, defined as projects requesting more than \$2 million of LDCF funding, have been approved by Council on a “no objection” basis. Only in cases where four Council members object to a project will it need to be submitted to a Council meeting for discussion (this has, however, to date never occurred). The SCCF follows the expedited GEF Trust Fund project cycle.
- ⇒ *Increased limit for CEO Approval:* Under LDCF approval procedures, the CEO is authorized to approve projects of up to \$2 million in size, notifying Council of such approval on a “no objection” basis. This represents a significant increase in CEO commitment authority, which is normally limited to \$1 million for projects within the GEF Trust Fund. The SCCF follows the GEF Trust Fund project cycle.

## **III – GEF ADAPTATION STRATEGY IN 2010–2014**

### **Goal, Impact, Objectives, Outcomes, Scope and Activities**

22. *Goal:* To support developing countries to increase resilience to climate change through both immediate and longer-term adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions.

23. *Impact:* Reduce absolute losses due to climate change, including variability.
24. *Objectives:* The goal will be achieved through two equally important objectives. One is to reduce vulnerability to climate change of sectors, areas, countries, communities and ecosystems, and the other is to increase adaptive capacity.
25. *Outcomes:*
- Adaptation objectives and budget allocations incorporated in broader development frameworks
  - Risk analysis and vulnerability assessment incorporated as part of development programs and project planning
  - Adaptation practices developed and implemented to respond to climate change-induced stresses in development sectors and vulnerable ecosystems
  - Climate change and variability -induced disaster planning mechanisms developed and applied
  - Reduced absolute losses due to climate change, including variability
  - Awareness raised and communities involved in disaster planning, preparedness and prevention
  - Strengthened institutional adaptive capacity to implement adaptation measures
  - Diversified and strengthened livelihoods
  - Enhanced climate resilience of relevant development sectors and natural resources
26. *Scope:* The strategy is mainly focused on a robust replenishment of the *Least Developed Countries Fund* and the *Special Climate Change Fund*. If properly financed, these two Climate Change Funds currently have the possibility to meet a significant share of the demand for adaptation of some of the most vulnerable countries in the world.

### **Proposed Innovative Features of the LDCF and the SCCF**

27. It is worth noting that the Climate Change Funds follow the operational rules of the GEF Trust Fund except for when Convention guidance decides otherwise. For example, the GEF project cycle, fiduciary standards, voting modalities and other procedures fully apply to the SCCF. The LDCF has, per UNFCCC guidance request, a streamlined project cycle. Both Funds do not apply the Resource Allocation Framework (recently denominated STAR) and apply the additional costs principle associated to adaptation benefits as opposed to the incremental costs and global benefits.
28. Based on this principle, innovative proposals listed in the GEF-5 Replenishment documents, including the expanded access for additional implementing agencies; the option to engage more directly with the GEF and develop national steering committees if predictable resources are available under these Funds; and a pilot initiative on direct access, are features that can be tested under the Funds.
29. Another important issue is the relative comparative advantage of the different GEF agencies for support of adaptation projects. This topic has been discussed by GEF stakeholders. Some of the agencies have proved to be leaders in adaptation activities, but others have yet to

develop or implement any adaptation project or program, or have showed a lack of specific development and adaptation expertise. For this reasons, GEF partners, countries and other stakeholders have emphasized the need to expand the network of agencies so as to include a wider range of adaptation experience and capabilities. For example, an agency such as the World Food Program (WFP), with a strong presence in the field managing food security and community-level services relevant to climate variability and change, has been identified as an appropriate candidate to be an additional agency to implement the LDCF and the SCCF.

*Example: World Food Program and Adaptation*

30. The WFP supports programs which aim to better manage the environment, help improve food security in communities to protect, develop or use natural resources as part of their livelihood strategies, and rebuild food security systems and vital infrastructures impacted by disasters.

31. Climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction play a prominent role in WFP's Strategic Plan for 2008 to 2011. The WFP's *disaster risk reduction, preparedness and response* programs offer significant opportunities to enhance sustainable development. Guided by governments, who have the primary responsibility for consistent disaster prevention and mitigation policies, and working with other partners, the WFP enhances national disaster risk reduction and adaptation frameworks with its experience and services, field presence, and programs to help communities reinforce their essential food and nutrition security systems and infrastructures – including voucher, cash and food-based safety nets.

