



**Interim Review**  
**of the**  
**Southern Voices on Adaptation**  
**programme**

Prepared on behalf of CARE Danmark

by

Raja Jarrah, Consultant

**August 2015**

## Interim Review of Southern Voices on Adaptation

---

### Introduction

This interim review of the Southern Voices on Adaptation (SVA) programme is based on information from project partners to July 2015, and further elaborates on the assessment of project progress already shared with SV partners at their workshop in Nairobi in April. It has been prepared now in order to support the request for funding for a future phase to be submitted to CISU, though the current phase runs to December 2015 and partners will be reporting on more achievements in the coming months.

### Achievements so far against objectives

#### Objective 1: Principles of Good Practice in National Adaptation are developed and employed in capacity building and advocacy

Level of achievement to date	Full	Partial	Not
Result 1.1: Draft statement of Joint Adaptation Standards has been developed			
Result 1.2: Coalition of civil society actors engaged in testing standards in different contexts			
Result 1.3: Case studies of national experiences used to refine and revise standards			

The first version of the Joint Principles for Adaptation (JPA) was adopted in 2014 after the inception workshop in Kathmandu (Result 1.1), and been put to use by partners in a variety of ways (Result 1.2). Based on their experiences, in April 2015 the JPA were modified at a workshop of project partners in Nairobi (Result 1.3). The modifications agreed by all partners for JPA Version 2.0, beyond minor edits, were changes in wording:

- to be more explicit about the range of stakeholders involved in consultation;
- to extend the scope beyond adaptation planning, and also cover monitoring and implementation
- to ensure that local adaptation planning is consistent with national level considerations; and
- to recognise the forms of social discrimination other than gender that contribute to climate vulnerability.

At the time of the revision, it was evident that the experience of using the JPA varied significantly between partners from different countries. The programme deliberately selected partner networks that covered a range of diverse operating contexts, to widen the scope of lesson-learning, so it was only to be expected that progress would not be the same everywhere. Twelve national partners are engaged in the programme, comprising: five core networks which are founding members of the JPA initiative, receiving grants of around \$40,000 each from the SVA budget; and seven affiliate networks, recruited through a call for proposals for testing the JPA, each receiving around \$20,000.

Factors contributing to the mixed pace of progress included:

### Different national policy contexts:

In four countries, Cambodia, Malawi, Nepal and Sri Lanka, the government is embarking on national adaptation planning, and the JPA is being used, to a greater or lesser extent, to help define the areas on which civil society will focus its input into the process. In Nicaragua, the climate change law is under development and there is potential for the JPA to be used to influence its content. The approach has so far been indirect, using the JPA as an awareness-raising and capacity-building tool among NGOs and at municipality level, as channels for dialogue and direct advocacy with national government are limited. In the remaining six countries engaged in the project, (Bolivia, Ghana, Guatemala, Kenya, Mozambique, Vietnam<sup>1</sup>) the climate change policy framework is largely in place (though not always the adaptation framework within it), and the main use of the JPA is to influence how it is implemented. In Kenya, for example, the JPA has been cited in dialogue with the government about the importance of gender, and to define transparency around adaptation finance.

### Relationship with government

Although climate change tends to be one of the less contentious areas of engagement between the state and civil society, the ease with which partners are able to work with their governments is a result of wider historical and political factors. In some countries, such as Malawi, Nepal or Sri Lanka, it has been fairly straightforward to gain access to relevant parts of government and discuss the JPA. In others, for example Bolivia, Nicaragua and Cambodia, civil society is held at a deliberate distance by government, and more indirect approaches are needed.

It is also worth noting that many of the partners are in countries in a state of political flux, with elections introducing uncertainty about the pace and direction of policy, as well as changes in government officials responsible for adaptation planning.

### Internal capacity issues:

The five core networks (Nicaragua, Bolivia, Malawi, Vietnam and Cambodia) all had a head start on the seven additional networks that were selected in a call for proposals after the start of the project. However, two of these partners had staffing issues which delayed the start of their implementation substantially. LIDEMA in Bolivia was undergoing internal changes and had difficulty in appointing a consistent staff focal point for the SVA project. CCCN in Cambodia was without a coordinator for almost a year and had a delayed contract signature while their Danish partner DCA identified additional funds.

For the second cohort of partners, those that were able to incorporate the JPA into their existing bodies of work on adaptation advocacy (Sri Lanka, Nepal, Kenya, Ghana, Guatemala) have made more visible progress than those that were embarking on a new initiative (Niger and Mozambique). LIBIRD in Nepal, for example, has been able to undertake a fairly ambitious consultation and research process despite receiving only a

---

<sup>1</sup> In Vietnam the principle government programmes for climate change expire at the end of 2015, and all future actions will be mainstreamed into overarching national programs for rural development and poverty reduction

relatively small grant from SVA<sup>2</sup>. The climate change platform in Mozambique, on the other hand, has to date still not been able to move beyond the early research and scoping stage.

