



**Climate Change  
Symposium  
sur le  
Changement  
Climatique  
2011**

[www.adaptation2011.net](http://www.adaptation2011.net)

Panel 4: National and International Policy – Linking policy and practice (Sponsored by the African Climate Policy Centre)

Chair: Monica Idinoba (African Union)

**Jose Levy :** What African countries perceive to be key adaptation priorities: results from 20 countries in the Africa Adaptation Programme

**Ernest Molua:** Redefining Africa’s agrarian development policies in the face of climate change challenge: linking policy and practice

**Charles Recha:** State of adaptive capacity to climate variability in semi-arid Tharaka District, Kenya

**Masego Madzwamuse:** Climate Governance in Africa: Adaptation Strategies and Institutions

## Panel Summary

This session chaired by Monica Idinoba from the [African Union](#) highlights the array of challenges that we face in linking global policy to the national level. Are national strategies being coherently developed and implemented? Are these policies adequately responding to the needs at the local level? The panelists during this session brought together interesting and thought provoking presentations from across the region on this complex theme.

### What is a key adaptive priority?

What do African countries perceive to be key adaptation priorities? Jose Levy from the [Africa Adaptation Programme \(AAP\)](#) discussed this with results from 20 countries across the region. The AAP programme aims to enhance adaptive capacities of vulnerable countries using evidence based solutions; build necessary capacity; and lay the foundation for long term investment to increase resilience to climate change across the African continent.

By analysing national documents, country activities were developed depending on priority needs. These included: raising awareness, promoting policy change (mainstreaming), access and mobilizing of financial resources, building institutions (at all levels) and other strategies like knowledge management.

So what has come out of the analysis done? Well, there are many climate change adaptation projects in place and these now require harmonisation. There is a lot of work but no synergies, which has led to lots of duplication and lots of waste. Better coordination and good knowledge management initiatives are needed. From this analysis, AAP aims to lay the foundation for better anchorage of climate change adaptation projects.

### Redefining Africa's agrarian development policies in the face of climate change

Agriculture productivity in Africa over the past 40 years has not kept pace with population growth. Ernest Molua from the [University of Buea, Cameroon](#) presented how climate change includes one of the many stresses influencing this. With Africa's dependence on agriculture, which provides 70-80% of the employment opportunities, the challenge is to create a framework for accommodating climate change impacts and adaptation strategies in addition to the other multiple stresses.

With a focus on the agriculture sector, Ernest's research aimed to reflect on the roles of institutional and governance arrangements in linking policy making from the global to the national/local levels to promote adaptation. However, the challenges are numerous: there isn't an integrated vision on agriculture and development, the agriculture sector governance needs to be strengthened and rural productivity needs to improve. So, how do we need to address

these challenges? Ernest argues that we need to develop a framework that can be adopted for analysing a climate sensitive decision, which should also take an integrated approach ensuring that economic growth, social equity and sustainable environments all flow and feed into each other.

#### Building adaptive capacity in a semi-arid district in Kenya

Climate variability affects livelihoods especially those dependent on rainfall. Charles W. Recha from [Chuka University College](#) presented that there is a need to assess the socioeconomic factors of vulnerable communities and how they impact adaptation. The focal study area in eastern Kenya is an arid and semi-arid region. Communities here rely on rain-fed agriculture and pastoralism as the main livelihood activities. Using household surveys, the research results show that livelihood strategies need to be diversified to strengthen their adaptive strategies.

Four factors are noted as major challenges for the communities in the region:

- Low resource base (access to land, education and water resources)
- Poor infrastructure and social amenities (such as proximity to markets, roads, etc)
- Lack of access to technology and support programmes (includes access to climate forecasts and welfare programmes through NGOs and government departments).

Both private and public actors need to address the complex underlying causes to these communities vulnerability to effectively strengthen their adaptive capacity.

#### Strengthening Africa's governance to deal with climate change

Appropriate strategies are required to respond to the climate change challenge facing Africa. But how are countries preparing and developing strategies and who are making the decisions? Are all necessary stakeholders involved in the process? Are we prepared for adaptation to take place at the national levels?

This [Heinrich Boll Foundation study](#), prepared and presented by Masego Madzwamuse , assessed adaptation preparedness in Botswana, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Nigeria and Ghana.

