

## Annex A. CCFLA Membership (as of January 2025)

### DEMAND

#### Local City Networks



#### Global City Networks



### NATIONAL GOVERNMENTS

#### Developing Countries



#### Donor Countries



### SUPPLY

#### MDBs



#### Bilateral Aid



### ENABLERS

#### Research/Implementers



#### Private Sector



#### Global Public Funds



#### NDBs



#### Philanthropies



#### UN-led



#### PPFs



#### Sectoral



## Annex B. Survey Data Reconciliation and Response Consolidation Procedures

The 2024 CCFLA Urban Adaptation and Resilience Finance survey gathered 41 responses (38 of which were considered; see ‘responses from mitigation-specific programs’ below) between July 22 and August 18, 2024<sup>1</sup>. The survey consisted of 48 questions (‘Qs’) designed to capture both the details of various programs and initiatives, as well as individual perspectives on climate adaptation finance<sup>2</sup>. In the table below, shaded cells differentiate between questions focused on program/initiative data, and those seeking respondents’ personal information and professional views.

**Table C-1. Survey Questions Categorized by Data Type**

Question	Q 1	Q 2	Q 3	Q 4	Q 5	Q 6	Q 7	Q 8	Q 9	Q 10	Q 11	Q 12	Q 13	Q 14	Q 15	Q 16	Q 17	Q 18	Q 19	Q 20	Q 21	Q 22	Q 23	Q 24
Program/Initiative Information																								
Respondent Views/Information																								

Question	Q 25	Q 26	Q 27	Q 28	Q 29	Q 30	Q 31	Q 32	Q 33	Q 34	Q 35	Q 36	Q 37	Q 38	Q 39	Q 40	Q 41	Q 42	Q 43	Q 44	Q 45	Q 46	Q 47	Q 48
Program/Initiative Information			D	D	D	D				S	S	S	S				EE	EE	EE					
Respondent Views/Information	D	D					D	S	S					S	EE	EE				EE				

The distinction between questions designed to gather program/initiative information and those aimed at collecting respondents’ views and personal information is required for clarifying the procedures used in data reconciliation and response consolidation. Three main issues were addressed: multiple programs reported by the same organization, multiple responses received for the same program, and responses from programs focused solely on mitigation. The subsections below provide a detailed explanation of how each issue was managed.

In the table above, the letter ‘D’ denotes questions related to Demand, ‘S’ denotes questions related to Supply, and ‘EE’ denotes questions related to the Enabling Environment. While respondents’ views were collected for all survey questions, program-specific questions were only addressed for the sectors in which respondents indicated their program operated. For example, if a program was reported to work only in Demand and Supply, questions related to the Enabling Environment were not included for that program.

### 1. Responses from mitigation-specific programs

Of the 41 responses collected, three were from programs focused exclusively on climate mitigation. Since the survey and scoping paper aimed to map members’ activities, challenges, gaps, and propose recommendations for the CCFLA Urban Adaptation and Resilience Finance workstream, responses from mitigation-only programs were discarded. The total number of responses considered in our analysis is **38** (see further clarification below).

<sup>1</sup> A full list of participating organizations and programs is available in Annex D.

<sup>2</sup> The complete survey is available in Annex B.

---

## 2. Multiple programs reported by the same Member organization

In the analysis, each response was considered at the program level, with all submissions treated as independent and equally weighted contributions. Although a small number of member organizations submitted multiple responses, with a single exception (see below) these were provided for different programs by different individuals, each representing their own professional expertise and viewpoint. No individual professional answered the survey more than once, ensuring that the data reflects a diverse range of insights without duplication of perspectives. The focus of this analysis is on the content provided for each program and by each professional, rather than on the organizations as a whole or their categorization by Demand, Supply, National Governments or Enablers. On that note, while CCFLA categorizes members into Demand, Supply, National Governments, and Enablers (see Annex A), the answers received were roughly proportional to the number of members in each category, and, for that reason, no sectoral weighting was deemed necessary. This approach was considered the most suitable for highlighting program-specific details and individual expert opinions while avoiding complexities from organizational-level or sectoral overrepresentation in the scoping paper. By treating each submission equally, the analysis accurately reflects the diversity of programs and opinions across CCFLA's urban adaptation and resilience finance members ecosystem.