32. In countries where the WFP has a continuing presence, *vulnerability analysis and mapping* helps the organization, governments, and other stakeholders identify hungry poor populations, where they are located, and the nature and causes of their vulnerabilities. WFP's Food Security Analysis Service and its unique network of about 120 specialists posted around the world answer these fundamental questions through about 90 assessments every year.

33. As a further response to the impacts of climate variability, WFP activities such as targeted food-supported employment programs are being deployed to build flood defenses and small-scale irrigation systems, fix dunes to stop the encroachment of the desert onto agricultural land, plant trees to mitigate the impacts of floods and landslides, harvest water and to rehabilitate depleted land.

34. These activities help vulnerable communities adapt to the actual and expected impacts of climate change. In 2007, the WFP food or cash-based employment programs targeted to food insecure communities amounted to \$280 million, reaching over 13 million people. They contributed to the construction or rehabilitation of 1,579 ponds, 1,571 wells, 14,305 kilometers of irrigation systems and 1,621 kilometers of dykes. 169,884 hectares of land were protected, cultivated or rehabilitated and made available for agricultural production, and 152,851 hectares of land were reforested throughout the world. With GEF support, these programs could be expanded and more effectively tailored to incorporate climate change adaptation needs.

## **Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF)**

35. *The Least Developed Countries Fund is aimed at addressing the special needs of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) under the Climate Convention; Adaptation has been identified as the most relevant issue; the Fund must finance the most urgent and immediate adaptation needs of the LDCs.*

36. *Purpose under the Convention:* The Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) was established in response to guidance received from the Seventh Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC meeting in Marrakech in 2001. It is designed to support projects addressing the urgent and immediate adaptation needs of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), focusing on reducing the vulnerability of those sectors and resources that are central to human and national development, such as water, agriculture and food security, health, disaster risk management and prevention, and infrastructure, as identified and prioritized in their National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs).

37. *Preparation for Programming:* Of the 49 current LDCs, 47 have already received support to prepare their NAPAs. NAPA preparation was also funded for Cape Verde, which has later on graduated from the LDC group. The remaining two LDCs lacking NAPA funding are Equatorial Guinea, where no agreement on a project proposal has been done, and Somalia, which is not Party to the UNFCCC, and thus not eligible to LDCF funding. GEF has already disbursed \$9.4 million to support the NAPA preparation phase.

38. *Programming Priorities:* Following the preparation phase, the demand has exponentially grown for the implementation of NAPAs. Programming priorities indicated by the NAPAs are in the following sectors: *water resources; food security and agriculture; health; disaster preparedness; infrastructure and natural resource management. Community-based adaptation* is also considered a cross-sectoral priority requiring urgent attention. Especially for the LDCs/SIDS, improved coastal management would be a priority.

### *The Special Challenge of Food Security and Water under the LDCF*

39. The gap in funding for adaptation is rapidly growing in the closely related areas of water resources, coastal oceans, and food security. The rapid recent warming of the oceans influences continental rainfall patterns and ice melt. The result is that droughts and floods worsen, sea level rises, fisheries are impacted, coastal storm vulnerability is increased, and acidification from excessive carbon sequestration in the oceans dissolves coral reefs with pending catastrophic damage to coastal communities. Moreover, elevated heat, evaporation rates, and drought create greater demands for crop irrigation and more frequent famines through crop failure.

40. These linked impacts of climate change pose very complex adaptation challenges that are additional to the existing policy and management failures facing hydropower, water supply, irrigation, fisheries and water resources management, including the commonly ignored areas of groundwater and coastal management. Climate stress is only one of the multiple stresses on water and coastal ocean resources that need to be collectively addressed along with adaptation to a changing climate if drinking water supplies, protein from fisheries, food from irrigation, and

electricity are to be sustained. Projections show billions of people will suffer from water and food shortages in the future resulting in deepening poverty, further political instability, and forced migration.

41. Based on NAPA priorities and on the project demand under the LDCF, the adaptation strategy under this Fund is therefore expected to give high emphasis to water and food security. Some of the most direct impacts of climate change, including climate variability, will continue to be on agriculture and food systems. More frequent and intense climate-related events already have adverse impacts on food availability, accessibility, stability and utilization. Increasing temperatures and declining precipitation reduce yields, force transitions to lower valued commodities, and cause volatility in commodity prices. Farmers in food insecure regions, especially those that rely on local production to meet their food needs are particularly vulnerable to global climate variations and price fluctuations. Even small changes in temperature and humidity levels pose risks for food safety and human health, with humans, plants, livestock and fish facing exposure to new pests and diseases.

