

Thirteenth meeting of the Adaptation Committee

Adaptation Committee (AC) Members include:

Ms. Cecilia da Silva BERNARDO (Angola), Mr. Javier Antonio GUTIERREZ RAMIREZ (Nicaragua), Ms. María Del Pilar BUENO RUBIAL (Argentina), Mr. Vladimir KATTSOV (Russia), Mr. Frédéric SCHAFFERER (France), Mr. Julio CORDANO (Chile), Mr. Donald LEMMEN (Canada), Mr. Ali SHAREEF (Maldives), Mr. Damdin DAVGADORJ (Mongolia), Mr. Clifford MAHLUNG (Jamaica), Ms. Liu SHUO (China), Ms. Madeleine Rose DIOUF EP SARR (Senegal), Ms. Iryna TROFIMOVA (Ukraine)

Ms. Renske PETERS (advising from the Netherlands, to fill an empty seat)

Apologies – USA – the delegate is pregnant, and travel was not helpful.

RINGO representatives included Erin Roberts (ODI), Gregg Walker (Mediators Beyond Borders International and Oregon State University), and Lindsey Fielder Cook (Quaker UN Office).

Links to papers are provided below, while the overall AC meeting site is:

http://unfccc.int/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/items/10531.php

Tuesday, 27 February 2018

The first morning session was closed to observers – we arrived in the afternoon and were invited to introduce ourselves, which was helpful. Organization nameplates were also available, and the atmosphere was welcoming and engaged. Overall, this meeting reflected a growing maturity in the AC, in their purpose and scope. But it remains unclear how much actual adaptation expertise is present in the committee as a whole, and approximately 1/3 of the members rarely spoke during the meeting (China, Ukraine, Mongolia, Nicaragua).

Agenda Item 2, 3 and 4:

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_agenda.pdf

The agenda was accepted, and Pilar Bueno (Argentina) was elected, and Don Lemmen (Canada) was re-elected as Co-Chairs. This proved to be a good combination, as both have the needed skills and a balance of concerns, while engaging Pilar as co-chair brought her energy to the group while helped to reduce the political wordsmithing experienced between Members in the 12th AC.

The Secretariat noted that Japan and the European Union had provided funds for the AC.

Agenda Item 5: Mapping of Adaptation Relevant Mandates

Paper link:

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_5a_mappingmandates.pdf

This discussion focused on adaptation foci in the UNFCCC related groups. Quite a few members had individually attended related Convention meetings on behalf of the AC, and gave reports, while the AC also heard from the CTCN on their work. The AC discussed the paper's (see above) 'next step' suggestions and '*agreed to include the relevant mandated action items into its workplan.*'

Personal notes:

Annual activity, and the UNFCCC Secretariat created a summary – acting for the Adaptation Committee. Next steps include feeding into development of the next work plan. Requests from pre-2020 stock takes, requests to work plan can be added. Continue collaboration with the LEG. Help to better assist NAPs.

- Make more effective recommendations
- What is its role to support regional technical meetings on adaptation?
- Enhance linkages between TNAs and NAPs
- Next steps (see note 26 of the paper)

These are some examples of the need for more discussion, and in this week most of these points will be discussed. Gender action plans – ensures the AC participates. With Indigenous work, expect AC will receive invitation to support this work.

Mention of Climate Champions – they are aware of the adaptation work, and the champions are currently doing more work on mitigation.

There is an explosion of relevant initiatives!

Agenda Item 5b Recent collaboration with other adaptation-related institutional arrangements under the Convention

This Agenda Item came with a series of reports by AC members who had attended related Convention bodies, including PCCB, GCF, TEC and WIM Ex Com Task Force on Displacement. There was a presentation by CTCN, which collates ‘technology’ information (for want of a better word). RINGO members can connect with related research – in particular - need for sustainable lifestyles and agriculture. <https://www.ctc-n.org/> There were no papers for this section.

Personal notes:

Cecilia (Angola) spoke of her presence at the GCF had a workshop in Bonn to focus on support to NAPs. AC reported on the experience of countries to access GCF funds. Report based on interviews. Countries were happy that the AC had properly reflected their concerns, and UNDP and GCF appreciated the work. The paper also reflected some good experiences too. Cecilia stressed – there is a call for GCF to better enable accessibility of the funds. Guidelines of GCF must be translated in other languages. Nothing further from the AC was requested, this work done was appreciated.

