

TAMD Climate Change Indicator- Methodological Note

Short title	INDICATOR 3: BUDGETING AND FINANCE <i>Financial support for climate change mainstreaming & related initiatives</i>
Type or Indicator	<i>Scorecard; outcome</i>
Technical definition/ Methodological summary	<p>This indicator is designed to capture the extent to which actions, measures and processes to address climate change are costed, budgeted for, and provided with the necessary financial support.</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 extent to which measures to address climate change are costed and financially supported in systems targeted by multiple programmes.</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>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>The indicator is most likely to represent an <u>outcome</u> indicator, as it examines the outcomes at the level the target system resulting from the outputs of a programmes.</p> <p>The indicator takes the form of a scorecard based on five criteria relating to how climate change measures are costed, budgeted and funded. 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 3. Budgeting and Finance			
CRITERIA/QUESTIONS	NO	PAR-TIAL	YES
1. Is funding available to pilot measures that address climate change (e.g. adaptation, risk management, mitigation, low-carbon development)?			
2. Is funding available to roll out/support mainstreaming/integration of climate change?			
3. Do mechanisms/capacities exist for assessing the costs associated with measures to address climate change, such as those identified during climate screening/risk assessment?			
4. Is funding available to cover the costs of the necessary climate change measures identified (and costed) during climate screening/risk assessment?			
5. Are actions to address climate change supported by an authoritative financial entity (e.g. at national level, Ministry of Finance)?			
6. Is funding available to pilot measures that address climate change (e.g. adaptation, risk management, mitigation, low-carbon development)?			
<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 is used to assess systems targeted by one or more programmes, and is an outcome indicator, which will be assessed at the beginning, during, and at the end of a programme (where the outcomes resulting from a single programme are to be assessed), or at regular intervals (e.g. annually) where the cumulative results of multiple programmes are to be assessed. Where the indicator is applied to a targeted system, 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. Question 1 refers to <i>piloting</i> of measures to address climate change, whereas Question 4 refers to measures identified during climate risk assessment (CRA). Pilot measures are measures identified as offering potential learning opportunities, and may be identified in a climate change plan or strategy. In contrast, measures identified in a CRA are necessary measures to address climate change risks in specific (e.g. project or programme) contexts. 4. 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 the extent to which measures have been costed and a commitment to funding made within other institutional 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 piloting of measures to address climate change due to lack of funding.	Some piloting of measures to address climate change, but other pilot measures identified not pursued due to lack of funding.	Piloting of measures to address climate change not constrained by lack of funding.
2	Mainstreaming systems not implemented due to insufficient funding; where screening identifies need for climate risk assessment (CRA) this is not happening due to insufficient funds (or no screening).	Mainstreaming processes exist but are insufficiently developed due to funding constraints; CRAs are performed only for some high-risk initiatives, or are often inadequate in scope, due to funding limitations.	Funding fully supports mainstreaming processes; CRAs are performed for all high-risk initiatives, and are of adequate duration and depth.
3	Measures are not costed, and there is little or no awareness of methodologies for costing.	Some measures are costed but costing is patch or ad hoc, and costing methodologies are contested or not well understood.	Measures are routinely costed using standard, accepted methodologies.
4	Even where measures to address climate change are identified, these are not implemented due to a lack of funding.	Some measures are implemented, but funding is limited and other measures identified are not pursued for this reason.	Adequate funding exists to implement all (priority) measures identified in CRAs routinely.
5	No institutional financial support.	Formal commitment to provide financial support but insufficient evidence of delivery, or level of support falls short of what is needed.	Evidence that financial support is forthcoming for required measures, actions and processes; climate change is a priority for financial entity concerned.
1.			
Rationale	For effective action on climate change (whether in the form of adaptation or mitigation), there needs to be financial support in place for mainstreaming processes, and for the implementation of adaptation/mitigation measures. Financial support is more likely if there are robust methodologies for calculating the costs associated with adaptation and mitigation. Financial support will be most secure where there is buy-in from key institutions. At the national level, the most important such institutions will be the Ministry of Finance and/or the Ministry of Planning.		
Data source	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. 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		

	<p>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 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 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 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> 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</p>

	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 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 the questions. In some cases data may be based on implementing partners' own

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