42. Climate change worsens the living conditions of farmers, fishers and forest-dependent people, many of whom are already food insecure. Climate induced disasters reduce livelihood assets and opportunities, increasing the number of people at risk of hunger in both rural and urban areas. More than 90 percent of exposure to natural disasters is in the developing world and the poor are at greatest risk of losing assets and livelihoods. As they lack adequate insurance coverage food insecurity will continue to increase.

43. Sub-Saharan Africa is particularly vulnerable to reduced agricultural productivity, increased water insecurity and increased risks to human health with nutrition, health and education implications. For example, in Ethiopia and Kenya, two of the world's most drought-prone countries, children aged five or less are respectively 36 and 50 percent more likely to be malnourished if they were born during a drought. Rural people's ability to cope with climate change impacts depends on the existing cultural and policy context, as well as on socio-economic factors like gender and the distribution of household assets.

44. Sustainable food security practices and climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies can be supportive and reinforcing. Climate and weather risk management strategies (the emerging concept of "climate services" akin to more traditional weather services) also can support sustainable agriculture and fisheries practices.

45. In managing the LDCF, the GEF and its network of agencies have built relevant on-the-ground experience in financing adaptation action and learned lessons on activities that are particularly significant to reduce vulnerability and increase adaptive capacity of LDCs and other vulnerable countries.

### **LDCF Activities**

46. Consistent with the priorities identified in the NAPAs, the LDCF finances the activities that are linked to the most urgent and immediate adaptation needs of the LDCs, or activities whose further delay could increase vulnerability, or lead to increased costs at a later stage.

47. Below, a few examples follow that show specific activities ready for or under implementation in response to priorities identified in the NAPAs under the LDCF.

⇒ *Water*: Activities include: Improved rainwater harvesting facilities in each village; System of Rice Intensification prescriptions reduce vulnerability to changing precipitation amounts and patterns; Modifications to design of reservoirs and irrigation channels, and to management of these features and natural ponds to better manage climate change induced risks. Project example: *Building Capacities to Integrate Water Resources Planning in Agricultural Development (Cambodia, UNDP)*

In addition, drought management planning, floodplain management and early warning systems, more efficient water supply and irrigation technologies, and institutional reforms through IWRM can help sustain water and food supplies. In addition, ICM in coastal areas and ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries can help reduce vulnerability to multiple disasters, including saltwater intrusion to drinking supplies while sustaining fish protein sources.

Moreover, integrated coastal zone management in coastal areas and ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries can help reduce vulnerability to multiple stresses, including saltwater intrusion to drinking supplies while sustaining fish protein sources.

⇒ *Food security/Agriculture*: Activities include: Crop diversification; Improved cropping sequences; Conservation tillage; More efficient water use in irrigation; Community-based supplemental irrigation; Food storage; Creation of an enabling environment for Climate Risk Management; Policy development and implementation; Institutional coordination; and Generation of knowledge and awareness raising. Project example: *Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture in Malawi (AfDB)*

⇒ *Disaster Risk Management*: Activities include: Increase disaster risk management capacity in affected valleys; Artificial lowering of water level in glacial lakes; Creation of an early warning system for glacial flashfloods. Project example: *Reduce CC-induced Risks and Vulnerabilities from Glacial Lake Outbursts in the Punakha-Wangdi and Chamkar Valleys in Bhutan (UNDP)*

⇒ *Natural Resources Management*: Pilots implemented at community level including: Forest management and mangrove/wetland restoration → Natural coastal protection; Innovative ways of securing potable water; Promotion of alternative livelihoods; Improving institutional and technical capacity, including early warning systems. Project example: *Community-based Adaptation to Climate Change through Coastal Afforestation in Bangladesh (UNDP)*

## **LDCF Financing Needs**

48. *Current and projected financing needs*: A recent assessment of the financing needs to support the implementation of NAPAs carried out by the UNFCCC Secretariat estimates that the costs of adaptation range between \$800 million and \$1.5 billion. As the LDCF is the Fund especially established under the Convention to pay these costs, the GEF estimates a replenishment need for the LDCF at least of \$500 million. The activities to be financed will be consistent with the priorities identified in the NAPAs, through a programmatic approach that will

build on project experience and maximize impact by reducing vulnerability and increasing the adaptive capacity of the most important and vulnerable development sectors.

