Input by Marianne Karlsen, Senior Adviser, Ministry of Environment, Norway

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?

A precondition to be able to provide sensible input to such a complex question is to narrow it down by asking WHO will provide the information to build this information? All actors could and should, but in the context of UNFCCC, it is the countries who are responsible for reporting. Below takes therefore the point of departure that countries are responsible to obtain and to communicate its adaptation process that would contribute to a common understanding of "what works - and what doesn't". Let me also initially refer to the IPCC since the IPCC is the common reference framework for all actors.

I don't believe it is feasible or necessarily desirable to create a structured set of indicators to achieve a common understanding of what drives the success of adaptation. Firstly - what is success? It means different things to different people and depending on the power structures in a place we may find that some groups' or people's perception of success will define success that leaves out key issues and people. Secondly you would need a common understanding of climate resilience which at best is possible to define in a national context.

However what may be a more attractive way of capturing "what works on the ground" would be to elaborate a framework around a way to accumulated experiences (practical examples) that takes the point of departure of a set of guiding questions that opens for flexible ways of responding. These questions need to be guided by a quality assurance system on how countries obtain this information - the process of collecting the information is in many ways equally important as the information itself.

Based on information from countries it would be necessary to develop analytical tools at international level, including review processes of how countries have responded. Under UNFCCC we do have systems for this already, but there is a need to strengthen and focus the existing systems to accommodate this.

This "bottom up" approach would then have to be accompanied by a structured way of feeding back to countries. For parties under the convention there are ample arenas already existing to this effect. However there seems to be a gap in how international organizations, institutions, development agencies and non-governmental organizations both contribute as well as take part in the accumulated knowledge about adaptation. There might be means to bridge these gaps under the convention and outside the convention, but there are limits to this as well, including how willing different actors are to align and coordinate.

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)?

It is always difficult to link the outcome of one intervention to a result at a general level if there is no direct link between the outcome and the desired result. The time issue is an additional obstacle for all adaptation activities. For many adaptation interventions such as building adaptive capacity a link will be very difficult to establish. Again relying on a fixed set of quantitative indicators alone might be less than helpful. In my opinion this would drive adaptation interventions into easily measurable projects, that is adaptation specific (f. ex. building seawalls) - easy to measures and, yes, it does protect against higher storm surges. Actions that address the drivers of vulnerability of those living behind the seawall would however not be easily captured in this approach. There is a need for a qualitative approach to capture which and how development activities contribute to adaptive capacity. To do this I believe it is important to move a step back and look at M&E from a more holistic perspective, linking the single activities into a broader adaptation process. The first attempts to do this under the Convention is the NAP process, which provides a framework that facilitates a link between the overall development framework, adaptation and adaptation activities in different areas. This to my opinion may provide a framework for linking individual actives to overall adaptation processes. And since the NAP process is reiterative and allows activities to link up to a national M&E system this may provide a platform also for ensuring that countries learn what works and what doesn't. For example if vulnerability assessments are being conducted regularly this would be a way to identify changes in vulnerability patterns and may establish linkages between adaptation efforts and changes in vulnerability (being cognizant that vulnerability may change for all other reasons than adaptation). This approach does not guarantee the results however - not in any country or under any circumstances. It also takes a lot of time to develop such a system and fast tracking such systems through donordriven frameworks has yet to be proved efficient and effective in any area. Finally when identifying systems for capturing results from outcomes at activity level using existing systems must be the guiding principle.

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?

This has to be a responsibility at national level. Information needs vary greatly across sectors, levels and actors. Hence information needs to be "tailor made" and targeted to different stakeholders and groups in different ways to be effective. There are many ways of doing this, but one lesson we have learned in Norway is that if you target all in your information strategy - you will be relevant for none. This would mean that general web portals for example or general publications to "all" may not be the most efficient way to communicate.