

Input by Soojeong Myeong, Korea Adaptation Center for Climate Change, Korea Environment Institute, Korea**National Adaptation Policy of Korea**

The first National Adaptation Plan (NAP) of Korea was established in 2010 and is currently being implemented over the years 2011-2015. The NAP is a medium term road map for 10 sectors and contains 78 adaptation actions developed by multiple ministries such as the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Health and Welfare, and the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport. It was slightly revised when the results of the analysis of the recent climate change scenarios were provided by Korea Meteorological Administration in 2012. Monitoring and evaluation of the NAP are designed to be conducted by the implementing ministries for self-examination and are focused on the implementation progress of each project for now. The Ministry of Environment gathers all the M&E information as a coordinator for the NAP.

Local adaptation plans were established for the prioritized adaptation action at the provincial level over 2011 and 2012. Detailed local adaptation plans at the county level will be developed in the near future.

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?

To monitor and understand the success of achieving climate resilience, climate resilience needs to be defined first. IPCC (2012) defines resilience as 'The ability of a system and its component parts to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner, including through ensuring the preservation, restoration, or improvement of its essential basic structures and functions'.

Therefore, it is necessary to develop (an) efficient indicator(s) which can reflect the status of the basic structure and function of a system (or society) to examine climate resilience for common understanding. Then, the monitoring results needs to be shared and the understanding of the results should be communicated in an open environment.

However, the success of M&E depends on the availability of data. If there is an existing statistical data set, it will be easy. Otherwise, collecting new data in a consistent format is required, which can be a burden in adaptation. Data unavailability can be one of the limitations for actual monitoring and evaluation.

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 necessary to develop both specific and aggregated indicators for M&E to examine the adaptation process in multi-dimension. An individual adaptation project needs its own indicators for

monitoring. However, in a big picture, M&E should be able to reflect the overall vulnerability and resilience of a nation in order to reflect the progress for the national adaptation goal which is generally countries' becoming less vulnerable and having more adaptive capacity.

Therefore, it would be an efficient way to develop a framework using a combination of indicators such as climate performance index; which consists of the trend, level, policy, and overall score. The overall resilience at the country level can be monitored and evaluated using a combination of a few prioritized individual indicators.

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 disseminate the results of individual assessment to the national level, communication is crucial. Efforts to reach out other groups are important in adaptation. Therefore, it is necessary to establish an open platform for communication. This platform should be both horizontal and vertical, i.e., cross-sectoral or cross-ministerial and throughout different levels of implementing entities (community, local, municipal, state or provincial, national, regional, and international). Related information can be shared through websites, newsletters, meetings, etc.

Lessons from M&E results need to be drawn to improve the next adaptation process because eventually the results of M&E should be able to be used as instruments to achieve the fundamental goals of adaptation. An entity that provides lessons from the analysis of M&E results would be helpful for this feedback process.