For some partners, the funding provided by SVA for testing the JPA was complementary to related activities funded under separate projects. According to the survey conducted in June 2015, most partners were able to commence activities on the JPA before funds were actually received from SVA. In two cases, Kenya and Ghana, they were not; and funding was only received late September/early October 2014.

So far, partner networks have sought to use the JPA in these different ways:

Inform research, inc. report on national adaptation status	Link local actors to the national level	Analyse sectoral policy	Influence advocacy priorities of the network
Mozambique <sup>3</sup> Bolivia Nepal	Kenya Cambodia Nepal Guatemala	Nicaragua	Ghana Malawi Sri Lanka Vietnam

**Objective 2: Civil society promotes pro-poor and equitable adaptation in 7 countries, based on JPA**

Level of achievement to date	Full	Partial	Not
Result 2.1: Analysis of key actors in adaptation in selected countries			
Result 2.2: Status of adaptation analysed in selected countries:			
Result 2.3: Advocacy strategies and interventions in 10 countries			
Result 2.4: Simplified NAP – Guidelines produced			

By July 2015, only four networks have presented advocacy strategies that include a detailed stakeholder analysis (Result 2.1). This does not mean that networks are not aware of the key actors in their policy context – intuitively they will know who needs to be influenced. However it does imply that their approach to advocacy is likely to be more opportunistic and not based on a deliberate strategy with an underlying theory of change or influence map.

Five partners (Ghana, Malawi, Vietnam, Bolivia and Sri Lanka) have reported on the status of adaptation planning and implementation in their countries, with a further two reports in progress (Nicaragua and Cambodia) (Result 2.2). In one sense this result has been over-achieved since this analysis was only expected from core partner networks, yet partners from Ghana and Sri Lanka were also able to submit one. In particular, CANSA and Janathakshan have used the JPA version 2.0 to evaluate the current draft NAP in Sri Lanka, and also help determine key indicators and specific institutional requirements based on the principles and criteria of the JPA.

<sup>2</sup> Activities in Nepal have had to be scaled back in view of the need to dedicate capacity towards earthquake response after April 2015.

<sup>3</sup> By agreement the grant for Mozambique was used for developing an advocacy strategy rather than actual advocacy

*In the process of interviews and research to prepare the adaptation status report for **Ghana**, ABANTU/GACCES realized that their advocacy needs to reach beyond the Ministry of Environment, Science, Technology and Innovation (MESTI), which had been their original focus. They identified that key amongst the implementing entities is the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), with which they now plan to engage on the JPAs, and to ascertain the extent to which the principles are being utilized.*

Although not all partners have submitted formal advocacy strategies, the majority of have reported on some form of advocacy activity related to the JPA that has taken place (Result 2.3). The target of 10 countries was achieved, though such interventions have yet to start Mozambique, and Niger.

*CISONECC has successfully used the JPA to inform the processes leading to the development of National Meteorological Policy in **Malawi**. It has included strategies for community participation, balance in investments, effective climate information generation, dissemination and use and coordination between government sectors. Notably, the policy has also included Participatory Scenario Planning (PSP) as one of the strategies to be used by government in managing climate information.*

This lack of a formal advocacy strategy among many partners is one more marker that the SVA programme finds itself still at an early stage of the influencing process. Activities such as awareness raising and initial dialogue can be more wide-ranging and less focused at the stage of introducing the JPA. As the advocacy initiative progresses, the specific influencing objectives, and corresponding targets and tactics, will need to be made more explicit.

Networks have so far been predominantly using the JPA within their “comfort zones” – talking to civil society actors, or to familiar government departments and contacts. As networks have many members involved in implementation of adaptation actions, local or municipal government levels have sometimes been approached, rather than the national level. Ultimately, however, for many of the principles in the JPA to be respected they need to be heeded and acted upon by national government departments. An important consideration in a follow-on phase for SVA is the needs for a progression to different advocacy targets and audiences to create lasting impact.

