

**Input by Doreen Chipika Bwalya, Principal Executive Engineer, Ministry of Transport, Works, Supply and Communication, Zambia**

- 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?**

Agreeing on a refined set of indicators, in the case of Zambia, has meant first and foremost identifying a particular climate change problem affecting the country and communities in particular. Contextualizing the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 4th Assessment output and the UNFCCC provisions processes into what is familiar at the country level in terms of impacts has been part of that process. Stakeholder consultations that facilitate exchange of views are also paramount. Prioritization of key components, including phasing the interventions, facilitates the identification of particular investment options and implementation upon which indicators and results are effectively measured.

**Problem Identification:** An identification of the cost implications of climate change to the economy is the entry point for a common understanding and this can be achieved through undertaking various studies and scoping exercises. In the case of Zambia, initial studies undertaken for the NAPA process laid the foundation for costing impacts whose results triggered stakeholder recommendations for a paradigm shift in planning and elevated climate change from environmental problem to a developmental challenge with high risks on GDP growth attainment.

**Stakeholder Consultation:** Stakeholders form a pool of expertise and a wealth of information and support of all kinds. At all levels of decision making, grass root of national knowledge exists in various forms, including indigenous, for existing adaptation solutions and new approaches from literature and good practices from international scenes. Zambia has learnt that beyond Government institutions exists stakeholders such as Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) with baseline data already for particular communities of interest and in fact poses better comparative advantage in terms of good practices that can be replicated. As such an inclusive approach strengthens a common approach at national and local community levels. As a pilot country under the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR), Zambia shares lessons but also learns from other countries on best practices.

**Prioritization of key components and phasing:** The country must, through the above process establish the problem and identify approaches including decide steps or phases to implement interventions. Zambia identified mainstreaming, institutional strengthening, awareness and communication as priority towards laying the foundation for investments.

**Investments identification and implementation:** The above processes naturally strengthened the case for investment identification and implementation modalities. Potential indicators were identified across a stream of components prioritized. Broad areas for further work were identified including agriculture, infrastructure and early warning systems. Soft issues (studies, systems, institutions) laid the foundation upon which investments (roads, canals, hardware for early warning, alternative livelihoods, e.t.c) would be undertaken as an intertwined process.

**Finally,** the key element of the question above is building a common understanding across various levels. The Climate Investment Funds through the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR) can provide best practices. Zambia has benefited immensely from the processes at the international level among pilot counties, at the national level and through working with communities. As a learning by doing process, room for refining indicators and enduring further consultations to arrive at the intended objective is the task 'champions' and support structures can deliver.

**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)?**

Mainstreaming climate change at the national level removes the intervention from an isolated project based approach to a programmatic country owned process. Mainstreaming tells policy makers and bureaucrats that development objectives face a risk of failure unless adaptive measures to handle impacts of floods and droughts are implemented. For example:

Zambia's climate is highly variable, with frequent droughts, seasonal and flash floods, extreme temperatures and dry spells. Floods and droughts have increased in frequency over the past three decades, costing the nation an estimated 0.4% in annual economic growth. These trends are expected to intensify in the future: projected temperatures are expected to increase by 3-5o C by 2100, with average precipitation declining during the early rainy season (October to December) and intensifying thereafter. In the absence of adaptation, rainfall variability alone could keep an additional 300,000 people below the poverty line over the next decade, and reduce annual GDP growth by 0.9%.

*Source: Zambia Strategic Programme for Climate Resilience (SPCR), 2011*

A national scale approach produces a consolidated risk to facilitate for interventions with national priorities, such that, though investments are at project level, their results will respond to national goals. As such, a framework that links individual assessments with national level assessments can be created through mainstreaming and establishing strong institutional structures.

In the Zambian scenario, by strengthening the national institutional and financial framework for climate resilience, the PPCR will contribute to mainstreaming climate resilience in the economically vulnerable sectors, thus promoting more effective assessments.

**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?**

To ensure successful reporting and dissemination of M&E results and allow for sharing of lessons learnt, it is vital that there is a blend of a bottom-up, participatory approach, with top-down monitoring to ensure consistency. The monitoring and reporting framework should have clear roles and responsibilities for stakeholders and also make use of existing M&E systems and reporting channels within the communities.

In the case of the PPCR, the National Climate Change Secretariat has the responsibility for overall Program (national) level monitoring and has assigned specific responsibilities for monitoring and reporting to the sub-project implementing units and the implementing partner NGOs working in each subbasin, as well as to the inter-stakeholder platforms at the national/component levels. Sub-project monitoring will also be carried out by beneficiaries using a participatory score card system. Furthermore, to ensure successful lesson sharing, the target communities will be phased to allow for learning and dissemination of knowledge.