49. A recently published analysis carried out by the UNFCCC Secretariat, *Investment and Financial Flows to Address Climate Change: an Update*, utilized the National Adaptation Programmes of Action (NAPAs) as a tool to estimate the costs of adaptation at project level, identified through bottom up assessments in the 38 NAPAs so far completed. In total, these countries have identified about 430 “urgent and immediate” adaptation projects, of which the cost of 385 has been evaluated. The estimated total cost of these projects is over \$800 million with an average project cost of approximately \$2 million (excluding a single \$700 million project). Table 1. illustrates the sectoral breakdown of these NAPA projects.

**Table 1. Projects identified in National Adaptation Programmes of Action, by sector**

Sector	Number	Total cost (USD)
Agriculture/livestock/fisheries	104	269 692 234
Water resources	57	140 960 970
Coastal management/marine ecosystems	34	95 671 300
Forestry	33	53 494 730
Health	31	40 043 000
Cross-sectoral	27	740 227 240
Terrestrial ecosystems/biodiversity	21	24 908 592
Early warning and forecasting	15	37 423 063
Energy	15	27 964 120
Fisheries	14	35 375 500
Infrastructure	13	16 881 631
Education	10	9 005 000
Disaster management	8	12 953 597
Tourism	2	1 250 000
Insurance	1	225 000
<b>Total</b>	<b>385</b>	<b>1 506 075 977</b>

50. It is difficult to compare the estimates of adaptation projects in NAPAs with the global estimates of adaptation costs such as those given in the 2007 UNFCCC report for several reasons. First, the NAPAs are not intended to address medium to long-term adaptation, but to identify urgent and immediate adaptation needs. So far, fewer than 40 countries have completed NAPAs and it is questionable whether these can be extrapolated to the rest of the developing world. Second, the total investment needs per project may not represent annual investment needs but cumulative needs. And third, it can be difficult to determine the extent to which climate change is a primary cause or more a justification for investments.

51. Based on lessons learned from LDCF experience, there is a need to significantly increase the impact achieved at the project level and expand the scale and scope of the LDCF projects and programs on the ground at the sectoral and national levels. In order to achieve this objective, resources under the LDCF must significantly grow. The process initiated by the NAPAs and the analysis provided by the reports identifying the most urgent and immediate needs remain seminal steps to be scaled up and replicated at the sectoral and national level. The LDCF remains the only mechanism created by and accountable to the Climate Convention with respect to the urgent

and immediate needs of the LDCs, and this strategy highlights the responsibilities of donor countries to honor their commitments under the Convention.

52. In conclusion, despite the fact that estimating the financial needs for adaptation for the LDCs remains difficult, it is imperative that at least \$500 million be mobilized within the next 4 years to finance the urgent and immediate adaptation needs of the Least Developed Countries to implement the National Adaptation Programmes of Action as estimated by the UNFCCC.

### **Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)**

53. *In the context of the GEF Adaptation Strategy, and on financing adaptation in general, the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) currently plays a pivotal role as it is the Fund with a large potential to address the adaptation needs of vulnerable countries worldwide. Unlike the LDCF, which is specifically dedicated to the urgent and immediate needs of the LDCs, the SCCF is open to all vulnerable developing countries. In addition, it may finance a wide range of concrete adaptation measures, which may include longer-term time horizons. Projects have the option to focus on long-term planned response strategies, policies, and measures, rather than short-term activities.*

54. *Purpose under the Convention:* The Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) was established in response to guidance received from the Seventh Conference of Parties to the UNFCCC meeting in Marrakech in 2001. It is designed to finance activities, programs and measures related to climate change that are complementary to those funded by GEF under the climate change focal area, in the areas of:

- (a) Adaptation to climate change;
- (b) Technology transfer;
- (c) Selected sectors including: Energy, transport, industry, agriculture, forestry and waste management; and
- (d) Economic diversification.

55. Among these four categories, adaptation has the top priority. This strategy brief note describes the essential features of the SCCF Adaptation program. The scope of the GEF Adaptation Strategy encompasses only the first financing window of the Special Climate Change Fund on Adaptation (a).

56. *Eligibility:* All developing countries that are parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) are eligible to receive financial support for adaptation interventions to be integrated into development activities.

57. *Preparation for Programming:* The adaptation program under the SCCF does not allocate resources for enabling activities limited to assessing vulnerability to climate change and identifying adaptation needs. Projects proposed under this Fund are to be for implementation of adaptation activities under priority areas of intervention as identified by the Climate Convention.

