

# NAP PROGRESS IN PARTICIPATION AND TRANSPARENCY

USING THE JOINT PRINCIPLES FOR ADAPTATION TO ASSESS PROGRESS IN PARTICIPATION AND TRANSPARENCY IN NAP PROCESSES

BASED ON INPUT BY SOUTHERN VOICES ON ADAPTATION PARTNER NETWORKS IN VIETNAM, CAMBODIA, NEPAL, SRI LANKA, KENYA, AND MALAWI



## Contents:

Introduction	1
Methodology	2
Progress on participation	4
Progress on transparency	6
Positive features – and Challenges	9
Recommendations	10
An invitation to all stakeholders	11

## INTRODUCTION

Following an invitation from the UNFCCC to provide input to a Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) meeting on National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) in February 2018, Southern Voices on Adaptation gathered civil society feedback on participation and transparency in NAPs from countries where Southern Voices on Adaptation (SVA) partner networks are based.

In this report, a subset of Southern Voices' [The Joint Principles for Adaptation](#) (JPA) and 28 criteria developed during the 2014 – 15 phase of the Southern Voices on Adaptation project (previously used to monitor and shape national adaptation policy frameworks), have been employed to provide feedback on participation and transparency.

## USE OF THE JOINT PRINCIPLES FOR ADAPTATION (JPA)

The JPA are included as one of the supplementary materials to the UNFCCC NAP technical guidelines and are currently in use by SVA partners in dialogue with national and local governments and other stakeholders to improve the planning and implementation of adaptation policy.

Southern Voices therefore regard the JPA as the best benchmark for determining effective adaptation policies. For this reason, we invite stakeholders involved in climate adaptation processes at the national and sub-national levels to apply the JPA for the promotion and monitoring of equitable and pro-poor adaptation.

## KEY RECCOMENDATIONS

To improve participation and transparency in National Adaptation Plans, Southern Voices on Adaptation recommend the following actions:

1. More funding should be dedicated and explicitly ear-marked to increase transparency and participation in adaptation policy and planning
2. Explicit documentation regarding indigenous peoples, affected communities and vulnerable groups' involvement in NAP processes must be provided, including how current and future adaptation activities will serve to benefit these groups
3. To expand the level of understanding and increase awareness amongst the general public, NAP plans should be provided in local languages and efforts should be made to disseminate such plans to affected communities
4. Monitoring and evaluation frameworks for NAPs need to be created with clear, publicly available provisions regarding involvement of non-governmental stakeholders
5. Introduction of documentation on *how* and *why* decisions related to funding and allocation of projects have been made, with this being publicly available to stakeholders
6. The procedure for redress regarding negative consequences of adaptation project is explicitly documented in adaptation planning documents
7. The creation of an anonymous complaints/grievance procedure regarding adaptation projects

Further recommendations, including how these are linked to the criteria informed by the Joint Principles for Adaptation, can be found on page 10 of this report.

## METHODOLOGY

Assessments were provided by six partner networks: The NGO Forum on Cambodia (Cambodia), The Climate Change Working Group (Vietnam), Clean Energy Nepal (Nepal), Janathakshan (Sri Lanka), The National Council of Churches of Kenya (Kenya), and the Civil Society Network on Climate Change (Malawi) through a survey circulated prior to the LEG expert meeting in February 2018.

To assess **progress on participation** the three criteria of JPA Principle A, as well as one additional criterion from JPA Principle D (which serves an important indicator of participation in local adaptation planning and as an integral part of vertical integration), have been used.

<b>Principle A. The formulation, implementation and monitoring of adaptation policies is participatory and inclusive</b>
<i>Criterion A1. Multiple stakeholders (such as, but not limited to civil society, sub-national governments, research institutes, academia, private sector, and indigenous peoples) participate in defining options and priorities</i>
<i>Criterion A2. The knowledge and experience of local communities and indigenous peoples is incorporated</i>
<i>Criterion A3. Plans and policies are publicized in ways that local people can understand and engage with</i>
<b>Principle D. Local adaptation plans are developed through approaches that build resilience of communities and ecosystems</b>
<i>Criterion D1. Communities affected by climate change participate in defining adaptation options and priorities</i>

To assess **progress on transparency** five criteria from Principle B, as well as one criterion from Principle G (which relates to transparency of climate change information and is relevant to stakeholders for proper adaptation planning), have been used.

