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I. Introduction

Adaptation to climate change takes a variety of forms, and can be done at different scales. Adaptation efforts can be discrete, or mainstreamed into sectors. Due to this diversity of forms adaptation can take, there is no universal metric for measuring success. Despite this, we need to be able to ensure that adaptation efforts are collectively decreasing the vulnerability of countries to climate change impacts. Systems to track, monitor and evaluate progress made on adaptation (referred to as M&E systems) help ensure this. Specifically, M&E systems can be used for one or more of the following goals:

- To ensure accountability: to funders, and to beneficiaries
- To evaluate and ensure effectiveness: so we know what we are implementing is working
- To assess efficiency: to determine the benefit of the intervention in the context of costs and risk
- To support project and program management: and correct course where need be
- To learn: about what works, share it, and scale it up

The design of a given M&E system depends on not only its purpose but also the scale at which it is to be implemented. Under the Green Climate Fund (GCF) Readiness Programme, Fiji has indicated interested in developing a system that helps track the progress of its adaptation projects across scales:

- At the local level: monitor whether individual adaptation projects are proceeding according to plan and achieving results
- At the national level: assess whether its national adaptation plan and national development plan are achieving their adaptation-related results
- At the international level: report on the collective performance of numerous adaptation projects / programs in Fiji as part of donor portfolios

To this end, WRI proposes a multi-scale M&E framework that helps coordinate, monitor, and enable successful adaptation. The framework provides a strategic map for how these adaptation needs can be achieved across scales. The framework outlines how adaptation projects can be scaled up and strategically aligned with national level plans and policies, and how national level plans and policies can include adaptation and be supportive of achieving adaptation gains. It ensures that the development context is well accounted for, builds off existing policies and plans, and includes simple and user-friendly guidance on implementation.

The M&E framework proposed and the organization of this report mirror the needs identified above:

- **Enabling effective adaptation** at the project level
- **Assessing and ensure progress** at both the project and national level
- **Enabling reporting** at the national and international levels

Understanding and coherently communicating about the full spectrum of adaptation activities within a country is a challenging task, and the framework helps put into place the pieces that are necessary for this puzzle. While it aims to ultimately enable communication about national level progress on adaptation, it does not provide specific guidance on how this communication should be made. This will depend on what is most appropriate and useful in the Fijian context. Finally, being part of the GCF Readiness Programme, this framework explicitly considers connections with the current proposed GCF performance measurement framework for adaptation.
II. Overview of the proposed adaptation M&E system for Fiji

This section provides an overview of what we are proposing: a conceptual M&E framework for Fiji (Figure 1) and a snapshot of the proposed guidance associated with each component of the framework (Table 1). Section III then provides detailed guidance for each component of the framework. This guidance is in the form of tools, scorecards, methodologies, or processes.

The intention of the framework and associated guidance is to provide the Government of Fiji with a system to coordinate, monitor, and enable successful adaptation at scale. This framework and the associated guidance are intended to help different audiences who will have different roles to play in achieving successful adaptation in Fiji.

The framework has three levels: project, national, and international. The term “project” has been used instead of “local” or “sub-national” because while we recognize that projects can be at the national scale, but this guidance assumes that many of Fiji’s adaptation projects are and will be at the local or sub-national scale (and this is why guidance on achieving scale is included in the framework).

Figure 1 graphically depicts the different components of the framework. The flow of the framework begins at the bottom with the blue section on projects, moves up to the green section that connects the project and national levels, and moves further up to the national level where all the information needs to be gathered and processed in order to be communicated nationally and internationally.

Table 1 builds off the framework in Figure 1 to highlight the guidance for each component of the framework, the responsible individual or organization, and the output that can be expected from using this guidance. It also links to the section and page numbers where this guidance can be found.

Project level: Enabling Effectiveness

In order to ensure that a country is becoming more resilient to climate change overall, Fiji needs to ensure that projects are enabling effective adaptation – i.e. projects are successfully achieving adaptation outcomes, not just activities and outputs. The components of the framework and related guidance are intended to enable adaptation projects to achieve outcomes. However, individual adaptation projects are not adequate to address the impacts of climate change.

Link between project and national level: Assessing and Ensuring Progress

In order to ensure national progress on adaptation Fiji needs to move beyond a series of individual, small-scale projects. The framework therefore explicitly links the project and national levels, providing guidance to enable projects to scale up and be linked with Fiji’s existing national climate change strategies, and guidance to ensure that national level development policies and plans can effectively support achievement of adaptation goals.

National level: Enabling Reporting

In order to understand progress being made on adaptation, learn what is working and why, and share these lessons learned both nationally and internationally, Fiji requires a national level mechanism to coordinate data and information about adaptation. The framework includes a dedicated place for this to occur, and the creation of a data management system for Fiji’s adaptation projects is the first step towards learning from and reporting on adaptation progress.
Figure 1: Conceptual framework for the proposed adaptation M&E system for Fiji

INTERNATIONAL LEVEL
- Donors, UNFCCC, other countries

NATIONAL LEVEL
- Mainstreaming adaptation and ensuring development policies and plans support adaptation (2b)
- Ensuring the national picture of its adaptation is greater than the sum of projects (2a)
- Coordinating adaptation efforts, gathering data for learning and sharing (3)

PROJECT LEVEL
- Project-level adaptation M&E (1b)
- A development-based approach to project level adaptation M&E (1a)

FUNCTIONS OF THE M&E SYSTEM
- 1 ENABLING EFFECTIVENESS
- 2 ASSESSING AND ENSURING PROGRESS
- 3 ENABLING REPORTING
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>M&amp;E System Function</th>
<th>M&amp;E System Guidance</th>
<th>Output of Guidance</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
<th>Section and Page Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project level</td>
<td>Enabling Effectiveness</td>
<td>A development-based approach to project level adaptation M&amp;E</td>
<td>An adaptation synopsis of each project, specifically a list of adaptation outcomes that are based within the development context</td>
<td>Project designers and implementers</td>
<td>Section 1a. Page 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Project-level adaptation M&amp;E</td>
<td>A detailed M&amp;E plan to achieve the adaptation outcomes identified for the project</td>
<td>Project designers and implementers</td>
<td>Section 1b. Page 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link between project and national levels</td>
<td>Assessing and Ensuring Progress</td>
<td>Tool for assessing scaling potential (Chaudhury, M. et al. 2016)</td>
<td>A scaling synopsis for each project, specifically an evidence table that can highlight how the M&amp;E plan can enable scaling</td>
<td>Project designers and implementers</td>
<td>Section 2a.i. Page 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Guidance on linking projects to the National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy</td>
<td>A simple checklist to ensure that projects are delivering outputs in line with the objectives laid out in Fiji’s National Adaptation Climate Change Strategy</td>
<td>Project designers and implementers</td>
<td>Section 2aii. Page 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mainstreaming adaptation and ensuring development policies and plans support adaptation (Source: Brooks N. et al. 2013)</td>
<td>A set of eight scorecards, each on a different climate risk management indicator</td>
<td>Depends on broader institutional arrangement - TBD</td>
<td>Section 2b. Page 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National level</td>
<td>Enabling Reporting</td>
<td>Coordinating adaptation efforts and gathering data for learning</td>
<td>A data management system to track and learn from all Fiji’s adaptation projects (to be developed later in the project)</td>
<td>Depends on broader institutional arrangement - TBD</td>
<td>Section 3. Page 17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Guidance on using the proposed framework

Beginning from the bottom, this section begins with guidance on enabling effectiveness at the project level. The section moves on to processes that ensure progress on adaptation by linked efforts on adaptation at the project and national levels, and finally on to the national level. At the national level the framework focuses on coordinating adaptation efforts and gathering data for learning (specific guidance on this is to be developed later in this project). The data and lessons gathered at the national level will ultimately enable Fiji to report on its adaptation progress at the international level.

1. Project level: Enabling Effectiveness

Projects, often being the “unit of analysis” for adaptation, need to be well thought-out to deliver adaptation benefits that make sense in the larger development context. Adaptation and development are closely linked, but do not necessarily achieve the same outcomes: development can increase the adaptive capacity of individuals and thereby have adaptation benefits, but not all development automatically increases adaptive capacity.

For adaptation, a focus on the negative climate impacts on development is necessary to arrive at the adaptation needs and the outcomes that a project can deliver. Section 1a proposes a “development-based approach” to project-level adaptation M&E. This means the approach couches adaptation goals and gains within the broader development context of the country, and explicitly recognizes the close connection that development and adaptation efforts and gains share.