*In **Vietnam**, CCWG produced a National Adaptation Status report as part of the SVA programme. Subsequently, this report served as a basis for drafting CCWG’s comments on Vietnam’s Indicative Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) report to the UNFCCC, thus using the JPA as a conceptual tool to conduct an initial assessment of the INDC’s Adaptation component. Comments were submitted to the Government in July 2015, along with the JPA and assessment tool for the INDC drafting team themselves to apply.*

## Southern Voices on Adaptation - Interim Review, August 2015

By July 2015 partners had raised the JPA with government staff and officials in these ways:

Not discussed yet	Local-level government officials	Members of legislature	Ministry of Environment	Several different national Ministries
Mozambique Bolivia Malawi	Guatemala Nepal	Kenya Nicaragua	Ghana (expert group) Cambodia (written submission to Minister)	Sri Lanka Nepal Vietnam

SVA has produced a guide for civil society on how to engage with the LEG technical guidelines for developing NAPs (Result 4), but there is little evidence that this has been used by partners. Several reasons contribute to this:

- it was produced before the JPA were developed, and therefore does not relate directly to the application of the Principles and Criteria; this resource needs to be updated and made more specific;
- most networks have yet to engage with their national governments on NAP processes – and many governments are not themselves directly following the LEG procedure – so a “guide to the guidelines” has simply not been needed; and
- the guide has simply been made available for those who wish to use it, without any proactive training or outreach efforts. As such, it may have gone un-noticed, sitting passively as a resource on the SVA website.

Partners have expressed the need for a different kind of guidance, specifically on “localisation” – how to interpret the JPA and associated criteria in local contexts. This can potentially be delivered through a “help desk” or knowledge-sharing platform and discussion forum on the SV website. A structure to do this, along with production of some supporting materials, needs to feature in the design of a future project phase.

Notwithstanding all the above, a survey in May 2015 demonstrated that a large majority of networks have found the JPA useful for their work.

*“Please rate on a scale 1-5 (where 5 is the highest) the added value of the JPA in your efforts to influence development and implementation of adaptation policies”*

	1-	2-	3-	4-	5-	Total-
Responses	0	0	17% (2)	50% (6)	33% (4)	12

(because the survey responses were anonymous it is not possible to identify which network gave what rating)

### Objective 3: Official developing country delegates and CSOs draw on the JPA in the international climate negotiations

Level of achievement to date	Full	Partial	Not
Result 3.1: Policy briefs for targeted advocacy at national delegates			
Result 3.2: Diversified communications and media used to reach delegates			

The JPA have not been used to influence international negotiations in the way originally envisaged – namely, through informing and influencing national delegates. The analysis was made that there was limited scope for promoting the JPA in the UNFCCC negotiations on

adaptation, since that framework had been by and large already agreed. Rather, the most productive channel for advocacy to promote pro-poor adaptation was around how that framework was operationalised and implemented. Thus SVA shifted its attention to the Adaptation Committee and the NAP support process. The JPA were presented to government officials at the NAP Expo events held in Bonn, in August 2014 and April 2015. Inclusion of the JPA in written submissions to the UNFCCC has also ensured that it receives official mention in UNFCCC records, and on their website. SVA has established good connections with the Adaptation section in UNFCCC secretariat, which has been supportive in suggesting further avenues for JPA dissemination, such as the Nairobi Work Programme.

*Janathakshan/ CANSA-SL have worked with ministries and the expert committee on climate change to convince the government of **Sri Lanka** to host the next Asia-Pacific Adaptation Network (APAN) summit in 2016. As CANSA-SL has been consistently promoting the JPA in Sri Lanka, this event will provide an excellent opportunity to disseminate the JPA to a wider audience.*

The JPA has received more exposure in international spaces with a predominantly civil society audience, including two Community Based Adaptation conferences (CBA8 in Kathmandu and CBA9 in Nairobi), and COP20 in Lima. Some civil society actors have picked up on the JPA for their own work: the Adaptation Fund Network, coordinated by Germanwatch, has used the JPA to develop the analytical framework for its guidance for assessing adaptation funding initiatives in countries; and CAFOD has developed a programme with Suswatch for a regional initiative on tracking adaptation finance in Central America, based on principles drawn from the JPA. CARE's Adaptation Learning Programme is also making use of some elements of the JPA in its advocacy work.

These are early signs that the JPA will have traction outside the boundaries of the project. It will be important to maintain this potential in its sights during the follow-up phase. However, experience has shown that the thrust of the connection between the JPA and international policy needs to be inverted – rather than seeking to use the JPA to influence international negotiations, the programme should consider the international policy framework as a way to encourage implementation of the JPA within countries.

### Management considerations

The feedback from partners is that there are few major management issues that need to be addressed. The majority of respondents, (six out of nine), agreed that the current design was good and needed no major changes. Two of the three who “slightly disagreed” offered no comment on what needed changing – and a third (Cambodia) requested an increased grant size, and a dedicated regional facilitator for SouthEast Asia. The need for more funds and closer regional facilitation was echoed in some comments by others.

