Dear Colleagues and Friends

We received some really thoughtful inputs to our latest Exchange and I would like to give you an overview of the responses.

Linkages between NAPs and NDCs

Avijit Paul from Bangladesh said that NAPs and NDCs should be complementary, especially as Dr. Chanakod Chasidpon from Thailand pointed out that the NDCs are meant to focus on reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, while the NAPs are intended to identify adaptation needs and how to address them. Robert Dobias said that many of the NDCs in Asia-Pacific also include adaptation plans, so there is a need for consistency across all related plans and strategies. SVRK Prabhakar from Japan notes that the inclusion of adaptation in developing country NDCs reflects the priority that these countries place on the need for adaptation and their burgeoning disaster-related costs. Chuluunkhuu Baatar from Mongolia confirms that adaptation is of the “utmost importance”, so it has been highlighted in the NDCs and will be addressed more comprehensively in a forthcoming NAP.

Aligning NAPs and NDCs with the SDGs

All of the respondents agreed that the NAPs and NDCs should be aligned with the SDGs, and not just SDG13 on climate change. Chanakod Chasidpon identified SDG2 on ending hunger, SDG9 on resilient infrastructure, and SDG 11 on safe, resilient, and sustainable cities as three goals with obvious linkages with climate change. Binaya Raj Shivakoti suggests that the SDGs are the broader policy goal, so the NAPs/NDCs will have to complement the SDGs. Robert Dobias goes even further and suggested that NAPs, NDCs, and SDGs all need to be fully aligned with national economic and social development plans and sectoral strategies and plans.

How best to use NAPs, NDCs, and SDGs to advance climate resilient development in Asia-Pacific

Avijit Paul proposes that awareness of climate change impacts is already high, so the priority need now is to create/revitalize common platforms to share what really works in implementing climate resilience strategies. Chanakod Chasidpon suggests that we need to draw from the NAPs, NDCs, and SDGs synergistic programs and projects to enhance climate resilient development. Robert Dobias goes a step further and suggests regional bodies like SPREP and ASEAN might follow the EU example and develop a regional NDC covering both mitigation and adaptation. SVRK Prabhakar believes that the NAPs should borrow the metrics from the SDGs and adapt them to the “much-needed metrics within the adaptation process”. By combining adaptation objectives in the NAPs, NDCs, and SDGs, Chuluunkhuu Batar believes this could not only raise awareness and integrate adaptation into national development plans but also assist in raising the necessary funding. Binaya Raj Shivakoti also sees NAPs, NDCs, and SDGs attracting external support.

Ratcheting up adaptation ambition through NAPs and NDCs

All respondents agree that there is a need to ratchet up the adaptation ambitions under the Paris Agreement. Binaya Raj Shivakoti said “we are already in the era of adaptation” and it is not some far off future concern. Chuluunkhuu Batar points out that the NAPs should be used to update the NDCs and raise adaptation
ambitions. Avijit Paul makes a good point that revision of developed country NDCs should ratchet up their support for adaptation in least developed countries.

Other observations

Dr. Chanakod Chasidpon suggests that the UNFCCC should provide a clearer scope of NDCs and clarify if all aspects of climate change should be included or only mitigation.

Robert Dobias wonders whether climate resilient development would be strengthened by multi-country adaptation plans, particularly where there are shared resources like river basins or marine resources. This may help to lift the adaptation ambitions of neighboring countries that don’t have the same level of technical or financial resources.

SVRK Prabhakar points out that NAPs don’t really have the same rigorous targets and metrics as the SDGs. “Targets and metrics for NAPs would help in the better harmonization of these two”.

A late submission was received from Anoop Poonia, who was travelling, so we have added his thoughts to the other submissions. Please check out his ideas too.

So, once again, my sincere appreciation to everyone who contributed their valuable opinions on these topics. If you have an issue that you would like the network of several thousand people interested in climate change adaptation to weigh in on, please let us know. Professor Holland from USP in Fiji has suggested that we should orient the next Exchange to issues of concern to the small island developing states, so please let us know what are the greatest concerns affecting these most vulnerable countries.

Dr. Peter N. King
Senior Policy Advisor
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)
Regional Centre

Responses from the APAN Community

Anoop Poonia, Policy Coordinator - Financial Flows, Climate Action Network-International (CAN), India
(Posted on 31 January 2018)

1. What are the linkages between NAPs and NDCs and how can we align the NAPs and NDC processes with the SDGs?

The NDCs and SDGs have the milestone and goal relationships. The SDGs are the goals each country aspires to while the NDCs are the stepping stones.