The final step of the development-based approach in section 1a is to create an M&E plan to achieve the adaptation outcomes identified through the eight step process. Section 1b provides an overview of several existing M&E methodologies that can be used to create an M&E plan, in the event that the project is not already prescribed a specific M&E methodology by a donor and requires assistance in choosing from the variety of methodologies available.

1a. A development-based approach to project level adaptation M&E

The following 8 steps guide project implementers through a process of arriving at the key building blocks necessary to undertake M&E for an adaptation project in a way that ensures the adaptation project is well situated within the development context, that adaptation gains build off development gains, and that development gains are not undermined by climate change impacts.

The eight step approach described below can be used for all Fiji’s adaptation projects, even for those projects that will come with their own set of adaptation M&E processes and criteria that are determined by the donor of the project, as developing an M&E plan to achieve the outcomes of the project is only in the last step of this eight step process.

The individual/s responsible for undertaking this are project implementers, at the start of a new adaptation project. The output of this guidance is an adaptation synopsis of each project that ensures it is based within the development context. Specifically: a set of adaptation statements of benefit, descriptors of each project: type, scale, differential vulnerability, the M&E purpose of the project, list of adaptation outcomes, and M&E plan to achieve the outcomes.
1. **Describe the development context within which adaptation benefits will be delivered**

E.g.: A remote community has very poor water access and households spend a great deal of time and effort transporting water to the home for household and kitchen garden use. Limited access to water often means kitchen gardens are not as productive as they could be, and households are quite food insecure.

2. **Create a development statement of benefits the project intends to support**

E.g.: A project to pipe water to this community will enable households to use the time previously spent transporting water on profitable activities. In addition, increased access to water will increase the productivity of the kitchen gardens and increase food security. Additional benefits include improved hygiene and health.

3. **Describe the impacts of climate change that will negatively impact the development statement of benefits that the project intends to support**

E.g.: Projections show that the source of water, from where it will be piped, is in an area that will experience increased rainfall variability and increased intensity and volume when it does rain. Despite the piped connection, the households in the community may face an overall reduction in water availability due to increasingly variable rainfall. In addition, the pipes may not be able to withstand high volumes of water when there is intense rainfall.

4. **Create an adaptation statement of benefit the project intends to achieve**

E.g.: This project aims to ensure continuous water availability and access, and thereby food security, to this community despite the negative impacts of climate change. The project will help the stakeholders of the community assess, prioritize and implement actions from a set of adaptation options, such as finding alternative sources of water, building water storage infrastructure, and storm-proofing the pipe system.

5. **Describe the adaptation project**

Using the simple lists below will help project designers and implementers characterize their adaptation projects. Doing so can help better conceptualize the adaptation purpose and outcomes of the project, as well as the M&E system that is most suitable for the project.

**Type:**
- To build adaptive capacity
- To deliver adaptation actions
- Both

**Scale:**
- Household
- Village
- District
- Multiple districts i.e. sub-national
- National
Explicit consideration of differential vulnerability:

- Gender
- Age
- Poverty
- Minority status
- Any other disadvantage, specific to the context

6. Describe the M&E purpose of the adaptation project

Choosing one or more purposes from the following list:

- To ensure accountability: to funders, and to beneficiaries
- To evaluate and ensure effectiveness: so we know what we are implementing is working
- To assess efficiency: to determine the benefit of the intervention in the context of costs and risk
- To support project and program management: and correct course where need be
- To learn: about what works, share it, and scale it up

7. Create a list of potential adaptation outcomes from the project

E.g.: Despite the negative impacts of climate change, the households in this community have continuous and secure water access and availability throughout the year, which increases their food security. Increased food security increases their capacity to respond to external shocks and adapt to changing circumstances.

8. Create a plan to achieve the outcome(s)

- Create a logic model or theory of change for the project
- Clearly identify project inputs, activities, outputs and their links to the outcome(s) identified in the previous step
- List indicators that will enable those undertaking the M&E to assess whether the adaptation outputs and outcomes identified are being achieved

1b. Project-level adaptation M&E guidance

In order to implement step 8 above, this section provides guidance on existing good practice on project-level M&E for adaptation projects. This guidance highlights available M&E methodologies from reputable organizations around the world. It is a sub-set of a larger synthesis analysis of M&E methodologies in the publication “Monitoring & Evaluation for climate change adaptation and resilience: A synthesis of tools, frameworks and approaches” (Bours, D., McGinn, C. and Pringle, P. 2014). This publication provides a detailed yet succinct overview of each of the methodologies (and others not included here), and is a good resource for additional information on the topic of choosing between different sets of guidance.

The individual/s responsible for undertaking this piece of guidance are project implementers and M&E specialists. The output is a monitoring report (one or at multiple intervals) and/or an evaluation report (mid-term or at the end of the project).
Project level M&E for adaptation projects can be quite challenging, because of the context-specific nature of adaptation. There is no simple, standard goal or set of indicators with which to measure progress. Although the M&E system for an adaptation project is specific to the given project, general good practices for adaptation M&E include:

- Use a theory of change to ensure that there is a clear and logical pathway to the desired outcomes
- Be participatory, especially including stakeholders who may not readily participate, including women, youth and the elderly
- Ensure accountability not only to donors but also to beneficiaries, to ensure their adaptation needs are being met
- Don’t focus only on tangible outputs while losing sight of outcomes that are harder to quantify and report on
- Establish a baseline if possible, even if it a simple baseline, against which progress can be measured
- Attribution (making a direct link between the project and a given outcome) is challenging and it is helpful to consider contribution as an alternative
- Do not have too many indicators to the point where you can’t “see the forest for the trees” (it might help to ask questions like: what kind of information can be understood and used to make decisions, policies, or better project designs?)
- Sometimes having quantitative data is very challenging and qualitative data can be very helpful, either instead of quantitative data or alongside it

This set of M&E methodologies has been chosen because they are practical, take into consideration the fact that adaptation may well be occurring at multiple levels (to different degrees), and seem useful in the Fijian context. Table 2 highlights relevant characteristics of each set of guidance. This guidance is not needed for GCF projects, which have their own performance measurement framework and guidance for adaptation (see Annex 3).

**Table 2: Useful project-level M&E guidance (adapted from Bours, D., McGinn, C. and Pringle, P. 2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of M&amp;E guidance</th>
<th>Organization that developed the guidance</th>
<th>Step-by-step guide</th>
<th>Detailed framework</th>
<th>List of indicators</th>
<th>Example logframe</th>
<th>Case studies</th>
<th>Linked intervention levels</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation frameworks for adaptation to climate change</td>
<td>UNDP</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making adaptation count</td>
<td>GIZ, BMZ, WRI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to ADAPT</td>
<td>IDS, Christian Aid, Plan, SCR</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A brief description of each of the methodologies in Table 2 and a link to the full resource are as follows:

- **Monitoring and evaluation frameworks for adaptation to climate change**: This report provides useful insights into the need for multi-level M&E frameworks and may be a valuable starting point for adaptation M&E because it provides useful insight into some of the most fundamental issues which need to be tackled in establishing an M&E framework for climate change adaptation interventions. While very specific to UNDP, it may provide good background on linking portfolio-level goals and objectives to project level goals, objectives, outcomes and outputs (i.e. a traditional logframe) in the context of climate adaptation. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: [www.seachangecop.org/node/139](http://www.seachangecop.org/node/139)

- **Making adaptation count**: This manual provides guidance that encompasses both conceptual and practical matters, and places a strong emphasis on matching an intended program to environmental, institutional, and other key contexts. It is designed to be flexible, and it makes a point of addressing dilemmas and challenges in a way that encourages one to make sound decisions about them. This manual lays the groundwork for the later GIZ document *Adaptation Made to Measure* (2012). (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: [www.seachangecop.org/node/107](http://www.seachangecop.org/node/107)

- **Learning to ADAPT**: This manual is aimed primarily at an audience of national-level practitioners, it serves to frame adaptation within the development and disaster risk reduction programming, while also highlighting key differences and challenges, and their implications for M&E. The manual includes a useful discussion on evaluating sub-national programs beyond the usual logframe-based evaluations, with an emphasis on promoting learning. The author makes a strong case for process-based evaluations and those that are aligned with the ADAPT principles: Adaptive, Dynamic, Active, Participatory, and Thorough. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: [www.seachangecop.org/node/103](http://www.seachangecop.org/node/103)

- **AdaptME toolkit**: This toolkit equips practitioners with critical information and guidance with which to devise an adaptation M&E framework that fits their program, context, and purposes. It
is not a directive or comprehensive set of instructions; indeed, the author emphasizes that there is no one-size-fits-all approach. AdaptME takes an ‘ask the right questions’ approach, which enables users to more selectively apply key concepts to their own priorities. AdaptME is designed to be flexible; it can be used as the basis for a new M&E system or it can be applied to an existing system or framework to enhance the degree to which it accounts for climate adaptation considerations. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: www.seachangecop.org/node/116

