the effective delivery of adaptation funding

'passing the buck...to the people that need it most'

Charles Ehrhart, CARE International Climate Change Coordinator





envisioning adaptation funding flows in poor countries

- NAPAs and other national level strategic planning processes are supposed to identify priorities
- international funds are intended to provide (partial?) resources for follow-through
- purposeful link between national-level processes and international-level adaptation frameworks





This presentation is about the effective delivery of international adaptation funding "in" poor countries, not "to" poor countries.

what's needed to make it matter for poor people?

- richer set of principles for adaptation funding
- clearer process guidelines and support
- conducive international frameworks & institutions



current principles

- adaptation should be "mainstreamed"
- adaptation planning should be "participatory" (vs. consultative)





The focus of current principles is on "process." This isn't a bad start. But it needs to be expanded to include a commitment to results, or impact principles. So, let's split our assessment of principles and conditions into two categories: process, on the one hand, and results, or impacts on the other.

Question #1:

What should the process of determining adaptation priorities look like in poor countries?



We can look to other processes for key lessons (such as PRSPs, efforts to "mainstream" gender and the environment in national plans, and the global response to HIV/AIDS). We don't have to reinvent the wheel, nor do we have to learn every lesson the hard way.

additional 'process' principles

- ♦ inclusive planning
- transparent decision-making





Question #2:

What kinds of activities should receive priority adaptation funding support?

🎇 care

'results-oriented' principles

- the most vulnerable communities and social groups targeted
- community-based adaptation supported
- conditions (e.g. the monitoring of impacts and outcomes) for downward-accountability created





The focus of current principles is on "process." This isn't a bad start. But even then, the list of process-oriented principles needs to be expanded. What can we learn from the evolution of PRSPs and other national-level planning processes?

guidelines and support

- guidelines and indicators are needed to help stakeholder achieve/ realise principles and conditions
- financial and technical support





In order to achieve/realise principles, stakeholders will need guidelines and indicators of success. But this won't be enough. They will also need financial and technical support.

Question #3:

How do international policy frameworks and institutions need to be structured so that they support the best national-level plans and practices?

international frameworks and institutions

- timeframes that are conducive to best process/practices
- minimalist set of requirements intended to do one thing - quickly channel resources to the people that need them most
- partnering rather than policing



