

Key messages from responses

Marita Manley, SPC/GIZ

Q1: Given the diverse set of indicators that currently exist to measure and evaluate adaptation, how can we build a common understanding of success in achieving climate resilience?



- Define vulnerabilities, impacts, prioritise actions – pre-requisite for defining successful adaptation and indicators
- **Adaptation is a process**
- **Context specific and dynamic** – indicators of success differ, no single measure
- Different actors, different information needs
- **Define common principles and characteristics – are common indicators necessary?**

- **Who defines success?** Who needs a common understanding?
- Do indicators capture whether resilience is equitable?
- Establish targets – qualitative and quantitative
- **More to adaptation M&E than just quantitative indicators**

- Go beyond technical fixes –**define reasons for vulnerability** e.g. inequity, lack of agency/skills to overcome challenges
- Most M&E stuck in monitoring actions – need to **monitoring impact** and assess contribution to enhancing adaptive capacity
- Do we need indicators that promote learning?
- **Pragmatism vs idealism**

Q2: 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)?



- Frameworks should be **flexible, responsive, reviewed regularly and capable of promoting learning, integrating knowledge**
- **Governance** important to support learning and information sharing
- Bottom up and top down both valuable but top down not always = sum bottom up
- Assign **responsibilities** including those involved in defining indicators
- Pragmatism vs idealism
- Link adaptation to poverty / livelihood indicators

- **Mainstreaming = vehicle** for enabling links to happen
- **Strong institutional structures needed for coordination**
- Need **communication channels** that can foster sharing and exchange
- Define criteria and requirements for any assessments conducted
- Framework needs to capture that **adaptation is a process**
- **Forums, networks**, create space for exchange
- Learn from development best practices

Q3: How can results from M&E be reported and disseminated to promote learning and identification of good practices?



- **Governance frameworks** important to support coordination and learning – outline clear roles
- Need to build **relationships and trust** – government officials, NGOs etc
- **Knowledge Management**
- **Use existing systems, data and forums for sharing**
- Promote data availability and sharing
- Need criteria for indicators

- **Learning (by who? what for?)** – often M&E systems designed without learning in mind
- Need broad range of stakeholders
- Understand the context of adaptation – and what conditions made success possible
- Create space for **reflecting**, including on failures

Key principles

- Need **criteria** for indicators
- Need dialogue and space for exchange and to reflect
- Need clear, **straightforward** structures
- Enable and encourage bottom-up feedback
- Ensure **transparency**
- Include **resources** for M&E, built in from beginning
- **Dissemination should consider target audience**