<b>Principle B. Public funds for adaptation are utilized efficiently and managed transparently and with integrity</b>
<i>Criterion B1. The implementation and financing of plans is periodically monitored by a body on which civil society is represented</i>
<i>Criterion B2. Adaptation funding is made available through a transparent process of allocation</i>
<i>Criterion B3. There is full and free access to information on how adaptation funds are being spent (finances and processes)</i>
<i>Criterion B4. There is a mechanism in place to safeguard against initiatives that might have negative impacts</i>
<i>Criterion 5. A secure mechanism for expressing grievances and seeking redress is available</i>
<b>Principle G. Plans and policies respond to evidence of the current and future manifestations and impacts of climate change</b>
<i>Criterion G4. Climate information is made accessible to enable adaptive decision making by all stakeholders</i>

To provide a rating against each criterion, a 0-3 scale has been applied.

The ranking scale is delineated as: 0 – no start made, 1 – 1.4 little progress, 1.5 - 2 some conditions in place, 3 – substantially achieved.

This scale corresponds to SVA's [National Adaptation Policy Assessment Tool](#), which is used to assess national adaptation policy.

Partner networks also provided narrative reports on contextual details and current progress of the NAP processes in their countries; the involvement of civil society and other stakeholders; positive features to share; and challenges faced.

3

### **IMPORTANT POINTS TO CONSIDER**

Readers consulting this report should keep in the mind the contrasting challenges, different NAP stages and varying political contexts of each country when interpreting the assessments in this report. We therefore encourage readers not to use this report as a tool for country-to-country comparison.

In addition, it is important to consider that this report is merely a synthesis from Southern Voices on Adaptation's partner organisations' own individual assessments using the tools stated above in regard to transparency and participation in NAP processes. For that reason, the content in this report should not be interpreted as an assessment of other policies, individual administrations or other activities ongoing in the countries considered. Equally, due to the on-going process of NAP development and the different stages partner countries find themselves in, the assessments provided should be considered invitations for improvement in the collaborative spirit of the NAP process as is proposed by the UNFCCC.

Furthermore, the conclusions made should also not be considered as representative of the views of civil society organisations (CSOs) in their entirety. This explanation is not intended to devalue the contributions Southern Voices partners, but simply emphasises the importance of treating its results with an appropriate contextual sensitivity.

The purpose of this report, including The Joint Principles for Adaptation and SV-Adapt assessment tool, is therefore to identify progress and gaps in adaptation processes and to in-turn promote effective and equitable adaptation.

We believe the assessments and recommendations included can provide a key insight into how transparency and participation can be increased using the JPA, whilst encouraging improvements in current and future NAP activities.

What follows is a breakdown of the individual criteria and accompanying assessments given by partners, with brief explanations for their scores. The report will first cover progress on participation and then proceed onto transparency. Finally, the report will consider promising progress and challenges in partner country NAPs and will conclude by listing recommendations to build upon the successes achieved so far.


## PROGRESS ON PARTICIPATION

The overall assessment from SV-Adapt partners on participation is SOME CONDITIONS IN PLACE – with an overall score of 1.69

### Assessment Principles:

**JPA Principle A:** The formulation, implementation and monitoring of adaptation policies is participatory and inclusive

**JPA Principle D, Criterion D1:** Communities affected by climate change participate in defining adaptation options and priorities



**CRITERION A1 - Multiple stakeholders (such as, but not limited to civil society, sub-national governments, research institutes, academia, private sector, and indigenous peoples) participate in defining options and priorities**

### SOME CONDITIONS IN PLACE (SCORE RANGE: 1-2)

The overall picture is that all countries analysed allow for some engagement of civil society and other stakeholders, while the scope of stakeholder involvement varies from case-to-case:

In **Malawi**, the assessment is that - *“mechanisms for stakeholder consultation are defined in general terms in various policy instruments but there are no mechanisms for various stakeholders to define options and priorities in the context of climate change adaptation planning.”*

In **Vietnam**, SVA’s partner finds that the relevant ministries are - *“open to enhance participation with other stakeholders in developing and implementing governmental policies (...) however, the NAP is still in the beginning steps of development so CSOs have not had much involvement so far.”*

## **CRITERION A2 – The knowledge and experience of local communities and indigenous peoples is incorporated**

### **SOME CONDITIONS IN PLACE (SCORE RANGE: 1-2)**

In general, some effort has been made to consult local communities and indigenous peoples:

**Cambodia** for example reports a highly consultative and inclusive process - *“The vulnerable farmers, IP (indigenous peoples) and affected community regularly engaged in consultative workshops such as farmer forums, dialogue sessions with policy makers and inputs into research or joint statements. 80% of community requests (80%) were reflected in the NAP priority and Environment Code.”*

**Nepal** also has both formal recognition and a consultative process, while in **Vietnam** the network emphasises that – *“many reports from CSOs have been shared with the government at workshops, meetings”*. However, despite progress also being reported, **Malawi** highlights – *“most of the policies do not articulate specific ways in which indigenous knowledge can be harnessed and utilized.”*

5

## **CRITERION A3 - Plans and policies are publicised in ways that local people can understand and engage with**

### **SOME CONDITIONS IN PLACE (SCORE RANGE: 1-2)**

The key issue related to this criterion is whether plans and policies are available in local languages. This is the case in **Malawi** where – *“the recently developed climate change and disaster risk management policies have been summarised and translated into vernacular languages. This trend will continue with other policy documents waiting to be developed.”*

In **Vietnam**, the challenge is instead to move beyond technical ministerial language and improve access to information – *“This (technical) language limits understanding amongst the general public (MoNRE, 2014). (...) rural people, particularly those in remote areas, (and) ethnic minority people are not aware of this source of information nor are they able to access it.”*

## **CRITERION D1 - Communities affected by climate change participate in defining adaptation options**

### **SOME CONDITIONS IN PLACE (SCORE RANGE: 1-3)**

This final criterion for participation reflects a mixed set of assessments by partners, with most highlighting areas for improvement.

The impressive rating in **Nepal** (3) reflects the country’s track record of providing Local Adaptation Plans of Action (LAPA’s) as a cornerstone of its national adaptation planning process – *“Communities have the opportunity to bring feedback and input into proposed plans before final decisions are made. In the context of Nepal LAPA is being formulated by using its seven step cyclic process, where communities have equal rights to put their views and ideas.”*

In **Vietnam**, SVA’s partner emphasises– *“Within NTP-RCC policy itself, the two-way dialogue approach especially focus on local community is highlighted. However, in reality, there is no mechanism for communities to involve in the planning process and implementation and very few communities (in several outstanding provinces like Can Tho, Ben Tre, Quang Nam with strong support from donors) have opportunities for feedback and input to the program’s implementation.”*


In **Cambodia**, SVA’s partner highlights how a lack of resources limited their contribution to the NAP at the local level – “NECA members worked closely with the commune to ensure that the community are aware of climate impact and their needs for CCA are incorporated and supported in CIP/CDP [community investment/development plans, ed.]. Still, only very tiny number of communes were targeted.”

**PROGRESS ON TRANSPARENCY**

**JPA Principle B:** Public funds for adaptation are utilised efficiently and managed transparently and with integrity

**JPA Principle G, Criterion 4:** Climate information is made accessible to enable adaptive decision making by all stakeholders

The overall assessment from the 6 countries surveyed on transparency is **LITTLE PROGRESS** – with an overall score of 1.35



**CRITERION B1 – The implementation and financing of plans is periodically monitored by a body on which civil society is represented.**

**LITTLE PROGRESS (SCORE RANGE 0-3)**

The reason for the low rating on this criterion is because monitoring mechanisms have either not yet been developed or are still in their early stages in many cases. For instance, **Vietnam** scored 0 because – “The MRV system under PA and NAP is still in developing process.” In **Cambodia**, a monitoring system allowing civil

society involvement was only established in 2017 signifying that “some conditions are in place”, which explains its low score of 1. This is also the case in Malawi, where - *“there is no body which is involved specifically in monitoring plans, (but) the adaptation sub-committee [of the National Technical Committee on Climate Change, ed. ] provides an overall oversight of the implementation of the adaptation plans and civil society are represented.”*

## CRITERION B2 – Adaptation funding is made available through a transparent process of allocation

### SOME CONDITIONS IN PLACE (SCORE RANGE: 1-3)

One reason given for this middling score comes from SVA’s Nepalese partner’s assessment that – *“Allocation of all adaptation monies for various uses is made known, with little information on how it has been decided- The information is available to the public only after the decision made by concern authority.”*

**Vietnam** emphasise that criteria for allocation has also been publicised, but **Malawi** mentions that the information from government on funding is *“controlled and regulated”*.