58. *Programming Priorities:* Starting to implement adaptation activities promptly where sufficient information is available to warrant such activities, inter alia, in the areas of:



- water resources management
- land management
- agriculture
- health
- infrastructure development
- fragile ecosystems, including mountainous ecosystems
- integrated coastal zone management.
- Improving the monitoring of diseases and vectors affected by climate change, and related forecasting and early-warning systems, and in this context improving disease control and prevention.
- Supporting capacity building, including institutional capacity, for preventive measures, planning, preparedness and management of disasters relating to climate change, including contingency planning, in particular for droughts and floods in areas prone to extreme weather events.

### **SCCF Activities**

59. Eligible activities are directly related to the programming priorities listed above. Selected examples of concrete adaptation activities that are already under implementation under the existing adaptation SCCF program are:

60. *Health:* Cost-effective strategies and measures developed that reduce the long-term risk of climate change impacts on diseases such as malaria etc; Roll Back Malaria programme and other campaigns up-scaled to take into account climate change; Adjustments to existing health regulations to factor in climate change risks. Project example: *Integrating Climate Change into the Management of Priority Health Risks in Ghana. (UNDP)*

61. *Integrated Coastal Management:* Improved management of drainage system; Implementation of adaptation measures such as beach nourishing at particularly important sites; Construction of hydrological models; Institutional support for implementation of integrated coastal zone management and disaster management. Project examples: *Conservancy Adaptation Project (Guyana, World Bank)* and *Adaptation to Climate Change in the Nile Delta (Egypt UNDP)*

In addition, ICM in coastal areas can help reduce vulnerability to multiple disasters, including saltwater intrusion to drinking supplies; and ecosystem-based approaches to fisheries that help sustain fisheries for protein sources.

62. *Water Resources Management in response to Glacial Retreat:* Filling knowledge gaps on links between climate change, glacial retreat and socio-economic/ecological effects; Capacity development and policy support for integrated water management and prioritization of limited water resources at national and community levels; Pilot measures and improved water management promoted in agriculture and hydroelectricity sectors; Innovative ways of meeting potable water needs. Project example: *Design and Implementation of Pilot Climate Change Adaptation Measures in the Andean Region (Regional in Bolivia, Ecuador and Peru, World Bank)*

63. *Improved Water Resources Management in response to droughts, floods and warming:* Real-time-data-sharing and hydrologic drought/flood prediction and warning systems; catchment protection; drought management planning; flood, floodplain, land use management measures; water use efficiency for water supplies and irrigation for food crops as part of IWRM strategies; groundwater protection and management for alternative supplies; sustainable fisheries management to adapt to lake warming. Example projects: *Follow-up to SPA projects for drought management in the Amazon River Basin and for flood and floodplain management in the Plata River Basin; Senegal River Basin; Lake Malawai/Nyassa/Niassa Basin.*

64. *Potential use of fiscal instruments.* Given the wide range of sectors and economic activities that need to be engaged, broader fiscal policies and economic measures may sometimes be appropriate in addition to the specific activities listed above. While detailed analysis and careful design will be essential, numerous fiscal measures could be designed consistent with the economies and circumstances of vulnerable countries to make them more climate-resilient.

65. Examples include: (i) tax-breaks for climate appropriate reconstruction after disasters, (i) government supported insurance programs and policies for farmers, coastal and other vulnerable communities linked to climate appropriate investments and behaviors and (iii) technical assistance to help governments take climate change risks into account in their national economic planning, particularly for climate sensitive sectors with public ownership or control such as water and other infrastructure. There is considerable opportunity to incorporate risk management more generally in national economic planning decisions in the most vulnerable countries given the large impact of climate disasters, especially in smaller economies. There is an opportunity to integrate “climate services” akin to weather services as part of national economic planning systems.

66. The engagement of Ministries of planning and economic development would be sought in order to influence development planning and investments. Should developing countries wish to engage in discussion of such strategies or related fiscal measures, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) may be an ideal partner.

### **SCCF Financing Needs**

67. *Current and projected financing needs:* The major obstacle emphasized by our stakeholders, including the agencies and the client countries, is the uncertainty that currently exists with respect to how much money is available to develop adaptation projects under the SCCF. The SCCF is the only active fund currently available aimed at providing resources for all vulnerable developing countries (only LDC countries, by definition, are eligible for LDCF resources). The demand under the SCCF to date is about \$150 million per year, while the Fund currently totals \$121 million of pledges, of which only \$100 million is for adaptation. (More projects might be also proposed if more resources were available.) To meet the demand and ensure financing predictability, the GEF estimates the minimum need for \$500 million for the SCCF adaptation window for the same 4 year cycle of the GEF-5 replenishment, to finance the necessary adaptation activities under the priority sectors listed above.