The key findings from this study show that adaptation agenda falls short of key governance principles – participation, transparency & accountability. Additionally, government institutions face numerous challenges including coordinating the numerous agencies that have been established to deal with climate change. Many of these institutions are centralised – decentralisation may help in having an impact at the local level. Similar problems are also faced by non-state actors (like NGOs) and development partners. Another problem is that research does not adequately respond to national knowledge gaps on climate change adaptation.

To adequately deal with these and other challenges, a multi-tiered approach is required to build the necessary capacity in Africa at a policy level with sound and well linked institutional frameworks in place.

#### Q&A discussion

Governance was a hot topic at the event. There were no ready answers to a number of complex questions around governance. There is a lot of work but no synergies, which has led to lots of duplication and lots of waste. Better coordination definitely has a role to play here.

Some of questions that probably need more reflection included:

- Is there a model country in Africa that can be considered to have best governance structure in place?
- Are national strategies being coherently developed and implemented by national governments? Are these policies adequately responding to the needs at the local level?

# Jose Levy

## What African Countries Perceive to be Key Adaptation Priorities: Results From 20 Countries in the Africa Adaptation Programme

Mihoko Kumamoto<sup>1</sup>

Anthony Mills<sup>2</sup>

### Abstract

Adaptation encompasses a wide range of measures that cut across numerous scientific and socio-economic disciplines. Governments face a considerable challenge in prioritizing measures, and in forging multi-disciplinary links to ensure that their adaptation strategies complement existing national development/sectoral strategies. Adaptation involves different sectors, types, scales, and levels of flexibility. This multitude of adaptation options/measures is one of factors that make it difficult to identify what African countries perceive to be adaptation priorities. This seems to be one of the factors contributing to difficulties that African countries face in identifying adaptation priorities. This paper addresses this issue by reviewing the priority adaptation options identified within the Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP). The AAP implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is supporting 20 countries across the African continent to adjust their national development processes to incorporate climate change risks and opportunities. Under this programme, all participating countries spent the first 6 months on studying existing adaptation strategies/policies/actions/interventions, identifying gaps, and formulating priority adaptation measures to address such gaps in a consultative manner. Here we review these priority adaptation measures and assess/categorise them with regard to, inter alia types, sector, scale and soft versus hard-interventions. We found that AAP focuses on soft, “no-regret” options covering multiple sectors at the national level. A majority of AAP measures intend to develop capacities at the systemic, institutional and individual levels such as promoting policy change, enhancing institutions and raising awareness of climate change issues. Countries also demonstrated their desire to pursue various financing options, particularly identifying and securing national and international funds for adaptation. Analysis also shows that promoting multi-sectoral coordination is a priority, implying that countries are aware of cross-sectoral nature of climate change adaptation and making efforts to promote multi-disciplinary approaches towards climate change. We suggest four main reasons for these trends. First, countries are keen to catalyse systemic changes and produce widespread, sustained impacts under AAP through soft, capacity development interventions at the systemic, institutional and individual levels. Second, UNDP’s comparative advantages affected countries’ choices, which are the development of capacities at the national level such as enhancing policy/regulatory frameworks and institutional development. Third, the AAP’s outcome framework which consists of 5 outcomes influenced countries’ selection to some extent. Lastly, the complexity and relative novelty of adaptation encouraged African governments to focus most of their AAP funding on awareness raising and creating the appropriate institutional environment for catalyzing and implementing adaptation on a large scale in different sectors.

---

<sup>1</sup> Technical Advisor, Environment and Energy Group, Bureau for Development Policy, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

<sup>2</sup> Department of Soil Science, Stellenbosch University

## **1. Introduction**

### ***Development in Africa***

Although Africa has made considerable progress in its socio-economic development, it faces a multitude of significant development challenges. The Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in Africa grew from less than 3.0 percent in 1999 to about 6.0 percent in 2006, and saw significant advancements towards democratic governance and protection of human rights (UNDP 2008). Yet Africa still faces extreme poverty, conflicts, limited employment, minimal private sector expansion, gender issues, growing gaps between the poor and an elite, a HIV/AIDS pandemic, and widespread malaria and tuberculosis (UNDP 2008).