The reason for the low score in **Cambodia** is that despite a transparent framework being in place, there are no resources channelled through it – *“There was limited funding sources from CSOs and government. It is now only project-based funding. There is a financing allocation framework in place that contributes to the transparent process in the future.”*

## CRITERION B3 - There is full and free access to information on how adaptation funds are being spent (finances and processes)

### SOME CONDITIONS IN PLACE (SCORE RANGE: 1-2)

The general assessment on this criterion is that despite moderate progress in some countries, more can be done to formalise and publicise funding of adaptation activities.

**Nepal** and **Malawi** for example gave a score of 2, showing significant progress.

**Cambodia** however highlight the lack of a database or system mapping adaptation finance and projects – *“There is no database and M&E system in place now. We can request for information about funding / projects directly from different stakeholders who fund the projects such as the ADB, UNDP and the Ministry of Environment.”*

The opposite seems to be the case in **Vietnam** where – *“funds go into central budget support, rather than target projects. This information is not publicized and freely available.”*



**CRITERION B4 - There is a mechanism in place to safeguard against initiatives that might have negative impacts.**

**LITTLE PROGRESS (SCORE RANGE: 0-3)**

Overall most partners rated the current arrangements in place poorly, with the exception of Nepal.

The partner network in **Nepal** indicates that – *“civil society has the opportunity to propose measures to mitigate negative impacts of proposed actions”* – showing their rationale for scoring 3. The network in **Malawi** highlights that the mechanism in place is not implemented consistently – *“The Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) is a requirement by law but the practice/implementation is not properly done. Consultants to conduct the work are rarely made public”*. A similar picture exists in Vietnam, where Environmental and Social Impact Assessments *“are rarely meaningfully conducted.”*

**CRITERION B5 - A secure mechanism for expressing grievances and seeking redress is available**

**LITTLE PROGRESS (SCORE RANGE: between 2 to 0 in Vietnam, where there is “no mechanism for grievance or complaints is in place”)**

There was a fairly wide degree of variation on the criterion, which may be reflective of the countries’ different stages in the NAP process.

**In Cambodia**, there is a general complaint mechanism in place at the local commune level, but beyond that there is *no any specific mechanism at different levels*. In **Malawi**, there are general complaint mechanisms at local level and through the court system, but – *“the procedure of redress for possible adaptation failure is not explicitly documented in adaptation planning documents. As such, existing mechanisms cannot easily be considered as mechanism for redress in the absence of clear guidance.”*

**CRITERION G4 – Climate information is made accessible to enable adaptive decision making by all stakeholders**

**SOME CONDITIONS IN PLACE (SCORE RANGE: 0-3)**

Again, the criterion represented a high degree of variation.

**In Sri Lanka**, the NAP process includes provisions a *“common repository of scientific awareness materials on climate change adaptation”*, representing a valuable resource for all stakeholders.

However, **in Vietnam**, *“climate change information (...) is not available for public with understandable language. There are very few projects about this topic and they are has not disseminated widely”*, suggesting more needs to be done to promote and inform the wider public on adaptation projects.

## POSITIVE FEATURES OF NAP PROCESSES

Wider impacts of NAPs regarding participation and transparency have also taken place in partner countries, representing important shifts in approaches that Southern Voices on Adaptation see as encouraging.

**In Kenya**, NAP planning and implementation has taken into account its decentralised governance structure by involving county-level governments who, along with other stakeholders (including civil society), were involved in both the Adaptation Technical Analysis Report informing the NAP and NAP implementation.

**In Sri Lanka**, where “various access points for civil society actors” are required for technical support and feedback, CSOs, INGOs and government agencies have been able to co-produce key adaptation material.

**In Cambodia**, following recommendations stemming from the NAP roadmap, civil society have been able to provide shared input into Cambodia’s NAP planning process.

This collaborative approach is echoed in **Malawi**, where the NAP process has been designed in an inclusive way, giving opportunities for “all kinds and levels of stakeholders to contribute” - including civil society, faith groups, academia, women and youth.

The Malawian NAP has also “assisted in terms of a mind-set change”; moving from a short-term focus towards a “focus on medium and long term” planning, whilst anchoring the national process to the international level.

