



United Nations

FCCC/SB/2022/5/Add.2



Framework Convention on  
Climate Change

Distr.: General  
21 October 2022

English only

---

**Subsidiary Body for Scientific and  
Technological Advice**

**Fifty-seventh session**

Sharm el-Sheikh, 6–12 November 2022

Item 3 of the provisional agenda

**Report of the Adaptation Committee**

**Subsidiary Body for Implementation**

**Fifty-seventh session**

Sharm el-Sheikh, 6–12 November 2022

Item 11 of the provisional agenda

**Report of the Adaptation Committee**

**Report of the Adaptation Committee**

**Addendum**

**Methodologies for assessing adaptation needs and their application**

*Summary*

This technical paper provides information on methodologies for assessing adaptation needs and their application, drawing on the inventory, available on the adaptation knowledge portal, of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs related to action, finance, capacity-building and technological support in the context of national adaptation planning and implementation, as well as on submissions from Parties and observer organizations on developing and applying methodologies for assessing such needs. The paper contains key concepts and definitions, provides an overview of existing methodologies and related experience, analyses lessons learned, emerging good practices and gaps, and concludes with recommendations.



## Contents

	<i>Page</i>
Abbreviations and acronyms .....	3
I. Executive summary .....	4
II. Introduction .....	5
A. Background and mandate.....	5
B. Sources of information.....	6
C. Scope .....	7
III. Key concepts and definitions .....	7
A. Adaptation needs .....	8
B. Methodologies .....	12
C. Risk and uncertainty .....	13
IV. Overview of existing methodologies and experience.....	15
A. Methodologies identified by Parties and observer organizations.....	15
B. First report on the determination of the needs of developing country Parties related to implementing the Convention and the Paris Agreement.....	23
C. Experience with existing guidance .....	24
V. Analysis .....	25
A. Lessons learned.....	25
B. Emerging good practices .....	26
C. Gaps.....	35
D. Synthesis.....	36
VI. Conclusions and recommendations .....	38
References .....	40

## Abbreviations and acronyms

AC	Adaptation Committee
AILAC	Independent Association for Latin America and the Caribbean
AOSIS	Alliance of Small Island States
AR	Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
BDP 2100	Bangladesh Delta Plan 2100
BTR	biennial transparency report
BUR	biennial update report
DTU	Technical University of Denmark
GEF	Global Environment Facility
IIED	International Institute for Environment and Development
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LDC	least developed country
NAP	national adaptation plan
NAPA	national adaptation programme of action
NDC	nationally determined contribution
NDR	needs determination report
PCCB	Paris Committee on Capacity-building
PROVIA	Global Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation
SCF	Standing Committee on Finance
SSP	Shared Socioeconomic Pathway
TNA	technology needs assessment
UN*	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WFO	World Farmers' Organisation

---

\* Used exclusively in figure 8.

## I. Executive summary

1. Adaptation needs refer to the actions and resources required to complete all stages of the adaptation process, from assessing risk and vulnerability to planning, implementing, monitoring and evaluating adaptation measures; and to address the underlying causes of climate vulnerability. Categorizing adaptation needs as biophysical and environmental, social, institutional, and information-, capacity- and resource-related, as described in the AR5, provides a framework for planning and conducting comprehensive assessments. Adaptation needs are situation-specific and dynamic, and depend on perceptions of adaptation goals and policy trade-offs that are likely to differ among stakeholder groups. In addition, they reflect the scale and complexity of the analysis and the methods used for it. They will evolve as the understanding of climate risks and adaptation options increases, technologies for adaptation continue to be developed, and the underlying drivers of vulnerability and other factors, including critical social and cultural dimensions, change.

2. Assessing adaptation needs is a fundamental part of enhancing climate resilience, with links to the UNFCCC process through adaptation planning and implementation (i.e. national adaptation plans), reporting and communications (e.g. adaptation communications, biennial reports, nationally determined contributions), analyses and assessments (e.g. determining the needs of developing country Parties, technology and capacity needs assessments) and reviews of progress (e.g. the global stocktake). Discussion of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs is complicated by inconsistent use of the terms “methodologies”, “methods” and “tools” in the literature and reporting. Generally it is possible to distinguish between top-down (impact or modelling-based) and bottom-up (vulnerability-based) methodologies, with most recent assessment approaches incorporating elements of both. Currently employed methodologies have largely been developed through learning-by-doing, often following UNFCCC guidance.

3. Experience of Parties and organizations in applying methodologies for assessing adaptation needs, as well as the latest scientific information, suggests that no single approach, methodology or suite of methodologies is likely to enable comprehensive assessment of adaptation needs in all situations. Experience also shows that assessing adaptation needs is a continuous process that should be undertaken within a broader policy context and integrated with national development and economic planning. Best available information, including indigenous knowledge and local and practitioner experience, on climate risks and societal vulnerabilities should be the starting point for assessing adaptation needs. Many processes, including vulnerability, risk and capacity assessments, can contribute to the assessment of adaptation needs, although they generally do not address the full scope of such needs. Many developing countries require further capacity, technological and financial support for undertaking more comprehensive assessments of their adaptation needs.

4. On the basis of the relevant submissions from Parties and observer organizations, Parties’ reporting to the UNFCCC, the AR5 and AR6, and other academic and technical literature, the following emerging good practices (see chap. V.B below) for assessing adaptation needs at any stage of the process using any methodology can be identified:

- (a) Using participatory approaches;
- (b) Covering multiple climate and socioeconomic scenarios;
- (c) Considering both transboundary and domestic or local climate risks, as well as compound and cascading risks;
- (d) Employing an adaptive risk management or pathways approach;
- (e) Considering transformational adaptation options in addition to incremental actions;
- (f) Conducting integrated assessments of capacity, technological and financial needs.

5. A five-step process for assessing adaptation needs is presented in this paper (see chap. V.D below) to assist Parties and other stakeholders in further considering adaptation needs and to encourage additional work on methodologies: (1) framing the assessment; (2) assessing climate risks and vulnerabilities; (3) identifying desired adaptation actions; (4) assessing resource needs (capacity, technology, information, finance); and (5) compiling adaptation needs (actions, resources).

6. Regarding future work related to assessing adaptation needs, key recommended actions include continuing to:

- (a) Share practical experience;
- (b) Provide support for developing countries;
- (c) Develop and assess the applicability of methodologies, methods and tools according to countries' capacities;
- (d) Strengthen engagement and collaboration among UNFCCC constituted bodies, the IPCC, practitioners and academia.

## II. Introduction

### A. Background and mandate

7. Planning and implementation of adaptation at any scale is generally preceded by assessment of adaptation needs. While many methods and tools are available for such assessment, guidance on selecting and applying them is limited, which presents a challenge for decision-making on how best to proceed (PROVIA, 2013; Stafford-Smith et al., 2022). In recognition of this challenge, and with a view to assisting developing countries without placing undue burden on them, the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement requested the AC, with the engagement of the IPCC,<sup>1</sup> as appropriate, to prepare a technical paper on methodologies for assessing adaptation needs and their application, and on related gaps, good practices, lessons learned and guidelines, for consideration and further guidance by the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice at its fifty-seventh session,<sup>2</sup> drawing on the inventory of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs on the adaptation knowledge portal<sup>3</sup> and the submissions from Parties and observer organizations<sup>4</sup> on developing and applying methodologies for assessing adaptation needs, and encompassing needs related to action, finance, capacity-building and technological support.

8. Improved understanding of the development and application of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs benefits Parties and a wide range of public and private sector institutions and organizations as they continue to plan and implement adaptation strategies and actions and seek or provide related support. Consideration of methodologies and their application is not an end in itself, but rather a step towards enriching discussions on a range of adaptation issues. Within the UNFCCC process, assessment of adaptation needs informs the development of many plans and reports involving adaptation (e.g. adaptation communications, BTRs, BURs, NAPs, NDCs). The findings in this paper may be relevant to Parties' discussions on those topics as well as discussions on adaptation technology, finance and capacity-building, the global stocktake, the global goal on adaptation and the new collective quantified goal on climate finance.

9. Assessment of adaptation is relevant on a wide range of spatial scales, from local and project-specific to national, regional and global perspectives. The focus of this paper is on

<sup>1</sup> The contributions of several authors from IPCC Working Group II to the review of and discussions on previous drafts of this paper are gratefully acknowledged.

<sup>2</sup> Decision 11/CMA.1, para. 17.

<sup>3</sup> <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NWPStaging/Pages/SearchAsses.aspx>.

<sup>4</sup> As per decision 11/CMA.1, para. 16; the submissions are available at <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/submissionsstaging/Pages/Home.aspx> (clear all tags and enter "assessing adaptation needs" in the search field).

methodologies that contribute to understanding adaptation needs at the national level, which includes understanding adaptation needs at the local and subnational level. It is informed by, and builds on, the findings in the first NDR (SCF, 2021; and see box 1) and will hopefully contribute to strengthening future NDRs. Methodologies for, and challenges in, assessing adaptation needs at the regional and global level are discussed elsewhere, including in the technical report on Africa's adaptation gap (Schaeffer et al., 2013) and the UNEP Adaptation Gap Reports (e.g. UNEP, 2017, 2021). Information on adaptation needs at the national, subnational and local level helps to enhance understanding of collective adaptation needs at the global level.

**Box 1**

**First report on the determination of the needs of developing country Parties related to implementing the Convention and the Paris Agreement**

COP 24 requested the SCF to prepare, every four years, a report on the determination of the needs of developing country Parties related to implementing the Convention and the Paris Agreement.<sup>a</sup> The first NDR (SCF, 2021) provides an overview of qualitative and quantitative information on mitigation and adaptation needs identified by developing countries on the basis of a review of 563 documents, including adaptation communications, NAPs, NAPAs, NDCs, technology action plans and TNAs. The report is not an assessment of needs, but a synthesis of existing data and knowledge, and a review of currently used methods and tools. It recognizes that countries are at different stages with respect to assessing their needs, and hence it is not possible to compare countries. It also acknowledges the challenges of assessing needs and that some countries have significant gaps in available data, tools and capacity. It notes the lack of a common framework and methodologies for assessing adaptation needs, and a need to enhance existing methodologies.

<sup>a</sup> Decision 4/CP.24, para. 13.

10. This paper takes a broad perspective on assessing adaptation needs and draws on experience and case studies from both developing and developed countries. While recognizing that work on this topic under the UNFCCC is to be undertaken with a view to assisting developing countries without placing undue burden on them,<sup>5</sup> the broader perspective is justified by the fact that all countries have significant work to do in assessing adaptation needs, and that this paper is intended to serve as a foundation for continued work in this regard. The approaches and tools described herein vary in their level of complexity and the resources required to implement them. Furthermore, aspects of the emerging good practices identified may only be applicable at a limited scale given the capacity constraints of some countries. Consideration of what constitutes an undue burden can be more appropriately addressed in future work focused on providing guidance for assessing adaptation needs.

## **B. Sources of information**

11. This paper draws on a wide range of information sources, which are referenced throughout. In establishing the context for this work, emphasis is placed on the findings in the AR5 and AR6, peer-reviewed literature from academic and technical institutions and other United Nations bodies (e.g. UNEP, 2021) and existing technical guidance on using relevant methods and tools (e.g. PROVIA, 2013). This information is complemented by knowledge and practical experience of applying relevant methodologies contained in the submissions from Parties and observer organizations referred to in paragraph 7 above and other documents submitted to the secretariat by Parties, and information contained in the first NDR. The paper builds on previous relevant work undertaken by various UNFCCC bodies, including the AC, the Climate Technology Centre and Network, the Least Developed Countries Expert Group and the SCF, and draws on a range of case studies and other information in the inventory of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs on the adaptation knowledge portal.

<sup>5</sup> See decision 11/CMA.1, chap. III.

## C. Scope

12. Chapter III below considers concepts fundamental to the topic of this paper, including emerging concepts in adaptation policy discussions.

13. Chapter IV below provides an overview of existing methodologies, methods and tools for assessing adaptation needs and experience of using the approaches on the basis of the relevant submissions and findings in the first NDR, as well as discussing existing guidance for applying the methods and tools.

14. Chapter V below is the analytical core of the paper. Building on the challenges, opportunities and gaps identified in the first NDR, it presents lessons learned, good practices (illustrated through case studies) and gaps identified in applying the existing methods for assessing adaptation needs. It also presents a five-step process for assessing adaptation needs that reflects the key concepts.

15. Chapter VI below presents conclusions and recommendations for possible future actions both within and outside the UNFCCC process that could help to further enhance understanding of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs and their application.

## III. Key concepts and definitions

16. The volume of literature concerning climate change adaptation, including methods and tools for evaluating and addressing vulnerability, impacts and adaptation to climate change, has greatly increased over the past decade. This growth has led to the development of new (or newly defined) terms that are relevant to the topic of this paper (see box 2). In addition, there are three concepts of fundamental importance within the scope of this paper: adaptation needs, methodologies, and risk and uncertainty.

### Box 2

#### Key technical terms used in this paper

**Adaptation limit** – the change in climate where adaptation is unable to prevent damaging impacts and further risk:

- **Soft limits** occur when additional adaptation may be possible if constraints are able to be overcome;
- **Hard limits** occur when no additional adaptation is possible (IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Adaptation need** – circumstance requiring action to ensure safety of populations and security of assets in response to climate impacts (IPCC, 2014, glossary; IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Adaptive management** – process of iteratively planning, implementing and modifying strategies for managing resources in the face of uncertainty and change. It involves adjusting approaches in response to observations of their effect and changes in the system brought on by resulting feedback effects and other variables (IPCC, 2014, glossary; IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Cascading impact** – effect that arises when a hazard generates a sequence of secondary events that result in physical, natural, social or economic disruption, whereby the resulting impact is significantly larger than the initial impact (IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Incremental adaptation** – adaptation action where the central aim is to maintain the essence and integrity of a system or process at a given level (IPCC, 2014, glossary).

**Maladaptation** – action that may lead to increased risk of adverse climate-related outcomes (IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Pathway** – temporal evolution of natural or human systems towards a future state. Pathway concepts range from sets of quantitative and qualitative scenarios or narratives of potential futures to solution-oriented decision-making processes to achieve desirable societal goals. Pathway approaches typically focus on biophysical, techno-economic or

sociobehavioural trajectories and involve various dynamics, goals and actors across different scales (IPCC, 2022, glossary):

- **Adaptation pathways** – a series of adaptation choices involving trade-offs between short- and long-term goals and values. These are processes of deliberation to identify solutions that are meaningful to people in the context of their daily lives and to avoid potential maladaptation (IPCC, 2022, glossary);
- **Climate-resilient development pathway** – trajectory that strengthens sustainable development and efforts to eradicate poverty and reduce inequalities while promoting fair and cross-scalar adaptation to and resilience in a changing climate. It raises the ethics, equity and feasibility aspects of the deep societal transformation needed to drastically reduce emissions to limit global warming and achieve desirable and liveable futures and improve well-being for all (IPCC, 2022, glossary);
- **Climate-resilient pathway** – iterative process for managing change within complex systems in order to reduce disruptions and enhance opportunities associated with climate change (IPCC, 2014, glossary; IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Risk** – potential for adverse consequences for human or ecological systems, recognizing the diversity of values and objectives associated with such systems. In the context of climate change, risks can arise from potential impacts of climate change as well as human responses to climate change (IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Risk assessment** – qualitative or quantitative scientific estimation of risk (IPCC, 2014, glossary).