---

## 3. Multiple responses received for the same program

There was only one instance where multiple responses (two) were received for the same program, and these responses were submitted by different individuals in different member organizations. In this case, a careful consolidation of program-specific information was conducted. At the same time, answers to questions aimed at collecting respondent's professional views were preserved in their integrity. There were no conflicting program-specific details in the responses that required further clarification from respondents.

As a result of this approach, the total number of responses representing respondents' professional views is 38, while the total number of responses to program/initiative-specific questions is 37.

---

## 4. Additional challenges identified by respondents

In addition to weighing the importance of the various challenges identified earlier, survey respondents also had the opportunity to write in any additional challenges they had encountered or were aware of. Key responses include the following:

### **Demand-side:**

- Lack of community participation/use of local knowledge to support project development
- Dependence on national government for access to financing.

### **Supply-side:**

- Lack of useful or standardized data that financiers can use to assess resilience projects
- Lack of adaptation specific financial products
- Small ticket size and difficulties in aggregating adaptation projects due to place-specific needs.

### **Enabling environment:**

- Lack of regulatory framework - specifically for nature-based solutions was raised.

The present scoping methodology did not permit further exploration and Member weighing of those challenges at present. They are recommended for further consideration by CCFLA Members and the Secretariat in the context of the Adaptation and Resilience Finance Workstream.

---

## **5. Additional priority topics suggested by respondents for future CCFLA knowledge products and/or workshops**

Public procurement of climate-proof infrastructure

Enhancing the financial well-being of cities to access external funding effectively

Central-local partnerships for urban adaptation and resilience finance

Institutional and policy frameworks for investment in urban resilience

Step-by-step on how cities can tap international climate finance

Better connect between national and municipal risk, urban development and climate change policies and plans

Focus on public sector investments into resilient infrastructure and how to make them as cheap and affordable as possible

Project preparation workshops with prospective project teams

## Annex C. Survey Respondents and Economic Domain of Activity

#	Organization(s)	Program(s)	Economic Domain of Activity		
			Demand	Supply	Enabling Environment (EE)
1	Green Climate Fund (GCF)	Multiple / not specified	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Green Finance Institute	Nature-based solutions in European cities	Yes		
3	Resilient Cities Catalyst (RCC)	Cities Forward and Gold Standard	Yes	Yes	
4	C40 Cities	C40 City Finance Programme, UrbanShift Programme, C40 Resilience Programme	Yes		Yes
5	Sustainable Infrastructure Foundation (SIF)	SOURCE			Yes
6	United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP)	Urban-Act	Yes	Yes	Yes
7	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNDRR)	Making Cities Resilient 2030 (MCR2030)	Yes		Yes
8	MobiliseYourCity	Multiple / not specified	Yes		Yes
9	Global Infrastructure Basel Foundation (GIB)	FAST Infra Label	Skipped program-specific questions related to demand, supply, and EE.		
10	World Resources Institute (WRI)	Cities4Forests	Yes	Yes	Yes
11	Asian Development Bank (ADB)	Cities Development Initiative for Asia (CDIA)	Yes	Yes	Yes
12	Agence Congolaise de Transition Ecologique et Developpement Durable, Republique Democratique du Congo	Infrastructure Funding	Yes	Yes	Yes
13	Lincoln Institute of Land Policy	Land-based Finance for Climate Resilient Development	Yes		Yes
14	Gold Standard	Gold Standard Adaptation Requirement			Yes
15	Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development (Germany)	Multiple / not specified	Yes	Yes	Yes
16	Commonwealth Local Government Forum (CLGF)	Blue Green Economy	Yes	Yes	Yes
17	Arsht-Rock Resilience Center, Atlantic Council	Adaptation Policy and Finance			Yes
18	ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability	Transformative Actions Program	Yes		