QUNO intervention - to acknowledge the view of the AC increasingly more active in witnessing adaptation needs, the model that Cecilia gave of bridging countries experiences and needs – this is a good advancement. Express appreciation and hope this model can help be used elsewhere, an important example at the workshop as an important model of what the AC can offer.

PCCB – partnership – important to discuss what they can do. Currently – mostly PCCB, not AC,

Taskforce on Displacement – integrated approaches. Developed a work plan, specific activities with lead organizations. Outputs will be available at the website.

TNA – help countries align their technologies. 9 adaptation technologies. Coastal zones, agriculture, water. Aim – to respond to needs of LDCs. Joint task force on adaptation and mitigation technologies – assist countries in implementing their NDCs and NAPs.

CTCN – call on Jamie Webb – 5th year – one third on adaptation, and more as both adaptation and mitigation, including focus on forestry and climate smart agriculture. Too small on human health. Rapid response – 10,00 dollars delivered in 2 months.

Discussions centered on how the LEG developed by NAPs center – developed with support of AC. Promote good stories. State of science on adaptation. Get lots of information on NAPs. Currently, NAP center – still developing things. Planning has been initiated. NAPS process is complex. Indicators – set experiences on this. NAP expo – how do we make better value? Countries have particular dimension, and is it worth reflecting on the worth of the guideline, and the issue of monitoring and evaluation, for adaptation many countries are grappling with this. How best to approach? Narrow scope, specific topic, needed to bring NAP process forward. Countries – need more assistance. As adaptation is country specific, this could be a step to better know what is working for some countries, what is not, that this kind of information would be good for the NAP expo.

NAP Taskforce – integration is a process, not something that happens immediately. Trade-offs between CBA and EBA. Lessons – regional levels support work of multiplier countries. Having a leader is essential for effective progress, having a time line, more effective to undertake activities at a regional scale.

Important to explore adaptation and security. Poverty, agriculture,

Report – AC has to take responsibility for the conclusions to be sent to the SBI. The REPORT is the LEG in collaboration of the AC. We are drafting the report, hope to share soon for the AC to review before finalization to the SBI. Aim mid-March for review.

Co-chair – broader conversation on the overall workplan. NAP taskforce, etc.

Agenda Item 6 – The TEP-A

Presentation slides, which helped frame the discussion for Agenda Item 6

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_6_tep-a.pdf

And quite an informative paper, worth reading as it looks in depth at the range of adaptation actions and actors linked to the Convention and beyond:

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_6_tepa.pdf

As per decision 1/CP.21, paragraph 126, the Adaptation Committee is to conduct the technical examination process on adaptation (TEP-A) from 2016-2020, consisting of technical expert meetings (TEMs), technical papers and summaries for policy-makers (SPMs) with a view to identifying concrete opportunities for strengthening resilience, reducing vulnerabilities and increasing the understanding and implementation of adaptation actions.

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_6_tepa.pdf

Personal notes:

Discussion of the COP23 experience to strengthen the TEPs and integrate them in Marrakesh Partnership for Global Climate Action. Focus on actions in adaptation with high-level mitigation potential. Discussing this report, the AC expressed concern that there were too many expectations on the work of this.

IFRC – there are a lot of regional actions in adaptation, but they often fail to link to the national plan and institutional processes. SDG 9 – SDG 8 – helps reinforce the needs for adaptation planning. This topic is at the heart of our mandate. Connect to communities that are most vulnerable to the climate extremes. Share other actions they are doing.

BINGO – Business for Social Responsibility. Spoke of difficulty with supply chains. Suggests partners with FAO, GIZ. Global climate action summit –

QUNO – appreciate discussion inclusion of ecosystems – natural climate systems, biodiversity, etc., and on conversation on economic growth SDG 7% for LDCs – natural approaches for adaptation and in turn protecting vulnerable communities, and the point of the AR5 that economic growth and population growth being the greatest drivers of CO₂, and how we need to consider adaptation, economic growth etc. with a future vision, how to live on a planet with limited natural resources.