Adding to these existing challenges are changes associated with climate variability and change. Africa is considered one of the regions most vulnerable to climate change (IPCC 2007) because of its high dependency on climate sensitive sectors such as agriculture, fisheries, and livestock. Fragile ecosystems, extreme poverty, poor governance and frequent natural disasters exacerbate this vulnerability. In order to cope effectively with climate variability and change, it is recognized that countries need capacities at systemic, institutional and individual levels including policy/legal frameworks, institutional mechanisms, economic and social capital, human resources, technologies and resilient ecosystems.

### ***Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP)***

The Africa Adaptation Programme (AAP) implemented by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and launched in December 2008 is assisting 20 countries across the African continent to incorporate climate change risks and/or opportunities into their national development processes. To achieve this objective, each participating country is implementing a variety of priority activities based on the five outcomes:

- Outcome 1: Dynamic, long-term planning mechanisms introduced to manage the inherent uncertainties of climate change
- Outcome 2: Leadership capacities and institutional frameworks developed to manage climate change risks and opportunities in an integrated manner at the local and national levels
- Outcome 3: Climate-resilient policies and measures in priority sectors implemented
- Outcome 4: Financial options to meet national adaptation costs expanded at the local, sub-national, national and regional levels
- Outcome 5: Knowledge on adjusting national development processes to fully incorporate climate change risk and opportunities generated and shared at all levels

Each of the 20 participating countries spent approximately 6 months at the outset of the AAP identifying priority actions to be implemented under these five outcomes. This project design phase consisted of: 1) reviewing the strategies, policies, action plans and processes that are relevant to climate change adaptation and overall national development; 2) reviewing existing institutional settings for climate change adaptation and any inter-sectoral coordinating

mechanisms; 3) engaging key stakeholders including government and non-governmental organizations, civil society, the private sector; and 4) analysing past and ongoing initiatives relevant to climate change adaptation to identify opportunities for collaboration and avoid any duplication. In most countries, the ministry responsible for climate change, which is often the Ministry of Environment, led these processes. Although countries followed the same outcome framework, each country came up with actions unique to their country context.

### ***Participating Countries***

The 20 participating countries of AAP are spread across all the sub-regions of Africa and can be categorized into the following 4 sub-regions: 1) North Africa; 2) East Africa; 3) Southern Africa; and 4) West and Central Africa. Box 2 lists the countries in their respective categories. Of the 20 countries, 9 countries are in West and Central Africa, 5 countries in Southern Africa, 4 countries in East Africa, and 2 countries in Northern Africa.

#### List of AAP Participating Countries by Sub-Region

<b>Sub-Region</b>	<b>Programme Countries</b>
North Africa (2)	Morocco, Tunisia
East Africa (4)	Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda, Tanzania
Southern Africa (5)	Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritius, Mozambique, Namibia
West and Central Africa (9)	Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Gabon, Congo, Ghana, Niger, Nigeria, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal

It is worth noting that a majority of the participating countries are the Least Developed Countries (LDCs), the Landlocked Developing Countries (LLDCs) or the Small Island Developing States (SIDS). Out of the 20 participating countries, 9 countries are LDCs (i.e., Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Malawi, Mozambique, Niger, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal and Tanzania); 6 countries are LLDCs (i.e., Burkina Faso, Ethiopia, Lesotho, Malawi, Niger, Rwanda); and 2 countries are SIDS (i.e., Mauritius, Sao Tome & Principe).

#### List of LDC, LLDC and SIDS

	LDC	LLDC	SIDS
Burkina Faso	X	X	
Cameroon			
Congo			
Ethiopia	X	X	
Gabon			
Ghana			
Kenya			
Lesotho			

Malawi	X	X	
Mauritius			X
Morocco			
Mozambique	X		
Namibia			
Niger	X	X	
Nigeria			
Rwanda	X	X	
Sao Tome and Principe	X		X
Senegal	X		
Tanzania	X		
Tunisia			

## **2. Typology of Adaptation Options**

There are a number of possible adaptation responses, which can be categorized in many different ways. Bullets below introduce some of these possible adaptation measures:

- *Informal or Formal.* Adaptation measures can be either formal or informal. For example, social safety nets provided by the government are formal, while financial or non-financial support provided by family members is informal. Informal mechanisms vary from socially constructed reciprocity obligations within family, village, religious community or occupation to semi-formal microfinance, rotating savings and credit, or state contingent loan arrangement (Barrett et al, 2007). Informal support mechanisms play an important role in promoting risk management (Barrett et al, 2007).
- *Autonomous or Planned:* Adaptation responses can be categorized into: a) autonomous, unmanaged ecosystems or human systems will do s pontaneously based on their past experiences; and b) planned or deliberate intentional adaptive responses, which plans and takes necessary adjustments based on anticipated events (Pittock and Jones 2000).
- *Short- or Long-term:* Adaptations measures could be short-term, which requires a limited length of time such as introducing climate resilient cultivars and seeds, or long-term, which requires long time to introduce and generate results such as mainstreaming climate risks into strategies, plans and decision making procedures.
- *Hard or Soft:* Adaptation could be divided into “hard” measures that involve structural changes such as expanding meteorological stations and strengthening coastal infrastructures or “soft” measures that do not involve infrastructure including adjusting institutional arrangements and increasing the understanding/awareness of climate change issues.
- *Localised or Widespread:* Some adaptation responses target at specific communities/individuals while others aim to create wide impacts at multiple levels of society. For stance, changing strategies and policy aim to produce widespread impacts, while introducing rainwater harvesting systems aim to generate changes at a specific, localized area.





















































## Climate Change Governance in Africa Masego Madzwamuse March 2011

Paper Submitted for the AfricaAdapt Symposium<sup>1</sup>  
9-10 March 2011, Addis Ababa Ethiopia

**Abstract:** *The negative and unavoidable impacts of climate change have been highlighted, particularly the impacts on the poor and developing countries. It is now clear that Africa will be hardest hit by climate change due to high poverty levels, a heavy dependence on climate sensitive resources for livelihoods and national economies; and a lack of financial, institutional and technological capacity to adapt. Policy makers have thus recognized the need to integrate climate change thinking and adaptation into all spheres of public policy. International responses have included additional focus on adaptation in climate change negotiations and an increase in availability of finance for climate change adaptation. While these developments are commendable a major limitation lies in the under-development of instruments for climate change adaptation governance particularly at national level and local level where adaptation needs to take place.*

*Appropriate strategies have to be developed based on realities that may differ widely from region to region. Thus, the national and local governance structures must ensure these realities are known to policy makers and mainstreamed into national strategies and programmes. In order to get a better understanding on the status of climate change adaptation governance the Heinrich Boll Foundation (HBF) commissioned seven case studies on Botswana, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Nigeria and Ghana. These studies looked into the state of adaptation preparedness in crafting adaptation responses; institutional capacities and arrangements; the levels of public awareness and participation; and the roles played by state and non state actors in international climate change negotiations. This paper presents a summary of key governance issues emerging from the country studies.*

### **Introduction:**

Developing countries and Africa in particular are most vulnerable to climate change due to weak adaptive capacities and a heavy dependence on climate sensitive resources for livelihoods and economic development. Rising temperatures will have severe impacts on rainfall patterns, sea levels, water and biodiversity. Mean rainfall is expected to fall in most parts of Sub-Saharan Africa, particularly in Southern Africa. Central and East Africa will experience increases in rainfall while predictions for West Africa are more variable. In areas where rainfall is predicted to increase high temperatures will shorten the growing periods for crops. The majority of African states will be faced with water scarcity and stress by 2050. While southern Africa will be faced by water scarcity as early as 2015.

Key economic sectors such as agriculture, water, energy, health, wildlife and tourism are identified as the most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change. 96% of Sub-Saharan

---

<sup>1</sup> This paper is based on Climate Change Governance in Africa: Adaptation Strategies and Institutions synthesis Report produced by the author for the Heinrich Boll Foundation. The synthesis draws from case studies undertaken by CAMCO Services (K) Ltd (Kenya); Professor Emmanuel Oladipo (Nigeria & Ghana); Kulthoum Omari (Botswana); Dr Nick Hepworth (Tanzania & Uganda); Tigere Chagutah (Zimbabwe) and Masego Madzwamuse (South Africa).



