

TAMD Climate Change Indicator- Methodological Note

| | |
|---|--|
| Title | <p>INDICATOR 1. CLIMATE CHANGE INTEGRATION INTO PLANNING</p> <p><i>Representation of strategies that address climate change in relevant planning documents & processes</i></p> |
| Type or Indicator | <p><i>Scorecard; outcome</i></p> |
| Technical definition/ Methodological summary | <p>This indicator is designed to capture the extent to which considerations of climate change (risks, opportunities) are integrated into planning processes in national, sectoral or other institutional contexts (e.g. donor institutions or MDBs). It is relevant to interventions intended to build capacity to address climate change through the development of climate plans, strategies and mainstreaming mechanisms/ systems.</p> <p>The indicator can be used to assess the performance of an individual capacity building programme, through evaluation of the target system (e.g. ministry, sector, institution) at the beginning, during, and at the end of the programme.</p> <p>The indicator may also be used to assess the status of climate change integration in systems targeted by multiple programmes, or simply in systems whose progress in this area is to be monitored (e.g. for self-assessment by institutions pursuing their own climate change integration initiatives without external support).</p> <p>Where the aim is to evaluate the effectiveness of capacity building interventions to support climate change integration in target systems/ institutions, assessments will need to be supported by evidence that any improvements are attributable to the programme(s) in question.</p> <p>This indicator is mostly likely to represent an <u>outcome</u> indicator, where the intended outcome of an intervention/ initiative is improved integration of climate change considerations in planning and decision making.</p> <p>The indicator takes the form of a scorecard based on five criteria relating to the treatment of climate change in planning documents, and the extent and maturity of activities and mechanisms to address climate change in planning processes. These criteria are expressed as questions that ask to what extent the criteria have been met: not at all (“NO”), partially (“PARTIAL”), or to a large extent/completely (“YES”).</p> <p>An overall score is calculated, as the number of “PARTIAL” answers plus the number of “YES” answers, with each of the former scoring 1 and each of the latter scoring 2, giving a maximum score of 10.</p> <p>The indicator scorecard is set out in <u>the table below</u>.</p> |

| INDICATOR 1. Climate Change Integration into Planning | | | |
|--|----|----------|-----|
| CRITERIA/QUESTIONS | NO | PAR-TIAL | YES |
| 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)? | | | |
| 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)? | | | |
| 3. Have specific measures to address climate change (adaptation/mitigation) been identified and funded? | | | |
| 4. Are climate-relevant initiatives routinely screened for climate risks (relating to adaptation/mitigation)? | | | |
| 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? | | | |
| <i>SCORE (No. of "YES" answers x 2, plus no. of "PARTIAL" answers x 1)</i> | | | |
| <p><u>Methodological points to note</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The term 'integration' may be used interchangeably with 'mainstreaming'. While this indicator has been developed in the context of climate change adaptation, it is sufficiently flexible that it also can be applied in mitigation contexts. Climate change plans/ strategies therefore may be adaptation and/or mitigation/LCD plans/strategies. Where it is applied to plans or processes that address both mitigation and adaptation it is recommended that mitigation and adaptation be addressed separately, particularly where formal mitigation requirements (e.g. environmental impact assessment or pollution abatement) are more advanced than adaptation requirements (e.g. screening activities for viability against climate scenarios), as is the case in many contexts. Following on from note (1), "measures to address climate change" may be adaptation or mitigation measures. In this context, risks may be risks posed <i>to</i> an initiative by climate (change) hazards, or risks posed <i>by</i> the initiative to the environment (emissions or increased vulnerability), to social groups (increased vulnerability) or to society/economy at a more systemic level ("maladaptation"). For adaptation, "climate-relevant" may be translated as "climate-sensitive". For mitigation, "climate-relevant" essentially means "associated with potentially significant emissions". It is not recommended that assessment of adaptation and mitigation is combined in a single assessment, as performance may be significantly different in these two areas, and the lack of specificity would make the indicator of very limited use. The indicator may be used as an outcome indicator to assess systems targeted by one or more programmes. Assessment of the results of a single programme should be carried out at the beginning of, during, and at the end of the programme. Assessment of the cumulative results of multiple programmes or of the evolution of integration in general in an institutional context should be carried out at regular intervals (e.g. annually). Where the intention is to evaluate the efficacy of interventions | | | |