Focus on the TEP-As this year. Discussions on the proposed session at the SB48 for a TEP-A expert discussion. Bring in more NGOs possibly,

Themes for 2020, how to enhance the process? Suggestions given.

Agenda Item 7: Technical support and guidance to Parties on adaptation action:

Overview presentation on National Adaptation Plans (NAPs)

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_7a_naptf_saotome.pdf

Overall conclusion for Agenda 7a: *‘The AC agreed to hold off elaboration of a new workplan for the taskforce until elements of the AC’s overall workplan are clear’*

7b: Long Term Adaptation Planning

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_7b_longterm_adaptation.pdf

Personal notes:

This is a substantive paper, showing the progress of AC engagement. What is still missing in the discussions is a sense of real people and temperatures rising in the long term at the current trajectory of RCP 8.5, in turn to emphasize urgency in mitigation (adaptation is a failure of mitigation). Encourage the AC to see themselves as the ‘human face’ of the negotiations, but often they remain in technical language. Further input was welcomed for the paper until 9 March.

UNDP – appreciate paper, it is both short term and long term. Ultimately, we are planning to influence domestic planning to include adaptation measures. Stronger recognition of this in the paper would be useful to policy makers. Also, ultimately, for adaptation, need for institutional ability to take risk into

account. Was uncomfortable on incremental versus transformation. Yet they are connected, you need to make incremental changes to create transformation.

Need to connect ecosystems to long-term planning. Future scenarios make ecosystem strengthening one of the most important long-term actions.

South Africa – missing from the paper – processes around the nexus. Long term, understand the trade-offs to make transformation. This is critical for planning.

Youth – call for immediate long-term planning.

Important new developments in the paper. General thought – focus on long term – what does this mean, for the IPCC it is after 2050? Please define what the terms mean. We are focusing on documents, but we need to consider how this engages with the NAP process. Every new COP we come up with new process, now we have something new, no one knows, and Parties cannot keep up as they keep coming up with new things. How do we build on the process, rather than start new? Also check assumptions, there are some misreading statements (M+E figure in the different NDCs). Point out work existing on insurance schemes that are not included.

IFRC – really like paper, has useful information. Share sentiments of other observers. Consider – look at adaptation in different time scales. IFRC work includes supporting governments to engage in adaptation and this should be increased in the paper. Consideration of this narrative in the paper.

Senegal – countries need long term planning. How do we help them in this paper approach?

THIS PAPER WILL BE REVISED FOR THE AC14.

France – struggling with water use. Thanked South Africa comment.

South Africa – help policy makers better understand how to deal with trade off concerns. We are water scarce – how do we adapt with food security, poverty, etc., and how then to include water, so what is guidance to help us consider the trade-offs. There are conflicting needs. Sector driven plans are not coherent. If the AC wishes to develop this, these are some of the things from which countries can benefit.

Senegal –this is a good space to learn from the NAP development.

7c Overall of existing partnerships providing technical support.

Presentation by colleague on the Nairobi Work Programme and CTCN. Working with CTCN to promote materials. CTCN has 450 network members.

7d – Ongoing work on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation

Quite an in-depth discussion, with a decision to wait on conclusions until completing a ‘forthcoming meeting to exchange views on national adaptation goals and indicators’.

7e – relationship with the Sendai Framework and the SDGs. Paper link:

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_73_indicators.pdf

Secretariat notes: The AC considered the concept note prepared for the meeting and provided further guidance and direction to the working group and the secretariat for the organization of the meeting. The AC expressed its appreciation to the government of Japan and to the ISDR for their offers to collaborate with the AC on the meeting. The Co-Chairs will invite members of the working group on this matter to join a telephone conference in the beginning of April.

Personal notes:

France – exchange has been limited. Sendi SDGs and PA, these are the three to look toward. This is quite interesting, as the PA has not yet developed indicators, while the SDGs and Sendai have many. They are suggesting a workshop, 2-3 days, with experts.

Call for inter-relationships between PA, SDG and Sendai on adaptation M+E designs.

Chile - How would this contribute to the global goal on adaptation? The global goal is supposed to be aggregated, global, and there is a challenge on how we are going to be aggregated. Don't make assumptions on how this will work.