**Participatory monitoring, evaluation, reflection and learning (PMERL):** These CARE manuals offer a clear step-by-step guide together with tools, recommendations, checklists, and references for community-based approaches to adaptation program design, monitoring, and evaluation. Designed to be used by field-level project teams, the materials are useful, practical, and easily understood and applied at the local level. The step-by-step guides are well-written and easy to follow, and while ideally one would build from the previous activity, they can also be used flexibly and selectively. These manuals also highlight the importance of gender mainstreaming within climate change adaptation. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: www.seachangecop.org/node/564

**Adaptation made to measure:** This manual is intended to inform the design and monitoring of climate change adaptation projects, and particularly seeks to equip the reader to take a systematic approach towards developing adaptation projects and results-based systems to monitor them. There is a step-by-step guide, with each stage of analysis illustrated by concrete examples. Each section of the workbook builds upon previous ones, so one must methodically complete each section before being able to continue to the next one. The reader must thus be prepared to invest time and effort into building a detailed framework. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: www.seachangecop.org/node/2942

**Results framework and baseline guidance:** This manual was created to help Adaptation Fund partners design M&E frameworks that are in alignment with AF requirements. However, it may also be useful to other entities because it is a good introduction to the basic components of results-based management frameworks. Those who are interested in approaches to align and aggregate disparate projects and programs into an overall portfolio would also find this of interest. The main drawback is that it is very difficult to navigate; the manual is well over 100 pages (including annexes) and there is no Table of Contents. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: www.seachangecop.org/node/1800

**Monitoring and evaluating adaptation at aggregated levels:** This paper specifically explores theory and contemporary practice surrounding M&E of adaptation at portfolio, national, regional and global levels with an emphasis on quantifying and aggregating indicators. The authors selected ten aggregated M&E systems to compare in terms of context, processes and content. The systems are compared and contrasted in the main report which is followed by appendices that describe the ten selected systems more in-depth. The review demonstrates diversity in approaches, challenges, and opportunities surrounding the development and implementation of aggregated approaches to adaptation M&E, and will be of interest to
national- and international-level policy-makers. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: www.seachangepcop.org/node/2888

- **Programme of research on vulnerability, impacts and adaptation (PROVIA):** The PROVIA manual and supporting documents provide perhaps the most comprehensive guidance that has been published to date on assessing climate change vulnerability, impacts, and adaptation. The authors review various M&E approaches, and especially emphasize those M&E tools that focus on learning and reflection. They also provide a decision tree to help users decide on an M&E process and walk the reader through a selection of adaptation M&E tools that they recommend. While the authors are to be commended for managing a large body of material very thoroughly and effectively, this may also be a disadvantage for some audiences as the manual is very long. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: www.seachangepcop.org/node/3131

- **PPCR monitoring and reporting toolkit:** The toolkit introduces a standardized logic model and instructions (including scorecards and tables) on how to complete the monitoring process in line with the PPCR requirements. As with other agency-specific reporting directions, these materials from CIF are targeted at a narrow audience of implementing partners. However, it would also be of interest to those seeking an example of a practical overarching results framework at the portfolio level, together with standardized indicators. Because the materials are intended to be used even by implementers who lack monitoring capacity, the directions are extremely clear and include guidance on how to actually collect the required information. However, as the core indicators are pre-defined, there is little or no information on the process of indicator development. (Bours, D. et al 2013). Link to methodology: www.seachangepcop.org/node/3127

2. **Link between project and national level: Assessing and Ensuring Progress**

Often, adaptation efforts fall into two categories – adaptation projects, and adaptation policies or plans. The framework explicitly links these two approaches to adaptation, in an effort to ensure more systematic and streamlined coordination between these approaches and different scales of effort. The links described in this section are both, from the project level to the national level (section 2a), as well as from the national level to the project level (section 2b).

2a. **Ensuring the national picture of its adaptation is greater than the sum of projects**

The framework has been created in a way that helps Fiji ensure that the whole picture of its national adaptation efforts is greater than the sum of its parts. That is to say, simply adding up the adaptation projects underway in Fiji and noting the various existing adaptation plans or plans that are linked to adaptation does not provide a full, complete and useful picture of adaptation in Fiji. Nor does it enable a linking up of these various efforts in order to enable successful, scaled up adaptation in Fiji. As a result, we often lose adaptation lessons that we can learn from individual projects.

The framework addresses the reality that adaptation projects are often individual one-off projects that are small in scale, and can be disconnected from national plans and policies. It does this by providing guidance on enabling scaling of adaptation projects, and guidance on linking adaptation projects with
Fiji’s National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy (which is the main vehicle through which adaptation needs and goals will be achieved at the national scale).

2a.i. Scaling adaptation projects

The inclusion of scaling in the framework seeks to address the challenge that often, projects are small in scale and on-off in nature. To address the challenge of climate change, we need solutions at scale – solutions that benefit large numbers of people, across multiple geographies, and ultimately informs policy. We define scaling as a process that involves expanding, replicating, adapting, and sustaining successful projects, programs and/or policies over time, so that they ultimately have a greater impact (Appadurai, N. et al. 2015). Scale is also a critical element of transformation\(^2\) (USAID 2014), which is a priority for the GCF.

As part of the GCF Readiness Programme, WRI has developed the Assessing Scaling Potential (ASP) tool. The ASP tool can be used to actively scan projects to assess what is good adaptation, and what good adaptation is ready to be scaled up. The tool can help project planners and implementers test the scalability of their projects, help portfolio managers prioritize projects based on their scaling potential, and creates opportunities for project planners, government agencies, and funders to collaborate on decision making regarding scaling. The tool does not, however, implement the process of scaling. This will require buy-in from the various stakeholders mentioned above. WRI has already trained adaptation planners in Fiji to use this tool.

The ASP tool lays out five steps for scaling, shown in Figure 2 below. The tool has draft detailed guidance to take participants through each of these five steps, and is included in in Annex 1 (Chaudhury, M. et al. 2016). The end result is that scaling becomes a focus of project planning and implementation from the beginning so that projects are more likely to scale up effectively to the sub-national or national scale, and findings from projects are more likely to be incorporated into policies and plans.

Figure 2: Five steps of the Assessing Scaling Potential Tool for Scaling

The framework does not suggest that the ASP tool is used at the start of a project, which is typically when the projects M&E system will be developed. However, the M&E system can be designed with step 3 “evidence of benefits” of the ASP tool in mind, so as to create an M&E plan (based on the process described in sections 1a and 1b above) that will enable scaling as the project is implemented. The individual/s responsible for keeping the ASP tool in mind when developing the M&E plan for the project are project designers and project implementers.

The key question in step 3 of the ASP tool is: what is the level of evidence that the project could potentially provide or is already providing? An adaptation activity has a greater chance of being successfully scaled if it is supported by clear evidence that the activity is beneficial. Six levels of evidence

\(^2\) For more information on transformation, please see a paper WRI wrote for USAID (USAID 2012).
can help determine whether enough evidence exists for the project to move from “pilot” to “policy principle” (World Bank 2003). The levels in include:

- **Pilot**: new idea, M&E system in place, no or little evidence exists
- **Promising**: benefits detected through anecdotes
- **Model**: benefits evident through a project evaluation
- **Good**: benefits evident through several evaluations
- **Best**: benefits evident in various settings found through external evaluation
- **Policy Principle**: benefits evident through scientific studies leading to policy reform

The progression from a pilot to a policy principle may not always be rigid and linear. Where a project is in the continuum also depends on the actors involved in the project and the conditions of scaling. However, creating an M&E plan that is able to answer this question will increase the potential for the project to be ready to scale.

**2a.ii. Linking projects to the National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy**

The following guidance is aimed at ensuring that all adaptation projects, whether GCF or other, done at the sub-national level in Fiji, support and add to the country’s overarching adaptation objectives. The guidance below is explicitly linked with Fiji’s National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy (NCCAS). The individual/s responsible for undertaking this are project designers and project implementers. The output is a simple checklist with a total score out of 5 for each adaptation project.

The NCCAS draft of 2012 focuses on land-based activities, and is what has been used in this paper. However, the Climate Change Division has requested technical support from UNDP-UNEP NAP-Global Support Programme (NAP-GSP) and partners to update the 2012 NCCAS and expand its scope to the marine sector, which is strategic for the economy of Fiji. Since this process is just beginning, we will use the 2012 NCCAS here and suggest this guidance is updated once the revised NCCAS is available.

