

Best Practices and Lessons Learned in addressing adaptation in LDCs through the National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA) Process



NAPAs are widely viewed as a success story

Best Practice:

The concurrent definition of the plan (the NAPA), technical support (through the LEG), and funding (through the LDCF), is a good practice for supporting national planning and implementation of activities and projects identified in the plans.

Lessons Learned:

Guidelines for the preparation and the implementation of a plan should be done concurrently, in order to guide finalization of the plan so no information is missed and the plans can be implemented without delay.



NAPA – Best Practices

The NAPA approach allows for flexible choices by the countries in how to design and implement it

Best Practice:

The use of locally defined criteria further increases the flexibility in the approach, to suit local development priorities.

Lessons Learned:

Some countries opted to focus on a **sub-region of a big country, based on their perception of highly vulnerable regions in their country**. Others chose to **work in a few sectors deemed most vulnerable to climate change**. This flexibility helped countries identify most urgent adaptation needs, given limited resources for the preparation phase.



Engaging the stakeholders from the NAPA preparation stage in implementation and other subsequent steps has many advantages

Best Practice:

Involving potential donors at the last stages of NAPA preparation when an implementation strategy is designed, is a very good practice, as it improves the alignment of implementation to on-going projects and programmes for the country from different sources of funding, greatly enhancing the process of identifying co-financing.

The involvement of multiple stakeholders and disciplines ensures that the outcome of the NAPA is fully owned by those that prepared it, and by endorsing the NAPA at appropriate levels of government, further ensures that the NAPA is fully owned by national governments.



Lessons Learned:

Given the limited funds in the LDCF, active exploration of additional funding from other sources contributes to full implementation of NAPAs.

In general, LDCs which have the lowest adaptive capacity and weak institutional arrangements tend to have limited success in accessing funds from the LDCF.



NAPA – Best Practices

Envisioning the involvement of NAPA teams in the long term helps raise awareness and ensures continuity of adaptation programmes and activities in the country

Best Practice:

Countries that have maintained continuity in the institutional framework between NAPA preparation and implementation tended to be more effective in the implementation of their NAPA.

Lessons Learned:

Continuing support for the NAPA team to oversee design of implementation, beyond the end of the NAPA preparation project, is widely seen as a critical need for many LDCs, to avoid any delays in implementation and to nurture the great capacity built in LDCs during the preparation phase.

Also, promoting local expertise is seen by many as a means of ensuring stronger national ownership of NAPA projects..



Regular interaction between the LEG and LDCs has been very useful for the countries

Best Practice:

The regular interaction between the LEG and Parties during side events and through surveys, as well as with the GEF and its agencies, has created a useful bridge between all stakeholders in the NAPA process, and has led to many difficulties being resolved to facilitate smooth preparation and implementation of NAPAs.

The diverse membership in the LEG has also contributed to balanced support being given to LDC Parties, building on the individual expertise and experience of each and every member

Lessons Learned:

The annotations to the guidelines for the preparation of NAPAs have proven to be very useful in providing further explanation of the steps. Examples developed by the LEG, guide books and technical papers on the NAPA, have been very well received by Parties, as well as the regional workshops, which provided LDCs with the opportunity to clarify their doubts and exchange experiences with other countries.



NAPA – Best Practices

Good relations with the GEF agency results in a smoother implementation of NAPA projects

Best Practice:

A good practice seems to be to choose an agency that has existing experience and activity in a given activity, since the agency can then easily apply its expertise to the project. In any case, taking the time to assess each agency's advantages against the country specific circumstances and project objectives can ensure a smoother process.

Lessons Learned:

Many countries have reported that good working relations with an agency at the country level can lead to a very positive interaction and smooth implementation of NAPA projects.

Good communications are also key to addressing bottlenecks as they arise. In the long run, addressing problems as they arise is far easier than cancelling a project and re-entering the GEF/LDCF pipeline with a new submission and another agency.



Designing a thorough implementation strategy can improve the effectiveness of NAPA implementation

Best Practice:

Thorough implementation strategies can help take advantage of opportunities as increased funding becomes available. Countries that were able to carefully consider and plan their implementing strategy during NAPA preparation process generally had a seamless transition into the implementation phase.

Lessons Learned:

Some LDCs have felt that the absence of early guidelines for the implementation of NAPAs has prohibited the development of a comprehensive implementation strategy during the NAPA preparation phase. In fact, many LDCs adopted a single project approach and would have favoured a programmatic approach if clear guidelines to develop such an approach had been made available to them.



The simplified LDCF project cycle provides expedited access to resources

Best Practice:

The simplified project cycle for LDCF projects has made it easier for LDCs to access funds under the GEF. In addition to that, funds were readily made available under the LDCF, which enabled straightforward funding for NAPAs. The principle of “balanced access” used by the LDCF is also a good practice, as it avoids the risks of a “first come, first served” policy

Lessons Learned:

Changing procedures is necessary to accommodate changes and enhancement to processes; however, due consideration should be given to transitional arrangements so as to avoid unnecessary and/ or excessive delays.

The lesson from the switch in GEF templates is that no delay should be imposed on projects in the pipeline to the point of re-submission and re-approval of projects if at all possible.



THANK YOU