19	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	C40 Cities Finance Facility	Yes		
20	Global Environment Facility (GEF)	Multiple / not specified	Yes	Yes	Yes
21	Agence Française de Développement (AFD)	CICLIA: Cities and Climate in Africa	Yes		Yes
22	United Nations Human Settlements Programme (UN-Habitat)	Climate Change and Urban Environment Sub-Programme	Yes	Yes	Yes
23	United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)	State of Finance for Nature in Cities	Yes	Yes	Yes
24	Resilient Cities Network	A New Urban Resilience Action Agenda	Yes		Yes
25	European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD)	EBRD Green Cities	Yes	Yes	Yes
26	The Gambia National Disaster Management Agency (NDMA)	Community-led DRR	Yes	Yes	Yes
27	Reall	Green Affordable Housing Finance (GAHF) Ecosystem Instrument	Yes	Yes	Yes
28	EIT Climate-KIC	NetZeroCities	Yes	Yes	Yes
29	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Global Program on Integrated Urban Resilience	Yes		
30	Bankers without Boundaries	Climate City Capital Hub	Yes		Yes
31	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Covenant of Mayors in Sub Saharan Africa	Yes		Yes
32	Weitzman School of Design and Penn Institute for Urban Research, University of Pennsylvania	SDSN Global Commission on Urban SDG Finance			Yes
33	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	FELICITY II Eastern Partnership and Central Asia Program	Yes	Yes	Yes
34	Netherlands Water Partnership (NWP)	Dutch Resilience Hub	Skipped program-specific questions related to demand, supply, and EE.		
35	Climate Investment Funds (CIF)	Climate Smart Cities Program	Yes		Yes
36	CDP	Capacity Building Program supported by Bank of America Charitable Foundation, Strengthening Sustainable Infrastructure Project Pipeline of Asian Cities	Yes		
37	Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank (AIIB)	Liaoning Panjin Climate Resilient and Wetland Ecosystem Protection Project (PRC)	Skipped program-specific questions related to demand, supply, and EE.		
38	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ)	Urban-Act	Responses to program-specific questions were merged with those of respondent 6, who also provided input on the Urban-Act program		

## Annex D. Interviews with CCFLA Members

To complement the survey responses (see Annex B, C, and D), the CCFLA team conducted a round of interviews in September 2024 to gain deeper insights into member activities, challenges, and opportunities related to scaling urban adaptation and resilience finance. The interviews were designed to validate and expand upon the survey findings, identify additional gaps, and explore potential recommendations in greater detail.

---

### 1. Objectives of the Interviews

The primary objectives of the interview process were to:

1. Validate the survey findings by gathering qualitative feedback from members.
2. Explore key challenges and opportunities for urban adaptation and resilience finance in greater depth.
3. Identify specific activities, strategies, and partnerships Members are engaged in to address these challenges.
4. Gather suggestions for refining the proposed recommendations to better align with Members' priorities and experiences.

---

### 2. Selection and List of Participants

Participants for the interviews were selected based on their active involvement in CCFLA activities and their expertise in urban adaptation and resilience finance. Efforts were made to ensure representation across geographic regions, sectors, and organizational types. The selection process also aimed to achieve a balance among Members operating across Demand, Supply, and the Enabling Environment. Members who indicated in the survey their willingness to participate in follow-up discussions were prioritized. Additionally, participants included those who had provided written inputs during earlier stages of the project and for whom further clarification was sought. While the list of interview invitations was more extensive, the list below includes only those who participated in the interviews.

Interviews were conducted with:

- Analyn Rubenecia, from the Cities Development Initiative for Asia, Asian Development Bank (CDIA-ADB)
- Barbara Barros, from C40.
- Alope Barnwal, from Global Environment Facility (GEF)
- Nidhi Upadhyaya, from The Atlantic Council's Climate Resilience Center (Arsht-Rock)
- Allison Ahern, representing the Resilient Cities Network
- Rahel Hermann, Robin Short, and Hanna Mueller, representing the GIZ.

---

### 3. Interview Format

Interviews were conducted virtually via video conferencing platforms to accommodate Members across different time zones. Most interviews lasted approximately 45 minutes, with some extending up to 1 hour and 30 minutes. They were facilitated by the consultants supporting the project. A semi-structured interview guide was used to ensure consistency across discussions while allowing flexibility for participants to elaborate on areas of particular interest or relevance to their work. The interview guide covered the following key topics:

- Confirmation of survey responses: Participants were asked to elaborate on their answers to specific survey questions, where relevant.
- Challenges: Discussion focused on the major barriers to scaling urban adaptation and resilience finance, including policy, technical, and financial challenges.
- Activities: Participants described their current and planned activities within this area and shared insights into successful approaches.
- Recommendations: Feedback was sought on the preliminary recommendations developed from the survey analysis, including suggestions for refining them and ensuring their relevance to Members' priorities.