The NCCAS does a good job of building from, and linking with, existing plans and strategies. It is directly linked with the policy objectives and strategies in Fiji’s National Climate Change Policy (NCCP) which enables the NCCAS to directly support the implementation of the NCCP. Specifically, the NCCAS has a set of objectives that link with NCCP objectives, and the NCCAS directly defines sector-specific adaptation actions for the “Adaptation” objective of the NCCP (which is to “reduce the vulnerability and enhance the resilience of Fiji’s communities to the impacts of climate change and disasters”) (GoF 2012b).

The general medium- to long term objective of the NCCAS is “to position Fiji to cope well with the anticipated impacts of climate change by reducing the vulnerability of its people and environmental, social and economic resources and systems including infrastructure. In addition the NCCAS will enhance their adaptive capacity and ability to reduce disaster risks which are threatening the well-being and general development of the people of Fiji” (GoF 2012b). To achieve this general objective, the NCCAS pursues the following specific objectives:

1. **Provide government and other decision makers with precise information on the implications of climate change** and associated uncertainties relevant to the time frames, locations and spatial scales that are of direct and immediate relevance; support them with practical tools and guides to promote the best possible management of climate impacts on land based resources. (This objective provides support to NCCP policy objective 3: Awareness Raising).
2. **Identify and analyze climate impacts, risks and vulnerabilities** based on the most recent climate change projections for the country and the region, and assess how the anticipated changes will impact on Fiji’s land based resources. (This objective provides support to NCCP policy objective 2: Data Collection, Storage and Sharing).

3. Based on the findings of this analysis, **identify and prioritize adaptation options and select adaptation measures** taking into account social equity, institutional, policy, environmental, economic and other relevant considerations. (This objective provides support to NCCP policy objective 5: Adaptation).

4. **Build climate resilience by implementing adaptation measures that minimize and/or prevent the adverse impacts of climate change and are based on traditional as well as scientific knowledge**; measures should inter alia improve both the preparedness and the response capacity for climate change impacts and extreme events. (This objective provides support to NCCP policy objective 5: Adaptation).

5. **Develop, maintain and share adaptation-relevant knowledge, information and data**, covering traditional knowledge as well as existing and new systems such as databases, websites etc. and provide skilled capacities to ensure information sharing and access for the public, government and decision makers; this will include practical tools and guides to promote the best possible management of climate impacts on land based resources. (This objective provides support to NCCP policy objective 2: Data Collection, Storage and Sharing and objective 4: Education and Training).

6. **Continue to develop and apply adequate public outreach measures** to increase knowledge and awareness among all people of Fiji of the risks posed by climate change, and enable them to gradually incorporate this knowledge into their planning decisions (mainstreaming). (This objective provides support to NCCP policy objective 3: Awareness Raising and objective 4: Education and Training).

7. **Strengthen the governance and institutional arrangements** in Fiji and clearly define responsibilities in order to enable effective and efficient implementation of adaptation strategies and actions; this entails the strengthening of implementation frameworks including actions that contribute to adaptation, identifying and addressing barriers to adaptation and to secure sustainable funding for adaptation measures. (This objective provides support to NCCP policy objective 1: Mainstreaming and objective 7: Financing).

The NCCAS acknowledges the difficulty in using these objectives to strengthen its adaptation efforts: “it is important to note that, due to the complex interrelationships between policies, strategies, plans and actions it may be difficult to establish a clear, unambiguous and direct causal link between the NCCAS’s objectives and the outcomes that result from its implementation. Also, the quantitative data necessary to measure outcomes may not (yet) be readily available. In such instances, proxy indicators may need to be developed to provide approximate information regarding achievements made. Flexibility is key to building a robust and resilient implementation process” (GoF 2012a).
Prior to establishing indicators to assess achievements, we propose a very simple checklist to assess the degree to which projects are even considering the NCCAS in their development. The checklist will be scored yes / no (with a corresponding 1 or 0, respectively). The total score will provide a very rough idea of whether the project is well linked to the NCCAS objectives, but low scoring projects can be directed to look more closely at how they can better align and support the NCCAS. A more detailed link between projects and the NCCAS can be made through sectors. The current NCCAS, which includes land-based sectors, provide a well-developed set of indicators on adaptation for each sector. Once the new NCCAS with marine-based sectors has been published, if similar guidance on adaptation is included, it may be worth considering creating an additional checklist for the links between projects and NCCAS sectors.

Checklist to link adaptation projects to NCCAS:

1. Does this project explicitly support one or more of the objectives of the NCCAS? (Yes / No)

2. If the project does not support any objective, can the project be amended to support one or more objectives? (Yes / No)

3. Does the M&E system of the project clearly show how it will measure progress towards helping Fiji achieve the stated NCCAS objective/s? (Yes / No)

4. Is the M&E system of the project coordinated with the indicators identified for the relevant sector in the NCCAS? (Yes / No)

5. Does the project have a plan to effectively communicate its findings and the degree to which it has achieved its outcomes? (Yes / No)

2b. Mainstreaming adaptation and ensuring development policies and plans support adaptation

The International Institute on Environment and Development (IIED) have developed a resource called Tracking Adaptation and Monitoring Development (TAMD). In this section, existing guidance from IIED’s TAMD framework has been adapted for Fiji. TAMD is a ‘twin track’ framework that evaluates adaptation success by looking at two sets of issues simultaneously: track 1 evaluates how well countries or institutions manage climate risks, and track 2 assesses how successful adaptation interventions are in reducing climate vulnerability and in keeping development on course (Brooks et al. 2013).

TAMD is created in such a way that individual countries can tailor the framework to meet its specific context. TAMD offers a step-by-step guide and an operational framework to support in-country application, and it has been used in 8 least developed countries to date. For example, countries have used TAMD to assess their readiness and ability to adapt (in Cambodia) and to help decision makers manage climate risks across local and national levels (in Ethiopia)

WRI proposes that Fiji uses TAMD track 1 to help it navigate the cross-scale vision it has for its adaptation work. Specifically, TAMD track 1 can help ensure that adaptation is mainstreamed into national plans and policies where appropriate, and that national plans and policies support adaptation and the achievement of adaptation goals. Within TAMD track 1 there are eight categorical climate risk management (CRM) indicators:
1. Climate change integration into planning
2. Institutional coordination for integration
3. Budgeting and finance
4. Institutional knowledge / capacity
5. Use of climate information
6. Planning under uncertainty
7. Participation
8. Awareness among stakeholders

Measuring progress on each CRM indicator involves a scorecard containing five questions to which the answer is yes, partially, or no, and scored 0, 1 or 2 respectively (see Figure 3 below). The answers to these questions can be aggregated to yield an overall score out of 10 for each indicator. Changes in the extent and quality of climate risk management over the various dimensions the indicators represent can be tracked over time (e.g. annually). The scorecards can and have been modified according to country contexts in the countries in which TAMD has been implemented, and modification for Fiji can be considered. The output is a set of eight scorecards, each on a different climate risk management indicator. The scorecards for all 8 indicators have been added to Annex 2.

The question-based score card indicators can be supported by descriptive narratives explaining how institutional climate risk management has been strengthened. These narratives should describe the processes and causal mechanisms linking the outputs of an intervention to the outcomes and impacts that have been observed. Dialogue with stakeholders should seek to develop narratives around the questions that make up the indicators used in the evaluation. For example, one of the questions under the integration indicator asks whether climate-relevant initiatives are routinely screened for climate risks. A descriptive narrative supporting this question would detail when and why the screening process was introduced, the nature of the screening process, which initiatives are screened, etc.

Figure 3: Example of a TAMD Track 1 scorecard indicator on integrating climate change into planning
The individual/s responsible for undertaking this are depend on broader institutional arrangements and the roles and responsibilities of individuals within these institutions. One option includes staff of Fiji’s Climate Change Unit (CCU) or Climate Change Division (CCD), but this will need to be determined in consultation with Nanise Boginivalu and other stakeholders in Fiji.

3. National level: Enabling Reporting

The absence of a metric to measure progress on adaptation, and a wide diversity of adaptation projects, make it challenging to gauge progress on reduced vulnerability or an increase in resilience at the national scale. In order to enable Fiji to have coherent lessons to communicate to a variety of audiences (including at the national and international scales) the framework has a dedicated placeholder for a strategy to coordinate adaptation efforts and gather data for learning. This strategy is to develop of a data management system.

This section highlights particular considerations for this data management system, and processes already under way that WRI will need to bear in mind when scoping and developing the data management system. This section is organized according to what the Government in Fiji already has underway, and what the Green Climate Fund is proposing within its performance measurement framework for adaptation. WRI will learn more about these systems during the mission to Fiji and link and/or build off this systems as much as possible when further developing the M&E system introduced in this document, particularly the data management system component.