**In Vietnam**, responsibility for the NAP as part of the Paris Agreement implementation has been delegated to the country’s 63 provinces – this is seen as an opportunity for civil society to engage at the provincial as well as national level.

**In Nepal**, the government has taken part in a) building on the track record of the Local Adaptation Plans of Action (LAPA)s under the NAPA framework b) aligning the NAP, the SDGs and DRR and c) adopting “development first” with integration of adaptation actions.

## CHALLENGES TO ADDRESS

Despite the positive trends listed above, there are still some common challenges that NAP processes should consider as they move forward:

- There is a technical capacity gap in some SVA partner countries, such as county offices in **Kenya**. This is also mentioned in Malawi, specifically regarding limited capacity to analyse current and future climate change scenarios and climate modelling.
- Financial constraints are cited in several countries. In **Malawi**, the NAP process has even stalled after the completion of the first phase following the completion of the Road Map and Stocktaking Report. In **Nepal**, the process is on hold due to technical problems relating to the NAP readiness grant from the Green Climate Fund.
- Climate Change is still not considered a national budgetary priority in many countries.
- An unclear plan for involvement of CSOs in the NAP process is mentioned as a consistent challenge.
- Lack of resources to involve the local communities, CSOs, and other stakeholders is present as well as lack of climate change information and long-term scenarios during the preparation of the NAP.

## RECOMMENDATIONS:

Based upon the challenges and assessments provided by partners, Southern Voices on Adaptation provides the following recommendations to enhance participation and transparency in NAPs.

- More funding should be dedicated and ear-marked to increase both transparency and participation

## ON PARTICIPATION:

10

- The needs of vulnerable groups need to be supported and implemented, not just recognised in formal documents

*Criterion A1. Multiple stakeholders participate in defining options and priorities*

- More resources to support and bring together stakeholders (CSOs etc.)
- A formal mechanism for other actors to define options and priorities in the context of climate change adaptation planning

*Criterion A2. The knowledge and experience of local communities and indigenous peoples is incorporated*

- A mechanism is introduced to involve indigenous/local knowledge
- Policies articulate specific ways in which indigenous knowledge can and is harnessed and utilised

*Criterion A3. Plans and policies are publicized in ways that local people can understand and engage with*

- Translation of plans into local languages
- Dissemination of information on plans to affected areas

*Criterion D1. Communities affected by climate change participate in defining adaptation options and priorities*

- A mechanism to involve affected communities in developing plans
- Specific reflection of issues relevant to affected communities in government policies and plans

## ON TRANSPARENCY:

*Criterion B1. The implementation and financing of plans is periodically monitored by a body on which civil society is represented*

- A monitoring and evaluation framework of NAPs needs to be clear and disseminated to all stakeholders
- Expanded involvement of CSOs in examining monitoring results and access to research on projects

*Criterion B2. Adaptation funding is made available through a transparent process of allocation*

- Ear-marking of budget allocation for adaptation projects (made available to public)
- Introduction of documentation on *how* and *why* decisions related to funding and allocation of projects have been made, with this being available to stakeholders

*Criterion B3. There is full and free access to information on how adaptation funds are being spent (finances and processes)*

- Mechanism to publish budget allocation on specific projects transparently, rather than through a centralised (and hidden) allocation system

[www.southernvoices.net](http://www.southernvoices.net)

*Criterion B4. There is a mechanism in place to safeguard against initiatives that might have negative impacts*

- The procedure of redress regarding adaptation projects is explicitly documented in adaptation planning documents.

*Criterion B5. A secure mechanism for expressing grievances and seeking redress is available*

- Ability to submit complaints/grievances anonymously regarding adaptation projects

11

*Criterion G4. Climate information is made accessible to enable adaptive decision making by all stakeholders*

- A climate change communication strategy is put in place by government, which needs to be reviewed and updated to take on board new and emerging issues
- Creation of knowledge sharing channels between government and stakeholders

## **AN INVITATION TO ALL STAKEHOLDERS**

We hope that the assessments and insights offered by our partners make their way into future considerations throughout NAP processes across the world. We also hope the recommendations, and the methodology employed by Southern Voices by using the Joint Principles for Adaptation, will be applied and utilised to both promote and monitor future adaptation activities. To find out more about the JPA, Southern Voices on Adaptation, and to access a variety of tools developed to promote pro-poor and equitable adaptation please visit: [www.southernvoices.net](http://www.southernvoices.net)