1. What are the session key findings? What are the new Lesson(s) learned / Scientific progress (since AR5 release, if relevant)?

Mainly, all participants got along to say that an adequate governance framework is essential both to respond to climate change and to tackle possible risks in adaptation measures.

Dealing with climate change involves many actors and several scales. The proposed direction is to encourage social learning, exchange of knowledge, and to build adaptive capacity in multi-stakeholders groups involving NGO, policy makers, core scientist, social scientist, … be it in a community-based adaptation or city level framework. Co-production of knowledge, through participatory approaches and a long-term perspective, was a major point of attention.

Another regular point, for some of the participants, was the importance of mainstreaming adaptation into current policies and priorities, and basically to explore already-existing opportunities. It would be a way to leverage action, and also to respond to the issue of the long-term perspective of climate change, that makes it sometimes very hard to deal with at the political level.

2. What are the major knowledge Gaps and Research Needs identified in the session?

S. Kreft notices that adaptation is gaining increasing attention by countries, communities, private sector... It is relevant at different scales that are interconnected, and therefore it calls for adaptation governance frameworks. Such frameworks are guided by norms, values and principles. A major question now, for developing the UNFCC adaptation architecture, is to see how to integrate adaptation in the 2015 Paris agreement. The Cancun adaptation framework does includes principles1 but the scientific community has not done much research on their appropriateness and implementation. References to the Cancun agreement are generally rather low in scientific literature (including the AR5). It seems that a more careful look at adaptation principles, as an important

---

1 e.g. country-driven approach, gender-sensitive, participatory and transparent approach, focus on vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems
component of adaptation governance, would be necessary to make sure that the 2015 agreement integrates some relevant principles.

In addition to that, A. Dzebo argues that the governance of adaptation is indeed “shadowy”. According to him, the transnational dimension of adaptation is not quite well understood yet. For example, GEF projects are operating at the global-regional scale, and new networks are being created at the city level, with the Cancun Adaptation Framework... The type of actions they pursue and their functions are not very known so far. There are research needs to understand better the implications of transnational projects. Dzebo argues that if there is an understanding that it’s not enough to involve states only, there might be a risk to get influenced by non-state actors (for example for economic reasons).

More specifically, R. Chen focuses on local adaptation in the urban context, and reckons that local adaptation is the key to respond to global climate change. According to him, one actor that still needs to be more understood is the private sector: growing public-private partnerships are raising the question of their implication for adaptation. Chen calls for perception analysis of the private sector, which would be more willing to evolve than generally perceived, and misses channel of participation so far.

3. Did the session discuss/identify promising approaches in the fields of Adaptation and Mitigation, or both?

S. Huq shared the experience of Bangladesh where vulnerable communities got together to self-organize an exchange of knowledge based on the principles of community-based adaptation (CBA). Following the idea that adaptation requires a ‘micro’ level of action, to take full account of local specificities, some international conference on CBA were organized throughout the years and the world with NGO, organizations and stakeholders to raise funding for CBA programs and spread the experience of Bangladesh. Those conferences each have a different focus theme, and try to produce alternative discourse on adaptation from the communities themselves. According to Huq, if nothing has changed much on the scientific literature on adaptation, a lot did change on the ground. In order to bridge the gap, he and some fellow scientists started to publish about their activity and CBA, which was integrated into AR5. This required to work more with academics and researchers, basically to co-produce knowledge on climate change.

R. Chen goes in the same direction, by presenting multi-stakeholders forums to take place in September this year in the city of Tainin, in Taiwan. The idea is clearly to build an adaptation framework at the city level that takes into account the full complexity of the phenomenon and all sectors involved.

G. Ziervogel also has a lot to say about the co-benefits and opportunities that governance can bring – rather than focusing on institutional barriers to adaptation, limits and constraints. By taking the case of the municipal level at South Africa, she claims that local government represents an opportunity because they have access to stakeholders, and can bridge the gap with the national and global level. She illustrates her saying with the case of Bergrivier, a municipality in Western Cape, willing to be part of a climate change program involving multiple collaborations, including with the University of Cape Town. The process brought together experts and policy-makers on adaptation, to build
adaptive capacity and do some social learning. Links were built between actors, in the two-year process of the experience, as well as social capital. For example, a woman had a role of ‘champion’ to facilitate the process even though she didn’t have knowledge on climate change. Adaptation was mainstreamed into existing climate change response policy and integrated in the development plan to have flexibility on the run. There was also flexibility on the process, with iterative feedback between the provincial and local levels and the development of a good relationship.

4. Are there take-home messages from the session?
(When relevant, please specify targeted group of stakeholders. For example, policy-makers / COP21 negotiators, practitioners (experts, etc.), NGOs, private sector, citizens, media, etc.)

5. Are there Important Quotes from the session?
Gina Ziervogel (senior lecturer in the Department of Environmental and Geographical Science at the University of Cape Town): “Co-production is a good way to build capacity. Strong relationship and trust helps to build adaptive capacity in the group. It’s about a process more than a destination.”

Saleemul Huq (Director of the International Centre for Climate Change and Development based at the Independent University, Bangladesh): “I’m a pro-adaptation person, but in Paris we don’t need to talk about adaptation. We need to solve the mitigation problem”.

Adis Dzebo (Research Associate at the Stockholm Environment Institute): “Adaptation and development are basically the same thing. It is part of the whole development priorities.”

6. Please include any other remark that you might have.