**Trade-off** – circumstance that arises when a policy or measure aimed at one objective reduces outcomes for one or more other objectives owing to adverse side effects, thereby potentially reducing the net benefit to society or the environment (IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Transboundary climate risk** – climate risk that crosses national borders. It is associated with the transboundary impacts of climate change and the transboundary effects of adaptation made by one or more countries that have repercussions for others (Stockholm Environment Institute submission).

**Transformational adaptation** – adaptation that changes the fundamental attributes of a social-ecological system in anticipation of climate change and its impacts (IPCC, 2022, glossary).

**Uncertainty** – state of incomplete knowledge that can result from a lack of information sources, imprecision in the data to ambiguously defined concepts or terminology, or uncertain projections of human behaviour. Uncertainty can be represented by quantitative measures or by qualitative statements (e.g. reflecting the judgment of a team of experts) (IPCC, 2022, glossary).

## A. Adaptation needs

17. While understanding adaptation needs is integral to addressing climate change, the term “adaptation needs” is not formally defined in the Convention. However, such needs are clearly captured in, for example, Article 4 of the Convention, which refers to the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties arising from the adverse effects of climate change, and makes clear that the scope of adaptation needs includes both technical and financial needs. The term “adaptation needs” appears in subsequent decisions of the Conference of the Parties, including the Cancun Adaptation Framework,<sup>6</sup> and in Article 7, paragraphs 4 and 7, of the Paris Agreement.


18. The IPCC first included the term “adaptation needs” in the glossary of the contribution of Working Group II to the AR5 (IPCC, 2014) and the concept is discussed in detail in

<sup>6</sup> See decision 1/CP.16.

chapter 14 of that report. Expanding on the formal definition (see box 2), adaptation needs are the gap between what might happen as the climate changes and what is desired (IPCC, 2014, chap. 14, p.836), including the actions and resources needed to address that gap. This definition indicates that adaptation needs encompass both actions taken to address climate risks and actions taken to benefit from any opportunities that climate changes may present. The scope of the term has expanded over time. In early discussions the term was used primarily to refer to immediate and near-term needs and focused almost exclusively on biophysical impacts (e.g. the example of NAPAs is discussed in IPCC, 2014, chap. 14). Assessing adaptation needs requires analysis of both what adaptation is addressing (observed and projected climate change impacts and non-climate drivers) and how adaptation will occur (the capacity and resources needed to undertake actions) (GEF, 2002; PROVIA, 2013). Capacity analysis has expanded over the past 15 years to include consideration of the underlying causes of vulnerability to climate change, with Füssel (2007) among the first to highlight the importance of this broader analysis.

19. Adaptation needs are no longer considered simply a starting point for the adaptation process but rather refer to actions and resources required for the entirety of that process – from assessment of impacts and vulnerability through adaptation planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation (referred to as the adaptation cycle in this paper; see figure 1). This point was highlighted in several submissions from Parties (e.g. Paraguay on behalf of AILAC, and Malta and the European Commission on behalf of the European Union and its member States).

Figure 1  
**The cyclical nature of assessing adaptation needs**



*Source:* Modified from figure 1.8 of the contribution of Working Group II to the AR6 (IPCC, 2022).

*Note:* Figure encompasses actions and resources needed for assessing climate risks and vulnerability through adaptation planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation, with future needs assessments informed by learning.

20. Building on the work of Burton et al. (2006), IPCC (2014, chap. 14) identified five categories of adaptation needs, four of which are as follows<sup>7</sup> (see IPCC, 2014, chap. 14, for additional references):

<sup>7</sup> The fifth category of needs highlighted by IPCC (2014, chap. 14) is the need for private sector engagement (ranging from small farmers to small and medium-sized enterprises to multinational corporations). The private sector reduces risks and vulnerability through internal risk management, thereby contributing to public sector initiatives and responding to opportunities presented by climate change. It also serves as a source of direct financing for adaptation actions, which complements the

(a) **Biophysical and environmental needs** – ecosystem services critical for maintaining and enhancing human health, livelihoods, safety and security. Many terrestrial, freshwater and marine ecosystems are already under severe stress as a result of climate change and non-climate factors, and need protection. Under this category, attention is drawn to the need for enhanced ecosystem monitoring in recognition of the risks presented when critical thresholds are crossed. Valuation of the ecosystem benefits of adaptation actions remains limited;

(b) **Social needs** – material and non-material elements necessary for groups and individuals to act on behalf of their own interests in addressing climate change. Vulnerability to climate change varies greatly from the local to the global level, with profound inequities resulting in vulnerable populations having little capacity to undertake adaptation actions. The scope includes emotional and psychological needs that can be seriously affected by climate change. Shared learning, including education and improved access to information, is important as adaptation is fundamentally a social learning process (IPCC, 2014, chap. 15);

(c) **Institutional needs** – the critical role played by formal and informal institutions in building adaptive capacity and implementing and incentivizing adaptation actions. Emphasis is often placed on the role of governments at all levels (from national to local) as well as international and global institutions (including the UNFCCC) that can help to enable enhanced action on adaptation. Effective institutional design includes having the flexibility to deal with the uncertainty inherent to climate change, the ability to integrate (mainstream) adaptation into short- and long-term policymaking, and the means to facilitate effective communication and coordination within and across relevant institutions. Mechanisms for coordination across multiple levels of government are seen as particularly critical given the key role that local governments play in adaptation. Non-government organizations, professional organizations and the private sector, including financial institutions, all have important roles in adaptation and benefit from cross-institutional coordination mechanisms;

(d) **Information, capacity and resource needs** – all stages of the adaptation cycle (see figure 1) require information and capacity, including human, financial and technological resources. Considerable attention has been given to enhancing availability of information, including through development of climate service institutions. Inclusion of multiple knowledge types (e.g. scientific, indigenous knowledge, local knowledge, experience of local practitioners) greatly enhances the utility of such information. Specific initiatives have been established under the UNFCCC to help address capacity and technology needs (e.g. the Climate Technology Centre and Network and the PCCB). The significant gap between the financing required for adaptation and that which has been made available to developing countries through various financial mechanisms is well documented and continues to widen (e.g. IPCC, 2022, chap. 17; SCF, 2021; UNEP, 2021). The SCF recognizes that lack of data, tools and capacity makes estimating the cost of adaptation needs difficult for many developing countries<sup>8</sup> (SCF, 2021; and see chap. IV.B below).

21. Several Parties made note of these, or similar, categories in their submissions on this topic. For example, the submission from the European Union and its member States presents five factors of importance in identifying adaptation needs:

- (a) Biophysical and environment-related factors;
- (b) Social, cultural or economic factors;
- (c) Inequalities within a society;
- (d) Institutional factors, rules and regulations;

---

responsibilities of the public sector, and can provide financial incentives to undertake actions that reduce risk (e.g. insurance). This paper recognizes the critical role of the private sector, but, rather than highlighting its engagement as a distinct category of need, it highlights the role it can play in addressing the four other categories of adaptation needs identified by IPCC (2014, chap. 14).

<sup>8</sup> This topic will be expanded on in a future synthesis report on the efforts of developing countries in assessing and meeting the costs of adaptation, which is being prepared in response to decision 19/CMA.1, para. 13.


(e) Access to information, capacity and resources.

22. In addition, Parties highlighted that adaptation needs are location- and context-specific and dynamic.

23. Building on the conceptual framework of adaptation needs put forward in the contribution of Working Group II to the AR5 (IPCC, 2014, chap. 14), the contribution to the AR6 (IPCC, 2022) addresses adaptation needs as a cross-cutting topic that relates to all chapters of the report. Important additional insights include the recognition that the definition of adaptation needs also depends on perceptions of risk and related necessary adaptation goals and associated policy trade-offs. These differing perspectives are key to the overall framing of adaptation solutions and success in the AR6, which highlights the critical importance of equity, justice, adequacy and effectiveness (see figure 2). NAPs, for example, allow for such needs to be reflected in a nationally determined and prioritized way.

Figure 2

**Key concepts from the contribution of Working Group II to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Sixth Assessment Report related to assessing adaptation solutions and success**



Source: Figure 1.7 in chap. 1 of IPCC (2022).

Note: Solutions are defined as adaptation options that are effective and feasible, and conform to principles of justice, which can be assessed as part of adaptation planning, and through monitoring and evaluation during and after implementation. A set of responses is adequate if they sufficiently reduce climate risk to levels considered tolerable.

## B. Methodologies

24. The terms “methodologies”, “methods” and “tools” are frequently used interchangeably, even in technical literature. Broadly speaking, a methodology provides a conceptual framework for analysis, methods are the systematic procedure of conducting the analysis and tools are the vehicles for collecting and analysing information. A methodology is likely to involve several methods, while methods may involve using multiple tools. Confusion arises as the word “methodology” is commonly used to refer to a specific way of performing an operation (according to dictionary definitions), which indicates that each method and tool could have a unique methodology.

25. In climate change adaptation literature, emphasis is generally placed on describing methods and tools, with relatively less attention given to characterizing methodologies. The same is true for the submissions from Parties and observer organizations on this topic. All adaptation assessments have methodologies, and usually these are clearly laid out as part of the assessment process. However, a typology for categorizing the methodologies is lacking. The submission from Paraguay on behalf of AILAC states that many AILAC countries have not yet established a process for collecting, categorizing or systematizing the methodologies used in assessing adaptation needs. The same is generally true at the global level. Establishing a systematic typology may assist in further understanding the range of methodologies being employed, as well as their relative strengths and weaknesses.

26. Adaptation assessment methodologies have frequently been characterized as being either top-down (impact driven) or bottom-up (vulnerability driven) (e.g. IPCC, 2014, chap. 14). Top-down methodologies use climate model output as a starting point to determine the climate change impacts that would need to be adapted to, whereas bottom-up methodologies use an understanding of current vulnerability to climate change as the starting point for determining adaptation needs. The former is dominated by quantitative, modelling methods and frequently places an emphasis on economic needs, while the latter generally involves more qualitative, participatory research methods and is especially important for capturing social adaptation needs. Although there is utility in this distinction, assessments have evolved such that most recent examples involve hybrid approaches that allow analysis to benefit from the strengths of both approaches (Dessai et al., 2005; McKenzie Hedger et al., 2006; IPCC, 2014, chap. 14; PROVIA, 2013). The terms “top-down” and “bottom-up” are used in a slightly different sense when discussing costing (see chap. III.B below). The technical report on Africa’s adaptation gap notes that top-down approaches using integrated assessment models may be particularly useful for assessing long-term adaptation costs at the national and global level (Schaeffer et al., 2013).

27. In an operational framing of adaptation assessments, Fünfgeld and McEvoy (2011) distinguish between impacts, risk and vulnerability assessments, but do not use the phrase “adaptation needs assessments”. Similarly, the first NDR differentiates between impact-, adaptation-, vulnerability- and risk-based approaches as the basis of national estimates of adaptation needs in developing countries. Several submissions from Parties and observer organizations include similar distinctions (see chap. II.C below), highlighting that existing processes and products contribute to assessing adaptation needs but generally fail to address the full scope of such needs.

28. One example of a well-established methodology that has been instrumental in advancing adaptation knowledge globally is the process established by the IPCC over the past three decades involving expert assessment of previously published knowledge. This general methodology has been adopted by many countries for undertaking national assessments, some of which incorporate new analysis. For example, Japan’s submission examines the probability and magnitude of climate change impacts, investigates the timing when impacts will be evident and when adaptation measures need to be in place and documents the level of confidence for all. Indigenous and local knowledge are increasingly being recognized as critical elements of assessments undertaken by the IPCC and at the national level (e.g. Science Media Centre, 2022). Such approaches have proven useful for identifying priorities for further research and analysis and serve as a starting point for assessing adaptation needs, with additional methodologies used to assess capacity and other resource needs.


29. Detailed discussion of methods and tools for assessing adaptation needs is beyond the scope of this paper, although examples are discussed in the context of Parties’ experience (see chap. II.C below). More detail is provided in the special issue of *Climatic Change* addressing decision support tools for climate change adaptation (Palutikof et al., 2019) and chapter 17 of the contribution of Working Group II to the AR6 (IPCC, 2022, chap. 17). Although a wide range of decision-making approaches are available and in use (Siders and Pierce, 2021), there is a lack of empirical evidence on the relative utility of different analytical methods for managing climate risks on the basis of their application by decision makers (IPCC, 2022, chap. 17).

### C. Risk and uncertainty

30. Adaptation is fundamentally a process of managing risk – a concept central to IPCC assessments, particularly in the AR5 and AR6. Uncertain outcomes are a fundamental aspect of understanding risk, and hence dealing with uncertainty is an inherent element of climate change decision-making. Uncertainty arises from a number of sources (see definition in box 2), with uncertainties regarding human behaviour being perhaps the most difficult to address. A significant body of literature is devoted to the tools available for decision-making under uncertainty (see box 3; see also Analysis under Uncertainty for Decision-Makers Network, 2020, for overview and bibliography), with many linked to the concept of adaptation pathways (see figure 3 and box 3).

Figure 3

Concept of adaptation pathways



Source: IPCC, 2014, Summary for Policymakers.

Note: See figure 18.1 in IPCC, 2022, chap. 18, for a more complex depiction of how pathways emerge from societal choices within multiple arenas, rather than simply resulting from discrete decision points.

**Box 3**

**Dealing with uncertainty through adaptation pathways**

Most decision-making related to climate change adaptation takes place in the context of deep uncertainty – defined as instances where experts or stakeholders either do not know or cannot agree on (1) conceptual models that adequately capture the various drivers and relationships in a system, (2) the probability distributions of uncertainty

about key variables or (3) how to weigh and value desirable alternative outcomes (IPCC, 2022, cross-chapter box DEEP, pp.2578–2580). Deep uncertainty characterizes many dimensions of assessing adaptation needs, and may relate to impacts, changing societal conditions, preferences and priorities, and responses over time. The assumption that scientific information is certain, when it is not, becomes a barrier to effective adaptation (IPCC, 2022, cross-chapter box DEEP, pp.2578–2580).

The most common approach to dealing with deep uncertainty is to focus on low-regret options, which are measures that deliver benefits over a wide range of climate and socioeconomic scenarios (IPCC, 2022, cross-chapter box DEEP, pp.2578–2580). However, such responses can be of limited scope in addressing adaptation needs, particularly in the long term. The AR6 emphasizes that focusing on near-term risk reduction reduces the opportunity for transformational adaptation.