France – concern over a workshop getting too political, a focus on global adaptation goal could be

GIZ - development of indicators. Countries will need different approaches. Change of views – not common indicators, but to understand what countries are doing for these so they can limit the amount of duplication. One thing that caught my attention – certain indicators – M+E systems extensive in some countries. PA has a transparency framework but does not have (?) as such. How can this be aligned or linked to other agendas? Clarifications.

DDR – Bonn team doing the monitoring. Workshop would need to be – SDGs and Sendai have targets, but what are we establishing. To what? A target, what are we monitoring toward? Climate change has intergenerational reality that the SDGs and Sendai do not.

UNU – SDGs is more top-down, not national specific. Different agendas, more to come from the White Paper.

QUINO - *David raised important challenges to inter-relation between the Paris Agreement, SDGs and Sendai, but I hope this question remains relevant – A Simple question, not only concerning a workshop but AC mandate in general – what role/influence does, or could the AC have this year to help insure adaptation guidelines evolving in the Paris Agreement Work Programme/rule book are more effectively inter-related to the existing SDG and Sendai Framework? A report to the COP24 would be too late for this kind of feed-in influence, yet the inter-relation is critical.*

Answer from Fredrick (France), was to say ideas are more important to share, but he did not really address on influence or mandate.

Influence – this meeting – good to have, even for Norway it is overwhelming. What will be the next steps after the meeting? What will be the deliverables of this workshop?

Senegal – we are just beginning to think through to give guidance, even if it is the beginning. This workshop is a stepping stone for getting larger issues developed.

Wetlands – coherence, target audiences.

Next steps – indicators one dimension within broader context. Need to look at how they build on coherence potential between them. Exchange of views is priority. Achievable objective but need to recognize national and global goal and we need to open that door for discussion. Themes are all important and should be achievable. A structure for the meeting could have a lot of convergence. But there are important differences between informing national adaptation and from a top down (SDGs) and this meeting is a chance to narrow the scope slightly.

7f Reports on adaptation approaches:

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_7f_various_approaches.pdf

This is a draft report – Members and observers could send more information by 9 March, and the Secretariat would produce a revised version for the SB48. The AC14 will consider the revised draft for inclusion of some activities into the workplan, ‘where appropriate’. Consider a ‘user friendly’ version.

Agenda 8a – Workshop to advance the understanding and overcome challenges relating to NIEs and GCF access.

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_8a_gcf_workshop.pdf

Outcomes (Secretariat summary): *The AC took note of a presentation on the current state of planning for the workshop and provided further guidance to the working group. The working group will finalize the concept by 9 March 2018. The secretariat will also revise the information paper prepared as input to the meeting, as appropriate.*

Personal notes:

Chile – notes that in the GCF, there was information that the adaptation applications were not as good (not sure of his word use) as the mitigation applications. Seek guidance from the AC members for their work at the GCF.

Angola – they can make a one-page paper intervention, what is important for them to say. (Thus, AC members input is welcome).

Senegal – raise issue of access, process. Good opportunity to call for direct access at country level to build capacity. What we are doing is at the national level. When we talk about adaptation and mitigation we need local level support. What we are doing here is helping with adaptation action. Promoting that access, to get countries to be accredited to go through the GCF process and we need more support from GCF. **The impact of implementation at the national level is important but it is difficult to get national entities accredited. This is a big challenge.**

Co-Chair – crucial point. A workshop will take place at the NAP expo in Sharm el Sheik.

8b – Wanting to foster greater involvement of the private sector.

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/ldc_expert_group/application/pdf/ac13_8b_ps_workshop.pdf

Summary outcomes (Secretariat): *The AC considered a concept note prepared for the workshop and welcomed interventions from organizations interested in collaborating on this workshop, the Business for Social Responsibility and the Overseas Development Institute. It provided further guidance to its working group to further revise the concept note and requested the secretariat to scope out potential locations and dates for the workshop by mid-April. The anticipated time to organize the workshop is October 2018.*

Personal notes:

How can business identify risk and identify cost-effective ways to act or to support adaptation measures? Three days – regulation, business day, resource day. ‘How to stimulate private sector involvement through public money’. Sustainable business – concept paper looks good. Like focus on SMEs. They make up a lot of supply chains. These are often the hardest to move. Important to focus on sectors that provide vital services for people. Want to bring in the ‘people’ side here.