68. The mandate of the SCCF is broad enough to incorporate the category of projects that were so far financed under the SPA (GEF Trust Fund), for example those that address the vulnerability of ecosystems. An example of activities that were previously financed under the SPA portfolio, and could be financed under the SCCF, include addressing climate impacts on coral reefs, mangrove, forest and other vulnerable ecosystems, and, as in the example listed below, agro-biodiversity of global significance.

69. *Example of adaptation activities for agrobiodiversity conservation:* Extension services are given the capacity to provide information and advice to farmers on agrobiodiversity conservation and effective coping measures to climate risks; Farm-based adaptation practices are developed and implemented, including water harvesting regimes, soil conservation, flood protection terracing, stress-resistant local varieties; Improved access to seasonal forecasts for farmers; Agreements between farmers, farmer groups, provincial and district governments to govern the use of resources and agro-biodiversity developed in the pilot sites; a Seed Insurance Scheme is being piloted in selected communities to promote agrobiodiversity and improve resilience of local farmers. Project examples: *Sustaining Agricultural Biodiversity in the Face of Climate Change (Tajikistan, UNDP)* and *Adaptation to Climate Change Using Agrobiodiversity Resources in the Rain Fed Highlands of Yemen (World Bank)*.

#### **IV – RATIONALE FOR STRATEGY**

70. The need for a significantly more robust replenishment of the LDCF and the SCCF, and the proposal to align the GEF replenishment process with that of the Funds are based on three main pillars:

- a. *Responsiveness to Convention Guidance;*
- b. *Responsiveness to developing country needs and consequent need for predictability of resources;*
- c. *Complementarity among different adaptation-related funds.*

#### **Responsiveness to UNFCCC Guidance<sup>4</sup>**

71. The GEF has received a significant amount of guidance on adaptation throughout the last 14 years from the UNFCCC. From the initial staged approach (COP1, COP4), Convention guidance on adaptation dramatically evolved, particularly in Marrakech (COP7, 2001), when the GEF was requested to finance *pilot or demonstration projects to show how adaptation planning and assessment can be practically translated into projects that will provide real benefits*, and to manage the newly established climate change funds, the LDCF and the SCCF.

72. At COP12, in Nairobi, the developing countries group pointed out the importance of a financial mechanism with greater balance between mitigation and adaptation activities. They questioned the adequacy of the GEF response to the adaptation needs of developing countries in

---

<sup>4</sup> Annex 2 lists UNFCCC guidance to the GEF regarding adaptation including all decisions, titles and respective websites.

accordance with guidance by the Conference of the Parties. This criticism has been recurrent during the most recent UNFCCC COPs. In response to the Convention and to developing country needs, the GEF Secretariat proposes to include in the GEF-5 strategy a comprehensive adaptation program in both financial and operational terms.

### **Amount and Predictability of Resources**

73. A major criticism the GEF has received with respect to the LDCF and particularly the SCCF, has been the lack of predictability of financial resources. Unlike the GEF, which is replenished every four years, the LDCF and SCCF receive voluntary contributions without a regular replenishment schedule. Countries, and agencies which support their work, need to know the available resources sufficiently far in advance to plan their programs and projects; this is an impossible exercise when resources are mobilized in relatively small amounts every six months. Moreover, the size of the Funds is very small compared to the adaptation needs of vulnerable countries. The GEF is fully capable to manage a much higher volume of resources as it does under the Trust Fund. A more commensurable amount for adaptation would also allow the GEF to meet its commitment vis-à-vis the Convention. This argument is further explained below under “Financing Needs.”

### **Complementarity among Different Adaptation-Related Funds**

74. It is important to clarify and increase understanding of the distinctions and complementarity between the GEF-managed adaptation funds, the LDCF, the SCCF and the GEF Trust Fund, as well as the Adaptation Fund, which is supervised and managed by the Adaptation Fund Board under the authority and guidance of the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Kyoto Protocol (CMP).

75. As mentioned in the previous sections, the GEF mandate on adaptation can be at this stage fulfilled under the LDCF and SCCF, as the global benefits required by the Trust Fund can be generated through projects that reduce vulnerability of ecosystems of global significance. These projects are both eligible under the SCCF, which has vulnerable ecosystems as a priority identified by the UNFCCC COP, and by the LDCF, as identified in the NAPAs.