Africa's population is dependent on rain-fed agriculture and in some countries yields are predicted to fall by 50% by 2050 while arable land will decline by 6% (IFPRI, 2009). Food security and access to food in general will therefore be severely compromised by climate change. Poor rural communities and poor countries with the least financial, institutional and technological capacity to adapt will face the worst impacts of climate change (OECD, 2009). Other factors that undermine weak adaptive capacity include poverty, weak economies, poor access to resources and armed conflicts. The potential impacts of climate change are severe and threaten to reverse the gains of sustainable development, undermine poverty reduction efforts, negatively undermine the livelihoods of rural communities and put additional pressure on already overstretched human and financial resources in developing countries.

Though Africa contributes less to the total global greenhouse emissions, the scale of the climate change impacts on the continent and its poor is and will be even more significant in the future. The implications of climate change on development make both mitigation and in particular adaptation, essential to responding to the impacts of climate change. To prevent a global average temperature rise of 2 degrees Celsius and ensure rights to sustainable development, new and stringent regulatory frameworks, laws policies and reforms are needed to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions, introduce low carbon development pathways and support social, economic and legal transmissions to address climate change (InWent and Transparency International, 2010). Policy-makers have therefore acknowledged the need to integrate climate change adaptation into all spheres of public policy-making and development strategies. The impacts of climate change will be felt most at a local level and therefore renders the active participation of stakeholders at national and local levels important. This reality raises key governance issues within the climate change adaptation agenda.

### **Climate Change Governance: Key issues and challenges**

Governance is the, "*interactions among structures, processes and traditions that determine how power and responsibilities are exercised, how decisions are taken and how citizens or other stakeholders have their say*"<sup>2</sup> (Graham, J., Amos, B., and Plumtree, P. 2003). *Climate Change Governance* issues are thus centred on power relationships and accountability within the framework of adaptation responses. It is ultimately about who has influence, who makes decisions, how decisions are made and how decision makers are held accountable. Key principles of governance include participation, equity, transparency, responsiveness, consensus and strategic direction. Within the context of adaptation governance this study therefore looked into the state of adaptation preparedness in crafting adaptation responses; institutional capacities and arrangements; the levels of public awareness and participation; and the roles played by state and non state actors in international climate change negotiations. These are all critical questions for climate change governance and decisions about climate change adaptation. This paper is based on case studies commissioned by the Heinrich Boll Foundation in Botswana, South Africa, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Uganda, Ghana and Nigeria to address the questions above.

---

<sup>2</sup>

Climate change governance is also about relations between states, given that climate change is a global challenge, and those faced with an adaptation deficit are among the least responsible for greenhouse gas emissions. Climate change governance is consequently also about the extent to which developing countries can bring developed states, and global companies and corporations to account. Climate change poses serious challenges for constructing equitable global responses to shared problems. Emissions of greenhouse gases come disproportionately from industrialized countries, yet the most harmful impacts as highlighted above are likely to befall the poorest, least responsible and least equipped to cope countries (Ashton, J and Wang, X, 2003). In most negotiations the most vulnerable countries tend to be the least able to make their voices heard, or assess the implications of any outcome in light of their own interests (ibid). In cases where there has been attempts to strengthen their voices through the collective particularly representing the South, there have been divisions and differences between Africa and Asia which fragments the powerbase of this group. These differences are further found within negotiation blocs. For instance, in Africa there would be a difference between the needs of least developed countries and rapidly industrializing middle income countries (Hoste, 2010). The Copenhagen negotiations and previous Conference of Parties (COPs) are a case in point which brings to light international power relations and the geo-politics of climate change.

Adaptation responses at the national level are not devoid of political considerations either and the role that spheres of power plays in determining policy outcomes. So far, states and government agencies have played a dominant role in shaping adaptation policy responses and decision-making, with inadequate space for civil society and local communities. Government institutions charged with the responsibility for crafting adaptation responses lack the capacity and political will to engage with stakeholders beyond state agencies and the private sector (Madzwamuse, 2009). This situation goes against key internationally agreed governance principles such as equity, stakeholder participation, accountability and transparency. Stakeholder needs and interests are not adequately reflected in adaptation responses. Of the eight countries covered in this review only three (Uganda, Ghana and Tanzania) followed a participatory approach to vulnerability and adaptation assessments in the development of adaptation responses. This has resulted in significant shortcoming with regards to the formulation of adaptation policies and strategies. Most adaptation strategies push for technological responses and capacity building initiatives targeted at government agencies and sectors, ignoring local adaptation capacity needs of vulnerable communities (Madzwamuse, 2009). Part of the problem lays in the weak participation of Civil Society Organisations (CSO) and the dominance of international NGOs in climate change adaptation agenda at the national level. Consequently the implementation and facilitation of NGO led responses tends to be externally driven and reflects disparate interests. The activities led by NGOs in such cases have resulted in intangible outcomes and lack of oversight at the national level. Very few concrete adaptation activities have been observed at the local level. Where networks of local NGOs are actively involved in climate adaptation, very little exchange of experiences and lessons learned takes place further affecting effective public participation.

