

Can climate compatible development provide an alternative development pathway for the global south?

Climate compatible development (CCD) is increasingly important to policy makers as a 'triple-win' strategy, combining climate adaptation and mitigation with development (Mitchell and Maxwell, 2010). CCD characterises a development pathway in that it is multi-sector, multi-stakeholder and multi-scalar (Stringer et al, 2014). What is less clear is if in bringing together climate adaptation and mitigation with development, CCD is creating an alternative development pathway or providing a mechanism with which to connect already existing development trajectories to wider mitigation and adaptation initiatives. This is an important distinction, yet there has been little research addressing it, both conceptually and empirically.

To date much of the empirical research on CCD has been at the project level, analysing how initiatives such as climate smart agriculture are simultaneously lowering carbon emissions and improving rural livelihoods (Lipper et. al., 2014). However, there has been significantly less research on the institutional adaptation and implantation of CCD at the national level where such initiatives and policies are developed and approved (Ficklin et al, forthcoming). This is, in part, due to the complexity of contextualised framings of climate change and development issues and the diversity of how they are being integrated into policy frameworks. However, we argue that it is also because CCD is an emerging concept and there is not a clear conceptualisation of what CCD is, and how it differs from other development pathways such as 'climate resilience', 'green growth' and 'low carbon development'.

In this paper we compare and contrast the opportunities and challenges, motivations and resistance to creating an alternative CCD development pathway in Tanzania and Swaziland. The research presented draws from semi-structured interviews conducted with national policy makers and stakeholders in the NGO and private sectors working at and across multiple levels, to provide the institutional perspective of CCD that is missing in the current literature. In addition, analyses from existing and forthcoming climate adaptation, mitigation, and development policies for each country are presented. The data presented was analysed with coding software and thematic matrices to source similarities and distinctions between the two country contexts. We draw out key discourses around adaptation, mitigation and development, identify what kind of CCD is occurring, and how it

is being presented in national policies. We present further findings on stakeholder engagement, analysing how CCD is being contextually understood and practised and whose definitions and values count at different levels.

Our data suggest that CCD rhetoric in policy is in its infancy and that its component parts are framed differently in each country context. Therefore triple-win thinking with adaptation, mitigation and development is not as yet being extensively considered in policy. However, as it is emerging it is provoking questions and debate about the definitions of adaptation, mitigation and development in policy and by extension the coherence of these definitions between institutions, policies and financiers. Our data from Tanzania and Swaziland makes an interesting comparison between different contextualised national framings of climate change and development issues and how this affects the opportunities, challenges, motivations and resistance to CCD as a development pathway in two contrasting country contexts.

In analysing CCD as an alternate development pathway, this paper presents data about the conceptualisation and framing of climate change and development issues in Tanzania and Swaziland. Furthermore, it analyses how CCD rhetoric is shaping how adaptation, mitigation and development are defined in national policies and institutions, and the impacts this has on the opportunities and challenges presented by a CCD development pathway. Our analysis suggests that although CCD rhetoric is only just emerging, it is gaining traction with international financiers and national policy makers. As such further research on CCD development pathways in both national and regional contexts is required.

References

Lipper, L., P. Thornton, B.M. Campbell, T. Baedeker, A. Braimoh, M. Bwalya, P. Caron, A. Cattaneo, D. Garrity, K. Henry, R. Hottle, L. Jackson, A. Jarvis, F. Kossam, W. Ann, N. McCarthy, A. Meybeck, H. Neufeldt, T. Remington, P. T. Sen, R. Sessa, R. Shula, A. Tibu and E.F. Torquebiqu. (2014). Climate Smart Agriculture in Food Security. *Nature Climate Change* 4, 1068-1072

Mitchell, T., S. Maxwell. (2010). Defining climate compatible development, *CDKN ODI Policy Brief*, November 2010/A

Stringer, L.C., A.J. Dougill, J.C. Dyer, K. Vincent, F. Fritzsche, J. Leventon, M.P. Falcao, P. Manyakaidze, S. Syampungani, P. Powell, G. Kalaba. (2014). Advancing climate compatible development: lessons from southern Africa, *Regional Environmental Change* 14(2), 713-725, [doi: 10.1007/s10113-013-0533-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10113-013-0533-4)