Government of Fiji M&E efforts underway

Fiji’s Climate Change Division (CCD) is currently creating a monitoring and evaluation framework to track the progress of the implementation of the NCCP, and the NCCAS has detailed sector-specific indicators to track progress on adaptation. However, it seems the development of the framework for NCCP is still under way, and the revised version of the NCCAS that includes marine-based sectors is also still under development.

The mid-term evaluation of the NCCP notes the following issues that inhibit progress on adaptation in Fiji, and good tracking of this progress (GoF 2016). This is helpful to consider in order to see patterns and gaps that can be managed when creating a data management system at the national level that coordinates findings from all Fiji’s adaptation efforts:

- The process of implementing the NCCP is fragmented which leads to poor traction at the policy level.
- A challenge to the implementation of the NCCP has been the weakness of the policy architecture.
- The monitoring of the implementation of the NCCP is the responsibility of the CCD, in collaboration with other lead and implementing agencies. However, there is no record of progress reports and no tracking system/marker or reporting requirements for climate change related projects across and outside of government.
- Climate change related activities on the ground are progressing without the reference to the NCCP and there are limited points of interaction to inform and influence each other.
• The absence of a vibrant data collection and good management of such a system, as well as the lack of finance, means that there is little incentive for stakeholders to be involved.
• The absence of an action plan and a corresponding M&E framework on the activities of the CCD means that that is no clear evidence base for any assessment or monitoring.

If the existing recommendations and plans that are already in place to develop and strengthen a supportive institutional structure, clear reporting mechanisms, and a usable M&E framework are implemented, Fiji will be well on its way to measuring progress on adaptation. Doing this, however, will require clear roles and responsibilities, incentives, empowerment, and resources for those given the responsibility of developing and maintaining systems to track progress on adaptation.

Green Climate Fund performance measurement framework

The GCF is in the process of finalizing its performance measurement framework (Annex 3) and creating guidance for each of the components of the framework for adaptation. While the GCF performance measurement framework does what its name implies – it measures the performance of GCF projects, whether individually or collectively, at different levels (project, national, fund, overall paradigm shift) – the proposed WRI M&E system intends to move beyond measuring and managing performance to also provide guidance on:

- Linking projects to their broader development context
- Scaling up adaptation efforts
- Linking adaptation projects with existing adaptation plans and policies
- Enabling Fiji to coordinate and analyze findings about all its adaptation efforts

The GCF performance measurement framework links well with Fiji’s NCCAS objectives. Table 3 below shows how the seven NCCAS adaptation objectives (see section 1a.ii.) relate to the five outcomes of the GCF performance measurement framework at the national level (see Annex 3). The only GCF outcome that doesn’t relate to one or more of the NCCAS objectives is the “cross-cutting” outcome, for which the indicator is “Number of technologies (including gender-friendly technologies) and innovative solutions transferred or licensed to promote climate resilience” (GCF 2016). It could be the case that technology transfer is not critical for Fiji’s adaptation strategy at this point in time, but it’s something that government officials and adaptation programmers can consider.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adaptation Need</th>
<th>NCCAS Objective</th>
<th>GCF national-level outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased information and use of information on climate change</td>
<td>1, 4, 5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify risks and address risks through adaptation options</td>
<td>2, 3, 4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase awareness of climate change and risk reduction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthen governance and institutional arrangements</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Fiji develops a streamlined mechanism to coordinate and measure its progress on adaptation it would be good to consider this strong link between the GCF national-level outcomes and the NCCAS. Ideally, the implementation of a conceptual framework like that proposed by WRI will enable Fiji to link project level data at the local scale with policy directives from the NCCP and NCCAS.
IV. Feedback and A Way Forward

In September 2016, WRI undertook a trip to Suva to hold an initial workshop and discussions with key stakeholders, including the Climate Change Unit (CCU) at the Ministry of Economy, Fiji Development Bank (FDB), the Office of Overseas Development Assistance, the Office of the Prime Minister, key line ministries and external stakeholders such as NGOs. During these consultations, the following key themes emerged:

- The CCU and other key players felt that a national M&E adaptation framework was needed but that the timing for its introduction was premature. This was due to factors such as capacity limitations within key agencies such as CCU and FDB, as well potential emerging new national M&E opportunities.
- The capacity limitations were based on an uneven grasp of M&E at various levels of key institutions, as well as little prior experience with climate change adaptation as a working concept.
- The development of new national five and twenty year development plans meant that there is scope for the development of a national M&E framework and a new institutional “home” for that framework. Development of a fully-fledged adaptation M&E framework outside of this process would therefore be premature.
- Data is gathered and shared unevenly across government agencies in Fiji. In some cases, such as the availability of Bureau of Statistics data or Ministry of Health information, the system is promising. In others, critical gaps involving data quality, archiving, usability, and timeliness were revealed.

Through these meetings WRI received feedback that while the conceptual framework outlined in the sections above, as well as the guidance and resources provided for each step, are helpful there is a need to fill a gap in understanding and capacity on the two main topics of climate change adaptation, and monitoring and evaluation, before such a framework could be implemented.

Given this feedback, WRI revised its work program to provide training and facilitate conversations around the institutional coordination required to gather, share and analyze data for tracking adaptation progress, rather than outlining a comprehensive data system to support the conceptual framework outlined in this paper. Based on this decision, WRI undertook a second trip to Suva in December 2016 to conduct a workshop to build capacity of key government agencies and NGOs on the topics of climate change adaptation and monitoring and evaluation. Specifically, this second trip also focused on further exploring existing data systems gaps among the key players and a way forward on adaptation M&E.

The first day of this two-day workshop included sessions on the distinction between development and adaptation, why and how to monitor adaptation, how to link adaptation project level M&E to national level tracking of adaptation progress, and the roles of different agencies in achieving this goal. This workshop was created to be participatory in nature, with workshop participants actively involved in small group work and discussions. The idea behind this was that participants would leave the workshop with a better understanding of how to do M&E for adaptation and how to ensure project-level M&E can enable tracking at the national level.
Day One ended with a self-diagnostic exercise, with participants looking at how their own organizations conduct M&E, how (and if) they address adaptation in their own work, and the resulting dependencies and inter-relationships between key agencies. This “mapping” helped set the stage for Day Two, which was an initial look at a way forward based on this framework and the current institutional structures in place in Fiji.

Building on from the previous day’s capacity building session, the during the second day of the workshop the Climate Change Unit and the Fiji Development Bank, as two key agencies who will work together in tracking adaptation progress, were asked to discuss their respective organizations’ current “state of play” or institutional capacities, workflows, and external relationships with regard to adaptation M&E. The purpose was to help create a snapshot of capabilities and current arrangements which could be built on to make collective progress on data management. These conversations included representatives from other relevant ministries, such as Ministry of Fisheries and the Bureau of Statistics.

The result of the two day workshop was to create a “roadmap” for Fiji to make progress on the data systems required to implement a comprehensive and multi-scale framework for tracking adaptation progress, such as the one proposed by WRI in this paper. The roadmap was essentially a discussion of the challenges currently faced by key stakeholders with regards to data, the opportunities ahead, and action points that can be followed through on as next steps.

Challenges

- The relationship between the CCU and FDB will continue to evolve: how the two work together to build on their respective strengths and overcome institutional weaknesses is a key area to be addressed.
- The expense of data collection and “silenced” data across projects, which will require improved coordination among government partners.
- Uneven availability of data from international funded (donor driven projects).
- The type of data collected, as the CCU often finds that the data it has access to is hard to integrate into its work, as it has not been gathered with climate change or adaptation in mind.
- Other issues involving government administrative boundaries (for instance, the Bureau of Meteorology defines districts in one way while other agencies have different district boundaries, making data comparison problematic).
- Territoriality of data, and a lack of willingness to share data.

Opportunities

- Clearly defining the inter-related roles of the CCU and FDB in adaptation M&E, especially with the goal of moving towards the creation of an effective multi-scale M&E framework to report on national adaptation progress.
- The CCU itself can build on its current in-house capacity building on adaptation M&E, and advance its strategy of creating an M&E network across government agencies, with the CCU acting as the facilitator.
- Improving data storage, quality, sharing, and timeliness. The role of donor-funded project data (and how it is unevenly shared) cannot be underestimated in helping paint a larger picture of adaptation progress across Fiji.
Revisions to the 2012 Climate Policy, and the development of the five and twenty year plans present opportunities to further embed an adaptation focus within national policy. The agent for this remains the CCU, but with the FDB having a key future role in climate resilient infrastructure and energy projects, their voice and understanding of key national policy linkages will be critical.

