Workshop on the monitoring and evaluation of adaptation
Nadi, Fiji, 9–11 September 2013

Background note

1. Introduction

The Adaptation Committee established under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) agreed to conduct a workshop on the monitoring and evaluation (M&E) of adaptation, building on and contributing to existing processes related to this topic. The Committee further agreed to prepare a background note as input to the workshop.

The following note[1] provides an overview on the current state of the M&E of adaptation, including related to:

- Common concepts and approaches (section 2);
- Methodological challenges, including as they relate to indicators (section 3); and
- Ongoing efforts relating to the M&E of adaptation actions (section 4):
    - Tools and frameworks;
    - Evaluations undertaken;
    - Moving from the project to the national level.

Annex I provides a list of events and webinars on the M&E of adaptation organized by a range of organizations.

2. Common concepts and approaches

In light of the complexity and long-term nature of climate change and its impacts, it is essential that adaptation be designed as a continuous and flexible process and subject to periodic review. Knowledge and information gained from M&E of adaptation actions should thus be fed back into the adaptation process to ensure that future adaptation efforts are successful.

The purpose of monitoring is to keep track of progress made in implementing a specific adaptation action in relation to its objectives and inputs, which include financial resources. Monitoring enables planners and practitioners to improve adaptation efforts by adjusting processes and targets. It should be carried out during implementation, as well as during the lifetime of the adaptation action and in some cases beyond.

Evaluation is a process for systematically and objectively determining the effectiveness of an adaptation action. Evaluation can be carried out during implementation (ongoing/interim evaluation), at the completion of implementation (final evaluation), and/or some years after completion (post evaluation). Assessing effectiveness involves two questions: first, have the objectives and targets been achieved? And second, can this achievement be attributed to the adaptation measure taken? Besides determining effectiveness, evaluations may have additional purposes[2], including:

- Assessing efficiency;

---

1 This note builds upon the scoping paper on the workshop prepared for the second meeting of the Adaptation Committee. Available at <http://unfccc.int/7374.php>. It draws on the 2010 UNFCCC *Synthesis report on efforts undertaken to monitor and evaluate the implementation of adaptation projects, policies and programmes and the costs and effectiveness of completed projects, policies and programmes, and views on lessons learned, good practices, gaps and needs.* Available at <http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2010/sbsta/eng/05.pdf>.

2 Taken from Pringle, P. (2011): *AdaptME: Adaptation monitoring and evaluation*. UKCIP, Oxford, UK. Available at <http://www.ukcip.org.uk/adaptme-toolkit>. The toolkit provides further information on the purpose and types of evaluations.

- Understanding equity;[3]
- Providing accountability;
- Assessing outcomes;
- Improving learning;
- Improving future activities or interventions;
- Comparing with other similar activities or interventions.

Successful monitoring and evaluation requires two basic questions to be answered up front: what has to be monitored and evaluated (scope), and who has to monitor and evaluate it (responsibilities)? According to UNDP's Adaptation Policy Frameworks, a good M&E framework includes clearly formulated goals, objectives, and output measures and depends on the availability of quality data. A well designed M&E framework can reveal how social, economic, institutional and political factors support or impede adaptation. In this way, countries and organizations can incrementally adjust their adaptation strategies to ensure that they are increasingly effective.[4]

3. Methodological challenges

While M&E of adaptation actions often only requires the refinement of existing M&E frameworks rather than developing completely new frameworks, it faces a number of methodological challenges. These may arise from:

- The nature of adaptation, including long timescales and uncertainty associated with impacts;
- A lack of agreed metrics to determine effectiveness, e.g. no agreed method to measure the reduction of vulnerability; or
- The difficulty of attributing cause and effect.

Monitoring and evaluation of adaptation actions may take place through the use of indicators, as these can be used to compare the situation after the adaptation action was implemented with the initial conditions prior to implementation. Indicators can be used to simplify, quantify, standardize and communicate complex and often disparate data and information.

Two types of indicators are used: process indicators (that measure progress in the process of developing and implementing an adaptation action) and outcome/impact indicators (that measure the effectiveness of the adaptation action). Process indicators are often used, as it is clearly hard to evaluate successful outcomes given the above mentioned methodological challenges.

