

**Second Meeting of the Adaptation Committee  
Bonn, Germany, 5–8 March 2013**

**Draft scoping paper**

**Workshop on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation to be conducted  
by the Adaptation Committee**

### **1. Introduction**

The Adaptation Committee (AC), in its three-year work plan, 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.<sup>1</sup> It further agreed to identify recommendations and guidance for consideration by the COP, as appropriate and as needed, with a view to providing technical support and guidance to Parties, in order to facilitate the enhanced implementation of adaptation actions.

This draft scoping paper intends to serve as a basis for the AC to determine the focus, level and other aspects of the workshop, in order to ensure that the workshop is useful to Parties in implementing enhanced adaptation actions.

The paper provides an overview on monitoring and evaluation of adaptation actions (section 2), including on issues related to:

- Common concepts and approaches;
- Methodological challenges; and
- Ongoing efforts relating to the M&E of adaptation actions.

The paper concludes by outlining options for workshop focus, themes and topics, and target audiences (section 3).

### **2. Monitoring and evaluation of adaptation<sup>2</sup>**

#### **2.1 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 monitoring and evaluation of adaptation actions should thus feed 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, including:

- To assess efficiency;
- To understand equity;<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Item 14 in annex II to FCCC/SB/2012/3.

<sup>2</sup> This section 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>>.

- To provide accountability;
- To assess outcomes;
- To improve learning;
- To improve future activities or interventions;
- To compare with other similar activities or interventions.<sup>4</sup>

## 2.2 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:

- (a) The nature of adaptation, including long timescales and uncertainty associated with impacts;
- (b) A lack of agreed metrics to determine effectiveness, e.g. no agreed method to measure the reduction of vulnerability; or
- (c) 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.

## 2.3 Ongoing efforts relating to the M&E of adaptation actions

The following section provides a snapshot of ongoing M&E efforts, including frameworks and methodologies developed, evaluations undertaken 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 methodologies, completed evaluations and lessons learned for strategies and policies, and for projects and programmes. Some of the examples are further elaborated in the text.

---

<sup>3</sup> 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.

<sup>4</sup> More information on the purpose and types of evaluations is provided in Pringle, P. (2011): *AdaptME: Adaptation monitoring and evaluation*. UKCIP, Oxford, UK. Available at <<http://www.ukcip.org.uk/adaptme-toolkit>>.

| Type of action                              | Strategies and policies   | Projects and programmes   |
|---|---|---|
| <b>M&amp;E methodologies and frameworks</b> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Environmental auditing, e.g. INTOSAI's Guide "Auditing the Government Response to Climate Change: Guidance for Supreme Audit Institutions"</li> <li>National level adaptation M&amp;E in Finland, Germany and the UK</li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>GIZ's guidebook to the design and results-based monitoring of climate change adaptation projects<sup>5</sup></li> <li>UKCIP's AdaptME toolkit<sup>6</sup></li> <li>Results Based Management and Logical frameworks, e.g. GEF's Adaptation Monitoring and Assessment Tool (AMAT)</li> <li>Participatory approaches, e.g. UNDP's Vulnerability Reduction Assessment</li> </ul> |
|   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>WRI's "Making Adaptation Count. Concepts and Options for Monitoring and Evaluation of Climate Change Adaptation"<sup>7</sup></li> <li>IIED's Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD) framework<sup>8</sup></li> </ul>   |   |
| <b>Completed evaluations</b>                | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>"Adaptation to climate change – are governments prepared?" A cooperative audit by nine European Supreme Audit Institutions<sup>9</sup></li> </ul>  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>OECD's "Monitoring and Evaluation for Adaptation: Lessons from Development Co-operation Agencies"</li> <li>Portfolio evaluations of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), the Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)</li> <li>IEG of the World Bank's "Adapting to Climate Change: Assessing World Bank Group Experience"</li> </ul>  |
| <b>Lessons learned<sup>10</sup></b>         | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>M&amp;E of adaptation actions is currently largely donor or climate finance-driven, with early lessons emerging and new tools being developed that need testing</li> <li>Early lessons include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To consider M&amp;E to be a communications and learning tool</li> <li>To make use of existing M&amp;E systems to the extent possible</li> <li>To keep M&amp;E simple, as complex methods may be overly costly to implement and may not communicate well</li> <li>To build capacity and engage broadly with stakeholders at all levels and in and across all relevant sectors</li> </ul> </li> </ul> |   |

### **Methodologies and frameworks**

During the last years, a number of methodologies 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

<sup>5</sup> GIZ (2012): *Adaptation made to measure - guidebook to the design and results-based monitoring of climate change adaptation projects*. Available at <<http://star-www.giz.de/.../giz2012-0243en-climate-change-monitoring.pdf>>.

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

<sup>7</sup> 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](http://pdf.wri.org/making_adaptation_count.pdf)>.

<sup>8</sup> 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?>>.

<sup>9</sup> EUROSAT WGEA (2012): *Adaptation to climate change – are governments prepared? A joint report*. Available at <<http://bit.ly/XU5AmW>>.

<sup>10</sup> These lessons are taken from 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](http://www.adaptationpartnership.org/sites/default/files/AP_Bonn_report_FINAL_0.pdf)>.

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.<sup>11</sup> 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 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.<sup>12</sup>

While the GEF and World Bank frameworks focus strongly on monitoring, others focus more on evaluation. For example, UKCIP's AdaptME Toolkit 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.

In addition, M&E frameworks are being developed on behalf of donor 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<sup>13</sup> 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). TAMD will be piloted in Ghana, Kenya, Mozambique, Nepal and Pakistan over 2013 and 2014. Similarly, WRI 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.

