

TAMD Climate Change Indicator- Methodological Note

Title	INDICATOR 2. INSTITUTIONAL COORDINATION FOR INTEGRATION <i>Extent and quality of coordination of climate risk management across relevant institutions</i>
Type or Indicator	<i>Scorecard; outcome</i>
Technical definition/ Methodological summary	<p>This indicator is designed to capture the extent to which climate risk management (CRM) is coordinated across relevant institutions such as ministries, government agencies, or other bodies with a responsibility to integrate CRM into their activities. 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 intervention that targets multiple institutions, through evaluation of the target systems (e.g. ministries, agencies, sectors, other institutions) at the beginning, during, and at the end of the programme. Such an intervention would have a focus on improving communication, cooperation and coordination across these bodies.</p> <p>The indicator may also be used to assess the status of climate change integration in (e.g. national) systems targeted by multiple programmes, or simply in systems whose progress in this area is to be monitored (e.g. for self-assessment by governments 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 improve coordination across institutions, assessments will need to be supported by evidence that any improvements are attributable to the intervention(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 coordination of CRM and climate change integration across institutions.</p> <p>The indicator takes the form of a scorecard based on five criteria relating to the nature of coordination mechanisms and processes that seek to ensure coherent responses to climate change across relevant sectors and institutions. 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 2. Institutional Coordination for Integration			
CRITERIA/QUESTIONS	NO	PAR-TIAL	YES
1. Has an authoritative body been tasked with coordinating climate change planning and actions?			
2. Does the coordinating body have high convening authority/hierarchical importance across other cross sectoral departments or ministries?			
3. Has a dedicated institutional mechanism been defined for coordination and implementation across sectors?			
4. Is there dedicated funding or certainty of long term funding for sustaining this institutional coordination mechanism?			
5. Is there regular contact between the coordinating body and relevant ministries and agencies (e.g. in key climate-sensitive sectors)?			
SCORE (No. of "YES" answers x 2, plus no. of "PARTIAL" answers x 1)			
<p><u>Methodological points to note</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 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. Where it is applied to the coordination of both mitigation and adaptation activities it might be better to address separately, particularly where mitigation activities (e.g. regulation of greenhouse gas emissions) are more advanced than adaptation activities (e.g. cross-sectoral adaptation initiatives that might integrate, for example, adaptation in the agriculture and water sectors), or vice versa. 2. 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 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). 3. The indicator is designed to be applied at the national level but may be applied or adapted for use at other scales and in other contexts. The questions that make up the indicator are complementary, but not strictly sequential. <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 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).
2	Coordinating body can only make recommendations and these often will not be followed.	Coordinating body makes recommendations and is influential, but has no formal (or effective) authority over other bodies (e.g. departments, ministries).	Coordinating body can impose requirements on other bodies (e.g. departments, ministries).
3	No mechanisms for coordination and implementation across sectors.	Mechanism exists, but does not deliver coordinated action, or does this only partially.	Effective mechanism that delivers coordinated action.
4	No dedicated or assured long-term funding (i.e. beyond current financial year).	Assured funding for up to 5 years but no formal commitment to longer-term funding.	Formal commitment to funding beyond 5 years.
5	No regular contact between coordinating body and relevant ministries/agencies, with contact on <i>ad hoc</i> basis only.	Regular contact but no formal mechanisms for ensuring or facilitating contact – contact based on demand from relevant agencies/ ministries and or outreach from coordinating body.	Well-functioning formal mechanisms for ensuring regular contact that ensure contact occurs on multiple occasions each year.
Rationale	<p>Climate change is cross-sectoral issue, and efforts to tackle it, whether through mitigation or adaptation activities, will need to be coordinated across sectors if they are to be effective at regional and national scales. At the national level, planning will need to be integrated across multiple sectors to ensure that adaptation in one sector is not undermined by, and/or does not result in, maladaptation in another sector.</p> <p>For example, in many cases adaptation in the agricultural sector will depend on effective adaptation in the water sector to secure the required water resources in the face of climate change. Conversely, if agriculture does not incorporate adaptive measures to address climate change impacts on water resources, it may result in a level of water consumption that is unsustainable in the face of climate change. With respect to mitigation, efforts to reduce emissions will often require coordination across sectors, for example the energy and transport sectors.</p>		
Data source	<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 national self-assessment) by government or other relevant personnel.</p> <p>Where assessments are carried out by external consultants, they will be based on consultations with key staff in the sectors 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</p>		

	<p>self-assessment, they will be carried out by staff familiar with the relevant sectors.</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 across the target sectors 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 cross-sectoral coordination process</i> Where the indicator is used to report on outcomes from support to a single cross-sectoral coordination 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 process targeted by the support. For example, an intervention might seek to improve adaptation/CRM coordination between the water and agricultural sectors. Where this support is from a single 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 process or across multiple sectors</i> Where the indicator is used to report on outcomes from support to multiple coordination processes, an overall score may be calculated by averaging the totals for each process. However, such aggregated scores should always be presented alongside 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). This approach might suit assessment at the national level, as coordination might be better between some sectors than others. An alternative approach would be to assess cross-sectoral coordination at the national level as a whole, but this might result in data that 'smooths out' differences between different sets of sectors (e.g. good coordination between water and agriculture but poor coordination between water and energy).</p> <p><i>Adaptation versus mitigation</i> 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> 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>
<p>Most recent baseline</p>	<p>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.</p>

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 processes evaluation will be looking for a consistent improvement across these processes, sustained over time. Good performance of support programmes that target these processes will be demonstrated by strong evidence that the outcomes 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 assessing the processes in question (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.
Time period/lag	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.
Quality assurance measures	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.
Data issues	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.
Additional	This indicator might be complemented by quantitative output indicators that

comments	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 'cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms established', or 'number of sectors linked through coordination mechanisms'.
-----------------	---