In separate conversations, Regional Facilitators have themselves raised the need for resources to enable them to work more closely with partners on a one-to-one basis. They have been creative in using other regional events as a mechanism for bringing partners together, allowing for shared learning and capacity-building, but this is a poor substitute for focussed attention on supporting a single network.

## Southern Voices on Adaptation - Interim Review, August 2015

Overall there was 100% consensus (strongly agree/agree) on the following statements, which support the continuation of an essentially business-as-usual approach:

- We have sufficient flexibility in how we use our SVA funding
- The reporting requirements of the SV secretariat are adequate for our network and not too demanding
- We appreciate having a regional facilitator and we make full use of the support they provide to benefit from the SV programme
- The conference calls and web-meetings run by SV have been useful for learning from other networks in the project
- We find the Southern Voices website a useful resource for our work

There was also consensus on two further statements, which suggest the need for additional or improved services from the project (plus a request for more communications in Spanish):

- It is important for us to get feedback on the reports we submit to SV Secretariat
- We would like the SV Secretariat to provide more services to the network

The two disagreements on the statement “The support we get from our SVA funding partners is of good quality and appropriate to our needs” seem to be related to inadequacy of funding, rather than other support. Only one respondent commented on the delay in receiving funding (LIDEMA – in their case, over three months between contract signature and funds received), but it is also known that this partner had other operational challenges that would not have been resolved by a speedier flow of funds.

Period between signature and funding	Partners	Consortium member
Less than two weeks	NCCK. ABANTU	CARE
Up to one month	CCWG. LIBIRD	CARE
Up to two months	SOTZIL, ANACC	IBIS
Over three months.	LIDEMA	IBIS

*Note: DCA partners in Cambodia and Malawi did not provide data, nor did CARE partners in Niger and Mozambique.*

### Tentative conclusions

...on track...  ....but by slow train!

The JPA clearly have potential, but there has not been enough time for this to be out to the test. National processes are taking longer than envisaged to get under way, and the project design relies on a certain momentum at national level to achieve impact internationally. Already there are signs that the JPA is demonstrating its utility, and long-term potential, but a consolidation phase is needed to build on what has been achieved so far.

The JPA are essentially framed with a NAP process in mind, while nevertheless being phrased to make them relevant to all adaptation policy processes. However, in the face of limited funding both for adaptation for NAP development itself, NAP progress in 2014-15 has been slow. The UNDP Global Support Programme reports progress for 25 countries (<http://www.undp-alm.org/projects/naps-ldcs/country-initiatives>), approximately 50% of LDCs, with half of these cases being little more than attendance at a regional workshop and exploratory discussions. However, NAPs are poised to receive new impetus with the

operationalisation of the Green Climate Fund, and the emergence of new initiatives such as the Adaptation Knowledge Initiative, Adaptation Gap Report and the NAP Global Network.

So while the slow progress of NAPs might have been seen as a constraint to the early utility of the JPA, it also represents an opportunity: wider dissemination and deeper engagement on the JPA now is very timely and increasingly relevant as NAPs gain momentum. The original vision of the programme remains valid.

***“If the approach proves successful after two years, the ...initiative will have a life of its own, with supporters and champions outside the present project... spreading the use and adoption of the JPA to more countries,... civil society networks, governments, (and) donor agencies...”***  
(from original CISU project proposal)

Looking ahead to a new phase, any extension of the existing project should factor in the following considerations:

- Objective 1 has been fulfilled - the JPA have been developed to the point where they are ready for release. There will be cause for further modification and refinement in future, as partners gain more experience of localising and contextualising the JPA, but the bulk of the conceptual work has been done.
- There are a new set of institutions and relationships that are relevant for SVA to engage with, directly or indirectly, in order to disseminate the JPA. New research, networking, guidance and learning on adaptation planning has continued to emerge since the original project design. Partners have to remain up to date with the institutions that governments are paying attention to.
- Partners have demonstrated that the “classic” model (formal advocacy strategy with stakeholder analysis targeted at NAP influence) proposed in the original design is not the only way to make use of the JPA. How adaptation will be framed in the Paris agreement is not yet clear and may even suggest new modalities for using the JPA. The programme should remain open and flexible to creative uses of the JPA.

This review recommends that this SVA project should be followed up with a new phase. The opportunity to influence pro-poor adaptation has never been greater; the JPA tool is remains useful and relevant; and existing partners have acquired some good experience and developed momentum that is already beginning to yield results.

Any new project should:

- maintain the JPA as its flagship;
- continue to work across all continents;
- provide for the ongoing capacity-building of partner networks, while focusing on those likely to achieve results;
- enable closer support to partner networks for interpretation of the JPA in their local context, including through some form of “Help Desk” function.