The Adaptation Goal envisaged in Paris Agreement can be concretely and measurably framed through SDGs with its set of targets and indicators. And SDGs can be in turn achieved through NDCs.

2. In what ways can countries use NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs to advance climate resilient development in Asia-Pacific?

- Countries should link these 3 to their key constituency priorities such as women and child welfare, income of farmers and health, forests and wildlife conservation, as these are mutually reinforcing for development indicators as well as serve to meet various goals in various fora.
- Integrated and women-child responsive planning helps to build appreciation for open, green spaces in cities that act as sinks and heat island antidotes besides supporting urban species and water security.
- The interplay between the 3 as well as other development/growth goals need to be harmonised with single directorate or secretariat ensuring convergence and harmony between various ministries/departments.
- The NDCs lack a template of roadmap and implementation so they are a combination of vision and policies that are housed in various ministries. The SDGs too are embedded in the various policies and schemes of the governments. So these 3 can provide the overarching framework that brings the ministries together.
3. Should adaptation ambition be ratcheted up under the Paris Agreement, and how might this be done through revised NAPs and NDCs?

- Through co-benefits approach to mitigation and adaptation that supports ambition ratchet up in each.
- Also the revision should focus on judicious use of existing resources, finances and altering the development models to integrate with human development index as well as species conservation goals.

Anoop Poonia  
Policy Coordinator - Financial Flows  
Climate Action Network-International (CAN), India

1. What are the linkages between NAPs and NDCs and how can we align the NAPs and NDC processes with the SDGs?

The basic linkage between NAPs and NDCs should be that one is complimentary to the other in the arena of adaptation and mitigation. However, as NDCs provide a conceptual knowledge on how a country is planning to contribute in reducing emission and promoting adaptation, the NAPs indicate the pathways and areas to be focused with priority. If we dive deep, many of the SDGs could be found in NAPs and NDCs having some different wording, but now it is high time to align the SDGs with NAPs and NDCs that depicts clear and consistent meaning everywhere. When studied by even an amateur, the clarity should be such that a parallel connection can be easily drawn with same wording/language. And this is highly required due to the raising consciousness among the mass people.

2. In what ways can countries use NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs to advance climate resilient development in Asia-Pacific?

Countries in Asia-Pacific are already quite aware of the adverse impact of climate change, now, it is time to create/revitalize common platforms to share learnings and understandings on climate resilience strategies. Regional adaptation concepts are there, but these are need to be more evidence based with historical data. Countries may consider to identify commonality of the adverse impacts of climate change and prepare Action Plans beyond the country boundary with specific focus on absolute advantage and comparative advantage of one another.

3. Should adaptation ambition be ratcheted up under the Paris Agreement, and how might this be done through revised NAPs and NDCs?

Considering the fact that the countries which are more vulnerable but have less emission will have to incur higher cost for adaptation with consistent scenario of climate change, yes, the adaptation ambition should be ratcheted up. While going through the revision of NAPs and NDCs the Developed Countries (DC) might consider the cost of adaptation of the Least Developed Countries (LDC) if it is assumed that the change in climate remains constant. In turn, the LDCs should also consider the extent of emission produced by them in the existing practice and to reduce the amount adopting strategies that would have multiplier effect.

Avijit Paul  
Program Officer  
Center for Natural Resource Studies (CNRS), Bangladesh

Dr. Chanakod Chasidpon, Policy and Plan Analyst, National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB), Thailand (Posted on 29 January 2018)

1. What are the linkages between NAPs and NDCs and how can we align the NAPs and NDC processes with the SDGs?
In order to respond to climate change impacts, many countries have formulated their National Adaptation Plans (NAPs). A NAP is “a means of identifying medium- and long-term adaptation needs and developing and implementing strategies and programs to address those needs.” Likewise, Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs) emphasize the action plans of countries to reduce GHG emissions so that the global average temperature increase will remain well below 2°C.

Because climate change has caused negative impacts to ecological, economic and social systems, many targets of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) have been adopted to alleviate these impacts.

For example, under Goal 2 End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture, Target 2.4 focuses on sustainable food production systems and implementation of resilient agricultural practices by strengthening capacity for adaptation to climate change, extreme weather, drought, flooding and other disasters.