| | | | |
|------------------|---|--|---|
| | <p>to support integration, improvements in scores will need to be complemented by supporting qualitative evidence in order to demonstrate attribution (e.g. narratives, testimonials, other evidence of causal relationships).</p> <p>5. The indicator is designed to be applied in diverse contexts, e.g. at the national or sectoral level (one or multiple sectors), or to assess planning within a particular ministry or other institutional context. The questions that make up the indicator are complementary, but not strictly sequential.</p> <p>Guidance on answering the questions that make up the indicator is provided in the table below.</p> | | |
| | Conditions necessary for answer of: | | |
| Q | NO | PARTIAL | YES |
| 1 | No mention of climate change in planning documents, or treatment of climate change restricted to aspirational statements with no discussion of specific risks/issues and measures to address these. | Risks/issues and measures discussed along with broad strategies to address them, but do not cover all relevant areas or sectors (e.g. some but not all climate sensitive sectors for a national plan). | Risks/issues and measures discussed along with broad strategies to address them, for all relevant (e.g. climate-sensitive) areas or sectors. |
| 2 | No coordinating body | Coordinating body but with limited mandate and/or funding. | Authoritative body with strong mandate and financial resources/ authority (e.g. Ministry of Finance or Planning). |
| 3 | No specific measures to address climate change identified. | Some measures to address climate change identified, but only in certain relevant areas or sectors, with limited discussion of costs, timescales & implementation mechanisms. | All relevant areas/ sectors associated with specific measures to address climate change, accompanied by details of costs, timescales and implementation mechanisms. |
| 4 | No screening. | Screening is patchy, ad hoc, or limited to only some relevant areas or sectors. | Screening is routine in all relevant sectors. |
| 5 | No safeguards system, or no system that goes beyond screening. | Some mechanisms or guidance to ensure that screening is followed by climate risk assessment, but falls short of comprehensive safeguards system and/or only in some relevant areas or sectors. | All relevant areas or sectors incorporate safeguards system or guidance representing integration cycle from screening through climate risk assessment to identification, prioritisation and implementation of risk reduction measures, and evaluation and learning. |
| Rationale | The incorporation of climate change into planning and investments by countries, donors, MDBs and other development entities is a key outcome in Theories of Change (ToC) related to adaptation (e.g. UK DFID). It is important to assess the extent to which adaptation support contributes to this | | |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>outcome. This indicator may be used to assess the success of programmatic interventions that seek to contribute to this outcome, in their operational contexts. This can be achieved by assessing changes in the systems (e.g. institutions, processes) targeted specific programmes, and also by assessing progress on the incorporation of climate change into planning at the national and sectoral levels, through national or sectoral assessments that capture the cumulative impact of multiple support programmes.</p> <p>The questions that make up this indicator are intended to capture the need for mechanisms to be put in place that identify climate change risks and ensure that these risks (and opportunities) are addressed at the planning level. Screening of initiatives (policies, plans, programmes, projects) is important (to identify climate change risks, opportunities and appropriate responses), but screening alone is not sufficient – there needs to be practical guidance on what to do with initiatives that are identified as (e.g.) high-risk. Experience (e.g. during DFID Strategic Programme Reviews or SPRs) illustrates the need for screening to be part of a more systematic integration process that provides guidance for what might be termed the “mainstreaming cycle”.</p> |
| <p>Data source</p> | <p>Data will be collected through evaluations based on completion of the scorecard (above) at specified intervals. Depending on the purpose of the evaluation, the scorecard might be completed by staff in donors’ country offices, by external consultants, or (for self-assessment within institutions) by staff within the institutions being evaluated.</p> <p>Where assessments are carried out by external consultants, they will be based on consultations with staff in the institutions being evaluated and (where appropriate) staff within donor country offices. Where assessments are carried out by country offices, they will be based on the judgment of key country office staff with responsibility for supporting the (national) processes and sectors in question, e.g. through sector budget support. In the case of self-assessment, they will be carried out by staff familiar with the relevant processes and also with climate change integration processes.</p> <p>When assigning scores, evaluators concerned with the efficacy of support programmes should also record complementary qualitative information relating to attribution of outcomes to interventions. This information might include notes on the chronology of changes in the target system(s) relative to key outputs from support programmes, the views of key stakeholders regarding the extent to which outcomes are direct (or indirect) consequences of programme outputs, and the identification of ‘pathways of change’ that link outputs and outcomes (e.g. via key mechanisms, processes, events).</p> |
| <p>Data included and data aggregation</p> | <p><i>Support to a single institution, sector, mechanism or process</i> Where the indicator is used to report on outcomes from support to a single system or entity (i.e. institution, sector, mechanisms or process), the data reported will be the score calculated across the 5 questions that make up the indicator (up to a maximum of 10), applied to the system targeted by the support. Where this support is from a single intervention/programme, the scorecard should be completed at the beginning of the programme, during the programme (e.g. annually in the logframe), and at the end of the programme. Where support is from multiple programmes, the scorecard should be conducted at regular intervals (e.g. annually, 6-monthly) spanning the period of support.</p> <p><i>Support to multiple institutions, sectors, mechanisms or process</i> Where the indicator is used to report on outcomes from support to multiple systems or entities (e.g. from multiple support programmes across multiple sectors for a cross-sectoral national-level assessment), an overall score may be calculated by averaging the totals for each relevant system/entity. However, such aggregated scores should always be presented alongside</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | <p>disaggregated data (detailing results for individual target systems) so that areas of strength and weakness can be identified (e.g. in specific sectors, ministries, etc). Alternatively, a national system might be assessed as whole. The approach taken will depend on the purpose of the assessment (e.g. a comprehensive assessment of CRM at the national level across all relevant sectors versus an assessment of national mechanisms that sit 'above' the sectoral level). It will also depend on the national CRM 'architecture (e.g. is CRM coordinated centrally by a body that has authority over relevant sectors, or decentralised down to the sectoral level).</p> <p><i>Adaptation versus mitigation</i></p> <p>In principle, this indicator could represent a 'key performance indicator' (KPI) that combines assessment of mitigation/low-carbon development and adaptation. However, it is recommended that mitigation and adaptation be assessed separately, as mitigation and adaptation often involve quite different processes and actors, and one may be considerably more advanced than the other.</p> <p><i>Interpretation</i></p> <p>In all cases, scores should be presented alongside qualitative information related to attribution (see data included and aggregation).</p> <p>Outcomes will be assessed on the basis of changes in the score over time, over the lifetime of the programme or programmes being evaluated, or otherwise at regular intervals for (e.g. internal) evaluation of planning systems in general. Attribution of outcomes to outputs will be assessed through the use of complementary qualitative information.</p> |
| Most recent baseline | The baseline will be represented by the first available set of results, i.e. the first time the scorecard is applied to a system. Subsequent assessments will be looking for an improvement/increases in score(s) relative to this first assessment. |
| Good performance | Good performance will be demonstrated by improvement/increases in scores over time that can be linked with support programmes. Where assessment is focused on multiple (e.g. national) systems evaluation will be looking for a consistent improvement over multiple systems (e.g. sectors, ministries), sustained over time. This will demonstrate good performance of the systems in question. Good performance of support programmes that target these systems will be demonstrated by strong evidence that the outcomes within the target systems can be attributed to this support (see data categories above, and discussion in TAMD Technical Paper). |
| Return format | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scores (out of 10) at different points in time (e.g. before, during, after intervention) 2. Numbers of countries improving scores by different amounts (increasing over time) <p>For the assessment of multiple systems (e.g. sectors, ministries, countries, etc), results might be represented graphically. For reporting directed at target systems, changes in scores over a specified time period (from -10 to +10 at the theoretical extremes) might be represented along the horizontal axis, and numbers of systems (for each integer change in score) along the vertical axis.</p> |
| Data dis-aggregation | If the indicator is to be presented as a single score out of 10 as in "Return format", answers for each of the 5 questions from which the indicator is constituted should also be preserved, so that areas of strength and weakness can be identified. Similarly, where evaluation of multiple target systems has involved aggregation/averaging across systems, results should be preserved for individual systems. |
| Data availability | Evaluation of this indicator does not depend on the availability of independent/external data. The indicator is based on the judgment of those |

