

**Input by Kevin Petrini, UNDP Regional Climate Policy Advisor for the Pacific**

- 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?**

**Defining Climate Change in the national context**

In many instances, the countries, development agencies and communities understanding of climate resilience is not the same. The first step will be to resolve this issue. It is important to be able to contextualize what a country considers an adaptation and mitigation response. As part of the Climate Public Expenditure and institutional review (CPEIR) process being used in countries in the Asia-Pacific, the first step is to define climate change related actions. This includes the typical climate change projects and programmes from vertical funds and bilaterals, but further provides a basis for discussion around other develop actions that contribute to building climate resilience. Through this process, a country is able to define how they are responding to climate change from their own perspective. For example, in Kiribati, labor mobility is seen as an adaptation response which addresses their “migration with dignity” policy which has been approved by the President in the response to climate change. Whereas this is a key adaptation response in Kiribati, this would not be the case in most other countries. If the national level policy and associated actions to support policy are clearly articulated then, with a common understanding, we can see how projects are addressing the “additionality” as well as mainstreaming in development processes. Through identification of actions that build resilience, we can engage in a discussion around nationally appropriate indicators in line with national systems.

**Integration of Climate Change and Disaster Risk Management**

Further to the paragraph above, we cannot build climate resilience in isolation. In particular, in the Pacific, there is a shift towards disaster and climate resilient development. In this approach national and regional strategies and plans integrate the climate change and the disaster risk issues where appropriate.

**Baseline Monitoring issues to be resolved**

In most countries, there is some type of centralized M&E system to monitor progress against the national development strategies and sector policies; however, in many cases these systems will need strengthening to be able to handle the “additional” M&E associated with climate change. In the Pacific we have National Development strategies and sector policies where CC is mainstreamed, part of the Environmental aspect or in some cases not explicitly addressed (mostly in sectoral policies).

**Including national level M&E indicators into development partner monitoring systems**

As development agencies, we can include the national level indicators in our respective logframes to measure resilience. Unfortunately, in many cases, indicators which measure resilience are not in the national M& E system so this practice is currently limited.

**Community monitoring and evaluation**

Further, in the case of work that I undertook in Samoa, we used the Vulnerability Reduction Assessment (VRA) indicators to measure community adaptive capacity. It provided a subjective approach which measures the perception of the community’s vulnerability reduction. This complimented with other social, environmental and economic data can give a full picture of adaptive capacity.

- 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)?**

### **Build off national M&E systems**

National M&E systems track the national development strategies in achieving the desired outcomes. One approach is to review the current national monitoring system and identify which, if any, indicators could be used as a proxy or combined with additional information such as Household Income and Expenditure Surveys (HIES) to produce a measurement of vulnerability reduction and adaptive capacity in the national context. If new data points were necessary, the collection of this data would need to be institutionalized, not only in terms of the national monitoring system, but also in the project and programme management level to ensure that the information is captured. Addressing this at the project and programme level can be problematic if there is not set project and programme operational procedures followed by climate change projects, which is the case in many Pacific Islands. As such, a country could consider developing project and programme operations guidelines, which gives development partners, sectors and communities a process by which information on monitoring (as well as other aspects of the project and programme cycle) can be collected to track progress in both the short and long-term. Further such an approach would be in line with the fiduciary standards set out by the Adaptation Fund and would further strengthen government's aspirations toward direct access.

- 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?**

### **National Coordination Mechanisms**

Strengthening of National Coordination mechanisms and their functions on M&E and lessons learned. As required under the AF fiduciary standards, a country should be able to have M&E and project closure functions. Documenting and strengthening existing practices will allow for this information to be presented through National coordination mechanism therefore it will be documented and absorbed by the members of the committee, board, etc... who are then making decisions on behalf of the country for further adaption and mitigation options including policies, plans, programmes and projects.

### **Web-based platforms**

In the Pacific Context, we have developed a few web-based means of sharing information including the pacificdisasternet, SPREP CC portal and the Pacific Solutions Exchange; these are means of sharing national, regional and international level information in a variety of ways.

### **Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation**

At the community level it is important to integrate participatory monitoring and evaluation as part of any activity. Through this process communities gain the adaptive capacity requisite for future changes, by understanding the adaptive process itself and monitoring the changes. This way it becomes community owned. As such, community engagement in the adaptation response could be one proxy for adaptive capacity. An example is through Participatory video. It can play a role in monitoring that can "tell the adaptation story" and share lessons in a way that may be missed by indicators alone.

Many lessons learned are held in adaptation planners and practitioners' heads; therefore, it is important that this tacit knowledge is captured through national mechanisms, web-based platforms, participatory video and other means.