Action Points

- There are planned follow-up capacity building initiatives, externally funded, which can further define the FDB’s needs and how CCU may be a key partner in helping the FDB monitor projects through an adaptation filter.
- Considering who has the authority and ability to improve the sharing of donor-funded project data in Fiji.
- Building this body of adaptation-specific M&E thinking into the ongoing and future work on capacity building in Fiji.

As Fiji and other countries begin to build their capacity and data systems for tracking adaptation progress at the national level include, overarching recommendations about tracking and reporting on adaptation progress made by a country include:

- Work from both the national and local levels simultaneously, building on existing national strengths and systems to develop a monitoring and evaluation system. To do this it’s helpful to have a general “end state” multi-scale framework in mind from the beginning, to use as a road map or compass without being overly prescriptive.
- In order for the monitoring and evaluation system to work, ministries need to provide data. It is critical to have an open discussion among ministries about types of data that could be shared since there is a tendency among to be “territorial” about data. Without cooperation and sharing of data among ministries, it will be very difficult to assess the extent to which adaptation is reducing vulnerability and building resilience at various scales.
- Keep in mind the multiple uses for findings on national level progress on adaptation, including reporting on NDC progress, strengthening national level adaptation planning, and having a competitive edge for accessing climate finance in the future.
V. Annexes

Annex 1: Assessing Scaling Potential Tool

STEP 1: CONDITIONS OF SCALING

A variety of conditions shape the scaling process in any given situation. These conditions have both positive and negative impacts on the scaling process. The scaling conditions are more often categorized by the following:

- **Resources:** Availability of financial resources and the institutional capacity of project staff to support scaling as the project grows are critical for scaling (Hartmann and Linn 2007; Uvin 1995). Time is also a critical resource because it could take decades for an activity to scale (Hartmann and Linn 2007). However, help of technologies, which are considered a resource, could diffuse knowledge about adaptation and save time required for scaling (Jat et al. 2012).

- **Partnerships:** Partnerships among government agencies that have the reach and finances to support scaling, NGOs that have a strong link to communities where adaptation projects are located, and private companies that can also finance and help scale adaptation interventions through their networks are critical for scaling adaptation activities (Reid and Schipper 2014).

- **Local context:** Cultural context can affect scaling. For instance, in some parts of India, the caste system does not allow project beneficiaries to equally benefit from an adaptation activity. In order to scale activities, local and community-driven approaches have better outcomes (Binswanger-Mkhize and Rget 2012).

- **Knowledge management:** M&E systems can help assess if a project is scaling according to plan and identify areas where the project needs to be modified to ensure successful scaling (Linn 2012). M&E systems can help capture lessons learned on scaling while helping to understand the climate and socio-economic uncertainties that the project may face as it scales over time. Lessons learned from M&E systems can be shared informally through strong partnerships and networks between institutions, or formally through knowledge exchange platforms where stakeholders from different scales meet (Benson et al. 2001; Stott and Huq 2014).

The conditions can act as either barriers or enabling factors, depending on the adaptation project. For instance, finances are required for scaling. Having finances is an enabling factor and not having enough finances can act as a barrier to scaling. Furthermore, in some cases, some conditions may play a stronger role than others. For instance, if there is funding for scaling but no community support, scaling may not take place easily. The list is not exhaustive, but instead points to the multiple factors that can influence scaling. The extent to which a condition is prevalent depends on the context. Therefore, it is not possible to determine if one type of condition is more influential than another. However, the interplay between these conditions influences the extent to which scaling can occur.

Therefore, the first step in using APS is identifying the conditions that could influence the scaling process. Below is a checklist of conditions. The key question is: what kinds of conditions both internal and external to the project will influence its’ scaling potential? The user should go through at least 2 options or project proposals that is being considered or even two projects that are already implemented and check all the conditions that apply. It is important to pick at least 2 options or projects so that they can be compared for prioritization. The user then adds up the number of check marks per project. Adding up the check marks helps create score for each project.
Scaling Conditions Checklist

The key question is: what kinds of conditions both internal and external to the project will influence its’ scaling potential?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resources</th>
<th>Partnerships</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Knowledge Management</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial resources that could help scale over several years</td>
<td>Links with government agencies, NGOs, and private sector</td>
<td>Ethnic, class, and/or gender barriers or enabling factors</td>
<td>Monitoring &amp; evaluation systems in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 1  Project 2</td>
<td>Project 1 Project 2</td>
<td>Project 1 Project 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional capacity to cope with an enlarged project/program</td>
<td>Networks among partners that support scaling</td>
<td>Community capacity and support for scaling to create ownership</td>
<td>Learning under uncertainty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 1  Project 2</td>
<td>Project 1 Project 2</td>
<td>Project 1 Project 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time required for scaling</td>
<td>Actors’ incentive / willingness to scale</td>
<td>Environmental context</td>
<td>Formal and informal networks for knowledge sharing on scaling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 1  Project 2</td>
<td>Project 1 Project 2</td>
<td>Project 1 Project 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology that supports diffusion</td>
<td>Enabling institutions, policy and regulatory environment</td>
<td>Project 1 Project 2</td>
<td>Project 1 Project 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project 1  Project 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL NUMBER OF CHECKS for Project 1:
TOTAL NUMBER OF CHECKS for Project 1:

STEP 2: GOOD ADAPTATION INDICATORS
A good practice is process or methodology for which there is consensus that it is beneficial. The six process (not outcome) indicators listed below do not guarantee that a “good practice” activity will result in a successful outcome. Furthermore, not every indicator will be relevant to every adaptation practice. Nevertheless, it is important to identify whether good practice indicators are part of the project, especially since the indicators are specific to adaptation. The indicators help differentiate adaptation projects from “development” projects. The indicators include:

- **Incorporating findings from vulnerability assessments.** Vulnerability assessments gauge exposure and sensitivity to social, economic, and natural vulnerabilities within a system and a given context. The results of the assessment should inform the design of adaptation projects so that they reduce vulnerability over time.

- **Incorporating analysis of past and future climate trends.** In order to plan for long-term climate change, adaptation planners should integrate data and information on both past and future climate trends into the design of adaptation projects. This is often integrated through a vulnerability, risk, or impacts assessment.

- **Providing climate information services.** While not appropriate for every adaptation project, climate information services, such as weather advisories, can help beneficiaries make informed decisions. This is especially true for the agricultural activities.

- **Promoting knowledge sharing.** Iterative learning is central to adaptation and enables practitioners to adjust and improve their activities as circumstances change or new information becomes available. Feedback loops within the project help modify the project as it scales and ensure that activities are successfully adapted to new contexts. Such iterative improvement often relies on monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems. Meanwhile, knowledge sharing among institutions and projects enables further scaling of adaptation practice.

- **Addressing uncertainty.** To respond to the high degree of uncertainty associated with climate impacts, adaptation practices should be flexible in responding to changing needs and robust under various uncertain conditions (Adger et al. 2005; Sterrett 2011).

- **Ensuring community ownership of the project.** Adaptation literature indicates that if the community in which the adaptation activity will be implemented does not participate in its design, it will be difficult for the activity to be successful (Sterrett 2011). Equitable participation by local communities helps adaptation activities to become sustainable and relevant to the context in which they are applied (Adger et al. 2005).

If the adaptation options or project addresses the indicators, then the decision maker can confidently say that the option or project has the potential to scale. Below is a checklist of the indicators. **The key question is: which indicators are integrated in the project?** The user should check mark the number of indicators the option or project proposal incorporates and add up the number of check marks per project.

**Good Adaptation Indicator Checklist**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes analysis from past and future climate trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

3 Process indicators measure ways in which project services and goods are provided. Outcome indicators measure the broader results achieved beyond the project through the provision of goods and services.
STEP 3: EVIDENCE OF BENEFITS

An adaptation activity has a greater chance of being successfully scaled if it is supported by clear evidence that the activity is beneficial. Six levels of evidence can help determine whether enough evidence exists for the project to move from “pilot” to “policy principle” (World Bank 2003). The levels in include:

- Pilot: new idea, M&E system in place, no or little evidence exists
- Promising: benefits detected through anecdotes
- Model: benefits evident through a project evaluation
- Good: benefits evident through several evaluations
- Best: benefits evident in various settings found through external evaluation
- Policy Principle: benefits evident through scientific studies leading to policy reform

The progression from a pilot to a policy principle may not always be rigid and linear. Where a project is in the continuum depends on the actors involved in the project and the conditions of scaling.

Using the table below, the user should assess which stage the project is in giving 1 point to each level. The user should give points based on what level of evidence the project produced. For instance, if the project is at the early stage but shows that there is an M&E system in place, it receives 1 point. However, if a project shows there is “good” level of evidence, it receives four points. The key question is: what is the level of evidence that the project could potentially provide or is already providing?

