

**Regional Technical Expert Meeting on Adaptation**  
**held in the context of the 27<sup>th</sup> Asia-Pacific Seminar on Climate Change**  
**Tokyo, Japan, 26 July 2018**

**Summary**

The 27<sup>th</sup> Asia-Pacific Seminar on Climate Change was jointly organized by the Ministry of the Environment, Japan (MOEJ) and the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT), Australia, in Tokyo, Japan on 26 July 2018, as a regional Technical Expert Meeting on Adaptation (TEM-A). 75 experts from 20 countries and regions, and 17 international organizations, research institutes and other relevant entities participated. The Overseas Environmental Cooperation Center, Japan (OECC) organized the meeting.

The seminar served as a useful opportunity for participants to share and exchange experiences and ideas, and lessons learned on their recent efforts in seeking for synergies for enhanced actions in the monitoring & evaluation (M&E) framework for the three global agendas (Adaptation under the Paris Agreement, the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction). Active discussions and group exercises helped the participants to exchange information useful to address challenges in integration at the local, national and global levels.

**Proceedings**

**Session 1. Adaptation, SDGs, and Sendai Framework indicators – integration from local to national and global level**

Presentations on experiences from linking M&E systems across different levels were delivered by the panelists from Morocco, Japan, the Gambia and India.

From Morocco, integration of adaptation and SDG indicators in a regional information system was introduced. Japan presented its national M&E of adaptation measures and introduced the first annual monitoring report published in 2017 which had established voluntary indicators for adaptation. The Gambia presented on the institutional arrangements for three agendas at country level and its challenges. From India explained its system of using Disaster Score Cards used for measuring disaster risks and resilience at the sub-national level.

The National Institute for Environmental Studies (Japan) reported on the role of the Institute

based on the Climate Change Adaptation Law and its contribution through the Asia-Pacific Climate Change Adaptation Information Platform (AP-PLAT). Also, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) gave an overview of a specific adaptation measure, the Climate Risk and Early Warning Systems Initiative (CREWS) and emphasized the importance of introducing early warning systems in island countries.

Participants raised questions and comments specifically on the use of *output* indicators versus the use of *outcome* indicators. It was highlighted that ideally, we should be moving to use outcome indicators to understand if we are actually decreasing vulnerability. In the context of budgeting, output indicators could be more suitable to assess policy accomplishments in terms of budget allocation as well as the effects of investments. It was suggested that countries should select the most appropriate mix of indicators which can then be re-designed based on the needs at the global or regional level.

For vertical implementation, questions were raised to clarify details of bottom-up approaches such as indicator usage, information flow/platform and how to promote incentives to provide information and to scale up to the regional level. Panelists shared country case studies, including an example showing local data feeding into the national level through monitoring reports, and another case in which the implementation of small projects at the local level contributes to Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). In addition, it was noted that sharing good practice conducted by the local government, as well as research funds for local research institutes, may work to foster local stakeholder engagement.

Regarding integration of the three agendas, challenges and the practicality in reducing the duplication of efforts were discussed. It was reported that even though national plans are developed to harmonize through a stakeholder consultative manner, problems may arise at the implementation and reporting stage where different stakeholders are involved, and proper communication and collaboration is not ensured.

It was noted that as linkages clearly exist, and SDGs indicators can be outcome indicators for adaptation policies, we should be able to reduce the burden of monitoring adaptation by using the SDGs results for reporting to the UNFCCC.

## **Session 2.**

### **Linkage between Adaptation, SDGs and the Sendai Framework and synergy for enhanced action**

Group work was conducted to facilitate the discussion on the linkages between adaptation, the

SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction. Groups representing different geographical/economic backgrounds (Small islands, Sub-Saharan African, Middle-East, Land-locked and OECD countries) discussed the following issues:

1. What are the top 5 indicators for understanding adaptation progress in your country?
2. Where/How should this information come from? Is this information collected in SDGs/Sendai Framework?

Different processes were examined by the groups to come up with indicators to prioritize. Some groups looked at the sectors to be covered first. Other groups started from identifying the anticipated climate change impacts and then moved to affected target groups/sectors, necessary actions, and indicators to measure progress. It was noted that some indicators that are important for a specific region may not be included as SDG or Sendai indicators (not as a 100% match). SDG and Sendai indicators were sometimes too narrow or from a backward perspective to meet the country's need in terms of adaptation.

As a result of the group work, it was noted that there are gaps in indicators where some are applicable to relatively many areas and some require close examination for actual implementation. The discussion helped the participants to understand commonalities of indicators, but also highlighted that these indicators may not be sufficient to conduct M&E of adaptation measures.

Several elements were not identified under the group discussion that may be taken in consideration for future discussions, such as:

- Climate insurance or social safety net;
- Requirements for small islands to address displacement from climate change;
- Risk perception of the community addressed in the indicators for early warning systems;
- Indicators to measure improvements in adaptive capacity;
- Indicators on NDCs;
- Qualitative indicators;
- Co-benefits of mitigation and adaptation.

In conclusion, participants saw the value of this group discussion in generating new ideas and in identifying some of the challenges in selecting specific indicators for local, national and global targets.