Depending on the type of adaptation measure that is being monitored and evaluated with indicators (e.g. projects or policies) challenges have varying significance. For example, developing and using indicators for projects is relatively straightforward, as many projects are undertaken within sectors where established monitoring and evaluation systems with proven indicators and associated datasets already exist. However, monitoring and evaluation of policies or strategies is more complex: it requires strong coordination across sectors and levels and is more susceptible to external factors, such as the overall regulatory and legislative environment.

4. Ongoing efforts relating to the M&E of adaptation actions

The following section provides a snapshot of ongoing M&E efforts, including tools and frameworks developed, evaluations undertaken, moving from the project to the national level and lessons learned. It does not intend to be exhaustive but seeks to illustrate the diversity of the M&E landscape.

The table below provides examples of frameworks, completed evaluations and lessons learned for strategies and policies, and for projects and programmes. Some of the examples are further elaborated in the text.

---

3 This includes the consideration of uneven distribution of impacts among different groups/communities, of varying levels of ability to engage in the design of the intervention, and of the differing needs for adaptation etc.

4 UNDP (2004). Adaptation Policy Frameworks for Climate Change: Developing Strategies, Policies and Measures. In particular technical paper 9. Available at <www.preventionweb.net/files/7995_APF.pdf>.

Type of action	Strategies and policies	Projects and programmes
M&E tools and frameworks	• Environmental auditing, e.g. INTOSAI's Guide "Auditing the Government Response to Climate Change: Guidance for Supreme Audit Institutions"	• GIZ's guidebook to the design and results-based monitoring of climate change adaptation projects[5] • UKCIP's AdaptME toolkit[6] • Results Based Management and Logical frameworks, e.g. GEF's Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) • Participatory approaches, e.g. UNDP's Vulnerability Reduction Assessment or Care's Participatory Monitoring, Evaluation, Reflection and Learning (PMERL) Manual[7]
	• WRI's "Making Adaptation Count. Concepts and Options for Monitoring and Evaluation of Climate Change Adaptation"[8] • IIED's Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD) framework[9]	
Completed evaluations	• "Adaptation to climate change – are governments prepared?" A cooperative audit by nine European Supreme Audit Institutions[10] • Various adaptation audits in Brazil, the UK and USA[11] • OECD's study of national approaches to M&E of adaptation systems in Germany, Mozambique, Nepal and the UK	• OECD's "Monitoring and Evaluation for Adaptation: Lessons from Development Co-operation Agencies" • Portfolio evaluations of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) and the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF) • Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank's "Adapting to Climate Change: Assessing World Bank Group Experience"

5 GIZ (2012): *Adaptation made to measure - guidebook to the design and results-based monitoring of climate change adaptation projects*. Available at <http://bit.ly/13lC7lO>.

6 Pringle, P. (2011): *AdaptME: Adaptation monitoring and evaluation*. UKCIP, Oxford, UK. Available at <http://www.ukcip.org.uk/adaptme-toolkit>.

7 <http://www.careclimatechange.org/files/adaptation/CARE_PMERL_Manual_2012.pdf>.

8 Spearman, M. and McGray, H. (2011): *Making Adaptation Count. Concepts and Options for Monitoring and Evaluation of Climate Change Adaptation*. Available at <http://pdf.wri.org/making_adaptation_count.pdf>.

9 Anderson, S. (2012): *TAMD: A framework for assessing climate adaptation and development effects*. IIED Briefing Paper. Available at <http://pubs.iied.org/pdfs/17143IIED.pdf?>.

10 EUROSAI WGEA (2012): *Adaptation to climate change – are governments prepared? A joint report.* Available at <http://bit.ly/XU5AmW>.

11 More information is available in the coordinated international audit on climate change *The Climate is Changing - Key Implications for Governments and their Auditors*. Available at <http://bit.ly/hPtlDs>.