Evidence
The key question is: what is the level of evidence that the project could potentially provide or is already providing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Evidence</th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E system in a pilot exists (1 point)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promising level of evidence (2 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model level of evidence (3 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good level of evidence (4 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Best level of evidence (5 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Principle (6 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STEP 4: SCALING PATHWAY

A scaling pathway can help to plan the scaling process over time while identifying key actors and conditions of scaling. There are two primary pathways to scaling: horizontal and vertical. Horizontal scaling occurs when a project replicates across people and geographies (Hartmann and Linn 2007; Linn 2012). Horizontal scaling is not only about copying an activity or project from one location to another; it involves adaptation, modification, and improvement of an activity or project before it is replicated.

Vertical scaling leads to changes in policies and legislation at the national, regional or local level (Hartmann and Linn 2007; Linn 2012). Vertical scaling, also known as political scaling (Uvin 1995), occurs when a project transitions from a small, local-level project to national and international levels. Vertical scaling can also happen when lessons learned from a project by an actor, such as a non-governmental organization (NGO), are directly shared with policy makers to influence policy reform regardless of whether the project transitioned from a small to a large project first. Alternatively, vertical scaling can occur when projects designed at the national level by the national government influence action at the local level.

A complex relationship between horizontal and vertical scaling exists. In some cases, a project will scale vertically from the local to the national level only if it is first horizontally replicated. In other words, horizontal scaling may first need to demonstrate the replicability of adaptation activities that benefit many and the subsequent need for institutional support and policy change (UNDP 2013). The process is rarely linear but is instead, based on interactions between vertical and horizontal scaling (Linn 2012).

Below are examples of two most common pathways.

**Example 1: Centralized scaling pathway.** In a centralized scaling pathway, the main agent of scaling within a centralized scaling pathway is the national government. An example of this is when Mexico’s federally administrated “Oportunidades” programme [point A] (UNDP 2013). It was first piloted in Campeche in 1996 [point B], lessons learned at the pilot level eventually led to various institutional and policy changes at the national level including creating a separate agency to run the programme, strengthening monitoring and evaluation for future implementation, simplifying transfer modalities, and increasing intergovernmental collaboration [points C and A2]. The programme expanded to cover an additional 300,000 rural families by 1997 [point E1], 2.6 million families by 2000 [point E2] and over 3 million by 2001 [point E3]. Having ‘survived’ both the 2000 and 2006 elections [point A2], the programme currently benefits over five million families, or 22% of the total population of Mexico.
Example 2 Multi-actor scaling: Scaling involves multiple actors and, in some cases, multiple actors may drive the process. In this situation, there is no one dominant actor. The Programme for South-South Cooperation (PSC) in Costa Rica followed this pathway (UNDP 2013). It began in 2003 as a pilot biodiversity project that measured the social and economic value of three national parks and biological reserves [point B]. The positive results led to further extensions [points C1], and provided data required for the vertically scaling up of the project at the national level. The project was implemented horizontally in three additional national parks and biological reserves the following year [points E1, E2, and E3] and was scaled up vertically with the support of meso level actors to the national level by 2008 [point A]. This also led to justification for the national government to increase investments for environmental conservation [point F] and the country declared its intention to be the first carbon free country in the world by 2021 [point A2]. The project has been replicated in Bhutan and Benin.

The objective of designing a pathway is for the planner to map out the actors involved, their relationships, and if the project can be scaled. The user should assess if the project proposal has a clear
scaling pathway. If it does, the project gets one point. Use the diagram below to chart a pathway. The key question is: Who are the actors involved in scaling, what do they offer, how do they connect, and how can scaling be charted across national, meso, and local levels?

Scaling Pathway Chart

![Scaling Pathway Chart](image)

**STEP 5: PRIORITIZATION**

The final step prioritization of adaptation options or projects. In this tool, prioritization means choosing a project that has the highest potential to scale based on the score it has received between steps 1 and 4. Below is a table with the list of steps in the first column. The second and third column allows the user to populate the table by adding the scores from each of the steps from at least 2 projects and compare results. The project that receives the highest score is the one that should be prioritized. If by chance both projects receive the same score, a decision needs to be made by discussion between key decision makers.

**Project Prioritization Table**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Project 1</th>
<th>Project 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Number of checks: Conditions of Scaling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Number of checks: Good Practice Indicators</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Number of points: Evidence of benefits</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Feasible Pathway (Yes: 1 point; No: 0 points)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. <strong>Prioritized Project</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2: TAMD Track 1 Scorecards

### Indicator 1. Climate Change Integration into Planning

**Representation of strategies that address climate change in relevant planning documents & processes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Is there a climate change plan or strategy set out in a dedicated strategy document and/or embedded in the principal planning documents at the level being assessed (e.g. national, sector, ministry)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is there a formal (e.g. legal) requirement for climate change (adaptation/mitigation) to be integrated or mainstreamed into development planning (cf requirement for EIA for certain activities/projects)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Have specific measures to address climate change (adaptation/mitigation) been identified and funded?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Are climate-relevant initiatives routinely screened for climate risks?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is there a formal climate safeguards system in place that integrates climate risk screening, climate risk assessment (where required), climate risk reduction measures (identification, prioritisation, implementation), evaluation and learning into planning?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score (No. of “YES” answers x 2, plus no. of “PARTIAL” answers x 1)**

### Indicator 2. Institutional Coordination for Integration

**Extent and quality of coordination of climate risk management across relevant institutions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Has an authoritative body been tasked with coordinating climate change planning and actions?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does the coordinating body have high convening authority/hierarchical importance across other cross sectoral departments or ministries?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Has a dedicated institutional mechanism been defined for coordination and implementation across sectors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is there dedicated funding or certainty of long term funding for sustaining this institutional coordination mechanism?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Is there regular contact between the coordinating body and relevant ministries and agencies (e.g. in key climate-sensitive sectors)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score (No. of “YES” answers x 2, plus no. of “PARTIAL” answers x 1)**
## Indicator 3. Budgeting and Finance

Financial support for climate change mainstreaming & initiatives – funding available for local initiatives, locally-owned/driven

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Is funding available to pilot measures that address climate change (e.g., adaptation, risk management, mitigation, low-carbon development)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Is funding available to roll out/support mainstreaming/integration of climate change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Do mechanisms/capacities exist for assessing the costs associated with measures to address climate change, such as those identified during climate screening/risk assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is funding available to cover the costs of the necessary climate change measures identified (and costed) during climate screening/risk assessment?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Are actions to address climate change supported by an authoritative financial entity (e.g. at national level, Ministry of Finance)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE** (No. of “YES” answers x 2, plus no. of “PARTIAL” answers x 1)

## Indicator 4. Institutional Knowledge/Capacity

Level of knowledge and training of key personnel in climate change issues and mainstreaming processes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Does planning involve individuals with some awareness of climate change?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Does planning involve individuals with formal training in climate change issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Does planning involve individuals who have attended accredited courses on climate change, development, planning and “mainstreaming” issues?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Is integration of climate change into planning overseen by individuals with in-depth knowledge of integration/mainstreaming processes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Are enough people with the required training involved in planning processes?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE** (No. of “YES” answers x 2, plus no. of “PARTIAL” answers x 1)
## Indicator 5. Use of Climate Information

Extent to which climate information is (i) used to inform responses to climate change and (ii) generated, at all levels of society

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does planning take account of observational data relating to climate trends and variability?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does planning take account of climate projections - is climate information (forecasts, projections, information on responses) readily accessible via information sharing platforms or networks (e.g. for screening)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Is there sufficient access to climate information generated by foreign and international organisations (e.g. IPCC, research bodies, academic institutions)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is the use of scientific information from external sources complemented by the use of domestically generated information including local/traditional/indigenous knowledge?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Does the capacity to interpret and use climate information (e.g. in scenario planning, risk frameworks, vulnerability assessments) exist?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score (No. of “YES” answers x 2, plus no. of “PARTIAL” answers x 1)**

## Indicator 6. Planning Under Uncertainty

Institutional capacity for decision-making under climatic uncertainty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Does planning (and wider climate change dialogue) incorporate ‘envelopes of uncertainty’, defined as plausible ranges of key climatic parameters over relevant timescales, informed by climate projections where feasible?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Does planning make use of scenario planning exercises, preferably based on ‘envelopes of uncertainty’?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Does planning explicitly address risks associated with ‘maladaptation’?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Is planning guided by well-developed frameworks and methodologies that address uncertainty?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Do mechanisms exist for ensuring that planning guidance is updated with new information on climate change as it becomes available?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score (No. of “YES” answers x 2, plus no. of “PARTIAL” answers x 1)**
## INDICATOR 7. PARTICIPATION
Quality of stakeholder engagement in decision-making to address climate change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are all relevant levels of governance represented in planning process?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are those who might be adversely affected represented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are those most in need of benefit from measures represented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are the poorest and most marginalized represented?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is the participation sustained throughout planning and implementation?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE** (No. of “YES” answers x 2, plus no. of “PARTIAL” answers x 1)