An alternative approach to dealing with deep uncertainties is to examine adaptation pathways. Pathways are iterative, continuously evolving processes for managing change in complex systems that involve a series of choices and trade-offs between short- and near-term goals (see figure 4; IPCC, 2014, chap. 20; IPCC, 2022, cross-chapter box DEEP, pp.2578–2580). There is not a single, correct pathway to reaching desired goals; rather, there are multiple possible pathways, with the most appropriate being dependent on many factors, including political, cultural and economic circumstances (IPCC, 2022, chap. 18). While there is no right path to achieving a particular goal (e.g. climate resilience), choices at any point in the process can lock in an undesirable pathway that may preclude reaching that goal (IPCC, 2022, chap. 17). The AR6 provides definitions for adaptation pathways, climate-resilient development pathways, climate-resilient pathways, development pathways and sustainable development pathways, which place different relative emphasis on adaptation, mitigation and sustainable development.

The approach of examining adaptation pathways stresses that choices made when assessing adaptation options represent one decision point in an ongoing process to achieve climate resilience. Choices will unavoidably involve trade-offs, with some populations affected more than others, which highlights the importance of understanding equity and justice implications (see figure 3; IPCC, 2022, chap. 1). Initial steps may involve applying low-regret options that enhance flexibility rather than limiting future options (IPCC, 2022, chap. 17). It is anticipated that many pathways will involve both incremental and transformational actions (IPCC, 2014, chap. 20).

## 1. Temporal scale

31. Adaptation needs assessments are undertaken knowing that risks will change over time. Although it is clear that adaptation needs increase as global warming increases (IPCC, 2018, Summary for Policymakers), uncertainty regarding both climate and non-climate factors increases with time. Considering multiple scenarios is a good way to address this uncertainty. The emission scenarios used by the IPCC capture a range of climate futures, while risk management dictates that consideration of low-probability (extreme) scenarios is appropriate when the consequences of impacts are potentially catastrophic (see chap. IV.B below).

## 2. Spatial scale

32. The complexity of assessing adaptation needs increases markedly when moving from site- or situation-specific needs to the national and global level. Most analysis of needs undertaken to date has been at the project level, often within specific sectors. Scaling project-level data to inform a national-level needs assessment is challenging and increases uncertainty. Uncertainty is magnified within diverse economies where attention is often placed on the largest or most vulnerable sectors, and hence needs within other sectors remain largely unknown. Additional uncertainty regarding climate change risks and associated adaptation needs results from limited understanding of how climate change impacts outside of a country will necessitate adaptation actions within the country (see chap. IV below).

## IV. Overview of existing methodologies and experience

33. This chapter examines information on the experience of Parties and observer organizations in applying methodologies and guidance for assessing adaptation needs as documented in the submissions referred to in paragraph 7 above, on the adaptation knowledge portal and in the first NDR. As noted, much of this information makes little distinction between methodologies, methods and tools.

### A. Methodologies identified by Parties and observer organizations

34. The call for submissions to support the development of this technical paper elicited input from eight Parties or groups of Parties and 11 organizations. While this is relatively few submissions, they cover a wide range of Parties (developed, developing and the least developed countries) and reveal significant commonalities among them. The submissions from organizations highlight sectoral perspectives; linkages with disaster risk reduction, sustainable development and other agendas; and emerging issues.

#### 1. Overview

35. Most of the submissions acknowledge the broad scope of adaptation needs that encompass all stages of the adaptation cycle. Recognizing the context and situation-specific nature of adaptation needs, the submissions from Argentina, the European Union and its member States and IIED acknowledge that assessment of such needs should, to the extent possible, be undertaken within a broader policy context, integrated with national development and economic planning and recognizing linkages with other international agendas (i.e. the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance). Although specific methodologies advocated within these different processes differ in terms of scale and approach, significant commonalities enhance synergies and can result in more efficient planning processes. The submissions stress that adaptation needs do not necessarily equate to, or replace, development needs.

36. The submissions also make clear that almost every country recognizes that there is not a single methodology, or suite of methodologies, appropriate for assessing adaptation needs in all situations. Given the differences in adaptive capacity between countries, reliance on a single methodology is not practical or desirable. For example, the submissions from the LDCs and the Local Climate Adaptive Living Facility highlight the need for methodologies to be simple, practical and deployable. Furthermore, since the methodology applied influences the outcome of the analysis, and the associated adaptation response, using more than one methodology will likely lead to more rigorous results.

37. Experience of Parties assessing their adaptation needs has developed through learning-by-doing (AILAC submission). General guidance provided by the UNFCCC or other international entities often serves as a starting point, with individual countries and organizations developing detailed methodologies determined by their specific circumstances. These methodologies are often sector-specific (AOSIS submission). The submission from AILAC notes that the application of methodologies in that region is largely limited to the entities that developed them. This statement is likely true globally. While understandable in the sense that every situation is unique, this explains the proliferation of methodologies and lack of framework for more systematic analysis.

38. Parties generally advocate for a stepwise approach to assessing adaptation needs, with each step likely involving different methods. Many existing products and processes, including risk and vulnerability assessments, are essential steps in a broader assessment of adaptation needs. The submissions from Argentina, Cuba, IIED and Japan highlight that the starting point is the best available scientific information and knowledge, including understanding the current and projected impacts of climate change and the underlying causes of vulnerability. The importance of transparency and participatory methodologies stressing equity and gender and social inclusion is commonly highlighted (AOSIS, IIED, LDCs and

Nigeria submissions). Bottom-up approaches received the most attention, with submissions noting the need for consultations with multiple levels of government, the private sector, NGOs and civil society. Such approaches require significant time and human resources (Alliance for Global Water Adaptation submission).


39. Many submissions draw attention to the importance of assessing capacity, technological and financial needs. Methodologies developed or endorsed by the UNFCCC, for example the methodology for TNAs (see figure 4, box 4 and the UNEP DTU Partnership<sup>9</sup> submission), tend to be broadly applied.<sup>10</sup> The recent development of a toolbox by the PCCB may lead to greater rigour in analysing capacity needs (see figure 5 and box 5). Furthermore, it was noted that the strong links between finance, capacity-building and technological support suggest that associated needs should be assessed in an integrated manner (Portugal submission).

Figure 4  
Technology needs assessment process



Source: Haselip et al. (2019).

Figure 5  
Scope of capacity-building in the UNFCCC process



Source: UNFCCC, 2022b.

<sup>9</sup> Now called the UNEP Copenhagen Climate Centre.

<sup>10</sup> For an overview of technical AC products, see <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/bodies/constituted-bodies/adaptation-committee-ac/publications-bulletins-adaptation-committee>.

## Box 4

**Technology needs assessment**

A formal process for assessing climate change technology needs has been part of the UNFCCC process since 2001 and hence is more mature than processes for assessing other needs. Since then, more than 90 developing countries have completed TNAs. Efforts have increased since 2010, with the UNEP Copenhagen Climate Centre providing technical and methodological support for assessments and the GEF providing financial support for TNA projects (UNFCCC, 2022a). The methodology is sector focused, with agriculture, water and infrastructure the most frequently prioritized sectors for adaptation needs (UNFCCC, 2022a). Recent experience with the TNA process is presented in Le Manceau et al. (2021).

The TNA methodology consists of three major steps (see figure 4). In the first step, identifying and prioritizing sectors and technologies, the importance of stakeholder engagement and multi-criteria analysis is emphasized. The second step, barrier analysis and identifying an enabling framework, includes market assessment and analysis of institutional capacity (see paras. 91–92 in this document). The final step involves developing a technology action plan, which encompasses the vision to move from assessment to implementation (UNFCCC, 2022a). The process is supported by extensive documentation, including a step-by-step guide (Haselip et al., 2019), guidance for gender-responsive TNAs (De Groot, 2018), guidance for identifying and prioritizing technologies for climate change adaptation (Trærup and Bakkegaard, 2015), technology guidebooks, including a taxonomy of climate change adaptation technology (Woo et al., 2021), and finance guidebooks, including on scaling up investment in climate technology (CTCN and UNEP DTU Partnership, 2021).

The TNA process may provide lessons learned regarding methodologies and guidance for broader assessment of adaptation needs. Shortcomings of the process have been identified, including limitations related to spatial scale (SCF, 2021). Perhaps the most important next step is moving TNAs from being a stand-alone process to being part of an integrated assessment of adaptation needs. Steps in this direction are already evident from many countries including technology needs in NDCs (UNFCCC, 2022a). Realizing the full potential of TNAs requires analysis of what is needed for implementing existing NDCs, including better alignment with the priority sectors included in them (Charlery and Trærup, 2019).

## Box 5

**Assessing capacity needs**

Capacity-building is critical under the Convention, with capacity-building frameworks adopted in 2001 (by decisions 2/CP.7 and 3/CP.7), and the Paris Agreement. The concept of adaptive capacity is well established in adaptation literature (e.g. Brooks and Adger, 2005; IPCC, 2007; Smit and Wandel, 2006; Smith et al., 2003). Key determinants of adaptive capacity, as highlighted by the IPCC (2007), are economic resources, technology, information and skills, infrastructure, institutions and equity, which also provide a useful framework for assessing capacity needs.

While capacity needs assessments are relatively new in the context of climate change and the UNFCCC (PCCB, 2020), they have long been an integral part of environment and development planning (e.g. GEF, 2001). Defined by UNDP (2008) as the analysis of desired capacities against existing capacities, capacity assessments identify areas where capacities need to be built or enhanced, as well as areas where existing capacities are strong and can provide a foundation for immediate adaptation actions. Capacity needs assessments at national level should consider needs at three different levels – individual, institutional and systemic (see figure 5). They should be viewed as an iterative, ongoing process rather than a one-off initiative (PCCB, 2020) in accordance with the broader nature of adaptation needs assessment outlined in this paper. It is noted that there is no universal metric for capacity, and many factors, including national circumstances, ambition and access to resources, affect the assessment process (PCCB, 2020). Furthermore, it is clear that no single methodology can be devised that can cover the entire spectrum of situations across all countries in terms of capacity (GEF, 2001).

The PCCB has published a toolkit for assessing capacity gaps, which includes methods, case studies and links to supporting resources, including guidance documents (PCCB, 2020). The literature (e.g. Bizikova, 2012; UNDP, 2008) stresses the importance of participatory assessment methods. Specific tools are available for assessing institutional capacity (e.g. Dixit et al., 2012; Gupta et al., 2010; United States Agency for International Development, 2016), reflecting the key role of formal organizations in both leading and enabling adaptation. The inclusion of gender and other equity considerations is critically important for capacity assessments (e.g. Bryan et al., 2016).

40. With respect to financial needs, commonly used methods and tools for economic analysis, as well as newer multi-metric techniques (see table 1), are beginning to see wider application with respect to climate change (see box 6). For example, Argentina noted its intent to use multi-criteria analysis for prioritizing adaptation options and cost–benefit or cost-effectiveness analysis to guide implementation. Nonetheless, application of these methods for assessing adaptation needs is not widespread, particularly at the national level. The AR6 notes that all approaches for estimating financial needs for adaptation, from national to global level, have limitations that can result in over- or underestimating actual needs (IPCC, 2022, cross-chapter box FINANCE, pp.2586–2593). Those approaches include aggregation of individual case studies along with scaling to area of interest, and integrated assessment model simulations of climate impacts and adaptation costs. Limitations include incomplete coverage of sectors and risks, and lack of understanding of soft and hard limits to adaptation. Estimating the benefits of adaptation, in terms of damage avoided, remains a challenge (IPCC, 2022, cross-chapter box FINANCE, pp.2586–2593).

Table 1  
**Economic appraisal methods for supporting adaptation decision-making**

<i>Method</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Level of complexity</i>
<b>Commonly used appraisal methods</b>		
Cost–benefit analysis	Appraises options in terms of their monetary value, weighing the life-cycle costs of options against projected benefits, with the option with the highest net present value or benefit–cost ratio selected. Analysis requires establishing a baseline against which costs and future expected benefits are measured, which is challenging. The method does not explicitly deal with uncertainty.	Medium
Cost-effectiveness analysis	Identifies the most economically efficient option for achieving a specific adaptation goal. Useful when the primary benefit metric cannot be expressed in monetary terms. It can only be used to compare options in relation to a single benefit metric. Analysis requires establishing a baseline against which costs and future expected benefits are measured, which is challenging. The method does not explicitly deal with uncertainty.	Medium
Multi-criteria decision analysis	Uses multiple metrics in addition to economic efficiency to assess adaptation options in terms of achieving specified adaptation goals. It can combine qualitative and quantitative information, so it is useful when it is difficult to assign monetary values or otherwise quantify some outcomes. Analysis requires establishing a baseline against which costs and future expected benefits are measured, which is challenging. Uncertainty can be incorporated as an evaluation criterion, typically relying on the judgment of experts or stakeholders.	Low to medium
<b>Approaches that explicitly incorporate uncertainty and risk</b>		
Robust decision-making	Used to evaluate how different adaptation options perform under large ensembles of scenarios to identify options that are robust to many different futures (i.e. options that are not necessarily optimal but good enough and that minimize negative outcomes). Particularly useful when future uncertainties are poorly characterized, and probabilistic information is not available.	Medium to high

<i>Method</i>	<i>Description</i>	<i>Level of complexity</i>
Portfolio analysis	Used to evaluate the trade-offs between the likelihood of a high degree of effectiveness in reducing a threat and the risk that the options under consideration will fail to be effective under certain future conditions. Helps identify a set of options that are effective over a range of plausible future conditions, as opposed to one option that is optimal for one future. Useful when there are many adaptation options available to achieve a goal and when good data are available.	High
Real options analysis	Explicitly assesses the level of flexibility in the timing for implementing one or more adaptation options. Also used to assess flexibility for adjusting an adaptation option over time, after it has been implemented. Evaluates whether it is better to invest in options that offer greater flexibility in the future. Useful for adaptation decisions involving large, upfront and irreversible investments, where there is flexibility in the timing of the investment, opportunity for new information to emerge and the ability to adjust the option in response to learning.	High
Adaptation pathways	Considers adaptation options in terms of adaptation turning points (i.e. points in time beyond which options are no longer effective) and what alternative adaptation options are available once a turning point has been reached. Rather than taking an irreversible decision now to implement an ‘optimal’ adaptation option – which may not be needed depending on how future climate conditions evolve – it encourages decision makers to adopt a flexible plan where adaptation decisions are made over time and the plan is adjusted as pertinent information emerges. Additional options can be brought forward or delayed to a later time, depending on future conditions. Challenges relate to defining appropriate turning points and data to monitor.	Medium to high

*Source:* Adapted from Boyd and Markandya (2021).

**Box 6**

**Methods of economic analysis**


The past decade has seen significant evolution in economic thinking on adaptation. The historic focus on cost–benefit analysis and identifying best economic adaptations has given way to multi-metric evaluations that include consideration of risk and uncertainty (IPCC, 2014, chap. 17). These new approaches allow consideration of non-monetary and non-market measures, inequities and behavioural biases, and ancillary benefits and costs. Economic analysis is one key input but should not be the sole basis for final decisions (IPCC, 2014, chap. 17). A focus on quantifiable costs and benefits can bias decisions against the poor and against ecosystems and those in the future whose values can be excluded or are understated. This evolution does not preclude the use of more traditional methods like cost–benefit analysis, particularly where uncertainty is not a significant factor and where adaptation actions are short term (Boyd and Markandya, 2021). Newer methods have primarily been applied at the project or local level, rather than as a part of national assessments of adaptation needs.