With regard to Goal 11 Make cities and human settlements inclusive, safe, resilient and sustainable, Target 11.b encourages cities and human settlements to adopt and implement integrated policies and plans towards inclusion, resource efficiency, mitigation and adaptation to climate change, and resilience to disasters.

Other examples of SDGs that address GHG mitigation include Goal 13 Take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts and Goal 9 Build resilient infrastructure, promote inclusive and sustainable industrialization and foster innovation. SDG 13 also acknowledges the UNFCCC as the primary international, intergovernmental forum for global actions to combat climate change. As one of the important indicators of SDG 9 is total CO2 emissions over value-added of manufacturing sectors, this indicator shows the direct linkage to mitigation of climate change.

2. In what ways can countries use NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs to advance climate resilient development in Asia-Pacific?

The formulation of NAPs, NDCs and SDGs should create synergies of programs and projects that will reinforce all actions towards enhancing climate resilient development. For example, infrastructure investment projects should be compatible with climate change predictions in the future.

3. Should adaptation ambition be ratcheted up under the Paris Agreement, and how might be done through revised NAPs and NDCs?

Personally, I think NAP is the most suitable mechanism to address the adaptation ambition while NDCs is best fitted for GHG mitigation. However, in the first submissions of (I)NDCs, many countries included adaptation as well. Since UNFCCC has not provided a clear scope of NDCs, countries probably think that the NDC should include every aspect of climate change.

Dr. Chanakod Chasidpon
Policy and Plan Analyst
National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB), Thailand

Robert Dobias, Advisor, National Research Council of Thailand (Posted on 28 January 2018)

Dear Dr. King,

In response to your questions related to “How to use NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs to advance climate resilience in Asia-Pacific?”, I offer the following thoughts:

Most NDCs in developing countries of Asia and the Pacific provide reference to their country’s policies, strategies, and planning documents related to climate change adaptation. This points out the need for consistency in these documents, starting with consistency between the NDC and NAP, but also national climate change strategies, sectoral climate change adaptation plans, and so forth. Inconsistency will lead to confusion when projects are formulated and submitted for approval, and when national and sectoral budgets are apportioned. The same would apply to alignment between NDCs, NAPs, and SDGs. As SDGs can be considered a supra-strategy, one way to ensure alignment is to make specific reference in the NAP (and perhaps in 2020, the updated NDC) as to how the NAP/NDC address specific SDGs.

NDCs prepared by developing countries in Asia and the Pacific vary in how they deal with climate change adaptation. Many provide an overview of climate vulnerabilities, a description of adaptation action to date, needs
concerning general capacity/technology/finance, and broad plans or aspirations for the future. I believe the most useful NDCs, however, might be those that provide specific adaptation targets which can be monitored (such as in Viet Nam’s NDC) and estimated costs to undertake adaptation action (such as the general estimates found in the India and Lao PDR NDCs, or the very specific adaptation cost estimates presented in the Bangladesh NDC). As I recall — I could be wrong here — climate change adaptation was not initially envisaged to be part of the NDC, but later this option was offered for various reasons, one of which was to provide donors with a quick guide to the financial, technical, and capacity needs of developing countries. It would seem, therefore, the more detail related to climate change adaptation targets and estimated costs in the NDC, the better.

If SDGs, NDCs, and NAPs are to advance climate resilient development, their goals and objectives need to be reflected in national and sectoral policies and strategies. Paramount among these is (for most countries) the five-year national economic and social development plan. The well-defined adaptation targets in Viet Nam’s NDC should serve this purpose well, but some other countries may find it difficult to translate their less well-defined NDC adaptation goals into national and sectoral policy documents. The NAPs need to be included in sectoral and sub-national development plans, and funded as part of those plans. But NAPs face an even greater challenge because, as the saying goes, all adaptation is local. The diversity of development-cum-climate change needs, overlapping jurisdictions, capacity and awareness constraints, ever-present maladaptation traps, and so on, are significant obstacles to effective adaptation action. In pursuit of climate resilience, NAPs will be facing issues similar to those faced now and in past decades by proponents of environmentally sound infrastructure development and integrated rural development, for example.