The insights gathered from the interviews played a critical role in validating the survey findings and refining the recommendations presented in this scoping paper. They also provided valuable examples of Member activities and strategies, which were used to illustrate best practices and opportunities for scaling urban adaptation and resilience finance. The feedback received during these discussions ensured that the final recommendations were grounded in practical experience and aligned with the needs and priorities of CCFLA Members.

## Annex E. CCFLA Urban Adaptation and Resilience Finance Workstream Scoping Workshop

---

### 1. Introduction

Following a survey (see Annex B, C, and D) and interviews round (see Annex E), the CCFLA Urban Adaptation and Resilience Finance Workstream Scoping Workshop (held 29 October 2024) presented members with the initial findings of the assignment, with the aim to validate and refine those tentative findings. To this end, the CCFLA Secretariat and the consultants presented the priority challenges and activities Members reported in the survey and interviews, the key gaps in current coverage and the proposed recommendations with options for area of focus. Members were invited to provide feedback to the Secretariat on the gaps and recommendations identified to ensure the findings of this paper were relevant and aligned with Members' priorities.

During the workshop, we used a Miro Board to collect feedback on the gaps identified by comparing Members' activities to the challenges for scaling urban adaptation and resilience finance, and the recommendations CCFLA is proposing to close these gaps. We provided participants with a set of green, yellow, and red dots which they could use to indicate the level of priority they would assign each of the gaps and recommendations, with the following instruction:

- Green = highly important and should be addressed with top priority
- Yellow = should be addressed but is not a priority
- Red = should not be included in the list of recommendations.

Participants could use a maximum of one dot per gap or recommendation. They were instructed to leave a section blank if they did not have an opinion on a particular option. Participants were also given the option to use sticky notes to add any further justification or comments relating to the specific gap or recommendation. Examples given included:

- Work you are doing that is relevant to the gap or recommendation
- Suggestions for refining the gap or recommendation
- Justification for your choice of sticker



















The general guiding questions provided to participants for consideration included:


1. Do these gaps and recommendations align with your own experience of working within urban adaptation and resilience finance?
2. Which of these recommendations do you think are the most important and should be taken forward?
3. Are there any gaps or recommendations on this list that you are already addressing? Please share any work you are doing that is relevant.
4. Are there any gaps or recommendations you feel are missing from this list and should be included in the report?


















## 2. Workshop Results



\*\*\* Indicates the top voted gap and option in demand, supply and enabling environment







Demand	
Gap/Options	Voting/Comments
<b>DS1:</b> There is a lack of project preparation support for adaptation projects at the feasibility, structuring and transaction stages. ***	<b>14</b>  ICLEI: PPF focus on bankability, when adaptation projects are rarely profitable or bankable.
<b>Option 1:</b> Develop an adaptation specific late-stage Project Preparation Facility (PPF) with a core focus on structuring and financing adaptation projects.	8  3  1 
<b>Option 2:</b> Provide opportunities for matchmaking between PPFs and financiers on adaptation specific projects. ***	<b>12</b>  2 
<b>Option 3:</b> Hold targeted assistance/discussion groups for PPFs to discuss challenges with advancing specific urban adaptation and resilience projects.	1  5  3 
<b>DS2:</b> There is a lack of collaboration between Members working with cities that face similar climate hazards.	3  4  MobiliseYourCity: I think the name of this gap might require a change as it can be grouped by hazards, types of cities, and solutions. Emile Becault, CDP: Perhaps bring together gaps 2 & 3.
<b>Option 1:</b> Connect Members working on financing solutions to similar climate hazards e.g. flooding, drought, extreme heat.	3 
<b>Option 2:</b> Connect Members working on financing projects in similar types of cities e.g. Low Elevation Coastal Zone cities.	6  2 
<b>Option 3:</b> Connect Members working on financing similar solutions e.g. Nature-based solutions.	<b>11</b>  Gold Standard: We've been looking at the cross-cutting points in project lifecycles to identify when and where integrated solutions can be used. But have also found that focusing on the solutions can be counterproductive and takes away from fully unpacking the problem we're trying to solve first.
<b>DS3:</b> There is a lack of centralization and sharing of knowledge on strategies and business models for funding and financing urban adaptation and resilience projects.	8 
<b>Option 1:</b> Develop a decision support tool to assist cities in developing strategies to finance adaptation and resilience plans.	5  2 