Brief descriptions of major methods of economic analysis to support adaptation decision-making are contained in table 1. More substantive overviews of these methods and related issues, such as valuation, can be found in UNFCCC (2011), PROVIA (2013) and IPCC (2014, chap. 17). Several Parties stressed in their submissions the importance of strengthened and more rigorous valuation of ecosystem services, particularly given the key role that nature-based solutions play in the adaptation responses of many developing countries. The IPCC Special Report on Climate Change and Land (IPCC, 2019a) estimates that the value of the world’s terrestrial ecosystem services (on an annual basis) is approximately equivalent to the annual global gross domestic product (medium confidence).

41. Of the guiding principles for assessing adaptation needs identified by the AC (see figure 6), all were mentioned in the submissions as being important. The three that were

highlighted most often were adaptability and adoptability, relevance and participation and inclusiveness. This reflects the broader comments in the submissions on the situation-specific context of adaptation needs. Methodologies employed need to be relevant to that context and have the ability to be modified to fit local circumstances. The emphasis on participatory approaches was also prominent.

Figure 6  
**Percentage of submissions referring to the respective principles for assessing adaptation needs**



Notes: (1) Figure formulated by the AC on the basis of submissions; (2) not all submissions explicitly addressed the principles.

42. Parties and observer organizations stressed that adaptation needs evolve with time as a result of increased understanding of climate risks and adaptation options, technology development, changes in underlying drivers of vulnerability and many other factors. As such, assessing adaptation needs can be viewed as an ongoing learning process compatible with the concepts of adaptive management and the iterative nature of adaptation. This perspective highlights the importance of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs being part of a broader monitoring, evaluation and learning system (IIED submission) and the need for mechanisms for effectively sharing experience of methods (Nigeria and WFO Climakers submissions).

**2. Methods and tools**

43. Most of the submissions include examples of methods and tools for assessing adaptation needs as well as case studies. This input, as well as relevant content from other submissions, can be found on the adaptation knowledge portal (see box 7) under methodologies for assessing adaptation needs. Descriptions of methodologies generally include an overview of the methods used in applying tools, but rarely address the overarching methodology. Methodological insights can be gained from many of the case studies in the submissions, although the lack of an analytical framework makes it difficult to draw conclusions about the relative value of different approaches.

**Box 7**  
**Adaptation knowledge portal**


The adaptation knowledge portal is an online resource of the UNFCCC knowledge-to-action hub on adaptation and resilience that provides open access to adaptation knowledge resources. As at February 2022, the portal included more than 1,750 entries, predominantly tools and case studies.

The portal includes an inventory specifically focused on methodologies for assessing adaptation needs. Launched by the AC in collaboration with the Least Developed

Countries Expert Group, partners of the Nairobi work programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change, and methodology users and developers, the inventory contains more than 250 entries, including case studies, tools, technical documents and reports, online portals, and educational and training materials. As for the rest of the portal, inventory users can type queries into the search bar and use tags from the drop-down bar above the search line to filter search results by region, geographic scale, adaptation sector or theme, adaptation element, climate hazard and target group.

44. Analysis of input received as at August 2021 shows that the inventory includes tools developed in all regions of the world, with North America (specifically the United States of America) contributing the most (see first chart in figure 7). Many of the tools have a sectoral focus, with agriculture and water resources being dominant, although most tools can be used to address multiple sectors (see second chart in figure 7). Consistent with the emphasis placed on bottom-up approaches, the majority of tools analysed are designed to address adaptation needs at the local level (see third chart in figure 7). It is noteworthy that less than 25 per cent of the tools included in the inventory focus on the national level. It is also not surprising to see the majority of tools relate to impact, vulnerability and risk assessment, with only a few encompassing the complete adaptation cycle (see fourth chart in figure 7). None of the submissions explicitly mention methods and tools for assessing adaptation needs related to monitoring and evaluation. A recently developed framework for monitoring and evaluation (Dinshaw and McGinn, 2019) may help to address this potential gap.

Figure 7  
**Tools in the inventory of methodologies for assessing adaptation needs on the adaptation knowledge portal**



Source: AC document AC/20/INFO5C.

45. With additional work, the utility of the inventory could be increased. For example, it would be helpful to differentiate between methods and tools that yield quantitative versus qualitative outputs. The value of the case studies in the inventory, which are generally linked to specific tools, could be enhanced by increasing their level of detail. Some of the case studies were used to inform chapter V below.

## **B. First report on the determination of the needs of developing country Parties related to implementing the Convention and the Paris Agreement**

### **1. Overview**

46. The first NDR (see box 1) provides a comprehensive overview of developing country Parties' experience in assessing their needs as documented in various types of report submitted by them to the secretariat. It includes both qualitative and quantitative information, with the former referred to as "needs" and the latter as "costed needs". Qualitative information was obtained from descriptions of national priorities, action plans and planned activities in reports submitted by each Party. Quantitative information includes costed needs at the project level and results of economic modelling. The report highlights the critical importance of strengthening understanding of costed needs at the national level to better identify gaps where financial support is needed and ways to leverage public and private resources.

47. The NDR includes an overview of the processes and approaches that have been used by developing country Parties, as well as the methods and tools associated with those approaches. Top-down approaches refer to modelling specific sectors or the economy as a whole, with documented government priorities being key to identifying needs. Bottom-up approaches refer to identifying needs from a project pipeline, with consultation with sectoral stakeholders being key. As with adaptation assessments, top-down approaches tend to yield quantitative outputs whereas bottom-up approaches typically yield more qualitative information.

48. While most countries have assessed their mitigation and adaptation needs separately, using different methods and tools, some have used the same methodologies to identify both mitigation and adaptation needs. The NDR notes that understanding the limitations of needs assessments undertaken to date provides an opportunity to enhance existing methodologies.

### **2. Analysis and recommendations**

49. The NDR notes that the amount of detail in Parties' reports on methodologies used, while compliant with reporting guidelines, varies greatly. The most commonly identified methodologies for assessing adaptation needs relate to sector-based vulnerability assessment, with a focus on agriculture, ecosystems and biodiversity, water and cross-cutting sectors. Other methods highlighted include impact-, risk- and adaptation-based approaches as well as multi-criteria decision analysis (see box 6). A compilation of methodologies identified in national reports (annex E to the NDR) highlights the imprecision of the use of the term "methodologies". The list includes approaches (e.g. vulnerability assessment), methods (e.g. multi-criteria analysis), tools (e.g. community vulnerability and adaptation tool) and even projects (e.g. Coordinated Regional Climate Downscaling Experiment CORDEX145 model).

50. The approaches undertaken to date vary depending on many factors, including institutional and human capacity, scope, cost, data availability and time frame. Bottom-up approaches are commonly used in assessing adaptation needs and include community-level actions. As noted in chapter III.A above, approaches developed or endorsed by the UNFCCC play a key role in helping developing countries to assess their adaptation needs. In addition to well-established methodologies, such as that for technology needs assessment, the guidance developed for NAPs has helped to establish a framework for assessing broader adaptation needs.

51. The lack of a common framework or common methodologies for assessing capacity needs is highlighted as a gap in the NDR, and a reason for the high variability of the information reported so far across Parties. The NDR notes that multi-criteria decision analysis, surveys and other consultations with stakeholders are methods employed to understand capacity needs.

52. With respect to financial needs, the NDR notes that many qualitative and quantitative reports of adaptation needs developed by Parties are not accompanied by cost estimates. In some cases, estimated costs and financial needs are included without any information on the

methodologies used to derive them. The fact that addressing adaptation needs requires long-term investments that cannot always be included in short-term projects likely contributes to the lack of costing information for needs developed through bottom-up approaches. The challenges of quantifying financial needs are well recognized, and the NDR notes that methodologies specifically developed for estimating such costs and needs are limited.

53. The NDR includes three recommendations directly relevant to methodologies for assessing adaptation needs, namely encouraging:

(a) Developing country Parties to provide to the UNFCCC, where possible, information on needs related to the methodologies employed for determining the needs identified in their national reports;

(b) Developing country Parties to consider the insights on methodologies identified in the first NDR when costing and determining their needs subsequently;

(c) Parties, multilateral and financial institutions, academia, methodology developers, research institutions and other relevant actors to continue to develop methodologies for determining needs for enhancing adaptation and resilience.

### C. Experience with existing guidance

54. Many of the submissions identify the need for improved guidance for assessing adaptation needs, ranging from general guidance on appropriate use (WFO submission) to detailed guidance on how to address uncertainties in climate and vulnerability data (Commonwealth Secretariat submission). The *IPCC Technical Guidelines for Assessing Climate Change Impacts and Adaptations* (IPCC, 1994) are widely considered to be outdated and were not referred to in any of the submissions. Comprehensive guidance on assessing adaptation needs is generally lacking, with that contained in PROVIA (2013) (see box 8) being among the most complete, but somewhat dated. More recent guidance is included in GIZ (Fritzsche et al., 2017), with an update forthcoming in 2023.

55. Numerous portals provide access to existing guidance for vulnerability, risk and adaptation assessments and other approaches that contribute to assessing adaptation needs. For example, guidelines for NAP preparation and implementation are available on NAP Central<sup>11</sup> and are complemented by an evolving collection of supplementary material.<sup>12</sup> Additional resources are available through the Climate Risk Assessment Method Search Engine,<sup>13</sup> the National Adaptation Plan Global Network,<sup>14</sup> the National Adaptation Plan Global Support Programme<sup>15</sup> and regional and national adaptation centres. While not developed as a means to comprehensively assess adaptation needs, many countries have used the process to formulate and implement NAPs as the basis for estimating needs (SCF, 2021).

Box 8

**Global Programme of Research on Climate Change Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation guidance on assessing vulnerability, impacts and adaptation to climate change**

The 2013 guidance document developed by PROVIA (renamed the World Adaptation Science Programme) provides an overview of information on key concepts, approaches to analysis, and methods and tools for participation and engagement, impact analysis, capacity analysis, scenario analysis, behavioural analysis, institutional analysis, formal decision-making and valuation. It covers the entirety of the adaptation cycle (referred to therein as the “adaptation learning cycle”) and hence aligns well with the scope of adaptation needs covered in this paper. The guidance is not prescriptive, but provides alternative approaches for all stages of the cycle. Recognizing that the process is

<sup>11</sup> <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/napc/Pages/Home.aspx>.

<sup>12</sup> Available at <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Guidelines/Pages/Supplements.aspx>.

<sup>13</sup> [https://cramse.adaptationcommunity.net/basic-search/?\\_sfm\\_geographic\\_coverage\\_in\\_analysis=Worldwide](https://cramse.adaptationcommunity.net/basic-search/?_sfm_geographic_coverage_in_analysis=Worldwide).

<sup>14</sup> See [https://napglobalnetwork.org/resources/?resource-type=86#resource\\_list](https://napglobalnetwork.org/resources/?resource-type=86#resource_list).

<sup>15</sup> See <https://www.globalsupportprogramme.org/>.

complex and often non-linear, it includes decision trees for choosing approaches at multiple entry points. While some of the submissions mention the guidance, there has not been a systematic analysis of its application and utility.

## V. Analysis

### A. Lessons learned

56. Key lessons learned relevant to understanding adaptation needs, and the process of assessing those needs, include the following:

(a) Adaptation needs encompass all stages of the adaptation cycle, from assessment of risks and vulnerability to planning, implementation, and monitoring and evaluation of adaptation measures;

(b) Adaptation needs include actions needed to address the underlying causes of vulnerability to climate change as well as the resources needed to undertake those actions;

(c) The categorization of adaptation needs presented in the AR5, particularly biophysical and environmental, social, institutional, and information, capacity and resource needs, may be useful for planning and conducting a comprehensive needs assessment;

(d) Adaptation needs are situation-specific and dynamic – they will change with time and climate scenarios and depending on the scale of and methods used for the analysis;

(e) Adaptation needs depend on perceptions of risks and related necessary adaptation goals and associated policy trade-offs;

(f) Assessing adaptation needs should be an ongoing process, whereby findings reflect improved understanding of climate risks, adaptation options and trade-offs, technology development, changes in underlying drivers of vulnerability and other factors;

(g) Assessments of adaptation needs should be undertaken within a broader policy context, integrating transformative needs with national development and economic planning, and explicitly recognizing linkages and trade-offs;

(h) Many developing countries require capacity, technology and finance to undertake more comprehensive assessments of their adaptation needs.

57. Lessons learned with respect to methodologies include the following:

(a) A comprehensive assessment of adaptation needs requires a suite of methodologies to be used on a case-by-case basis. No single methodology or suite of methodologies allows for comprehensive assessment of adaptation needs in all situations;

(b) Broadly embraced principles for methodologies for assessing adaptation needs include participation and inclusiveness, relevance, replicability and responsiveness;

(c) Methodologies should fit the purpose and be adapted to available information and capacity;

(d) The best available scientific information on climate risks and societal vulnerabilities and goals, usually from risk and vulnerability assessments, is a starting point for assessing adaptation needs;

(e) Top-down and bottom-up methodologies have different strengths for assessing adaptation needs, and most recent approaches have incorporated elements of both;

(f) Currently employed methodologies have largely developed through learning-by-doing, often following broad guidance provided by the UNFCCC (e.g. the process to formulate and implement NAPs);

(g) Pathway approaches (e.g. adaptation and climate-resilient development pathways) are emerging as a powerful concept for understanding adaptation needs at a range of temporal and spatial scales;

(h) More progress has been made in assessing needs for adaptation action than in estimating financial or technological needs.

## B. Emerging good practices

58. This section provide examples of good practices associated with assessing adaptation needs. Several of the examples relate to emerging issues with only limited experiential evidence of how they can be applied in assessing adaptation needs, particularly at the national level. Not all countries, particularly those with limited capacity, will be able to incorporate all these practices into their assessment processes. Their inclusion here reflects the growing understanding of adaptation and may encourage strengthening of methodologies related to assessing adaptation needs. Descriptions of good practices are accompanied by case studies briefly illustrating their practical application. Emphasis is on methods as opposed to the findings of specific case studies. Although each case study focuses on a specific good practice, there are existing processes and projects that incorporate many of these good practices (e.g. adaptation to the impacts of climate change on water resources in the Andes; see Condesan, 2022; Quishpe, 2021).

### 1. Using participatory approaches

59. All of the submissions, and indeed almost every reference consulted in preparing this paper, highlight the importance of participatory approaches at all stages of the needs assessment process. Even in discussion of complex decision support tools under deep uncertainty, it is noted that: “These tools and methods have been shown to **support deliberative processes where stakeholders jointly consider factors**, such as the rate and magnitude of change and their uncertainties, associated impacts and timescales of adaptation needed along multiple pathways and scenarios of future risks [emphasis added]” (IPCC, 2022, chap. 17, p.17-5). Participatory approaches promote inclusiveness and transparency and embrace a number of ethical and social-justice considerations, including the structural inequities faced by women, youth, children, disabled and displaced people, indigenous peoples and marginalized ethnic groups. These approaches are essential for understanding the vulnerabilities that underlie environmental, social and institutional needs, as well as the existing capacity to address those needs. They also serve to broaden ownership of issues and leadership on adaptation solutions. Levels of engagement can range from one-time solicitation of local knowledge and perspectives to sustained participation of stakeholders throughout the assessment process. Many methods and tools, including facilitation toolkits and conflict resolution techniques, are available for participatory processes (see PROVIA, 2013, for a comprehensive summary).