I believe many if not most countries in Asia and the Pacific will have NAPs or sectoral adaptation plans prepared, and at least limited implementation, by the time updated NDCs are submitted in 2020. There is a need to undertake rapid assessments of how well these plans have been received and implemented, and the results of these assessments should be considered when preparing the updated NDC. This can be done in two ways. First, the NAP and/or sectoral adaptation plans, as well as any related documents — like national climate change strategies — should be used to provide an improved description in the updated NDC of the country’s financial, capacity, and technical needs in climate change adaptation for the coming five years. Where monitorable adaptation targets have already been indicated, such as in the Viet Nam NDC, the assessments should indicate whether and how these targets can become more ambitious over the coming five years.

At some point in the future, regional groupings, such as ASEAN and SPREP, may want to consider following the EU in developing a regional NDC, primarily for mitigation purposes, but also to spur adaptation ambition.

In a similar vein, as NAP implementation gains momentum in Asia and the Pacific over the coming decade, some countries may carefully consider whether climate resilient development can be strengthened through formulation and implementation of multi-country adaptation plans that identify common or overlapping challenges best addressed through a cooperative approach. This might particularly apply where there are shared river basins/watersheds or marine resources. This approach could help more advanced countries lift the adaptation ambition of their neighbors who may not have the same level of technical or financial resources.

Best regards,

Robert Dobias
Advisor
National Research Council of Thailand
member states, as reflective of their stance on adaptation that does not reflect well the natural disaster costs many of these countries are incurring?

I think the important point is where countries should start with adaptation, would it be with NDC or NAP. Most developing countries have already included adaptation in their NDCs, that helped them to start thinking of the national level priorities and help them in moving towards NAP process that is yet to be completed. For developed countries, NAP would be the first and significant step towards adaptation.

Adaptation and SDGs are not exclusive to each other. We know that many of the SDGs, actually several all of them, contributes to societal resilience to shocks, whether climatic or economic in nature. SDGs cover climate change significantly with the goal 13 in entirety and many other goals having climate resilience related targets and indicators embedded in them. This probably places the SDGs at the higher hierarchy in terms of achieving resilience, and I would also consider NAPs becoming a sub-set in terms of the amount of resilience they can bring in and may probably work more like an enabling mechanism to achieve the resilience embedded within SDGs. I also consider that the resilience in SDGs is multi-sectoral and much more pervasive than a NAP can possibly achieve, understanding from how countries compartmentalize these issues in their planning processes. So, conceptually speaking, SDGs and NAPs are already well in sync with each other and that the realization of the resilience depends on how well the NAPs are made and implemented and how well NAPs are contingent of SDGs.

Now the question is about how to strengthen operational linkages between NAPs and SDGs. My understanding is that SDGs are at a much-advanced stage than NAPs, and are strong in terms of metrics and sectoral stewardships but suffer from financing. Whereas NAPs/adaptation probably has higher funding potential and may possibly have a strong institutional process and commitments due to the funding involved. So, I see here a potential for NAPs actually borrowing the metrics from SDGs and adapt them to the much-needed metrics within the adaptation process. This is where the fragmentation in terms of NAP and SDG processes makes coordination a difficult task; often both are headed by separate ministries even though the issues may merge at individual ministry level and most ministries sit in both processes. I am yet to see an example of how these processes are being harmonized and linked at the inter-ministerial level and at individual ministry level.

Much of the harmonization between SDGs and NAPs boils down to the individual project and program level. In terms of implementation on the ground, I can see few differences between NAPs and SDGs. For example, NAPs tend to be driven mostly by specific projects and programs, that are expected to be significantly different from usual developmental programs, aimed at vulnerable locations and sectors. For SDGs, countries have already started reporting specific programs and projects but I am not sure how different these programs are from the usual developmental programs designed before the advent of SDGs. It may be possible that many of the programs labeled under SDGs may find themselves under the NAP process and vice versa especially when there is no clear-cut definition and criteria is adopted for adaptation projects and such cross-reporting of developmental projects as adaptation projects have already been reported in studies on NAPs. So, this necessitates putting in place proper guidelines and screening procedures to be applied to the project and programme level so that they can be assessed for their compliance and contribution to SDGs and adaptation. SDGs have clear targets and metrics but we are not yet sure if NAPs will come up with their own targets and metrics as clear as SDGs are. The global processes under SDGs have clearly done a good job here. Presence of targets and metrics for NAPs would help in the better harmonization of these two at several levels. Read About Harmonizing NAPs, NDCs and SDGs

I will be happy to learn others’ perspectives on this subject.