| | |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| | <p>assessing systems (programme managers, country office staff, such as climate change advisers, implementing partners, external consultants). Guidance is provided on how to complete the scorecard, based on criteria for different answers for each question making up the indicator. Data are therefore based on one or more of the following: (i) the informed judgment of the evaluators, (ii) knowledge of the relevant programmes and target systems, (iii) consultations with stakeholders (who will include country office staff if the assessment is carried out externally). The availability of reliable data therefore will depend on the level of knowledge of personnel involved in the evaluation, and/or on the quality of consultations. However, there should be sufficient knowledge among evaluators to ensure that the scorecard is completed realistically.</p> |
| Time period/lag | <p>Where this indicator is applied in the context of individual programmes, it should be assessed annually in programme logframes, based on assessment of the target system(s). The indicator can also be applied to target systems (e.g. national systems, sectors, ministries, etc) on a regular (e.g. annual or biennial) basis, for example where these systems receive budget support.</p> |
| Quality assurance measures | <p>Where this indicator is assessed internally (e.g. by country office staff), an independent assessment might be performed (e.g. during a strategic review) by external experts. The answers to the 5 questions constituting the indicator should be justified by some explanation, e.g. describing the nature of the screening or mainstreaming processes and giving examples of measures to address climate change that have been identified during the assessment.</p> |
| Data issues | <p>It is recognised that some element of subjective judgment is required, although the questions have been designed to be quite specific and transparent, with supporting guidance on how to answer them contained in this note. In some cases data may be based on implementing partners' own assessments.</p> |
| Additional comments | <p>This indicator might be complemented by quantitative output indicators that can be applied directly to support programmes whose goals include the realisation of the outcomes addressed by the indicator. Quantitative outcome indicators might also be identified depending on the precise nature of an intervention, such as 'number of initiatives subject to climate change screening', or 'number of potential adaptation measures identified across initiatives subject to screening'.</p> |