60. There are many examples of the effective use of participatory approaches in assessing adaptation needs. Case studies 1–2 present examples from the NAP processes of Nepal and Peru, both of which were completed in 2021.

#### (a) Case study 1 – Nepal’s national adaptation plan process

61. Nepal’s NAP contains a vision, goals, principles and outcomes, including priority programmes and enabling actions, developed through a multi-year process (Government of Nepal, 2021). In developing the plan, Nepal placed high priority on stakeholder engagement and committed to an inclusive process that would “leave no one behind” (Nepal Ministry of Forests and Environment, 2018, p.17) (see figure 8). The process was led by the national Government, with stakeholders having a key role in the institutional arrangements. Thematic and cross-cutting working groups were established that brought together multiple levels of government, civil society organizations, research institutions and private sector associations, as well as a wide range of other stakeholders. Actors within each working group were initially characterized as service providers, policy stakeholders, beneficiaries, enablers or advocates (see figure 8). The diverse perspectives brought to the working group led to a thorough discussion of the opportunities for adaptation within defined areas (Nepal Ministry of Forests and Environment, 2018). Additionally, recognizing that “adaptation and equitable development can only be achieved if a fair share of benefits is distributed among all fraction [*sic*] of society, irrespective of their caste, class, ethnicity, gender, age and disability status”

(Nepal Ministry of Population and Environment, 2017, p.29), emphasis was placed on ensuring that marginalized and disadvantaged communities and indigenous and traditional groups were engaged in the process, with special consideration for youth, women and peoples with disabilities (Nepal Ministry of Population and Environment, 2016). Gender equality and social inclusion were treated as both cross-cutting issues and stand-alone themes in the NAP process, with the goal of integrating climate change adaptation into investments that promote inclusive economic development and livelihood opportunities.

Figure 8  
**Unique features of Nepal’s national adaptation plan process**



Sources: Figure on the left: Nepal Ministry of Forests and Environment (2018); figure on the right: Nepal Ministry of Population and Environment (2016).

62. The working group process required significant investment in both time and resources, and still faced challenges in addressing multiple concerns and priorities of diverse stakeholders in a consensus-based process (Nepal Ministry of Forests and Environment, 2018). The challenge was amplified as more organizations, often with limited capacities and understanding of adaptation, became part of the process. While the working groups were successful, it was recognized that additional stakeholder engagement platforms targeting subnational actors were needed to ensure broad and inclusive participation (Nepal Ministry of Forests and Environment, 2018).


**(b) Case study 2 – Peru’s national adaptation plan process**

63. An inclusive, participatory process was instrumental to the development of the goals and commitments set out in Peru’s NAP (Government of Peru, Ministry of Environment, 2021). Building on previous analysis that identified five priority sectors for action – agriculture, fisheries and aquaculture, forestry, health and water – the NAP process promoted opportunities for dialogue that would in turn drive action. The participatory strategy outlined guiding principles for communication and feedback, including an intercultural approach (incorporating engagement of indigenous groups), an intergenerational perspective (using traditional knowledge alongside newer information channels that appeal to youth) and recognition of the importance of gender-responsiveness. These principles helped lay a foundation for shared ownership of adaptation actions by stakeholders across the country.

64. The most important mechanism was the participatory process “Dialoguemos sobre Cambio Climático” (Let’s talk about climate change), which the Peruvian Government used to foster an inclusive, culturally responsive, participatory process. Implementation was complicated by the fact that much of the consultation took place during the coronavirus

disease 2019 pandemic, which resulted in a need to shift from face-to-face participation to a virtual interface without losing the inclusive and participatory approach (see figure 9). Virtual workshops took place in spaces that were customized to the type of actor or groups of actors engaged. In addition to facilitating participation, the virtual workshops were able to enhance understanding of the topics, including the need to incorporate a scalable monitoring and evaluation system into the NAP. Peru’s NAP, which was finalized in June 2021, is the result of a multisector, multilevel and multi-stakeholder process led by the Ministry of the Environment in such a way that the entire population can identify with the challenges and opportunities presented by climate change and can work together to enhance resilience and sustainability.

Figure 9  
**Timeline for participatory development of Peru’s national adaptation plan**



Source: Peru submission.

**2. Covering multiple climate and socioeconomic scenarios**

65. As adaptation is about managing climate risk, it is essential to consider a range of possible futures when assessing adaptation needs. Understanding adaptation needs under multiple climate scenarios illustrates the benefits of accelerated mitigation action and highlights how the costs of both climate impacts and adaptation will increase dramatically if global greenhouse gas emissions are not reduced rapidly (e.g. Schaeffer et al., 2013). A multiple-scenario approach provides a foundation for adaptive management strategies, defining climate-resilient pathways and insights on adaptation limits.

66. The scenarios profiled in IPCC assessment reports (i.e. representative concentration pathways in the AR5 and SSPs in the AR6) cover the likely range of climate futures, with the AR6 including a new SSP-based very-low-emission scenario (SSP1-1.9) to align with the global temperature goal of the Paris Agreement. The AR6 notes that low-likelihood outcomes, including warming substantially more than the assessed very likely range of future warming, cannot be ruled out and should be part of risk management. Therefore, it is important that risk assessments consider high- and very-high-emission scenarios (see case study 3), as well as scenarios compatible with the global temperature goal, to capture the range of possible adaptation needs and identify thresholds associated with hard adaptation limits. The socioeconomic pathways and assumptions that underlie the SSP-based scenarios provide a foundation for developing socioeconomic scenarios at the regional and national level. Although there are benefits to using standard scenarios, it is possible to gain important insights into vulnerabilities using a ‘what if’ scenario approach. In addition, new technologies

and big data, including passively generated information data from digital devices, can be used to create georeferenced data sets on factors affecting vulnerability that are otherwise unavailable or outdated, especially in developing countries (Ford et al., 2016).

**Case study 3 – Extreme scenarios of sea level rise**

67. The projected mean global sea level rise for the end of the twenty-first century under a high-emission scenario (SSP5-8.5) is 0.77 m (likely range 0.63–1.02 m) (IPCC, 2021, chap. 9). The upper limit of this likely range has sometimes been incorrectly termed a worst-case scenario and considered the upper end for practical design, despite the fact that the IPCC did not define the likely range for that purpose (Siegert et al., 2020). Research on the physical processes associated with global sea level rise reveals that an extreme scenario of a 2.3 m increase by 2100 is possible (IPCC, 2021, chap. 9). The reasons for this large difference between the likely range and the extreme scenarios of sea level rise primarily relate to uncertainties regarding stability of the Antarctic ice sheet (IPCC, 2021, chap. 9; Siegert et al., 2020).

68. When assessing adaptation needs to reduce coastal risks, the sea level rise scenarios used should depend on the risk tolerance of stakeholders (IPCC, 2019b, chap. 4; IPCC, 2021, chap. 9). In many cases the likely ranges for SSP2-2.6 and SSP5-8.5 will be adequate for assessing needs. However, in situations where the consequences of low probability (but physically possible) change are severe, robust risk management includes consideration of more extreme scenarios (Fleming et al., 2018). Examples where this would be appropriate include planning for safety in coastal cities and long-term investments in critical infrastructure located near the coast (IPCC, 2019b, chap. 4). The long-term nature of sea level rise means that exceeding the current likely range of global sea level rise is a question of not if but when (IPCC, 2021, chap. 9). Aggressive global measures to reduce greenhouse gas emissions would ensure these upper limits are not exceeded for many centuries.

69. New technologies provide powerful tools for visualizing the impacts associated with different sea level rise scenarios and assist adaptation planning by laying these scenarios over the distribution of critical infrastructure and social vulnerabilities. Examples are available from both developed countries (e.g. National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Office for Coastal Management, 2022) and developing countries (e.g. Maillard et al., 2020). Assessments may benefit from application of big data approaches, for example synthesis and harmonization of coastal data sets and satellite imagery, while recognizing that there are significant barriers to using big data approaches (Pollard et al., 2018).

**3. Considering both transboundary and domestic and local climate risks, as well as compound and cascading climate risks**

70. Assessment of adaptation needs at the national level has largely focused on climate risks and vulnerabilities arising from climate impacts within countries, frequently based on sectoral analysis. The importance of cross-border and regional climate risks, particularly associated with transboundary drainage basins, has been identified by many countries in their NAPs. While involving multiple jurisdictions may complicate the planning process, experience of the Global Network of Basins working on climate change adaptation (see Water Convention, 2021) indicates that jointly addressing transboundary risks reduces uncertainties and makes adaptation more efficient through sharing data, costs and benefits, and by enhancing the planning scale and strengthening prioritization. There are several examples of adaptation plans developed on the basis of transboundary risk analysis in Europe (e.g. the Chu-Talas, Danube and Rhine rivers) and they are emerging elsewhere (e.g. Lake Chad, Lake Victoria, and the Mekong, Niger and Volta basins). In the case of all these examples, participatory approaches were used for assessing adaptation needs, with transboundary basin organizations playing a crucial role in coordination (Water Convention, 2021).

71. The concept of transboundary climate risk goes beyond shared biophysical systems to encompass trade links, financial interdependencies and the movement of people (Adaptation Without Borders, 2017). The scope is not limited to climate impacts, as the adaptation actions taken to respond to climate impacts may affect other countries (e.g. trading partners). When

factored into global analysis, the distribution of climate risk is quite different from that based exclusively on direct climate impacts within country borders (Benzie and Harris, 2020).

72. Systematic analysis of transboundary climate risks to date has largely been limited to developed countries, but the concept is equally applicable to developing countries. Available analysis shows transboundary risks to be of equal or greater economic significance than domestic climate risks (see case study 4). In the case of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, transboundary climate risks were found to be as much as 10 times greater than domestic climate risks in some sectors, particularly trade and investment and food supply chains (PwC, 2013). For most countries, transboundary climate risks represent a known unknown, with ongoing research initiatives focused on addressing this gap (Stockholm Environment Institute submission). With respect to institutional adaptation needs, responsibility for addressing transboundary climate risks often falls outside the jurisdictions of government departments and likely requires cooperative action at multiple levels (Benzie and Harris, 2020).

73. A thorough understanding of transboundary risks allows for more complete analysis of compound and cascading climate risks. Such analysis reveals that the total risk in any location may differ from the sum of individual risks if interactions (including the combined effects of multiple stressors acting together to cascade and compound interactions across sectors) within and between systems are not considered (Adger et al., 2018; IPCC, 2022, chap. 1). Further risks may arise if adaptation responses do not achieve their intended objectives or result in trade-offs or adverse side effects for other societal objectives (IPCC, 2022, chap. 1). Enhancing understanding of the complex nature of climate risk is an important contribution of the AR6, which highlights the spatial and temporal variability in vulnerability, exposure and impacts, as well as system feedbacks, cascades and non-linear behaviour, all of which raise the potential of underestimating total climate risk.


#### **Case study 4 – Transboundary climate risks to agricultural commodity flows**

74. Agriculture is one of the most exposed sectors to climate change, both over the short term, as extreme weather events increase in frequency and severity, and the long term, owing to broader shifts in climatic patterns, including temperature and precipitation. Adams et al. (2021) undertook a first systematic, quantitative assessment of transboundary climate risks to trade in key agricultural commodities, namely maize, rice, wheat, soy, sugar cane and coffee.

75. The Adams et al. (2021) methodology for assessing transboundary climate risk projects the extent to which the impacts of climate change will affect yields of major agricultural commodities in particular countries over time, combined with measuring commodity-specific trade dependency, enabling projection of climate risk through global food trade networks.

76. For the assessment a ‘stress test’ approach is applied focusing on long-term trends in agricultural production. See figure 10 for an example of risks and opportunities for an importer.

Figure 10  
**Key trade relationships and climate risk for Kenyan imports**



Source: Adams et al (2021).

**4. Employing an adaptive risk management or pathways approach**

77. Many of the lessons learned, including that assessing adaptation needs is a continual process that should be undertaken in the context of national development and economic planning, are integral to adaptive risk management (e.g. Lempert et al., 2018) and climate-resilient development pathways (see box 3) (e.g. IPCC, 2022, chap. 18). Uncertainties related to future climate change impacts and adaptation actions are continually identified, assessed, prioritized, managed and revised on the basis of monitoring new information, experience and stakeholder input (Lempert et al., 2018). The approach entails an ongoing cycle of assessment, action, reassessment and response that will continue in perpetuity, rather than informing one-off decisions at a single point in time (Lempert et al., 2018). Decisions are made through consideration of a broad range of criteria, such as costs, benefits, equity, affordability, flexibility, trade-offs, co-benefits and co-impacts (Boyd and Markandya, 2021).

78. Such approaches stress that choices made when assessing adaptation options represent one decision point in an ongoing process to achieve climate resilience (see case study 5). They shift thinking away from one-time, one-off responses to address short-term issues (such as identified in NAPAs) and place the focus on the timing and sequencing of a series of adaptation actions as part of a long-term vision that can and should be adjusted as circumstances change. They also fit well with the short-, medium- and long-term perspectives included in some NAPs (e.g. Kuwait; Kuwait Environment Public Authority, 2019), recognizing that the lead-up time to implementing some adaptation measures can be decades (IPCC, 2022, cross-chapter box DEEP, pp.2578–2580).

**Case study 5 – Bangladesh Delta Plan 2100**

79. The confluence of the Ganges, Brahmaputra and Meghna rivers in Bangladesh forms the world’s largest delta. About 110 million people live within the delta and depend on it for their livelihoods (Roome, 2021). Climate change impacts, including sea level rise and salinization, represent a major threat to the region. To address these and a wide range of other issues, the national Government developed BDP 2100, a comprehensive development plan focused on economic growth, environmental conservation and enhanced climate resilience. It describes holistic, cross-sectoral actions that will improve productivity and minimize disaster risk (Government of the People’s Republic of Bangladesh, 2018). Technical assistance was provided by the Government of the Netherlands to benefit from the best practices of Dutch delta management (Zevenbergen et al., 2018).

80. Adaptive risk management and the concept of adaptation pathways are integral to the Plan in terms of addressing uncertainties. The rationale and approach are described as follows (Government of the People’s Republic of Bangladesh, 2018, pp.5–6):


“Due to the large uncertainties with respect to climate change and socioeconomic development, planning is being enriched with adaptive strategy making in several deltas in the world. Rather than providing linear recipes, robust and flexible strategies and measures have been taken, with strong institutions and a good knowledge base that allows policy makers and stakeholders to anticipate and decide on the most appropriate investments. Learning from these international experiences, BDP 2100 has been developed in light of the many possible future paths that are possible and is designed to be changed over time as new information becomes available or policy priorities change. So, instead of only focusing on short term ‘trial and error’ actions and projects, the idea is to keep the long-term vision in mind while prioritizing short term ‘no regret’ actions”.