With best regards,

SVRK Prabhakar
Task Manager & Senior Policy Researcher Adaptation Team, Natural Resources & Ecosystem Area
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), Japan
www.iges.or.jp

Chuluunkhuu Baatar, Managing Officer for Climate Finance and National, Communication Project Coordination, Climate Change Project Implementing Unit, Environment and Climate Fund, Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Mongolia (Posted on 26 January 2018)

I would like to share an experience of Mongolia, as its ecosystems, lifestyle, pastoral animal husbandry and rainfed agriculture make the country very much vulnerable to climate change-induced disasters.
1. What are the linkages between NAPs and NDCs and how can we align the NAPs and NDC processes with the SDGs?

In its NDCs, Mongolia puts a significant importance on the adaptation as the vulnerability sectors and priority measures identified. In the country context, adaptation is the utmost importance in ensuring the ecosystem balance, sustainable livelihood, and development. Thus, Mongolia has highlighted the adaptation component in its NDCs.

Mongolia does not have the NAP, but a similar national policy instrument in place, National Action Plan on Climate Change (NAPCC, 2011-2021) which on one hand enforces the integration of climate change into the sectoral and national development policies and on the other hand lacks the M&E and tracking system. Yet in the development of NDCs, NAPCC has served as the basis which means the NDC's implementation can be achieved through the implementation of NAPCC. In the coming years, based on lessons learned the more comprehensive process for the NAP to be developed under the GCF readiness support.

In term of SDGs, specifically targets 13.1 and 13.2 have adaptation objectives. So there are international as well as the national level of common objectives concerning climate change adaptation. And aligning NAPs, NDCs, and SDGs would require even sophisticated and integrated planning and evaluation system. There are different ways to align; top-down or bottom-up. From the SDGs, the local level short and medium-term actions can be derived which can be reflected in the NDCs and NAPs. On the other hand, the local vulnerabilities and measures identified by the NAP process can lead to defining objectives in the NDCs and SDGs.

2. In what ways can countries use NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs to advance climate resilient development in Asia-Pacific?

Furthermore, putting the adaptation objectives in the multiple levels of policy documents, NAPs, NDCs, and SDGs, could increase the chances of receiving funds, gaining political support, raising awareness, addressing the local needs and integration of climate change adaptation into the planning process in the country. Thus, NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs should be aligned for the purpose to advance climate resilient development.

3. Should adaptation ambition be ratcheted up under the Paris Agreement, and how might this be done through revised NAPs and NDCs?

Under the Paris Agreement, the adaptation ambition should be increased. And of course, this can be done through the revision of NAPs and NDCs. NAPs present the evidence-based results of vulnerability and risks of sectors and priorities of the country. This information shall be used in updating the NDCs and raising its ambition in term of adaptation contributions.

Chuluunkhuu Baatar
Managing Officer for Climate Finance and National Communication Project Coordination
Climate Change Project Implementing Unit, Environment and Climate Fund
Ministry of Environment and Tourism, Mongolia

Dear Peter,

Glad to see that you are resuming this interesting exchange series, I always enjoyed reading the views expressed in this forum.

Let me share my views on each question

1. What are the linkages between NAPs and NDCs and how can we align the NAPs and NDC processes with the SDGs?

I see NDCs as a summarised expression of adaptation/mitigation needs/plans/intentions while NAP, as its name
suggests, could be considered as an extended plan on adaptation. Naturally, SDGs being the broader policy goal, NAPs/NDC processes will have to complement SDGs, especially, climate goal (#13). I see reporting is one of the areas where NAP and NDC processes could directly complement SDGs.

2. In what ways can countries use NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs to advance climate resilient development in Asia-Pacific?

It simply depends on how well countries could mainstream NAPs, NDC and SDGs into their development process. Opportunity wise, each of these processes could be an avenue for sharing progress and attracting external supports since potential climate financing mechanisms could prefer either of NAPs, NDCs or SDGs (or other mechanisms) as one of the criteria for support. Beyond this point, for adaptation, I would rather suggest Global Adaptation Goal (Article 7) under the Paris agreement as a goal-post for advancing climate resilient development, while NAPs, NDCs, SDGs or other mechanisms (such as Sendai Framework) could play a complementary role.

