

# Climate Change Adaptation in Nepal: The Policy and Institutional Context

Dhruba Pant, Ph.D

*Launching Workshop for Preparation of a Training Manual  
on  
Climate Variability and Impacts on Water, Energy and Food  
Security in South Asia*

18-19 February 2014  
Hyderabad, India

# Introduction

- South Asia includes Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Nepal, Pakistan, and Sri Lanka.

Endowed with vast water resources.

- 70% of the population live in rural areas.
- Monsoon based Agriculture
- Agriculture main livelihood source.
- Major source of income.

# Impact of Climate Change

- Higher temperatures,
- increased variability in precipitation, and
- higher incidence of extreme weather events.

Therefore:

- Water security of millions is important.
- Highly vulnerable to droughts and floods (2010 Koshi floods, Nepal and Flood in Pakistan 2011).

# Challenges

- Weak Adaptation Capacities of the countries.
  - Data base and information
  - Finance
  - Technical Know-how
  - Regional Co-operation
- Increasing intersectoral competition for water.
- Need to balance demand and supply of water.
- Water-related climate variability will impact.

# Actions Required

- Enhanced cooperation and dialogue among the countries.
- local, national and regional initiatives that foster
  - Research and develop knowledge
  - data and knowledge sharing among institutions
  - Community based action programmes.
  - establishing cooperative framework to advance a regional agenda aimed at increasing the exchange of knowledge and best practices.

# Activities

- Assessment of Climate Change Impact across the countries.
- Identify successful adaptation measures for incorporation in policy and strategies.
- Climate resilience best practices and gender sensitive techniques in water management.
- Help develop local adaptation plans for climate resilience.

# Policy, legal and Institutional Dimensions: Nepal

## MPFS

- prepared in 1989 with a objectives of Conserving ecosystems and genetic resources.
- Protection of the environment.
- Granting of use right of forest and forest product to the users.
- Eliciting users' participation in resource management.

# Contd.

- Legally– delineation of roles and responsibilities of DFO and the FUG.
- The Forest Policy, 1989 revised in 2000 by including CFM in the Terai.
- Policy, legal and institutional reforms (Forest Act 1993 and Forest Regulation 1995)



# WRS 2002 and NWP 2005: Policy, legal and Institutional Dimensions

- The goal of water resources development in the country is to tap and utilize water resources
  - gaining economic and social benefits
  - ensuring the participation of all the stakeholders including private sector.

# Water Resources Act 1992

- Emphasises IWRM.
- Vests ownership right to the government.
- Has prioritized the intersectoral allocation.

# **NAPA: Policy, Legal and Institutional Dimensions**

- To minimize the existing effects and likely impacts, mainly on peoples, livelihoods, and their ecosystems in different ecological regions.
- Proposed to form a steering committee at the central level.
- Involvement of both state and non-state actors and experts in adaptation planning at district level.

# Contd.

- Involvement of some nationally recognized NGO for programme implementation.
- Proposed reforms in the existing policy, legal and institutional provisions.
- supportive program
  - human resource development,
  - Research, extension, and management
  - planning; monitoring and evaluation.

# **Institutional Effectiveness of Policy and Programme**

## **Community Forest Management**

As of January 2011 since 1995

- A total of 15,256 CFUGs comprising
- 40% of the total population covered
- managing 22 % (more than 1.3 million hectares) of the total forest area.
- Implementation of REDD+ on pilot basis.
- Resource Generation/mobilisation at local level.

# Institutional Effectiveness of Policy and Programme

## WRS and NWP

- Water Resource Information Centre.
- RBO to facilitate the River Basin Planning.
- Study on Formation of Sub/basin Committee in two of the basins (West Rapti and Babai)

## NAPA/LAPA

- Provides broader framework for climate change Adaptation Programme.

# Institutional Weaknesses of Program

NAPA envisages 70% of the fund to local level.

## CFUG

- contribution to the livelihood minimal.
- lack of required knowledge and expertise.
- lack of resources.
- Illegal logging benefiting a few.

## WRS/NWP

- Water right concerning the intersectoral allocation and use is yet to be made clear.

# Contd.

- lack of overall policy for the development of water resources -sectoral approach.

## WRS/NWP

- Delay in the implementation of the NWP.
- lack of availability of reliable and adequate data has been a major constraint.
- Both institutional and financial inadequacy.
- WECS has limitation in influencing the working of sectoral ministries.



# Contd.

## NAPA/LAPA

- Weak governance constraint to CC adaptation.
- Non existence of elected local bodies.
- Lowest coverage of infrastructure facilities.
- Huge burden of accumulated and additional costs due to time lag.
- Inadequate implementation of sectoral plan, and policies and strategies.

# Contd.

- Lack of public awareness on climate-related disasters.
- Inadequate required infrastructures to cope with climate induced disasters.
- Co-ordination mechanism at district not clear.
- District Water Resources Committees (DWRCs) not functional.
- Role of local elected institutions in water dev. not clear.

# Contd.

- Contradictions in NRM at local level between
  - Local Self-Governance Act (LSGA) 1997
  - CF Act of 1993
  - Water Resources Act 1992 has implications for climate change adaptation strategy.
  - Irrigation Regulations does not grant any authority to the DWRC.

# Conclusions

- MPFS 1989/Forest Act 1993 –adaptive strategy through decentralized management of NRM.
- WRS/NWP is successful in identifying the issues provides a framework for water development.
- NAPA provision of Donor-NGO partnership has limitation in scaling up and scaling out.

# Conclusions

- Both WRS and NAPA failed to take into account of
  - the resource availability, the existing bureaucratic culture, Political commitment for policy, institutional reform for its effective implementation.

Thank You