81. With respect to assessing adaptation needs, it is noteworthy that implementation of BDP 2100 requires a series of institutional and policy reforms that are already under way, with a Delta Governance Council and an interministerial forum having been established to provide strategic direction (Roome, 2021).

82. An issue-specific illustration of an adaptive risk management approach examines adaptation to increasing salinization in the delta (Hossain et al., 2018). Input from households and key informants, multi-criteria analysis and ‘adaptation turning points’ (thresholds beyond which a particular adaptation response is no longer effective) were used to develop three sets of adaptation pathways that allow adaptation to proceed in a stepwise manner as salinity increases from current levels of about 5.5 ppt to more than 15 ppt (see figure 11) without exceeding hard adaptation limits.

Figure 11

**Conceptual model of adaptation pathways approach**



○ Transfer station to new action | Adaptation tipping point (ATP) of an action — Adaptation pathways

Source: Hossain et al. (2018).

Note: Approach to adapting to increasing salinization in Bangladesh. Action or pathway A can sustain up to salinity level 7 ppt, action or pathway B in combination with A will be sustainable up to a salinity level of 10 ppt, at which point action or pathway C is suitable until salinity exceeds 12 ppt, while action or pathway D combined with action C is expected to sustain up to 15 ppt salinity.

## 5. Considering transformational adaptation options in addition to incremental actions

83. The majority of adaptation measures being planned and implemented are incremental actions designed to maintain the essential features of an existing system (IPCC, 2022, chap. 17). This is despite growing recognition that, in many situations, climate change impacts may exceed adaptation limits and threaten the viability or sustainability of those systems. In such situations, incremental actions are of limited effectiveness and transformational actions that change the fundamental attributes of a system at a scale and ambition greater than incremental actions are necessary (IPCC, 2014, chap. 14; IPCC, 2022, chap. 16). The AR6 stresses the distinction between actions that are incremental and those that are transformational may not always be clear, in that some incremental actions may serve to expand the potential for future, more transformational solutions (IPCC, 2022, chap. 1).

84. Transformational adaptation may involve radical restructuring, replacement or abandonment of systems, processes and practices that are no longer viable under new climatic conditions (Brooks et al., 2019). Because transformational adaptation is system wide, it is often (but not necessarily) associated with large-scale policy shifts developed through top-down, formal decision-making processes (IPCC, 2014, chap. 14). It has also been noted that, where transformational adaptation is left to autonomous processes and market institutions alone, it can lead to significant economic inequities (de Koning and Filatova, 2020). Successful transformational planning requires integration of climate-resilient pathways and sustainable development (IPCC, 2022, chap. 17).

85. Current methodologies for assessing adaptation options appear to be biased towards near-term, incremental actions. These approaches need to be complemented by methodologies that can identify needs and opportunities for transformational adaptation (Brooks et al., 2019; IIED submission). While work on such methodologies is ongoing, this should not preclude consideration of transformational actions when assessing adaptation needs. Indeed, consideration of both incremental and transformational adaptation expands the scope of adaptation measures and provides further options once a system reaches a soft adaptation limit (IPCC, 2022, chap. 16; and see case study 6). Migration, spatial planning, governance cooperation, universal access to health care and changing food systems have been identified as measures with high transformative potential (IPCC, 2022, chap. 17). Expert assessment, within a broadly inclusive process, will be important. Examples of transformational adaptation occurring in response to drivers other than climate change (Brooks, 2017) may also provide methodological insights.

### Case study 6 – Managed retreat in coastal communities

86. Relocation of people, communities and critical infrastructure to sites beyond the reach of specific existing and projected climate hazards has been the subject of considerable research and analysis, and in many cases would represent a transformational change (e.g. Mach and Siders, 2021). This is certainly the case for migration but moving even relatively short distances likely represents crossing a soft adaptation limit for the individuals involved. A case has been made for the importance of distinguishing between climate migration and managed retreat within adaptation policies and plans (Ajibade et al., 2020). The negative impacts of relocation may be particularly high on indigenous peoples (Felipe Pérez and Tomaselli, 2021).

87. The NDCs of several Parties identify managed retreat in coastal settings as a necessary response to sea level rise, coastal erosion and flooding. One example of advance planning for voluntary managed retreat is the island State of Sao Tome and Principe, where vulnerability has been mapped at the household level and spatial planning has identified new areas for urban development adjacent to the old coastal community but with greatly reduced risks of storms and coastal flooding (Koskinen Lewis et al., 2016). Key lessons learned with respect to successful managed retreat include ensuring community engagement and leadership at each stage of the relocation process, providing compensation where necessary, ensuring access to livelihoods and services in relocation areas, planning for manpower requirements and preventing return while ensuring coastal access (Koskinen Lewis et al., 2016).

88. Managed coastal retreat is a complex process with significant social and institutional dimensions. Its planning will inevitably raise questions about adaptation limits, acceptable losses and societal aspects that need to be maintained (Mach and Siders, 2021). In advance

of such a transformational solution, incremental adaptation options can serve to reduce risks and buy the time necessary for managed retreat to be planned effectively (IPCC, 2022, chap. 16; see table 2). These incremental changes could involve any of a suite of management, infrastructure and policy adaptation options (e.g. Major and Juhola, 2021).

Table 2

**Possible incremental and transformational adaptation responses to address impacts of sea level rise in a small coastal community with minimal infrastructure**

<i>Time period</i>	<i>Actions</i>	<i>Type of change</i>	<i>Notes</i>
Immediate	Improve evacuation plans	Incremental	Based on local knowledge; inexpensive
Short term (<5 years)	Locally constructed adjustments, join any available early warning systems, review retreat and temporary refuge options	Incremental	Some outside assistance needed for temporary refuge options
Medium term (5–15 years)	Moderate protection for some buildings and roads, retreat and relocation of most critical or vulnerable buildings and roads	Incremental	Moderate cost; some local, institutional and property issues; access to projected climate impact data
Long term (>15 years)	Plan and implement full retreat	Transformational	High cost; complex institutional and property issues

*Source:* Modified from Major and Juhola (2021).

**6. Conducting integrated assessments of capacity, technological and financial needs**

89. Every stage of the adaptation cycle, from vulnerability and risk assessment through analysis of adaptation options, to the planning, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of adaptation actions, requires human, technological and financial resources. All three are interrelated and hence should be assessed together (European Union and its member States submission). The coherence resulting from such an approach should reduce inefficiencies associated with separate analysis of each type of resource and ultimately reduce the analytical workload associated with the assessment.

90. Within the UNFCCC process, capacity, technology and finance are addressed under multiple agenda items and by separate constituted bodies (the PCCB, the SCF and the Technology Executive Committee). Guidance developed by these bodies recognizes the linkages between capacity, technology and finance. For example, a key step in developing a TNA is undertaking a barrier analysis and establishing an enabling framework that looks at capacity, financial and other needs (Haselip et al., 2019; and see case study 7). Likewise, case studies on Indonesia, and Trinidad and Tobago included in the PCCB toolkit highlight the importance of technology needs in informing capacity assessments (PCCB, 2020).

**Case study 7 – Barrier analysis as part of technology needs assessment**

91. As at February 2022, the UNFCCC TNA database<sup>16</sup> included 66 barrier analysis and enabling framework reports addressing technologies for adaptation. Guidance for these reports provided by Nygaard and Hansen (2015) identifies several categories of barriers, many of which are relevant to assessing adaptation needs broadly, including:

- (a) Economic and financial barriers;
- (b) Legal and regulatory barriers;
- (c) Network barriers;

<sup>16</sup> <https://tech-action.unepccc.org/tna-database/>.

- (d) Institutional and organizational capacity barriers;
- (e) Human skills barriers;
- (f) Social, cultural and behavioural barriers;
- (g) Information and awareness barriers;
- (h) Technical barriers.

92. Individual barrier analysis and enabling framework reports focus on technology solutions to address priority climate impacts within economic sectors. They differ in terms of level of detail and presentation, but all consider the range of barriers listed above (see table 3 for an example). Some, such as the report submitted by Jamaica, include cost–benefit analysis of measures to address major barriers (Gordon et al., 2021). Almost all barrier analysis and enabling framework reports place high priority on capacity-building at the institutional and individual level, and the financing required to build that capacity.

Table 3

**Barriers to implementing prioritized technologies in the water sector in Pakistan**

<i>Category</i>	<i>Barriers</i>
Economic and financial	High capital and maintenance cost
	Limited financial allocation to local governments
	Inadequate loan and donor funding
Policy, legal and regulatory	Lack of sound, comprehensive, cross-sectoral policies for resources protection, development and management
Information and awareness	Limited information and awareness about the existence and usefulness of the technology
Institutional and organizational capacity	Limited institutional capacity, especially at the local level, for integrating climate change risks into development planning
	Limited human skills and maintenance, especially at the local level

*Source:* Table 2.1 of Government of Pakistan (2016).

### C. Gaps

93. A number of gaps related to assessing adaptation needs have been identified by Parties and observer organizations in their submissions, in the broader academic literature, including the IPCC assessment reports, and in this paper.

94. The gaps most frequently cited in the submissions relate to the lack of resources needed to assess adaptation needs, rather than gaps in methodologies, including:

(a) Lack of financial and institutional support necessary for effective application of any methodology, particularly within developing countries (IIED submission). The LDCs note the need for strengthened institutions and institutional arrangements for climate change planning, financing and climate information services, including support for non-State actors;

(b) Limited access to data and data analysis tools (AILAC submission). Climate data continue to be a gap for many countries (AOSIS submission), despite major advances in climate services (World Meteorological Organization submission);

(c) Lack of information on the economic impacts of slow onset changes, relative to that available on damages associated with extreme climate events (LDCs submission);

(d) Lack of understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of existing institutions for supporting adaptation (WFO Climakers and World Food Programme submissions);

(e) Lack of private sector engagement and of documentation of private sector adaptation needs and actions (Argentina submission; also highlighted in IPCC, 2014, chap. 14).

95. With respect to methodologies, gaps include:

(a) Detailed documentation on the methodologies used by countries in assessing adaptation needs (SCF, 2021);

(b) Practical methodologies for quantitative assessment, which tend to be complex and data and resource intensive, while recognizing that qualitative and semi-quantitative analyses of adaptation needs can be extremely useful (Argentina and International Fund for Agricultural Development submissions);

(c) Practical methods for assessing financial and technological needs (Cuba submission);

(d) Methodologies for evaluating non-market costs and benefits, such as ecosystem services, and monetizing adaptation actions and the benefits derived from them, particularly for countries with limited capacity (LDCs submission);

(e) Methodologies for assessing adaptation needs related to monitoring and evaluation;

(f) Methodologies for identifying needs and opportunities for transformative adaptation (IIED submission);

(g) Methodologies for integrating multiple sectoral assessments (Commonwealth Secretariat submission);

(h) Methodologies for prioritizing adaptation options (AOSIS submission).

96. With respect to analysis of existing methodologies for assessing adaptation needs, gaps include:

(a) Lack of an analytical framework that would enable a systematic analysis of existing methodologies;

(b) Lack of empirical data that would allow for analysis of the relative utility of different methods and tools.

## **D. Synthesis**

97. Information in the IPCC assessment reports, other academic literature and submissions from Parties and observer organizations fails to show convergence on a single methodology, or suite of methodologies, for assessing adaptation needs that would be applicable across a wide range of national circumstances. Lack of convergence relates, in part, to the inconsistent use of the term “methodologies” as differentiated from methods and tools. Furthermore, experience within the UNFCCC process in assessing specific dimensions of adaptation needs (e.g. technology and capacity) reveals that overarching methodologies can remain quite simple, with the key to success being the availability of detailed guidance material that allows analysis to be undertaken in a systematic manner.

98. Building on that experience, this paper proposes a five-step process for assessing adaptation needs at the national level, with a variety of methods and tools being applicable at each stage of the process (see table 4):

(a) Framing the assessment;

(b) Assessing climate risks and vulnerabilities;

(c) Identifying desired adaptation actions;

(d) Assessing resource needs (including for monitoring and evaluation);

(e) Compiling adaptation needs.

Table 4  
**Five-step process for assessing adaptation needs**

<i>Stage</i>	<i>Scope</i>	<i>Indicative methods (broad categories)</i>
1. Frame the assessment	<p>Setting goals and objectives of the needs assessment</p> <p>Establishing desired level of detail and complexity</p> <p>Identifying resources and capacity needed and available</p> <p>Compiling and collecting required data and information</p>	<p>Participatory multi-stakeholder engagement</p> <p>Stocktake of available information, resources and capacity</p> <p>Data collection</p>
2. Assess climate risks and vulnerabilities	<p>Identifying differential vulnerabilities and their underlying causes</p> <p>Assessing projected climate impacts, including cascading impacts</p> <p>Analysing projected changes in climate risks and vulnerabilities (environmental, social, economic, institutional)</p> <p>Assessing existing adaptive capacity</p> <p>Identifying climate risks (including transboundary risks) and opportunities</p>	<p>Climate and socioeconomic scenario analysis</p> <p>Impact, vulnerability and risk assessment approaches, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Risk-based</li> <li>Community-based</li> <li>Ecosystem-based</li> <li>Sector-based</li> </ol>
3. Identify desired adaptation actions	<p>Identifying adaptation pathways and options, including timescale for feasible and effective implementation</p> <p>Appraising potential effectiveness, feasibility and justice and equity of the adaptation pathways and options</p> <p>Considering trade-offs and ability to balance across perspectives and values</p> <p>Costing adaptation options</p> <p>Ranking and prioritizing the adaptation pathways and options to identify desired adaptation actions and timing of implementation</p>	<p>Adaptation and climate-resilient development pathways</p> <p>Equity analysis</p> <p>Multi-criteria decision analysis</p> <p>Cost–benefit analysis</p> <p>Real options analysis</p> <p>Portfolio analysis</p>
4. Assess resource needs (capacity, technology, information, finance)	<p>Identifying resources required considering environmental, social, economic and institutional needs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For addressing underlying vulnerabilities</li> <li>For planning and implementing adaptation actions</li> <li>For monitoring and evaluating adaptation actions</li> </ol>	<p>Capacity needs analysis</p> <p>Technology needs assessment</p> <p>Costing adaptation actions</p> <p>Framework for monitoring and evaluation</p> <p>Economic analysis</p> <p>Analysis of responsibilities</p>
5. Compile adaptation needs (adaptation actions, resource needs)	<p>Compiling adaptation actions</p> <p>Compiling resource needs (capacity, technology, financial, information)</p>	<p>Guidelines for different end uses, including for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>NAPs, to facilitate implementation</li> <li>Mobilizing and accessing support</li> <li>Adaptation communications, BTRs, BURs, national communications and NDCs, to facilitate reporting under the UNFCCC</li> <li>Other national processes, such as subnational and sectoral planning and implementation</li> </ol>

99. The first stage, framing the assessment, is critical, as decisions made will affect the outcome of the process and help direct methods and approaches. The stage starts with defining the goals of the adaptation needs assessment, which will likely relate to adaptation goals broadly. As noted in the AR6, defining specific adaptation goals is challenging because climate change affects different groups and populations in different ways, such that their adaptation priorities and solutions will also differ (IPCC, 2022, chap. 1). Pragmatic goals generally involve reducing and managing, rather than eliminating, climate risk. Another important dimension of the first stage is to define the level of analytical detail necessary or desired to complete the assessment. Needs assessments can be multilayered, and often high-level analysis may be adequate to achieve the goals of the adaptation needs assessment without placing a heavy burden on limited capacity and resources.