## INDICATOR 8. AWARENESS AMONG STAKEHOLDERS
Level of awareness of climate change issues, risks and responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Partial</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are stakeholders aware of climate change and its potential implications (e.g. for their sector, for society at large)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are stakeholders aware of potential, available, or ongoing climate change response options?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does relevant information reach key stakeholders in climate-sensitive sectors?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do institutional mandates raise awareness of and disseminate information about climate change (risks, impacts, responses, etc)?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is adequate funding available for awareness raising among relevant stakeholders and public at large?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE** (No. of “YES” answers x 2, plus no. of “PARTIAL” answers x 1)
### Annex 3: Proposed GCF Adaptation Performance Measurement Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected result</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paradigm-shift Objective</strong></td>
<td>PSA Degree to which the Fund contributes to climate-resilient sustainable development</td>
<td>Secretariat/Accredited Entities (AEs)</td>
<td>Envisioned as a scorecard indicator that reflects an analysis from the aggregation of the PMF Indicators, information from APRs, and project/programme evaluations. The scorecard would likely be measured at the end of each GCF replenishment cycle. Elements considered in the scorecard and methods for its assessment to be further developed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased climate-resilient sustainable development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| <strong>Fund-level Impacts</strong>                                                           |                                                      | AEs                                                                         |                                                                                                                                       |
|                                                                                | ✔ “Total Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; Number of beneficiaries relative to total population |                                                                              | The indicator measures the number of people who have received support, where two dimensions of support are considered: targeted and intensity level. Based on these two dimensions, direct and indirect beneficiaries are identified. Disaggregated by gender. To improve clarity and consistency, it should be specified that the second part of the indicator “Number of beneficiaries relative to total population” can be specified as percentage consider a reformulation along these lines: “Percentage of beneficiaries relative to total population” |
|                                                                                |                                                      |                                                                              |                                                                                                                                     |
| 1.0 Increased resilience and enhanced livelihoods of the most vulnerable people, communities, and regions | ☐ A1.1(a) Estimated change in losses of lives (for males and females) due to the impact of climate-related disasters | AEs                                                                         | Disaggregated by vulnerable groups, and gender, and share of total population. Methodologies to be developed. The indicator is disaggregated in two. One indicator considers the estimated reduction in losses of lives and the other measures the estimated change in economic losses caused by the impact of climate-related disasters. Economic losses will be analyzed in relation to the size of economies. Sub indicators can be identified (j) for |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected result</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A1.2</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>number of lives and US$ simplifies the analysis and provides more specific information on the impact. Disaggregated by gender; to consider equitable sharing of benefits. Methodology to consider relevant sectors (e.g., climate-resilient agriculture, sustainable climate-resilient tourism, fisheries, green jobs, etc.) Indicator includes the possibility of expressing its measurement as percentage of those that are benefiting from diversified livelihoods options over the total number of project beneficiaries (which is already captured by AEs as core indicator).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0 Increased resilience of health and well-being, and food and water security</td>
<td>✔️A2.1</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>Disaggregated by health measure, disease Disaggregated by gender</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔️A2.2</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>Disaggregated by male and female-headed households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>✔️A2.3</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>Disaggregated by gender in relation to domestic, agricultural and industrial sources. Disaggregated by male and female-headed households for domestic sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected result</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.0 Increased resilience of infrastructure and the built environment to climate change threats | □ *A3.a Number of physical assets constructed and/or made more resilient to climate variability and change | AEs                                         | Number will be disaggregated by sector, type of asset, action (constructed or strengthened), etc.  
To cover assets associated with climate-vulnerable sectors, such as tourism. This indicator is proposed as core  
indicator for adaptation projects that will deliver resilient infrastructures. |
|                                                                               | □ *3.b Value of physical assets constructed and/or made more resilient to climate variability and change |                                             |                                                                                                                                     |
|                                                                               | made more resilient to climate variability and change                     |                                             |                                                                                                                                     |
|                                                                               |                                                                          |                                             |                                                                                                                                     |
| 4.0 Improved resilience of ecosystems and ecosystem services                   | □A4.1 Extent of ecosystems strengthened, restored and protected from climate variability and change | AEs                                         | Disaggregated by ecosystem type.  
This indicator has been slightly re-worded to improve clarity.                                                                                                           |
|                                                                               |                                                                          |                                             |                                                                                                                                     |
| Outcomes                                                                      |                                                                          |                                             |                                                                                                                                     |

**Cross-cutting**

□ ACrC1 Number of technologies (including gender - friendly technologies) and innovative solutions transferred or licensed to promote climate resilience  
Disaggregated by type of technologies and innovative solutions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected result</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.0 Strengthened institutional and regulatory systems for climate-responsive planning and development</td>
<td>☐ A5.1 Number of gender-friendly policies, institutions, coordination mechanisms and regulatory frameworks that improve incentives for climate resilience and their effective implementation.</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>The indicator measures the institutional, policy, and regulatory systems that improve incentives for climate resilience and are accompanied by evidence of their effective implementation. The evidence may be a qualitative assessment (e.g., through a standardized scorecard) of the various strategic plans and documents is needed at regular intervals to observe changes in terms of climate change streamlining and quality. It has been reformulated to improve its quantification capacity and inclusivity. The Readiness and Preparatory Support Programme may employ the indicator to measure its country-level results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.0 Increased generation and use of climate information in decision-making</td>
<td>☐ A6.1 Number of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors developed, delivered, and used</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>Disaggregated by stakeholder (government, private sector, and general population). This formulation allows a clearer quantification and interpretation of the information required. Project/programme evaluations should complement this indicator and inform (for example through households and/or climate service providers surveys) on the impact on the decision-making capacity of institutions and beneficiaries. The indicator will also capture gender-friendly information climate information products/services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected result</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.0 Strengthened adaptive capacity and reduced exposure to climate risks</td>
<td>□ A7.1 Use by vulnerable households (including number of female beneficiaries), communities, businesses and public-sector services of Fund-supported/developed tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate change and variability</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>This indicator is qualitative and/or quantitative in nature and country-specific. The qualitative aspects will require an in-depth analysis or a scorecard approach to determine the extent of progress. Households: disaggregated by male-headed and female-headed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>□ A7.2: Number of males and females reached by climate-related early warning systems and other risk reduction measures established/strengthened</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>An early warning system is perceived as a composite of four dimensions: (1) knowledge on risks, (2) monitoring and warning service, (3) dissemination and communication, (4) response capability. Disaggregated by hazard and geographical coverage. Disaggregated by gender. The reformulation of this indicator intended to reflect the recommendations of the Adaptation Committee to GCF for what concern simplifying the indicators so that they are specific and manageable in terms of measurement by different typology of AEs. As the geographic coverage of EWSs is usually a characteristic of the system (therefore already defined by the proposal) the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expected result</td>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Reporting responsibility (annual reporting)</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.0 Strengthened awareness of climate threats and risk-reduction processes</td>
<td>☑️ A8.1: Number of males and females made aware of climate threats and related appropriate responses</td>
<td>AEs</td>
<td>Disaggregated by gender.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Project/Programme Outcomes/Outputs | [Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.] |                                             |                                            |
| Activities                       | [Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.] |                                             |                                            |
| inputs                           | [Defined for each project/programme on a case-by-case basis.] |                                             |                                            |
VI. Acronyms

AF Adaptation Fund
ASP tool Assessing Scaling Potential tool
BMZ Bundesministerium für wirtschaftliche Zusammenarbeit und Entwicklung (Germany’s Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development)
CCD Climate Change Division
CCU Climate Change Unit
CIF Climate Investment Funds
CRM Climate Risk Management
GIZ Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (German Corporation for International Cooperation)
GCF Green Climate Fund
IDS Institute of Development Studies
IIED International Institute for Environment and Development
M&E Monitoring and Evaluation
NAP National Adaptation Plan
NCCAS National Climate Change Adaptation Strategy
NDC Nationally Determined Contributions
NPCC National Policy on Climate Change
SCR Strengthening Climate Resilience
TAMD Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development
UKCIP United Kingdom Climate Impacts Program
UNDP United Nations Development Programme
UNEP United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WRI World Resources Institute
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