How to mobilize more private sector money for adaptation?

ODI – engage in day two, integrate climate related risks in the enterprise. ODI to do value chain analysis. Bring partners from Senegal or Kenya for this workshop, keen to support.

Jamaica – notes adaptation forum in Cape Town, engaging BINGOs, bringing a wider participation to widen partnerships, get an engaged speaker like Richard Branson, Bill gates, etc., to get them to come and speak.

TEP-As – example given from observer (Wetlands) on the integration of eco-systems with community projects, and a large GCF grant recently given to Uganda for a such an approach.

Chile– inevitable – not to talk in silos, but to have a more integrated approach.

Wetlands – water as a cross cutting theme, for example, not only in a silo.

ODI – express concerns - TEP-A – identify opportunities, enhance adaptation, and opportunities. Yes, SDGs are important, takes focus away from climate change. Away from adaptation. For example, enabling adaptation planning – ensure that the approach is in line with the aims of the TEP-A.

Chile - Opportunities for countries to discuss, what are the challenges? Hear the stories at a concrete level (first day of workshop). Then second day, how do we address these challenges? Finance included, additional planning (NDCs and NAPs included). Create a balance between what is the problem, how do we deal with it? Are we reflecting vulnerable groups and eco-systems, or can we do more?

Adaptation plan – adaptation planning is not only an environment but also a development issue, and you will not achieve SDGs without adaptation.

This is all about a workshop to be held during the SB48. See breakdown in http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_6_tepa.pdf

Correction – planning first day, implementation second day.

QUNO – need for more engagement on sustainable lifestyles – we talk of technology but not livelihood transformation, and the IPCC is stating that not enough was done in the AR5 and that the i.5C report is engaging far more effectively in this. This is both an adaptation and a mitigation issue,

Question of how to scale-up and put those approaches in the NDCs. If brought in certain issues, NDCs can scale-up.

Developing countries – have needs expressed already by developing countries, and how to translate that into developing options. These can help feed into organizations that are helping, feeding in (IFRC, for example).

GIZ – we are overseeing the fundamental problems, gaps under the convention but are processes are in place. Talk about solutions for those gaps and needs. What can we do better, do differently? NDCs, etc., long term strategies, park when clear, but the question for implementing organizations, to decrease vulnerabilities. Focus on what there is now.

Senegal – in this adaptation process, we are all learning, it is a learning by doing

ODI – how do we think beyond the TEP? We know the needs – we could a request to these bodies (CTCN, for example), but how do we get to sharing of best practices, beyond what we are doing now. Or is having a Platform just another thing? Identify opportunities.

Jamaica – we feed into the SBSTA.

France – identifying themes of TEM, start with what is needed most. Think the needs approach has always been there. See where the different topics should go. More concrete world – initially, make link through the champions. (but they are just two people). A lot of people go to the TEM, find a good idea, implement them and we don't know what they did. And we should know that we are not the only one to solve the world adaptation problems. A lot o people are going to pick up on these and work. We are just a small group of many. Our topics have to be action orientated but be macro not micro to pick up. Action agenda is half under the process.

GIZ – not more websites, be more efficiency.

Fredrick – mandate for the TEMs is up to 2020. And TEP-A? Not sure, but likely to be renewed. Process about finding solutions and promoting them. List of past topics in paper.

Thursday 1 March

This was a full day devoted to break-out groups with mixed groups (members and observers) facilitated by lead observer organizations, on three distinct categories:

- 1) Adaptation action
- 2) Means of implementation
- 3) Outreach

The discussions focused on information in the paper under **Agenda Item 9: Flexible Workplan for the Adaptation Committee 2019-2021**

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_9_workplan.pdf

Interesting engagement and varied quality of discussion but a helpful way to bring in a range of ideas.

