

Input by Albert Salamanca, Research Group Leader, Political Ecology of Disaster and Risk research group, Stockholm Environment Institute, Thailand

- 1. Given the diverse set of indicators that currently exist to measure and evaluate adaptation, how can communities, countries and development and adaptation agencies build on a common understanding of success in achieving climate resilience?**

The challenge in adaptation M&E is not so much in the set of indicators itself but on whether the indicators truly represent the processes of adaptation. For instance, what indicators should be used to assess success in improving, enhancing or strengthening adaptive capacities? What indicators should be used to determine whether a project or program has instilled social learning so that such learning becomes an important contributor to the expansion of adaptive capacities? As it is right now, it appears that most M&E frameworks and indicators are at the project or program level to ensure accountability and effectiveness in project/program implementation. The question then becomes whether this is where M&E indicators is needed or is it in terms of demonstrating how interventions had enabled social learning and enhanced adaptive capacities so that households and communities are better able to adjust to the impacts of climate change?

- 2. 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)?**

For any framework to be useful, it has to address the crux of adaptation, which is enabling social learning and enhancing or strengthening adaptive capacities. In these goals, time is a critical concern. One can say that a household or community has "successfully" adapted if it has "successfully" responded to a hazard, calamity or disaster brought about by climate change. But current adaptation interventions, especially those that are donor-driven, are temporally short. So any adaptation M&E framework needs to decide whether it wants to address near-term results only or long-term outcomes?

- 3. How can results from M&E 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?**

First, good project/program designs must be built in all adaptation projects so that M&E is not just an afterthought but contribute to the evolution of learning and practice. This goes without saying that outcomes must be clearly mapped out at the beginning of the project cycle and continuously monitored and evaluated throughout. Second, impact evaluation of major

adaptation programs must be a part of project/program management to tease out truly 'good' practices. Disseminating unvetted 'good' practices will not be helpful. Also, there is a political economy context to any 'good' practice and this must be clearly understood so that those who are emulating it know the conditions upon which the 'good' practice comes about. Third, there are existing networks, forums and portals on adaptation to serve as avenues for dissemination. These must be supported. The insights from properly conducted M&E can usefully inform any discussion on adaptation. Finally, 'good' practices must not only be in terms of 'successful' interventions. Even failed ones have lessons to share so a process to encourage reflection should be enabled.