Lessons learned[12]	• M&E of adaptation actions is currently largely donor or climate finance-driven, with early lessons emerging and new tools being developed that need testing.
	• Early lessons include:
	  ○ To consider M&E to be a communications and learning tool;
	  ○ To make use of existing M&E systems to the extent possible;
	  ○ To keep M&E simple, as complex methods may be overly costly to implement and may not communicate well;
	  ○ To ensure ownership by key stakeholders and beneficiaries in order to make evaluation frameworks operational and relevant;
	  ○ To apply different indicators for different purposes as no single set will capture everything adequately;
	  ○ To ensure that data are collected from reliable sources, on a regular basis and using statistically robust methodologies;
	  ○ To use a mix of quantitative, qualitative and narrative tools, including surveys and scorecards, so that results can be 'triangulated' to give the most accurate picture possible of adaptation success.
	• Gaps identified include:
	  ○ Lack of financial, human and technical resources and capacities;
	  ○ Lack of good baseline data and historical trends to allow for an analysis of effectiveness;
	  ○ Insufficient reporting and exchange of data and information, in particular when adaptation measures are implemented by a range of stakeholders across levels and sectors.

4.1 Tools and frameworks

During the last years, a number of tools and frameworks have been developed for monitoring and evaluating adaptation actions. Some of those tools are designed for a specific level or purpose (e.g. for national auditing or portfolio evaluations), while others can be applied across different levels and sectors.

For example, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and the World Bank have developed frameworks for M&E at the portfolio and project level. The GEF's Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT) seeks to measure progress toward achieving the outputs and outcomes established at the portfolio level under the LDCF/SCCF results framework for GEF-5. AMAT will be applied three times during the life of the project (approval, mid-term and completion). As projects and programmes progress, the LDCF/SCCF will have enough data points to reexamine and reassess specific indicators, and integrate changes to improve how portfolio results are tracked for adaptation.[13]

The results framework developed for the Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR) under the Climate Investment Fund (CIF) has already been revised and simplified as most pilot countries do not have the capacity to establish a complex M&E system, which would have been required under the original results framework. The revised PPCR results framework has 11 (5 core and 6 optional) instead of 22 indicators covering resilient development planning, adaptive capacity, decision making, and innovative investment approaches to reflect the expected transformation process in PPCR countries.[14] In addition, the PPCR has developed a monitoring and reporting toolkit, which consists of guidance and reporting tools (score cards and tables) for the five PPCR core indicators, two of which are to be applied at the national level while the other three at the project/programme level. The guidance elaborates for each indicator reasons for measuring, a methodology, data sources and collection, as well as responsibilities for monitoring and reporting and quality assurance.[15]

12 These lessons are taken from the previously mentioned UNFCCC report, the scoping studies concluded under the TAMD project and relevant OECD reports referred to later in the note as well as the report of the workshop "Tracking Successful Adaptation – Smart Monitoring for Good Results", which took place in Bonn, Germany on May 7 and 8, 2012, and was organized by GIZ, USAID, DFID and the Adaptation Partnership. The report is available at <http://www.adaptationpartnership.org/sites/default/files/AP_Bonn_report_FINAL_0.pdf>.

13 The tool is available at <http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF>.

14 The results framework is available at <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/revised-ppcr-results- framework-3>.

15 The toolkit and guidance are available here: <https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/measuringresults>.

Besides multilateral agencies, M&E frameworks are also being developed on behalf of bilateral development cooperation agencies, which are linking M&E adaptation with development. For example, "The Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD)" project by IIED with funding from the UK's DFID[16] takes a two-track approach by evaluating adaptation success as a combination of how widely and how well countries or institutions manage climate risks (Track 1) and how successful adaptation interventions are in reducing climate vulnerability and in keeping development on course (Track 2). The project aims at tracking adaptation progress at the macro level through identifying a small number of indicators that could be aggregated across a wide range of adaptation interventions, and that could inform high-level decision-making about the use of adaptation resources.

Similarly, WRI, on behalf of the GIZ, has developed a 6-step framework that aims to provide adaptation and development practitioners with a practical tool for developing M&E systems for tracking the success and failure of adaptation initiatives in the development context. Each step raises key design and implementation questions for practitioners to address. The framework is complemented with guidance on result-based monitoring of climate change adaptation projects.

The UKCIP's AdaptME Toolkit can be applied at different levels and in different sectors and seeks to provide practical support in evaluating adaptation progress and performance. Among others, users are supported in refining their evaluation purpose and objectives, reflecting on what they are trying to evaluate and the logic behind this, considering how progress and performance might be best measured and evaluated, prioritizing evaluation activities and recognizing that evaluations need to be proportionate to the investment in the actions being evaluated.

