

Input by Nicolina Lamhauge, Policy Analyst, Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)**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?**

For M&E of adaptation, it is important to distinguish between regular monitoring and periodic in-depth evaluation. Monitoring of adaptation initiatives will always be context specific since successful implementation of an intervention will depend on the specific characteristics of the area in which it is implemented and the potential risks these can pose on project or programme outcomes. Depending on the approach used, regular monitoring can generate valuable lessons on what aspect of the intervention are effective in achieving set objectives. This can usefully inform subsequent stages of the implementation and possible scale-up. However, given the primary objective of monitoring indicators to guide the implementation process in a given context, it is difficult (if not impossible) to identify a common set of indicators at the international level.

The PPCR has identified five core indicators that all pilot countries, with support from the multilateral development banks, will report on. Three of these focus on the effectiveness of PPCR support in reducing climate resilience in the pilot countries (number of people supported, the extent of use of PPCR supported tools, and the quality and extent of development of climate instruments and models). The remaining two indicators focus on the degree of integration of climate change in national planning processes and evidence of strengthened government capacity to mainstream climate resilience.

At the national level, however, a more useful measure of success in achieving climate resilience may be to focus on if the country over time is becoming less vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and if it is on course to achieving set national adaptation objectives. In developed country contexts, emerging approaches to M&E of adaptation primarily focus on whether the country's climate vulnerability is changing over time. This reflects the difficulty of measuring the impact of adaptation initiatives given their integrated approach to adaptation and the long time horizon of climate change. The choice of indicators for measuring such trends is to a large extent informed by the data available. While many developed countries have an established practice of collecting socio-economic and environmental data, the availability of similar data is often limited in developing countries, especially those that have experienced extended periods of conflict. Data availability must be complemented by technical and human capacity to effectively use the information for monitoring and evaluation.

Given the contextual nature of both monitoring and evaluation of adaptation it is crucial that a common understanding of success is based on a set of measures that are applicable across geographic scales and over time. In doing so, it may be helpful to examine the processes that have informed the Millennium Development Goals, the Sustainable Development Goals and other similar indices. Possible measures to consider include e.g. the percentage of households whose disposable income is adversely affected by climate change; the proportion of premature deaths related to the climate; the proportion of properties at risk of flooding; and the proportion of a country's GDP vulnerable to climate change. Some of these are currently included as optional indicators in the PPCR results framework.

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)?

Although a country's adaptation initiatives often consist of a large number of stand-alone projects and programmes, a national level M&E framework must provide an overall assessment of the country's climate vulnerability or resilience profile. Such an assessment will for example reflect the impact of land use planning, water initiatives, governance processes and so on, many of which do not have an explicit adaptation component but nonetheless play an important role in enhancing climate resilience.

However, since many developing countries rely on support from development and climate partners to achieve their adaptation objectives, there may be a temptation to align national level M&E frameworks to the reporting requirements of these partners. This approach contradicts the increasing emphasis of adaptation planning to take an integrated approach to adaptation.

From experience to date, it has not been possible to effectively link the reporting mechanisms at the project and programme level with national level assessments. Instead, national level frameworks focus on assessing changes in climate vulnerability over time. These are complemented by standard government audits that assess value-for-money. In some cases, the effectiveness of specific programmes may be evaluated. In developing countries this is often done by implementing agencies rather than national authorities. For this information to become available at the national level, good communication and regular stakeholder engagement are crucial.

3. How can results from monitoring and evaluation 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?

The process for lessons learned to be incorporated into on-going and subsequent adaptation initiatives and for them to be shared with the wider community are separate processes. In order for lessons learned to inform respective adaptation processes, this must be an integral component in the project or programme design from the outset. It is the accumulation of a large number of adaptation and other development interventions that over time reduce countries' resilience to climate change. For each of these, it is useful to understand how certain outcomes were achieved, what approaches were successful and which ones were not. An attempt, however, to centralise the findings from all of these may not necessarily contribute to an effective exchange of lessons learned given the wealth of information.

Instead, the establishment of focused communities of practice may be more helpful. However, in order for these to become valuable sources of information they must be clearly differentiated at the project and programme level on the one hand and the national and regional level on the other. At the national level, either a co-ordination unit or an independent assessment body would be well placed to bring together lessons learned on different approaches that have proven to be effective in achieving set objectives. At the project and programme level, a further thematic breakup of knowledge platforms may be needed in order to facilitate the exchange of lessons learned.