**Adaptation CoP – Funding meeting**

*Notes from Jouja’s talk*

Funders often feel overwhelmed with the prospect of funding adaptation, and don’t know where to start.

It’s much more common for adaptation work to be funded in the global south than in the global north (more on those terms here: <https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Global_North_and_Global_South>). This is for various reasons, including ethical and moral concerns, such as the relative low need of mitigation in the global south and the immediacy of climate impacts.

Adaptation needs to be narrative based in order to attract funding.

There is often a blur between mitigation and adaptation in practice.

Some existing examples of adaptation projects getting funding are nature based solutions, ecosystem approaches, seagrass restoration, rewilding.

Measuring adaptation is harder than mitigation, as you are attempting to avoid hypothetical scenarios. Therefore we need to move past traditional ways of measuring impact.

How can you demonstrate ‘reduced vulnerability’?

Useful things to consider:

* A key point is that the impact of funding today is automatically greater than funding tomorrow, there is an inherent depreciation in the value of funding climate projects.
* Talk about funding as a catalyst for change.
* Emphasise the importance of avoiding maladaption.
* Funders are influenced by what’s in the media, what’s controversial.
* What is the role of funders vs the role of government in adapting? – ask yourself ‘why is this not happening at Government level?’ or ‘why aren’t private sector organisations doing this?’