Adaptive capacity is dependent on policies and strategies that are responsive to the needs as

well as enhance the resilience of the most vulnerable systems and groups in society. A lack of appropriate policies and legislative frameworks may present barriers to the implementation of adaptation responses, and possibly increase the vulnerability of certain groups such as the women and the poor. Inadequate institutional support and inappropriate policies can act as a constraint to adaptation and limit access to much needed natural resources by communities dependent on such resources for both survival and adaptation to environmental change and climate variability. The crosscutting impacts of climate change and the imperative need for an integrated response requires resilient and adaptive institutions and exemplary actors to lead the process towards creating an enabling environment for adaptation to climate change. The country studies highlight a number of policy and institutional issues and the extent to which these facilitate or undermine the capacity of some groups and sectors to adapt to climate change.

Most countries lack a coherent policy framework and strategic vision for climate change adaptation. This is particularly the case in countries such as Zimbabwe and Nigeria lacking comprehensive planning process for adapting to climate change, often articulated in National Adaptation Plans of Action (NAPA) and/or National Climate Change Response Strategies (NCCRS). Adaptation tends to be provided for in a plethora of fragmented environment and development policies. Where NAPAs/NCCRS exist, such as in the case of Kenya, South Africa and Tanzania, these tend to be narrowly focused on biophysical vulnerabilities; based on top down vulnerability assessments carried out by teams of experts; follow sectoral and project approaches to adaptation; and fail to facilitate integrated responses as well as respond to micro-level adaptation requirements. As a result of these shortcomings the needs of the most vulnerable sectors in society (women, the poor and small-scale farmers) are not adequately catered for. There is therefore a danger that adaptation solutions prescribed to nationally, without the participation of those intended to adopt the practices, will actually limit, rather than create, spaces for local adaptation (McDevitt, 2009). In contrast, the Ugandan NAPA was developed through a robust participatory rural appraisal methodology which focused on analysis of climate related disaster impacts and coping strategies at community level. Though this approach is commendable and markedly different to that used by the other case study countries the NAPA has been criticized for lacking detailed vulnerability analysis at national level. The NAPA looks at community level issues but fails to provide a strategic overview of national adaptation needs. A balance between top down and bottom up approaches is required so as to the strategic needs at a national policy level and local level vulnerabilities.

The positioning of climate change adaptation within the environment sector also undermines the development a strategic vision for climate change adaptation at national level. Placing climate change adaptation solely with the environment sector with no reference to other sectoral plans limits broader public and decision makers' understanding of climate change impacts and the implications for national economies. This in turn undermines political buy-in that is required for mobilizing resources for and prioritization of climate change adaptation. Often guidelines for mainstreaming climate change adaptation into national level planning are not availed to economic planners. Addressing the impacts of climate change and

planning for adaptation is therefore done *ex post facto* and in an *ad hoc* manner.

Adaptive capacity is further undermined by macro-economic development frameworks. The drive towards attracting FDI, securing industrial competitiveness, fiscal policy, and moderation of wage increases so as to attract foreign investment and facilitate economic growth in Africa marginalises the poor and undermines their adaptive capacity. For instance, Agricultural sectoral policies in the case studies revealed a bias towards macro-economic interests in terms of promoting commercial agriculture and technological transfer while the needs of subsistence farmers are under-represented.