<p><b>Option 2:</b> Collect blueprints of successful business models for adaptation and resilience solutions.</p> <p>(cont. DS3, Option 2)</p>	<p>8 </p> <p>CFF: Exploring how to showcase adaptation business models developed. Happy to connect on this with others.</p> <p>UNDRR: Collection from city's experience will also be useful. Can be used to further disseminated in different forms like publication/ training (<a href="#">see link</a>). Cities learn better from other cities.</p>
--	---

Supply	
Gap/Options	Voting/Comments
<p><b>SS1:</b> There is a lack of knowledge on financing mechanisms available specifically for urban adaptation projects. ***</p>	<p>12 </p> <p>1 </p> <p>EIB: Attention to the capacity of cities and local authorities to effectively implement "innovative" financial instruments or mechanisms.</p>
<p><b>Option 1:</b> Develop a knowledge product on the range of financing mechanisms available for urban adaptation projects and their uses. ***</p>	<p>10 </p> <p>1 </p> <p>Gold Standard: Developed a tool with RCC which outlines the range of government financial sources that can be utilized and leveraged by urban adaptation projects via different financial mechanisms, as well as the methods in which the adaptation project itself can generate financial return.</p>
<p><b>Option 2:</b> Develop a knowledge product on the insurance products available for urban adaptation and resilience and blueprints for their use.</p>	<p>3 </p> <p>4 </p> <p>1 </p> <p>PennIUR: Maybe blueprint, dive-deep into local examples would be beneficial.</p> <p>Unidentified: Maybe is attracting little attention because people may not know it.</p>
<p><b>Option 3:</b> Develop a knowledge product on the bond products available for urban adaptation and resilience and blueprints for their use.</p>	<p>2 </p> <p>4 </p> <p>UNDRR: CBI and UNDRR has a training course developed on <a href="#">Deep Dive in Scaling-Up Sub-National Finance through Thematic Labelled Bonds</a>.</p>
<p><b>SS2:</b> There is limited use and standardization of taxonomies to track investments in urban adaptation and resilience.</p>	<p>4 </p> <p>4 </p> <p>UNDRR: <a href="#">some of our resources</a> that could be useful in this area.</p>
<p><b>Option 1:</b> Advocate for the adoption of a standardized taxonomy for urban adaptation finance and for its use across financial institutions</p>	<p>1 </p> <p>6 </p>
<p><b>Option 2:</b> Develop knowledge products to increase awareness and understanding of the importance of urban adaptation project tagging for tracking and increasing financing.</p>	<p>5 </p> <p>1 </p>

<p><b>SS3:</b> There is a lack of activities focused on bridging the gap between cities and private investors by communicating climate risk.</p>	<p><b>10</b> ●●●●●●●●●●</p> <p>Unidentified: <i>Option 1 and 2 already feasible in SOURCE.</i></p>
<p><b>Option 1:</b> Develop a policy brief or guide for cities on communicating urban climate risks to private sector to unlock finance for adaptation and resilience projects.</p>	<p><b>6</b> ●●●●●●</p> <p>Gold Standard: <i>We've been doing a lot of work on driving cities to understand how to make projects investable, we'll be co-hosting a masterclass with ICLEI and RCC next year to practically explore and develop business cases, government funding, and financing sources and structuring options for selected major adaptation-related projects. If of interest we could consider how to turn the learnings from this master class into a guidance document for cities to communicate and unlock finance for adaptation projects.</i></p> <p>UNDRR: <i>We have done joint trainings with CBI, GCF and the Gap Fund (on separate occasions) for cities to understand how to write project proposals that meet the requirements of these different financiers including the need to quantify climate related impact. It was very useful to address the gaps of cities not knowing how to access non-government budget funding or non-grant. So once the guidance is there, it should be disseminated together through different capacity building programmes as well. (so linked with Option 3 below, and Option 2 if focusing on quantifying climate impact for project preparation).</i></p>
<p><b>Option 2:</b> Develop a standardized tool for cities to collect and quantify climate risks.</p>	<p><b>5</b> ●●●●●</p> <p><b>1</b> ●</p> <p>Mobiliseyourcity: <i>I think the development of these kind of tools is relevant, but I think there are tools as the C40 one that can be useful. Therefore, it is not necessary to design another tool but to use and promote those that are available already.</i></p> <p>CDP: <i>CDP-ICLEI Track enable cities to report their climate risks - it also enable reporting in line with the recommendations of the TCFD - Investor signatories use this data to guide their investment decisions.</i></p> <p>Gold Standard: <i>Developed a standardized adaptation framework that can be used by both cities and the private sector to assess and monitor climate risks on a project-by-project basis as well as evaluate across a portfolio or SPV. One of the things we found when developing the framework was that yes you needed a standardized approach but it also had to be diversified enough that it could be used by both city adaptation projects and peri-urban agriculture projects, considering both the direct and indirect implications of climate hazards on the resilience of a city, I think this part of urban adaptation projects is often forgotten.</i></p> <p>UNDRR: <i>important to know how to quantify climate impact too.</i></p>