And finally, as governments are increasing their spending on climate change impacts, public adaptation actions have become the focus of auditing, often by Supreme Audit Institutions. These assessments provide the national parliaments with objective information to help them examine their government's public spending and performance. The International Organisation of Supreme Audit Institutions (INTOSAI)'s[17] Working Group on Environmental Auditing (WGEA) has developed guidance materials on auditing the government response to climate change, including adaptation. Among others, the guidance includes criteria for good governance in relation to climate change policy, an overview of possible risk areas and audit questions.[18]

So far the focus has mostly been on monitoring progress, however, this can be problematic if monitoring data is used to draw evaluative conclusions or when the focus is on determining why something is changing. Given that early adaptation projects, programmes and policies are nearing the end of their implementation, they could also be subjected to impact evaluation (IE). In contrast to monitoring of outcomes, impact evaluation seeks to answer whether outcomes have been caused by a measure's outputs. It involves counterfactual analysis, that is, a comparison between what actually happened and what would have happened in the absence of the adaptation measure. By measuring cause-effect relationships, impact evaluations assist in determining whether an action should be maintained and the financing scaled up or down. It can thus test the validity of specific adaptation measures.[19]

In 2010, the International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3iE) has undertaken a scoping study to provide an overview of the extent to which impact evaluation could be utilized in assessing the impact of adaptation.[20] The study looks at impact evaluations in agriculture, water resources management and social protection and highlights the potential for applying a variety of techniques. Already, the Agricultural Adaptations and Rural Development IE program (AADAPT) initiative by the World Bank shows how rigorous impact evaluations of agricultural development and adaptation interventions can be structured in Africa, Latin America and South Asia. According to AADAPT, 75 percent of the world's poor depend on rain-fed agriculture for their livelihoods

16 More information is available at <www.iied.org/how-do-we-tell-whether-climate-change-adaptation-making-headway>.

17 The INTOSAI is the international umbrella organisation for Supreme Audit Institutions. According to INTOSAI, the aim of the institutionalised framework is to promote development and transfer of knowledge, improve government auditing worldwide and enhance the professional capacities, standing and influence of member SAIs in their respective countries.

18 The guidance material is available at <http://bit.ly/19PdG7I >.

19 For more background on impact evaluation see the World Bank's Development Impact Evaluation Initiative, available at <http://go.worldbank.org/1F1W42VYV0>.

20 Available at <www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer/2012/05/07/Working_Paper_7.pdf>.

and climate change impacts are expected to increase farmers' vulnerability. While new technologies can provide effective coping strategies, creating incentives for farmers to adopt these often expensive production inputs presents a substantial operational challenge. Impact evaluation provides analytical tools to understand these operational issues. By testing alternative implementation arrangements designed to enhance farmers' incentive to adopt new technology, impact evaluation provides scientific evidence on what interventions deliver results on the ground.[21]

In addition, IFAD is planning to apply rigorous impact evaluation methodologies for projects under its Adaptation for Smallholder Agriculture Programme (ASAP). Impact evaluation is meant to address a number of issues, from the cost-effectiveness of adaptation measure, to reasons for good practices not being scaled up; identification of incentives to take up climate smart good practices, role of autonomous versus planned adaptation intervention, role of social issues in adaptation and many more. A first step, as identified by IFAD, is the need to unpack the definition of 'resilience', what does it look like in terms of specific and measurable indicators.[22]

In light of the increasing demand for robust M&E frameworks, more tools and methodologies are under preparation. For example, the UNFCCC Least Developed Countries Expert Group (LEG) will develop a detailed tutorial on the monitoring and evaluation systems, for use by the LDCs in their national systems and a tool for the monitoring and evaluation of progress, effectiveness and gaps in the formulation and implementation of National Adaptation Programmes of Actions and National Adaptation Plans at the national level.[23] Likewise, UNEP's PROVIA is embarking on developing a science-based approach to M&E of adaptation to provide support to practitioners who are looking for such advice and guidance. And finally, on behalf of the OECD, WRI and IIED are exploring methodological approaches to the M&E of adaptation. Work will focus on significant lessons from early practice of adaptation M&E and from other fields of M&E hoping to build on lessons learned.