100. Beyond that first stage, it is unlikely that any national assessment would start from scratch. Rather, it would incorporate and build on existing knowledge and data concerning climate risks, vulnerabilities, adaptation plans and adaptation actions. This information will be unequal with respect to scope, detail and geographical scale, having been collected at different points in time using different methods and tools. New activities would involve filling key gaps in available information concerning biophysical and environmental, social, institutional, and information, capacity and resource needs, while synthesizing existing information into a coherent national picture. This approach may be less than ideal from a technical perspective but is the most practical approach in terms of time and resources.

101. A critical analytical component of assessing adaptation needs relates to considering trade-offs between adaptation options or pathways (stage 3). Because different groups and populations have different adaptation priorities and goals, the decision to pursue one particular adaptation solution will result in an uneven distribution of benefits and burdens. Choices may preclude addressing other priorities or even have unintended negative consequences for certain groups or populations (maladaptation). This highlights the importance of understanding the equity and justice implications of choices made in pursuit of effective and adequate adaptation solutions (see figure 3).

102. There may be overlap between the various stages in the process, particularly between identifying desired adaptation options (stage 3) and assessing resource needs (stage 4). Understanding the resource needs associated with adaptation options, the associated benefits and the distribution of those costs and benefits will be a key factor in ranking and prioritizing adaptation options. It should be stressed that a number of methods and tools could be applied at each stage (see table 4). In the absence of stronger empirical evidence on the utility of different methods, the approaches applied in any setting should be dictated by specific circumstances, including capacity and time.

103. While depicted as a linear process in table 4, it needs to be remembered that assessing adaptation needs is an ongoing and continuous process (see figure 2). Knowledge and data concerning climate risks and vulnerabilities and adaptation solutions are continuously evolving, as are policy priorities and hence adaptation needs. An assessment of adaptation needs will unavoidably present an incomplete picture at one point in time and be, to some extent, outdated by the time it is completed. This is true of most assessments, including those of the IPCC. It should not be viewed as a limitation, but rather highlights the critical importance of monitoring and evaluation and the reason why the process must be ongoing. Results of successive assessments provide important insights into successes, failures and gaps in adaptation responses.

## **VI. Conclusions and recommendations**

104. Assessing adaptation needs is a critical step in enhancing climate resilience. It is challenging in part because it encompasses all stages of the adaptation cycle, including monitoring and evaluating implemented actions. It is happening from project to global level, with information at the national level particularly relevant under the UNFCCC.

105. The relevant submissions from Parties and observer organizations highlight a multitude of different methods and tools being used for assessing adaptation needs. There are important commonalities between approaches, including an emphasis on participatory

approaches to ensure understanding of existing vulnerability and capacity. In many cases, methodologies are developed in an ad hoc manner on the basis of generic guidance provided for developing NAPs or similar initiatives and customized to address the specific circumstances where they are being applied. National-level needs assessment draws on analyses conducted at different levels, at different points in time and using different methods and tools.

106. Comparing the practical experience of Parties with information contained in the academic literature highlights a significant gap between theory and concepts associated with assessing adaptation needs and current application of methodologies. This is to be expected and in no way diminishes the value of existing assessments of adaptation needs. It does, however, highlight the importance of integrating methodologies and the continued development of methodologies, methods and tools that incorporate new concepts, particularly adaptation pathways and climate-resilient development pathways. Methodological work must stress the importance of providing approaches suitable for countries with limited capacity to undertake such assessments, recognizing that these are also the countries most in need of support. This may require, rather than different methodologies, the ability to apply the same methodology at differing levels of detail and complexity.

107. To facilitate further work on methodologies, methods and tools for assessing adaptation needs, this paper identifies emerging good practices for needs assessment, recognizing the importance of incorporating new ideas as understanding of the adaptation process increases. It presents a five-step process for broadly assessing adaptation needs, recognizing that it is part of a continuous assessment process necessitated by the fact that knowledge of climate vulnerability, risk, adaptation solutions and priorities continues to evolve.

108. Regarding possible future work within and outside the UNFCCC process in relation to methodologies for assessing adaptation needs and their application, recommended actions include:

(a) Continuing and enhancing provision of international support to developing country Parties for assessing their adaptation needs in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 13, of the Paris Agreement;

(b) Continuing to share experience of assessing adaptation needs, including on the utility of the emerging good practices, such as those identified in this paper;

(c) Continuing to develop methodologies, methods and tools for assessing adaptation needs, in an integrated manner encompassing the complete adaptation cycle, and to consider the applicability of the methodologies, recognizing the need for methodologies that can be adapted for application in differing circumstances, including in countries with limited capacity;

(d) Considering experience and examples and further development of methodologies for identifying adaptation needs related to transformative adaptation, cascading risks and transboundary adaptation according to the capacity of countries;

(e) Strengthening engagement and collaboration between UNFCCC constituted bodies, the IPCC, practitioners and academia on matters related to assessing adaptation needs along the adaptation cycle, including improving and updating overview guidance for integrated assessment of capacity, technological and financial needs.

## References

- Adams KM, Benzie K, Croft S, et al. 2021. *Climate change, trade, and global food security: A global assessment of transboundary climate risks in agricultural commodity flows. SEI report*. Stockholm: Stockholm Environment Institute. Available at <http://doi.org/10.51414/sei2021.009>.
- Adaptation Without Borders. 2017. *Transboundary climate risks: an overview*. Available at [https://adaptationwithoutborders.org/sites/weadapt.org/files/2017/transboundary\\_climate\\_risks\\_web-2.pdf](https://adaptationwithoutborders.org/sites/weadapt.org/files/2017/transboundary_climate_risks_web-2.pdf).
- Adger WN, Brown I and Surminski S. 2018. Advances in risk assessment for climate change adaptation policy. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*. 376(2121): pp.20180106. Available at <https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/10.1098/rsta.2018.0106>.
- Ajibade I, Sullivan M and Haeffner M. 2020. Why climate migration is not managed retreat: Six justifications. *Global Environmental Change*. 65: pp.102187. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378020307706>.
- Analysis under Uncertainty for Decision-Makers Network. 2020. *Decision Support Tools for Complex Decisions under Uncertainty*. Available at [http://au4dmnetworks.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/20180503\\_AU4DM\\_Shard\\_workshop\\_Catalogue.pdf](http://au4dmnetworks.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/06/20180503_AU4DM_Shard_workshop_Catalogue.pdf).
- Benzie, M and Harris, K. 2020. *Transboundary climate risk and adaptation. Science for Adaptation*. Science for Adaptation Policy Brief 2. Nairobi: World Adaptation Science Programme. Available at [https://wasp-adaptation.org/images/Resources/WASP\\_Science\\_for\\_Adaptation\\_Policy\\_Brief\\_No.\\_2.pdf](https://wasp-adaptation.org/images/Resources/WASP_Science_for_Adaptation_Policy_Brief_No._2.pdf)
- Bizikova L. 2012. *Capacity assessment and awareness raising on climate change in Tajikistan: using participatory scenario development (PSD) approach*. Tajikistan: UNDP. Available at <https://www.undp.org/tajikistan/publications/capacity-assessment-and-awareness-raising-climate-change>.
- Boyd, R and Markandya, A. 2021. *Costs and Benefits of Climate Change Impacts and Adaptation*. In: Warren F and Lulham N. 2021. *Canada in a Changing Climate*. National Issues Report. Ottawa. Available at [https://changingclimate.ca/site/assets/uploads/sites/3/2021/05/National-Issues-Report\\_Final\\_EN.pdf](https://changingclimate.ca/site/assets/uploads/sites/3/2021/05/National-Issues-Report_Final_EN.pdf).
- Brooks N. 2017. *Transformational Adaptation: Concepts, Examples, and their Relevance to Agriculture in Eastern and Southern Africa*. Garama 3C Ltd, Vuna. Available at [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313861822\\_Transformational\\_Adaptation\\_Concepts\\_Examples\\_and\\_their\\_Relevance\\_to\\_Agriculture\\_in\\_Eastern\\_and\\_Southern\\_Africa](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313861822_Transformational_Adaptation_Concepts_Examples_and_their_Relevance_to_Agriculture_in_Eastern_and_Southern_Africa).
- Brooks N and Adger WN. 2005. Assessing and enhancing adaptive capacity. In: B Lim and E Spanger-Siegfried (eds.). *Adaptation Policy Frameworks for Climate Change: Developing Strategies, Policies and Measures*. Cambridge: UNDP and Cambridge University Press. Available at [http://www.preventionweb.net/files/7995\\_APF.pdf](http://www.preventionweb.net/files/7995_APF.pdf).
- Brooks N, Anderson S, Aragon I, et al. 2019. *Framing and tracking 21st century climate adaptation: Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning for Paris, the SDGs and beyond*. International Institute for Environment and Development. Available at <https://www.iied.org/10202iied>.
- Bryan E, Bernier Q, Espinal M, et al. 2016. *Integrating gender into climate change adaptation programs: A research and capacity needs assessment for Sub-Saharan Africa*. Working Paper No. 163. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CCAFS). Available at <http://hdl.handle.net/10568/72482>.
- Burton I, Diringer E and Smith J. 2006. *Adaptation to Climate Change: International Policy Options*. Arlington, VA, USA: The Pew Center on Global Climate Change. Available at <https://www.c2es.org/wp-content/uploads/2006/11/adaptation-climate-change-international-policy-options.pdf>

- Charlery L and Trærup SLM. 2019. The nexus between nationally determined contributions and technology needs assessments: a global analysis. *Climate Policy*. 19(2): pp.189–205. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1080/14693062.2018.1479957>.
- Condesan (Consortio para el Desarrollo Sostenible de la Ecoregion Andina). 2022. *Proyecto AICCA – Adaptación a los Impactos del Cambio Climático en los Recursos Hídricos de los Andes*. Available at <https://aicca.condesan.org/>.
- CTCN and UNEP DTU Partnership. 2021. *Scaling up investment in climate technologies: Pathways to realising technology development and transfer in support of the Paris Agreement*. JA Haselip (ed.). Copenhagen: UNEP DTU Partnership. Available at [https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/resources/Perspectives\\_Scaling\\_up\\_investments\\_0.pdf](https://www.ctc-n.org/sites/www.ctc-n.org/files/resources/Perspectives_Scaling_up_investments_0.pdf).
- De Groot J. 2018. *Guidance for a gender-responsive Technology Needs Assessment*. UNEP DTU Partnership. Available at <https://unepccc.org/publications/36105/>.
- De Koning K and Filatova T. 2020. Repetitive floods intensify outmigration and climate gentrification in coastal cities. *Environmental Research Letters*. 15(3): pp.034008. Available at <https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab6668>.
- Dessai S, Lu X and Risbey JS. 2005. On the role of climate scenarios for adaptation planning. *Global Environmental Change*. 15(2): pp.87–97. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378004000895>.
- Dinshaw A and McGinn C. 2019. *ACCAF: A UNCDF LoCAL Framework for Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring and Evaluation*. Available at <https://www.uncdf.org>.
- Dixit A, McGray H and Gonzales J. 2012. *Ready or Not. Assessing National Institutional Capacity for Climate Change Adaptation*. Washing DC: World Resources Institute. Available at <https://www.wri.org/ready-or-not>.
- Fleming E, Payne J, Sweet WV, et al. 2018. *Coastal effects*. Available at <http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/publication/70201869>. In: Volume II of USGCRP. 2018. *Fourth National Climate Assessment*. U.S. Global Change Research Program, Washington, DC. Available at <https://nca2018.globalchange.gov>.
- Ford JD, Tilleard SE, Berrang-Ford L, et al. 2016. Big data has big potential for applications to climate change adaptation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 113(39): pp.10729–10732. Available at <https://www.pnas.org/doi/full/10.1073/pnas.1614023113>.
- Fritzsche K, Schneiderbauer S, Bubeck P, et al. 2017. *The Vulnerability Sourcebook: Concept and guidelines for standardised vulnerability assessments*. Climate Policy Support Project. Bonn: GIZ and BMZ. Available at [https://www.adaptationcommunity.net/download/va/vulnerability-guides-manuals-reports/vuln\\_source\\_2017\\_EN.pdf](https://www.adaptationcommunity.net/download/va/vulnerability-guides-manuals-reports/vuln_source_2017_EN.pdf).
- Fünfgeld H and Mcevoy D. 2011. *Framing Climate Change Adaptation in Policy and Practice*. Available at [http://www.vccar.org.au/sites/default/files/publications/Framing\\_project\\_workingpaper1\\_240611\\_1.pdf](http://www.vccar.org.au/sites/default/files/publications/Framing_project_workingpaper1_240611_1.pdf).
- Füssel H-M. 2007. Vulnerability: A generally applicable conceptual framework for climate change research. *Global Environmental Change*. 17(2): pp.155–167. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0959378006000525>.
- GEF secretariat and UNITAR. 2001. *A Guide for Self-Assessment of Country Capacity Needs for Global Environmental Management*. Washington, D.C.: GEF.
- GEF secretariat. 2002. Note on GEF Support for National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPA). GEF Council. Available at [https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.19.Inf\\_7\\_NAPA.pdf](https://www.thegef.org/sites/default/files/council-meeting-documents/C.19.Inf_7_NAPA.pdf).
- Gordon UM, Constable A, Charlery L, et al. 2021. *Jamaica Barrier Analysis and Enabling Framework*. UNEP, GEF, UNEP DTU and the University of the West Indies. Available at

<https://tech-action.unepccc.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2021/03/jamaica-baef-final-report.pdf>.

Government of Nepal. 2021. *National Adaptation Plan (NAP) 2021-2050: Summary for Policy Makers*. Kathmandu. Available at [https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/NAP\\_Nepal.pdf](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/NAP_Nepal.pdf).

Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Climate Change. 2016. *Barrier Analysis and Enabling Framework (for water and agriculture sectors); Technology Needs Assessment for Climate Change Adaptation*. Islamabad. Available at [https://unfccc.int/ttclear/misc\\_/StaticFiles/gnwoerk\\_static/TNA\\_key\\_doc/57c2b2a361414dafb2468a842c8154ce/c82af9a3f32747a2ab9f5495d12dfaa7.pdf](https://unfccc.int/ttclear/misc_/StaticFiles/gnwoerk_static/TNA_key_doc/57c2b2a361414dafb2468a842c8154ce/c82af9a3f32747a2ab9f5495d12dfaa7.pdf).