<p><b>Option 3:</b> Host training sessions for cities with private investors to inform them of the type of information they look for when deciding on investment potential of urban adaptation and resilience projects.</p> <p>(cont. SS3, Option 3)</p>	<p>4 </p> <p>5 </p> <p>Mobiliseyourcity: <i>My main concern would be on the content of the trainings.</i></p> <p>Gold Standard: <i>Important for cities seeking private finance for adaptation projects to understand not just the type of information they look for but also the type of private financier that they should be approaching. Private finance is too broad of a term, it includes a variety of different investors (e.g., impact funds, venture capital, adaptive technology companies, corporates with vulnerable supply chains etc.) that are all looking for different project types (e.g., resilient residential buildings, preventative healthcare technologies, resilient infrastructure) and impact narratives to invest in. Think this is often forgotten when city adaptation projects are looking for funding. We held a training with RCC this year at EURESFO that included a session on match making between adaptation projects types and categories of investors - happy to share learnings.</i></p> <p>UNDRR: <i>We did a <a href="#">training</a> that brought DRR/Climate officer and finance officer together to identify climate/disaster related projects and pitch the project to different financiers before and it helped to support cities in understanding what financiers are looking for and increasing a chance of them accessing finance. It can be linked with option 1 above.</i></p>
--	--

Enabling Environment	
Gap/Options	Voting/Comments
<p><b>EE1:</b> There is a lack of focus on policies and regulations to encourage private investment in adaptation and resilience finance. ***</p>	<p>6 </p> <p>Gold Standard: <i>Is there an opportunity here to align with the work CCFLA are doing on the enabling environment national and subnational assessments?</i></p> <p>UNDRR, placed between Gaps 1 &amp; 2: <i>One of the city's challenge in accessing innovative or private funding is also the limited national government legal and policy framework which prohibit cities to access these funds without national government consent. In many country context, it's regulated and controlled by national governments. So the dialogue should permit policy changes, etc. to set up the right enabling environment as well.</i></p>
<p><b>Option 1:</b> Develop local knowledge products on regulating land use &amp; buildings for adaptation &amp; resilience (e.g. in Brazil).</p>	<p>1 </p> <p>2 </p> <p>1 </p> <p>Unidentified: <i>Land use and buildings are key but this action might be too risky given the local specificity and political issues.</i></p>
<p><b>Option 2:</b> Convene Members working in Local contexts to discuss local policies and regulations that can encourage private investment in urban adaptation and resilience. ***</p>	<p>9 </p> <p>1 </p> <p>Lincoln Institute: <i>The role of own source revenues/government funds to mobilize additional finance for adaptation needs to be more present in these options.</i></p>

<p><b>EE2:</b> There is a lack of activities aimed at engaging cities in the development of National Adaptation Plans (NAPs) and related investment plans.</p>	<p>5 ●●●●●</p>
<p><b>Option 1:</b> Convene Members and other partners working on multilevel governance to discuss focussing on the urban content of NAPs and how to finance the urban part of these plans.</p>	<p>2 ●● 2 ●● 1 ●</p> <p>FMDV: multi-level and multi-actor country platforms and FinHubs with an emphasis on capacity building and strengthening of human resources.</p>
<p><b>Option 2:</b> Hold events and workshops focused on facilitating multilevel conversations on urban adaptation and resilience finance.</p>	<p>7 ●●●●●●● 3 ●●●</p>