Secretariat: *Together to talk through what has been highlighted. Viewed as very successful. Many ideas, see what the commonalities are, look forward.*

Friday 2 March

Agenda Item 10: Awareness Raising

http://unfccc.int/files/adaptation/groups_committees/adaptation_committee/application/pdf/ac13_10_forum_ppt.pdf

Secretariat summary: The AC considered the status of planning for the 2018 Adaptation Forum. It provided further guidance to its working group and the secretariat on the suggested guiding questions, objective, format and contributors.

Personal notes:

Discussion of the Talanoa Dialogue (Facilitative dialogue). The TEMs are seen as an important part of this.

France – there is a lot of information that should be shared.

Chile - How successful we are in adaptation will depend on how successful we are in mitigation. We don't want to go away from mitigation, but this has profound consequences for adaptation as well and it would be good to have an adaptation input as background, richer debate, and keep governments involved/informed about the consequences of one scenario over another.

Jamaica – we are already adapting here, with even 1C, so we cannot separate this when considering whether we input of not to the Talanoa. This dialogue may be more in mitigation at the moment, but not only. Goal of adaptation is linked to mitigation. Need to reinforce these points.

Russia – adaptation could be helpful in mitigation efforts.

France – with 1.5C report, etc. This dialogue is to take stock on collective efforts of countries and where we are for the global effort. But this is not the mandate. Why should we intervene with adaptation? It would be time to place a marker that these discussions also include adaptation. We are taking the mandate so that in the future it should include adaptation. I am uncomfortable in putting my foot in this. How to move forward.

Key discussion points came out of the TEMs. Another key message, integrate between these three frameworks. Capacity building which needs to happen. Presenting TEMs at the Adaptation forum would be good to extend audience.

Report given, and Secretariat added that there were quite a few researchers and scientists. Noted case studies which were very helpful in cross cutting planning through SGGs, Sendai and adaptation.

Agreed that the AC could contribute but not want to wade into the political matters. Try to scope out what might be a possible contribution. Anything that is developed needs to be vetted by the whole AC. And when we have consensus, that will be the direction we will go. Deadline 2 April.

Agenda Item 11: organizational work

Secretariat summary: *The AC took note of members interested in participating in the meetings organized by the AC in 2018. It further agreed on leads and members of its working groups and on members nominated in response to invitations for collaboration from other constituted bodies. The leads of groups are requested to hold a call with members of their respective groups in mid-March to elaborate their schedules of work.*

Personal notes:

AC members – agenda, progress so far. Intersessional work would be beneficial. Possible to display the list of working groups.

Goes through list of meeting with AC Members volunteering presence. China and Ukraine finally speak, to volunteer.

TEP-A will take place during the SB48 in Bonn – encourage participation.

Adaptation Committee 14 – The AC agreed to hold its 14th meeting from 24 to 26 October 2018

This meeting will include AC recommendations and to finalize the Work Plan.

Agenda Item 13: Any other matters: *The AC initiated consideration on possible input to the Talanoa Dialogue.*

Agenda Item 14: Closing

Secretariat summary: *The AC acknowledges and welcomes the active participation of observers in its meetings. The COP, by decision 2/CP.17, decided that the meetings of the Adaptation Committee shall be open to attendance by admitted observer organizations, except where otherwise decided by the Adaptation Committee, with a view to encouraging a balanced representation of observers from Annex I Parties and from non-Annex I Parties.*

Lindsey Fielder Cook

Quaker United Nations Office

Additional observations from Gregg Walker, MBBi, IECA, and Oregon State University

Lindsey has prepared a thoughtful and thorough account of the AC 13 meeting. I endorse Lindsey's work. I have added a few additional comments.

- During the report and discussion regarding the work of the CTCN, a distinction was made between "hard" and "soft" technologies; implicit recognition that both human dimensions and qualitative methodologies are part of adaptation work.
- AC members recognized that capacity development includes work devoted to critical thinking and problem solving.
- AC members also noted that adaptation is situation specific and requires a mix of approaches (a "mixed strategy"). An observer noted that spatial scale should be addressed.

- In contrast to AC 12, observers were engaged significantly in the meeting. Many observers offered comments and Thursday was devoted to breakout sessions about the AC's workplan.
- A number of observers have become regular (or recurring) participants at the AC meetings. They understand AC issues (and the AC agenda) and provide valuable contributions.