4.2 Evaluations undertaken

Most of the evaluations so far have been undertaken by funders of adaptation actions and focused on portfolios and projects. For example, the Independent Evaluation Group of the World Bank has assessed the World Bank Group's experience on adaptation. This evaluation drew lessons from World Bank Group experience with adaptation to both current levels of climate variability and ongoing climate change. Besides recent adaptation-specific projects, it reviewed the impact of longer-standing efforts to deal with climate variability, for instance via drought relief, sustainable land management, and flood control. The report concluded that current results frameworks are not outcome-oriented and risk emphasizing spending over results. According to the IEG, it is not possible to meaningfully measure spending on adaptation.[24]

In 2011, the OECD undertook a first empirical assessment of M&E frameworks used by development co-operation agencies for projects and programmes with adaptation-specific or adaptation-related components. It analyzed 106 project documents across six bilateral development agencies. The report calls for complementing individual project and programme evaluations with overall assessments of trends in the country's vulnerability to climate change. According to the OECD, a framework for linking individual assessments with national level assessments could help to broaden the focus from the means of achieving outcomes (individual interventions) to the desired end result (countries' becoming less vulnerable to climate change). By doing so, the combination of country-level monitoring and project level M&E should highlight the issues of whether the overall level of action is sufficient, how the distribution of vulnerability is changing and whether the composition of interventions is coherent.

Taking into account the guidance from INTOSAI, the regional organization for Supreme Audit Institutions (SAI) on the European level (EUROSAI WGEA) undertook a cooperative audit on adaptation involving the SAIs of Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Malta, the Netherlands, Norway, Russia and Ukraine, and the European Court of Auditors. The audit showed that governments are not sufficiently prepared for the expected impacts of climate change and do not have adequate actions in place to deal with these unavoidable negative effects. The Dutch audit, for example, concluded that climate adaptation policy as a whole is not coordinated, monitored or

21 More information is available at <http://go.worldbank.org/M5F3GPO6O0>.

22 More information is available ar <http://ifad-un.blogspot.com.ar/2012/09/rigorous-impact-evaluations-are-much_20.html>.

23 The LEG report is available at b<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2013/sbi/eng/08.pdf>.

24 The report is available at <http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/content/ieg/en/home/reports/climate_change3.html>.

evaluated. Outside Europe, for example, reports on adaptation from the U.S. Government Accountability Office, focused on government-wide strategic planning and noted the need for a national strategic plan that will guide the US' efforts to adapt to a changing climate, including defined federal priorities.[25] A recent report examined (1) the impacts of climate change on roads and bridges, wastewater systems, and NASA centers; (2) the extent to which climate change is incorporated into infrastructure planning; (3) factors that enabled some decision makers to implement adaptive measures; and (4) federal efforts to address local adaptation needs, as well as potential opportunities for improvement. Similarly, the Brazilian Federal Court of Accounts audited adaptation measures in the agriculture and livestock sector, coastal zones and in the Brazilian semiarid region regarding water security.[26]

4.3 Moving from M&E of adaptation projects and programmes to comprehensive M&E systems for adaptation at the national level

In 2013, the OECD reviewed national M&E systems for adaptation in Germany, Mozambique, Nepal and the UK to identify lessons learned and to inform the future development of adaptation policies and programmes accordingly. The OECD observed that the German and the UK M&E frameworks are structured around a limited number of priority adaptation areas considered particularly important in the context of adaptation and where there is scope for action. The frameworks do not include an assessment of the political enabling environment needed to facilitate the adaptation process. Instead, they examine if the integrated approach to adaptation contributes to more climate resilient societies. In contrast, in Nepal all development initiatives – including those focusing on adaptation – are subject to national monitoring mechanisms, tracking progress in implementing agreed activities. In parallel, adaptation initiatives implemented with support from development partners have their own M&E frameworks. The OECD further highlighted that there are differences in the objectives and constraints faced by the M&E systems in the different countries. For example, there are no baselines or targets in the indicator systems in Germany and the UK, which instead make use of trend analysis. Both Germany and the UK have followed similar timescales to develop their M&E frameworks and to get them operational. Although they adopted their legal frameworks in 2008, the first assessments are not expected until 2015. This contrasts with the timescales and pressures faced by developing countries such as Nepal or Mozambique, as they seek to analyze effectiveness and value for money.[27]

The OECD further investigated M&E frameworks for adaptation in developed countries as part of its 2013 analysis of national adaptation planning in OECD countries.[28] Among the key challenges identified by the report is measuring and assessing whether plans or strategies are reducing countries' vulnerability to climate change. According to OECD, the limited progress in designing and implementing M&E frameworks partially reflects the high-level nature of many adaptation strategies, which are not always sufficiently detailed to enable assessments of progress. However, even countries with plans specifying actions, responsibilities and timescales are at an early stage with M&E. However, some promising and replicable approaches are being developed in a small number of OECD countries, including Finland, France, Germany and the United Kingdom.