76. The adaptation pilots financed under the GEF Trust Fund through the Strategic Priority on Adaptation (SPA) illustrate the importance of programming adaptation measures in the other GEF focal areas like Biodiversity, International Waters, and Land Degradation. As part of the GEF-5 focus on integrated, cross-focal area approaches in natural resources, opportunities would be sought where countries have interest to link climate change adaptation measures with other GEF interventions in natural resources to take advantage of cross-convention synergies, needed sector reforms, and programmatic approaches. Interventions related to food security, water resources, and coastal oceans are especially complex and would benefit from integrated approaches.

77. With respect to the Adaptation Fund, as all Funds have adaptation as the top priority, there may be a conceptual risk of overlap in scope. However, it is equally important to recognize that the LDCF was created to address all the specific needs of the LDCs under the Convention, besides adaptation, and will likely remain the leading financial mechanism for the

implementation of NAPAs. The SCCF has three additional financing avenues besides adaptation, which include technology transfer followed by support for specific sectors and economic diversification. There are many other elements that diversify these Funds, make them all unique, and significantly distinguish their respective mandates and *modus operandi*.

78. First, there is a strong mandate from the Convention and its Protocol to keep these as distinct Funds. Second, there are three aspects that make the Adaptation Fund unique: its revenue regime; the composition of its governing body; and the “direct access” modality. Additionally, the LDCF and the SCCF maintain the conventionally structured project financing that shareholders and stakeholders are familiar with, whereas the Adaptation Fund is exploring a highly innovative approach to adaptation financing. Therefore, the LDCF and SCCF will continue to operate in their conventional manner during the GEF’s next replenishment timeframe and using conventionally mobilized resources, with the option of including innovative elements as proposed in previous sections. Since the Adaptation Fund Board is still discussing the Operational Policies and Guidelines and related issues (fiduciary standards, etc), other criteria to differentiate among the Funds may arise in the future.

79. It is also important to take into account the timing of this replenishment: a new post 2012 regime will not start, by definition, before 2012, and the demand for adaptation under the Funds is now.

## V – CONCLUSION

80. In closing, based on Convention guidance, responsiveness to developing countries’ needs – including predictability of resources – and a commitment to complementarity and maximization of GEF-managed funds and resources, this strategy includes a request for a strong replenishment of the *Least Developed Countries Fund* (LDCF) and the *Special Climate Change Fund* (SCCF). The financial needs for adaptation under the LDCF and SCCF are of \$1 billion total for a four-year cycle, concomitant with the GEF replenishment, illustrated in Table 2. below. To fund the LDCF and the SCCF at the appropriate level, it is proposed that these Funds be replenished on a four-year cycle concomitant with the replenishment of the GEF.

**Table 2. Estimated Financing Needs for the LDCF and the SCCF**

Funds	Estimated Financial Needs (2010–2014)	Replenishment Proposal	Total
LDCF	\$800 M–\$1.5 B To finance urgent and immediate adaptation needs as identified in the NAPAs for NAPA implementation under the LDCF	\$500 million	
SCCF	Activities include adaptation and development as well as ecosystem	\$500 million	

	resiliency. Estimated costs based on worldwide demand to GEF through its agencies \$150 M/per year		
LDCF & SCCF			\$1 billion

**Result-Based Management Framework  
Adaptation to Climate Change**

**Goal: To support developing countries to increase resilience to climate change through both immediate and longer-term adaptation measures in development policies, plans, programs, projects and actions.**