3. Should adaptation ambition be ratcheted up under the Paris Agreement, and how might this be done through revised NAPs and NDCs?

This is an important question for me. Whether ratcheted up or not, does not matter, there are no other choices left. You see the recent news (https://qz.com/1162791/2017-natural-disasters-and-climate-change-effects-cost-the-world-306-billion) saying that the natural disaster and CC cost over 300 billion USD in 2017. Impacts of climate change is going to intensify (since no bold mitigation actions (= intention) on the sight, except a new leadership trend by private sector, while climate issues have not adequately infiltrated into the minds of wider public) every passing year, which means more of the resources will be needed to cope with the impacts of CC (and hence for adaptation) in future. We are already in the era of adaptation (often mistakenly viewed as an issue of distant future!). NAP and NDCs could be a valuable tool for mainstreaming climate risks into the planning process of ministries (Cambodia, for instance, has developed climate change action plans across various sectors and ministries), but they should be reinforced with measures to minimize uncertainties of the current science on the prediction of climate impacts. Similarly, NAP/NDCs should be driven by the real necessity, with serious intention, of countries (available assessments do say LDCs, SIDS are vulnerable to CC, but most importantly how seriously it is being felt internally by government, sectors, and their subjects). Countries have to be serious too, preparing NAP or submitting NDCs for the sake of external support or to fulfill international obligations would not help much.

Best regards,

Dr. Binaya Raj Shivakoti,
Senior Water and Adaptation Specialist, Natural Resources & Ecosystem Area,
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), Japan
http://www.iges.or.jp
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E-DISCUSSION LAUNCH EMAIL (posted on 17 January 2018)

For the 14th APAN Exchange, Dr. Peter King, Senior Policy Advisor at the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) Regional Centre is asking key questions on “How to use NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs to advance climate resilience in Asia-Pacific?”

You can find the questions below. To contribute, send your responses to: the-exchange@adapt-asia.org. This Exchange ends 30 January 2018. We look forward to hearing your views.

Dear friends and colleagues,

It has been a while since I’ve reached out to you using this platform as we have had a change of staff in IGES. Each Exchange that we’ve done in the past, the last 13 of them, has been a tremendous learning experience. I am hoping to revive this knowledge exchange platform, particularly with the recent conclusion of COP23, and ask you to consider some important questions related to NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs.
There is continued emphasis to support countries in planning for adaptation among development partners, particularly from the Ministry of the Environment, Japan and UNDP. Part of this planning process necessarily falls under the NAPs and the NDCs. Developed countries have tended not to include adaptation in their NDCs, although all countries are likely to experience the need for climate change adaptation, even if the 2 degrees target of the Paris Agreement is achieved.

In order to reach the target set in the Paris Agreement and stay below two degrees, all countries need to consistently and effectively implement current NAPs and NDCs and continuously enhance them over time, ratcheting up ambition not only for mitigation. More specifically, how can we use these processes, including the SDGs, to advance climate resilience in Asia and the Pacific?

For this 14th APAN Exchange Series, please consider the following questions:

1. What are the linkages between NAPs and NDCs and how can we align the NAPs and NDC processes with the SDGs?

2. In what ways can countries use NAPs, NDCs and the SDGs to advance climate resilient development in Asia-Pacific?

3. Should adaptation ambition be ratcheted up under the Paris Agreement, and how might this be done through revised NAPs and NDCs?

I look forward to receiving your responses and to another robust and informative Exchange discussion.

Thank you very much.

Dr. Peter N. King  
Senior Policy Advisor  
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES)  
Regional Centre

Admin matters: For each Exchange, you have about two weeks to share any thoughts, ideas, and experiences via the-exchange@adapt-asia.org with the group. At the end of the Exchange period, a consolidated summary of the discussion will be shared.

The APAN Exchange Series on Climate Change Adaptation is implemented by the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES) and supported by the Ministry of the Environment, Japan. IGES moderates the exchanges and ensures that members receive a maximum of one email a day. Messages posted reflect the personal views of the contributors and not the positions of their organizations.

If you would like to opt-out of the Exchange at any time, please contact Chochoe Devaporihartakula, IGES Programme Manager at chochoe@iges.or.jp.

The APAN Exchange Series on Climate Change Adaptation is made possible with the support from the Ministry of the Environment, Japan. Learn more about APAN and our partners by visiting: http://www.asiapacificadapt.net/