In East Africa (Kenya, Uganda, and Tanzania case studies), while agricultural policies aim to increase access to irrigation, early warning systems for farmers and drought mitigation measures, very little has been done to address structural inequalities which underlie socio-economic vulnerabilities in the agricultural sector. Pastoralists in most parts of Kenya, northern Uganda, and Tanzania as well as Southern parts of Ethiopia have lost large tracts of land through externally promoted agricultural investment schemes which took away many of the communities' dry season pastures (Nelson, 2009). In South Africa, although a comprehensive set of policies (agriculture and land reform policies<sup>3</sup>) geared towards addressing structural issues relating to poverty, and efforts towards redistributing national economic benefits to previously disadvantaged groups exist, major challenges lie in policy implementation. The South African land reform process is considered to have stalled. Some observers argue that it has failed completely due to tensions between appropriate development paths at macro-economic level and the needs at micro-level. Suggestions are that the land and agrarian reform has failed to escape the trappings of neo-liberalism (Noyoo, nd; Bond, 2005; and Mngxitama, 2005). As a result landlessness continues to compound poverty as it impedes communities, especially in the rural areas from having recourse to a source of livelihood through farming and other land based activities.

Another area that points to the bias towards attracting FDI is in biodiversity and natural resources. Capital interests have led to displacements of local land owners and resource users in rural communities to make way for major tourism interests, commercial forestry and agriculture for export – leaving a significant number of rural dwellers landless, without access to biodiversity and natural resources and highly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change (Murombedzi, 2007; Taylor, 2009; and Nelson, 2010). To secure these capital interests governments are increasingly centralizing natural resources management. This trend could significantly affect the use of natural resources as a basis for climate change adaptation at local level. It is widely recognized that one of the fundamental pro-poor responses to climate change is to ensure that macro-economic policies reduce poor peoples' vulnerability (DFID, 2004).

National adaptation strategies have also failed to address gender inequality aspects. Adaptation strategies for most of the vulnerable sectors such as agriculture, biodiversity and water have major gaps in terms of making provisions for gender-related differential impacts of climate change. Enabling provisions which include, among others, security of tenure, provision of technical information such as meteorological and weather forecasts and access to micro-finance, as well as opportunities for productive employment are often not adequately

---

<sup>3</sup> i.e. Integrated rural Development Policy, the Agricultural Policy, Land and Redistribution for Agricultural development, the Policy on Agriculture and Sustainable Development among others.

and appropriately extended to women. Packaging appropriate solutions to suit the needs of the recipients is as important as providing the solutions.

Key institutions are faced with major challenges that undermine adaptive capacity. These include; weak coordination as a result of conflicting and overlapping mandates in government agencies, dysfunctional arrangements for inter-agency integration, overburden of external (UNFCCC and donor) reporting requirements and inadequate financing for adaptation. Low income countries such as Uganda, Tanzania and Zimbabwe have challenges with attracting and retaining skilled human resources and the decentralisation of adaptation responses needs to be strengthened by empowering local governments and building their capacity for adaptation.

Strategic visioning for climate change adaptation is limited at national level. Most actors i.e. in Uganda are involved in climate change awareness-raising, capacity building and research with fewer investments in strategic areas such as legislative aspects, coordination, advocacy and financial cooperation. Furthermore research does not adequately respond to national knowledge gaps on climate change. African research capacities are being drawn to collaborate on disparate, foreign-led research which responds to external research interests and agendas.

Coordination mechanisms within the donor community are weak and project approaches continue to dominate development assistance. Donor coordination is confined to environment working groups. As a result coordination and communication is restricted and fails to integrate other key sectors such as agriculture, energy and poverty reduction where the bulk of development assistance is channeled. In some cases donors are merely rebranding existing initiatives as climate change activities, making it difficult for government and other actors to access much needed funding towards developing adaptation strategies.

### **Conclusion:**

This paper concludes that a multi-tiered (vertical and horizontal) approach is required to build the capacities of governments and communities in Africa to effectively respond to and adapt to climate change. Mainstreaming climate change into economic frameworks and sectoral policies is of paramount importance in order to ensure integrated adaptation responses. The current state of national adaptation strategies and confining the climate change agenda to the environment sector makes it difficult for development planners to have a holistic perspective of adaptation priorities at both macro (national) and micro (local) levels. Public participation and assessment of social and economic vulnerabilities needs to be strengthened so as to inform processes for identifying responsive adaptation priorities.