Government of Peru, Ministry of Environment. 2021. *Plan Nacional de Adaptación al Cambio Climático del Perú: un insumo para la actualización de la Estrategia Nacional ante el Cambio Climático*. Lima. Available at [https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/Per%c3%ba\\_NAP\\_Spanish.pdf.pdf](https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/Per%c3%ba_NAP_Spanish.pdf.pdf).

Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. 2018. *Bangladesh Delta Plan 2100 - Bangladesh in the 21st Century (Abridged Version): The Best Gift for the Future Generations by the Present Generation*. Dhaka: General Economics Division, Bangladesh Planning Commission. Available at <https://oldweb.lged.gov.bd/UploadedDocument/UnitPublication/1/756/BDP%202100%20Abridged%20Version%20English.pdf>.

Gupta J, Termeer CJ a. M, Klostermann JEM, et al. 2010. The adaptive capacity wheel: a method to assess the inherent characteristics of institutions to enable the adaptive capacity of society. *Environmental Science & Policy*. 13(6): pp.459–471. Available at <https://research.wur.nl/en/publications/the-adaptive-capacity-wheel-a-method-to-assess-the-inherent-chara>.

Haselip J, Narkeviciute R, Rogat J, et al. 2019. *TNA Step by Step: A guidebook for countries conducting a Technology Needs Assessment and Action Plan*. Copenhagen: UNEP DTU Partnership. Available at <https://tech-action.unepccc.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/04/2019-02-tna-step-by-step-guide.pdf>.

Hossain PR, Ludwig F and Leemans R. 2018. Adaptation pathways to cope with salinization in south-west coastal region of Bangladesh. *Ecology and Society*. 23(3). Available at <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26799149>.

IPCC. 1994. *IPCC Technical Guidelines for Assessing Climate Change Impacts and Adaptations*. T Carter, M Parry, H Harasawa, et al. (eds.). London and Tsukuba, Japan: University College London and Center for Global Environmental Research National Institute for Environmental Studies. Available at <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ipcc-technical-guidelines-for-assessing-climate-change-impacts-and-adaptations-2/>

IPCC. 2007. *Climate Change 2007: Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. M Parry, O Canziani, J Palutikof, et al. (eds.). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. Available at [https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/ar4\\_wg2\\_full\\_report.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/2018/03/ar4_wg2_full_report.pdf).

IPCC. 2014. *Climate Change 2014: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. CB Field, VR Barros, DJ Dokken, et al. (eds.). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. Available at <http://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar5/wg2>.

IPCC. 2018. *IPCC Special Report on the Impacts of Global Warming of 1.5 °C above Pre-industrial Levels and Related Global Greenhouse Gas Emission Pathways in the Context of Strengthening the Global Response to the Threat of Climate Change, Sustainable Development, and Efforts to Eradicate Poverty*. V Masson-Delmotte, P Zhai, H-O Pörtner, et al. (eds.). Geneva: World Meteorological Organization. Available at <https://www.ipcc.ch/sr15/>.

IPCC. 2019a. *IPCC Special Report on Climate Change, Desertification, Land Degradation, Sustainable Land Management, Food Security, and Greenhouse Gas Fluxes in Terrestrial*

- Ecosystems*. PR Shukla, J Skea, E Calvo Buendia, et al. (eds.). Available at <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/srcl/>.
- IPCC. 2019b. *IPCC Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere in a Changing Climate*. H-O Pörtner, DC Roberts, V Masson-Delmotte, et al. (eds.). Cambridge and New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. Available at [https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/3/2022/03/SROCC\\_FullReport\\_FINAL.pdf](https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/3/2022/03/SROCC_FullReport_FINAL.pdf).
- IPCC. 2021. *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. V Masson-Delmotte, P Zhai, A Pirani, et al. (eds.). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. Available at <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/>.
- IPCC. 2022. *Climate Change 2022: Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability. Contribution of Working Group II to the Sixth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. H Pörtner, D Roberts, M Tignor, et al. (eds.). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press. Available at <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg2/>.
- Koskinen Lewis P, de Carvalho A, Mendes Dias C, et al. 2016. *Managing Population Retreat from At-Risk Areas. Small Island States Resilience Initiative*. Washington, D.C.: The World Bank and Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery. Available at [https://www.gfdrr.org/sites/default/files/publication/SISRI%20Knowledge%20Note%203%20Participatory%20Population%20Retreat\\_0.pdf](https://www.gfdrr.org/sites/default/files/publication/SISRI%20Knowledge%20Note%203%20Participatory%20Population%20Retreat_0.pdf).
- Kuwait Environment Public Authority. 2019. *Kuwait National Adaptation Plan 2019-2030: Enhanced Climate Resilience to Improve Community Livelihood and Achieve Sustainability*. Kuwait. Available at <https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/Kuwait-NAP-2019-2030.pdf>.
- Le Manceau LJ, Hemmingsen L, Traerup S, et al. 2021. *From Needs to Implementation: Stories from the Technology Needs Assessments*. Copenhagen and Bonn: UNEP DTU Partnership and UNFCCC. Available at <https://unepccc.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/tna-stories-2021.pdf>.
- Lempert R, Arnold J, Pulwarty R, et al. 2018. Reducing Risks Through Adaptation Actions. In: D Reidmiller, CW Avery, DR Easterling, et al. (eds.). *Impacts, Risks, and Adaptation in the United States: Fourth National Climate Assessment, Volume II*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Global Change Research Program. pp.1309–1345. Available at [https://nca2018.globalchange.gov/downloads/NCA4\\_Ch28\\_Adaptation\\_Full.pdf](https://nca2018.globalchange.gov/downloads/NCA4_Ch28_Adaptation_Full.pdf).
- Mach KJ and Siders AR. 2021. Reframing Strategic, Managed Retreat for Transformative Climate Adaptation. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*. 372(6548): pp.1294–1299. Available at <https://www.science.org/doi/10.1126/science.abh1894>.
- Maillard L, Summerlin T, Wilder A, et al. 2020. *Evaluating the Impacts of Sea Level Rise and Storm Surges on Seychelles' Critical Infrastructure: Summary for Policy Makers*. Available at <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/handle/2027.42/155352>.
- Major DC and Juhola SK. 2021. *Climate Change Adaptation in Coastal Cities*. Helsinki University Press. Available at <https://hup.fi/site/books/m/10.33134/HUP-6/>.
- McKenzie Hedger M, Connell R and Bramwell P. 2006. Bridging the gap: empowering decision-making for adaptation through the UK Climate Impacts Programme. *Climate Policy (Earthscan / James & James)*. 6: pp.201–215. Available at <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/14693062.2006.9685595>.
- Nepal Ministry of Forests and Environment. 2018. *Nepal's National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Process: Reflecting on lessons learned and the way forward*. Kathmandu: Ministry of Forests and Environment of the Government of Nepal, the NAP Global Network, Action on Climate Today and Practical Action Nepal. Available at <https://napglobalnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/napgn-en-2018-nepal-nap-process.pdf>.
- Nepal Ministry of Population and Environment. 2016. *National Adaptation Plan formulation process: approach paper*. Kathmandu: Government of Nepal and Action on Climate Today (ACT). Available at <https://www.greengrowthknowledge.org/sites/default/files/downloads/policy->

[database/NEPAL%29%20National%20Adaptation%20Plan%20Formulation%20Process%20-%20Approach%20paper.pdf](https://www.unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/220126_NEPAL%20National%20Adaptation%20Plan%20Formulation%20Process%20-%20Approach%20paper.pdf).

Nepal Ministry of Population and Environment. 2017. *Synthesis of Stocktaking Report for National Adaptation Plan (NAP) Formulation Process in Nepal*. Kathmandu: Ministry of Population and Environment. Available at <https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/NAPC/Documents/Parties/Final%20Technical%20Synthesis%20Report.pdf>.

Nygaard I and Hansen UE. 2015. *Overcoming Barriers to the Transfer and Diffusion of Climate Technologies*. Copenhagen: UNEP DTU Partnership. Available at <https://tech-action.unepdtu.org/publications/overcoming-barriers-to-the-transfer-and-diffusion-of-climate-technologies-second-edition/>.

Palutikof JP, Street RB and Gardiner EP. 2019. Decision support platforms for climate change adaptation: an overview and introduction. *Climatic Change*. 153(4): pp.459–476.

Felipe Pérez B and Tomaselli A. 2021. Indigenous Peoples and climate-induced relocation in Latin America and the Caribbean: managed retreat as a tool or a threat? *Journal of Environmental Studies and Sciences*. 11(3): pp.352–364.

PCCB. 2020. *PCCB Toolkit to assess capacity building gaps and needs to implement the Paris Agreement*. Bonn: UNFCCC. Available at [https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/220126\\_BLS21379%20UCC%20PCCB%20Toolkit.v04.pdf](https://unfccc.int/sites/default/files/resource/220126_BLS21379%20UCC%20PCCB%20Toolkit.v04.pdf).

Pollard J, Spencer T and Jude S. 2018. Big Data Approaches for coastal flood risk assessment and emergency response. Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: *Climate Change*. 9: pp.e543.

PROVIA. 2013. *PROVIA Guidance on Assessing Vulnerability, Impacts and Adaptation to Climate Change*. Nairobi: UNEP. Available at <https://www.adaptation-undp.org/sites/default/files/downloads/provia-guidance-nov2013.pdf>.

PwC. 2013. *International threats and opportunities of climate change for the UK*. PwC. Available at <https://pwc.blogs.com/files/international-threats-and-opportunities-of-climate-change-to-the-uk.pdf>.

Quishpe D. 2021. *Adaptation to the Impacts of Climate Change on Water Resources in the Andes (AICCA), Ecuador*. weADAPT Solutions Portal Available at <https://www.weadapt.org/solutions-portal/adaptation-to-the-impacts-of-climate-change-on-water-resources-in-the-andes-aicca-ecuador>.

Roome J. 2021. *Implementing Bangladesh Delta Plan 2100: Key to boost economic growth*. World Bank Blog End Poverty in South Asia Available at <https://blogs.worldbank.org/endpovertyinsouthasia/implementing-bangladesh-delta-plan-2100-key-boost-economic-growth>.

Schaeffer M, Baarsch F, Adams S, et al. 2013. *Africa's adaptation gap technical report: climate-change impacts, adaptation challenges and costs for Africa*. UNEP AMCEN and Climate Analytics. Available at [https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/8376/-Africas%20adaptation%20gap-2013Africa%20Adapatation%20Gap%20report-%20small\\_2013.pdf?sequence=2&BisAllowed=](https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/8376/-Africas%20adaptation%20gap-2013Africa%20Adapatation%20Gap%20report-%20small_2013.pdf?sequence=2&BisAllowed=).

Science Media Centre (New Zealand). 2022. *Indigenous knowledge and climate adaptation – Expert Reaction*. Available at <https://www.sciencemediacentre.co.nz/2022/03/01/indigenous-knowledge-and-climate-adaptation-expert-reaction/>.

SCF. 2021. *First report on the determination of the needs of developing country Parties related to implementing the Convention and the Paris Agreement*. Bonn: UNFCCC. Available at <https://unfccc.int/topics/climate-finance/workstreams/determination-of-the-needs-of-developing-country-parties/first-report-on-the-determination-of-the-needs-of-developing-country-parties-related-to-implementing>.

- Siegert M, Alley RB, Rignot E, et al. 2020. Twenty-first century sea-level rise could exceed IPCC projections for strong-warming futures. *One Earth*. 3(6): pp.691–703.
- Siders A and Pierce AL. 2021. Deciding how to make climate change adaptation decisions. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*. 52: pp.1–8.
- Smit B and Wandel J. 2006. Adaptation, Adaptive Capacity and Vulnerability. *Global Environmental Change*. 16: pp.282–292.
- Smith J, Klein R and Huq S. 2003. *Climate Change, Adaptive Capacity and Development*. London: Imperial College Press.
- Stafford-Smith M, Rissik D, Street R, et al. 2022. Climate change adaptation guidance: Clarifying three modes of planning and implementation. *Climate Risk Management*. 35: pp.100392. Available at <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2212096321001236>.
- Traerup S and Bakkegaard K. 2015. *Determining technologies for climate change adaptation - A hands-on guidance to multi criteria analysis (MCA) and the identification and assessment of related criteria*. UNEP DTU Partnership. Available at <https://tech-action.unepccc.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2019/09/mca-guidance-adaptation-english19jan2016.pdf>.
- UNDP. 2008. *Capacity assessment methodology – user’s guide*. UNDP Capacity Development Group, Bureau for Development Policy. Available at [http://content-ext.undp.org/aplaws\\_publications/1670209/UNDP%20Capacity%20Assessment%20Users%20Guide.pdf](http://content-ext.undp.org/aplaws_publications/1670209/UNDP%20Capacity%20Assessment%20Users%20Guide.pdf).
- UNEP. 2017. *The Adaptation Gap Report 2017*. Nairobi: UNEP. Available at <https://unepdtu.org/publications/the-adaptation-gap-report-towards-global-assessment/>.
- UNEP. 2021. *Adaptation Gap Report 2021 -The Gathering Storm: Adapting to climate change in a post-pandemic world*. Nairobi: UNEP. Available at <https://www.unep.org/resources/adaptation-gap-report-2021>.
- UNFCCC. 2011. *Assessing the costs and benefits of adaptation options: an overview of approaches*. Bonn: Nairobi Work Programme on impacts, vulnerability and adaptation to climate change. Available at [https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/pub\\_nwp\\_costs\\_benefits\\_adaptation.pdf](https://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/pub_nwp_costs_benefits_adaptation.pdf).
- UNFCCC. 2022a. *Technology Needs Assessment: pathways for climate tech implementation*. Available at <https://unfccc.int/ttclear/tna>.
- UNFCCC. 2022b. *Building capacity in the UNFCCC process*. Available at <https://unfccc.int/topics/capacity-building/the-big-picture/capacity-in-the-unfccc-process>.
- United States Agency for International Development. 2016. *Global climate change (GCC) institutional capacity assessment facilitators guide*. Available at [https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf\\_docs/PA00MW7G.pdf](https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00MW7G.pdf).
- Water Convention (Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes). 2021. *Progress report of the Global network of basins working on climate change adaptation as of February 2021*. Available at [https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2021-11/Global\\_network\\_overview\\_pilot%20projects\\_progress\\_Feb2021\\_final\\_ENGL\\_01.11.2021.pdf](https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2021-11/Global_network_overview_pilot%20projects_progress_Feb2021_final_ENGL_01.11.2021.pdf).
- Woo A, Ahn S, Su Hyeon Han, et al. 2018. *Taxonomy of Climate Change Adaptation Technology A guidebook for countries conducting a Technology Needs Assessment for Adaptation*. Seoul and Copenhagen: UNEP DTU Partnership. Available at <https://tech-action.unepccc.org/publications/report-taxonomy-of-climate-change-adaptation-technology/>.
- Zevenbergen C, Khan SA, van Alphen J, et al. 2018. Adaptive delta management: a comparison between the Netherlands and Bangladesh Delta Program. *International Journal of River Basin Management*. 16(3): pp.299–305.