Impact: Reduced absolute losses due to climate change, including variability

<b>Objective 1: Reduce vulnerability to address the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability</b>	
Expected Outcomes	Core Outputs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptation objectives and budget allocations incorporated in broader development frameworks</li> <li>• Strengthened institutional capacity to implement adaptation measures</li> <li>• Awareness raised on the impacts of climate change, including variability</li> <li>• Risk analysis and vulnerability assessment incorporated as part of development programs and project planning</li> <li>• Adaptation practices developed and implemented to respond to climate change-induced stresses linked to development sectors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant frameworks that include adaptation measures (UNDAP, PRSP) and budget allocations</li> <li>• Policy reforms and inclusion of (building and other) codes to prevent damage of goods and economic losses due to climate change, including variability</li> <li>• Adaptation assets created in support of individual or community livelihood strategies, disaggregated by gender</li> </ul>
<b>Objective 2: Increase and increase adaptive capacity to climate change, including variability</b>	
Expected Outcomes	Core Outputs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptation objectives and budget allocations incorporated in broader sector frameworks</li> <li>• Risk analysis and vulnerability assessment incorporated as part of GEF programs and project design</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant frameworks that include adaptation measures (UNDAP, PRSP) and budget allocations</li> <li>• Policy reforms and inclusion of (building and other) codes to prevent damage of goods and economic losses due to</li> </ul>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptation practices developed and implemented to respond to climate change-induced stresses in sectors linked to development</li> <li>• Enhanced climate resilience of relevant natural resources and ecosystems</li> </ul>	<p>climate change, including variability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adaptation practices piloted and replicated in GEF programming</li> <li>• Adaptation assets created which strengthen individual or community livelihood strategies, (disaggregated by gender)</li> </ul>
---	--



## Compilation of UNFCCC Guidance

**Decision 11/CP.1**, *Initial guidance on policies, programme priorities and eligibility criteria to the operating entity or entities of the financial mechanism*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop1/07a01.pdf#page=34>

**Decision 2/CP.4**, *Additional guidance to the operating entity of the financial mechanism*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop4/16a01.pdf#page=5>

**Decision 5/CP.6**, *The Bonn Agreements on the implementation of the Buenos Aires Plan of Action*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop6secpart/05.pdf#page=36>

**Decision 5/CP.7**, *Implementation of Article 4, paragraphs 8 and 9, of the Convention (decision 3/CP.3 and Article 2, paragraph 3, and Article 3, paragraph 14, of the Kyoto Protocol)*, see [http://unfccc.int/files/cooperation\\_and\\_support/ldc/application/pdf/13a01p32.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/cooperation_and_support/ldc/application/pdf/13a01p32.pdf)

**Decision 6/CP.7**, *Further guidance for the operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop9/06a01.pdf#page=13>

**Decision 7/CP.7**, *Funding under the Convention*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop7/13a01.pdf#page=43>

**Decision 27/CP.7**, *Guidance to an entity entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism of the Convention, for the operation of the least developed countries fund*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop7/13a04.pdf#page=6>

**Decision 7/CP.8**, *Initial guidance to an entity entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism of the Convention, for the operation of the Special Climate Change Fund*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop8/07a01.pdf#page=17>

**Decision 8/CP.8**, *Guidance to an entity entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism of the Convention, for the operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop8/07a01.pdf#page=19>

**Decision 4/CP.9**, *Additional guidance to an operating entity of the financial mechanism*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop9/06a01.pdf#page=9>

**Decision 5/CP.9**, *Further guidance to an entity entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism of the Convention, for the operation of the Special Climate Change Fund*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop9/06a01.pdf#page=11>

**Decision 6/CP.9**, *Further guidance for the operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop9/06a01.pdf#page=13>

**Decision 1/CP.10**, *Buenos Aires programme of work on adaptation and response measures*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop10/10a01.pdf#page=2>

**Decision 8/CP.10**, *Additional guidance to an operating entity of the financial mechanism*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/cop10/10a01.pdf#page=19>

**Decision 3/CP.11**, *Further guidance for the operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2005/cop11/eng/05a01.pdf#page=10>

**Decision 1/CP.12**, *Further guidance to an entity entrusted with the operation of the financial mechanism of the Convention, for the operation of the Special Climate Change Fund*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2006/cop12/eng/05a01.pdf#page=3>

**Decision 2/CP.12**, *Review of the financial mechanism*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2006/cop12/eng/05a01.pdf#page=6>

**Decision 3/CP.12**, *Additional guidance to the Global Environment Facility*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2006/cop12/eng/05a01.pdf#page=9>

**Decision 7/CP.13**, *Additional guidance to the Global Environment Facility*, see <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2007/cop13/eng/06a01.pdf#page=33>

**Draft decision -/CP.14**, *Further guidance for the operation of the Least Developed Countries Fund*, see [http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop\\_14/application/pdf/cp\\_ldcf.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop_14/application/pdf/cp_ldcf.pdf)

**Draft decision -/CP.14**, *Additional guidance to the Global Environment Facility*, see [http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop\\_14/application/pdf/cp\\_gef.pdf](http://unfccc.int/files/meetings/cop_14/application/pdf/cp_gef.pdf)