Coordination capacity needs to be strengthened and placed within a state agency (ministry or department) with political clout and convening power to facilitate integration across other agencies and sectors. Accountability to the national citizens particularly the most vulnerable members of society is critical. Adaptation should be integrated into the frameworks of decentralized governance structures and adaptive capacity built at that level. The success of

climate change adaptation will depend on the extent to which responses are felt at the local level. There is need for increased adaptation funding at local and national levels; however priority must be given to the adaptation needs of the most vulnerable in society (i.e. women, small-scale farmers, subsistence fishers, the poor etc.). Systemic capacities to improve accountability must be built at all levels of governance. Individual capacities located within donor partners and other non-state actors (NGOs, CBOs, private sector and research institutions) ought to be harnessed to support national adaptation needs.

Overall, adaptation governance in Africa calls for a relook at the quality of growth and development processes, an emphasis on equity as well as improvement of the level of public engagement in the formulation of national responses.

## References:

Ashton, J., Wang, X. 2003. Equity and Climate: In principle and practice. In Aldy, J. *et.al.* 2003. *Beyond Kyoto: Advancing the international effort against climate change*. PEW Centre on Global Climate Change. <http://www.pewclimate.org/publications/report/beyond-kyoto-advancing-international-effort-against-climate-change> Accessed October 2010.

Bond, P. 2005. *Dragging South Africa's Land Debate from the Neoliberal Quicksand*. Znet Daily Commentaries. [www.zcommunications.org/dragging-sa-and-8364-s-land-debate-from-the-neoliberal-quicksand-by-patrick-bond.pdf](http://www.zcommunications.org/dragging-sa-and-8364-s-land-debate-from-the-neoliberal-quicksand-by-patrick-bond.pdf) Accessed 10 September 2010

DFID. 2004. *The Impact of Climate Change on the Vulnerability of the Poor: Key sheet No.3. Policy Division*. DFID. UK.

Graham, J., Amos, B., and Plumtree, P. 2003. Principles for Good Governance in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century. Policy Brief Number 15. Ottawa: Institute on Governance

Hoste, J. 2010. *Where was United Africa in the Climate Change Negotiations?* Africa Policy Brief No.2. EGMONT Royal Institute for International Relations. <http://www.egmontinstitute.be/papers/10/afr/2010-feb-Afr.P.Brief-Hoste-climate-change.pdf> Cited 20 October 2010

InWent and Transparency International. 2010. *Concept Note to the Climate Governance Conference: Addressing Climate Governance Risks in a New Climate Regime – Knowledge, Economy and Equity Paradigms*. 15 June 2010, Berlin, Germany.

Madzwamuse, M. 2009. Adaptation: Rational or sticky point for climate change negotiations? In *On the Road to Copenhagen*. Perspectives #2.09. HBS.

McDevitt. 2009. Helpdesk Research Report: Climate Change and Zimbabwe. Governance and Social Development Resource Centre.

Mngxitama, A. 2005. *The National Land Committee 1994 -2004. A Critical Insiders Perspective*. Report 34, Vol 2. Pg 1-48. Durban Centre for Civil Society.

Murombedzi, J. 2007. *Climate Change, Natural Resources and Adaptation in Southern Africa*. A situational analysis report produced for Resource Africa and FFI.

Nelson, F. 2009. Drought, Adaptation and Land Rights in East Africa. In *Dispatches on Adaptation*. IUCN Southern African Sustainable Use Group.

Nelson, F. 2010. *Community Rights, Conservation and Contested Land: the politics of natural resource governance in Africa*. IUCN & Earthscan.

Noyoo, N. nd. *Civil Society and Poverty Reduction in South Africa*. A research conducted for the Foundation Maison des Science de L'Homme, Paris, France.

OECD. 2009. *Integrating Climate Change into Development Cooperation: Policy Guidance*. Environment Directorate. OECD.

Taylor, M. 2008. *Securing Access to Land for Food Security*. Presentation made at the 'Conference on land governance and emerging development agendas: Legal empowerment, climate change and food security'. 24-25 November 2008. Oslo. UNDP (OGC, DDC and the Legal Empowerment of the Poor Programme) and TerrAfrica Partnership.

IFPRI. 2009. *The Role of Sustainable Land Management for Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation*. TerrAfrica Partnership