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<sup>14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup>

### ***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.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>11</sup> The tool is available at <[http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking\\_tool\\_LDCF\\_SCCF](http://www.thegef.org/gef/tracking_tool_LDCF_SCCF)>.

<sup>12</sup> The results framework is available at <<https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/content/revised-ppcr-results-framework-3>>.

<sup>13</sup> More information is available at <<http://www.iied.org/how-do-we-tell-whether-climate-change-adaptation-making-headway>>.

<sup>14</sup> 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.

<sup>15</sup> The guidance material is available at <<http://www.environmental-auditing.org/Home/FocusonClimateChange/tabid/241/Default.aspx>>.

<sup>16</sup> The report is available at <[http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/content/ieg/en/home/reports/climate\\_change3.html](http://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/content/ieg/en/home/reports/climate_change3.html)>.

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. Moving away from projects, the OECD is currently reviewing M&E of adaptation at the national level in Germany, Mozambique, Nepal and the UK. Results will be presented in April 2013.

Taking into account the guidance from INTOSAI, the regional organization for Supreme Audit Institutions 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 Europeans 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 evaluated.

### **3. Options for the workshop**

Taking into account the above ongoing efforts as well as the agreed work plan of the AC, the following section discusses options for focusing the workshop, themes and topics and potential participants. It concludes by highlighting other aspects the AC may wish to consider when organizing the workshop.

#### **3.1 Focus**

This workshop on the monitoring and evaluation of adaptation is closely related to other activities of the AC's workplan, namely the "consideration of various issues and approaches in relation to means of implementation, such as monitoring adaptation programmes and projects implemented, including the funding provided and received, and providing a synthesis report to the COP; and improving coherence with regard to monitoring and evaluating adaptation activities" (Activity 19). The distinction between the M&E of action and the M&E of support is consistent with function 5 of the AC, which is to consider information communicated by Parties on their monitoring and review of adaptation actions, support provided and received.

Given that the main deliverable of the workshop, as per the AC's work plan, is the "identification of recommendations and guidance for consideration by the COP, as appropriate and as needed, with a view to providing technical support and guidance to Parties, in order to facilitate the enhanced implementation of adaptation actions", it may be appropriate to focus the workshop on the M&E of actions.

In addition, the M&E of support is also part of the work plan of the Standing Committee as it seeks the measurement, reporting and verification of the support provided to developing country Parties, including the undertaking of analyses and information exchanges. The AC may wish to consider ways to collaborate with the SC on the M&E of support for adaptation. At the same time, the AC may wish to consider adding M&E aspects to the planned workshop with relevant bilateral, regional and multilateral institutions facilitating the means of implementation (Activity 4).

#### **3.2 Themes and topics**

Before considering potential themes and topics for the workshop, it may be worthwhile to reflect on the intended purpose of the workshop. If it is meant to primarily enhance capacity and provide technical support to countries lacking behind on M&E of adaptation, it may be appropriate to have the full spectrum of M&E themes and provide stocktaking of M&E efforts to date. However, if the workshop is sought to develop recommendations for the COP, it may be appropriate to involve a limited number of leaders in the M&E of adaptation who focus on lessons learned and gaps identified. Or it could be a combination of both, taking stock of M&E efforts to date, with a view to identifying good practices, lessons learned, and gaps as a basis for recommendations for the COP.

Themes and topics that have been highlighted by previous workshops, initiatives or reports, including the 2010 UNFCCC synthesis report, for further consideration include:

- In light of the upcoming National Adaptation Plans and the multi-sectoral, multi-scale and multi-stakeholder nature of adaptation, how should monitoring and evaluation of adaptation take place? What roles and responsibilities need to be assigned, and to whom?
- How can monitoring and evaluation of adaptation make the best use of existing monitoring and evaluation systems, including existing indicators? Could these systems be used as they are, do they need to be revised or are new and additional systems required?
- Building upon early lessons, what kinds and combinations of process and outcome indicators would be most suitable?
- How can results from monitoring and reporting be reported and disseminated so as to ensure that they are fed back into the respective adaptation process but also to allow for lessons learned and good practices identified to be shared with the wider community of adaptation planners and practitioners?
- What kinds of incentives are needed to encourage not only the development of robust M&E systems but also the use of the M&E findings?
- How can a framework be created that links individual assessments with national level assessments to broaden the focus from the means of achieving outcomes (individual interventions) to the desired end result (countries' becoming less vulnerable and having more adaptive capacity)?
- How can we align our definition of success and the ways of measuring success so that funding agencies and countries/communities have shared objectives? Many adaptation activities are funded by a variety of bilateral and multilateral donors, each of which must report to and be evaluated by its own funder (bilaterals are evaluated by their congress, parliament, or treasury; multilaterals are evaluated by a board, etc.).

### **3.3 Potential participants**

Consistent with its objective, the workshop may bring together:

- Adaptation planners and implementers in the public sector at the local, national (including development agencies) and regional level;
- Independent auditors/evaluators of the public sector at the local, national and regional level;
- Adaptation planners, implementers and evaluators from non-governmental and multilateral organizations, civil society and the private sector;
- Experts from academia and research organizations.

### **3.4 Other aspects**

The AC may wish to consider other aspects, including:

- Duration and format of the workshop and the respective resource implications;
- Ways to select participants (e.g. by invitation or by expression of interest possibly through the provision of a paper);
- The involvement of external expertise (e.g. for the preparation of a background paper or providing a keynote), including "key players" in the M&E adaptation field (e.g. individuals behind the initiatives listed in the table under Section 2.3);
- Ways to develop recommendations for the COP (e.g. within the workshop by its participants, or by AC members only following the conclusion of the workshop).

---