The OECD also emphasized the importance of ensuring that the results from M&E assessments are fed into the development and evolution of national adaptation programmes. According to OECD, this requires both continuous learning (such as regularized assessments or periodic reviews) and feedback mechanisms that outline how M&E results (as well as new information) will contribute to ongoing planning and implementation processes. To facilitate continuous learning and feedback into policy development, some OECD countries like the UK, France or Denmark have provided a statutory basis for periodic reviews.

With regard to M&E frameworks in developing countries, the TAMD project mentioned above has analyzed M&E systems as part of undertaking scoping studies in its project countries. The scoping phase established that frameworks for monitoring and evaluating adaptation and development across sectors and interventions are not in use. Even though some of the countries are taking on large-scale adaptation investments, no cross-intervention evaluative frameworks currently exist. Several countries are, however, beginning to address issues of coordinating M&E and strengthening relevant systems and institutions. For example in Ghana an M&E plan

[25] Additional information, including the various reports are available at <www.gao.gov/key_issues/climate_change_response/issue_summary#t=0>.

[26] The reports are available here: <www.environmental-auditing.org/tabid/126/CountryId/410/Default.aspx>.

[27] The final report will become available here <http://www.oecd.org/env/cc/adaptation.htm>.

[28] Mullan, M. et al. (2013), *National Adaptation Planning: Lessons from OECD Countries*, OECD Environment Working Papers, No. 54, OECD Publishing. Available at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/5k483jpfpsq1-en>.

has been drawn up that includes the development of an institutional framework for coordinating the M&E system as a whole. The plan also aims to establish monitoring indicators against the Adaptation Strategy baselines and targets.[29]

While developed countries face difficulties in establishing M&E systems as shown in the OECD report, developing countries face even more constraints as exemplarily shown in the TAMD scoping studies and exploratory case studies of African M&E systems by the Clear Initiative.[30] The exploratory case studies concluded that monitoring is still dominant and mostly donor-driven, but that there is evidence of increasing evaluation practice and endogenous demand from African governments for country-led M&E systems. Government evaluation systems are either in an early stage of development, or are not being developed at all. In all countries examined two key challenges for implementing evaluation include invoking demand from politicians, while also drawing on in-country quality evaluation capacity. According to the study, where M&E systems are being developed, there are:

- Well-positioned individual and institutional champions across the system;
- Incentives that link performance data, monitoring information and evaluation recommendations to resource allocation that is results orientated; and finally
- Commissioning of appropriate evaluations that use the recommendations, rather than focusing on monitoring.

[29] Summary report and country reports are available at <www.iied.org/tracking-adaptation-measuring-development>.

[30] The case studies can be found here <www.theclearinitiative.org/african_M&E_cases.pdf>.

Annex 1. Examples of relevant meetings on M&E of adaptation

Date and place	Title of the meeting	Organizer
7-8 May 2012, Bonn, Germany	Tracking Successful Adaptation – Smart Monitoring for Good Results	GIZ, USAID, DFID and the Adaptation Partnership
26 February-1 March 2013, Kathmandu, Nepal	Adaptation M&E panel session at the 2013 Evaluation Conclave	SEA Change[31]
22-23 April 2013, Paris, France	Meeting of the OECD Joint DAC-EPOC Task Team on Climate Change and Development Co-operation with sessions on National level M&E of adaptation and methodological challenges to M&E of adaptation	OECD
2-3 May 2013, Washington, DC, USA	Program for PPCR M&E Specialists during the PPCR pilot country meeting	Administrative Unit Climate Investment Funds
29-30 August 2013, London, UK	Scientific approaches to the M&E of climate adaptation	PROVIA, UNEP and IIED

[31] SEA Change is a virtual Community of Practice focused on the monitoring and evaluation of climate change interventions in Asia, and beyond. On a regular basis they organize webinars on topics related to M&E of adaptation. Webinars can be accessed here <http://www.seachangecop.org/webinars>.