

TAMD Climate Change Indicator - Methodological Note

Short title	INDICATOR 7. PARTICIPATION <i>Quality of stakeholder engagement in decision-making to address climate change</i>
Type or Indicator	<i>Scorecard, output or outcome depending on how applied</i>
Technical definition/ Methodological summary	<p>This indicator is designed to assess the extent to which climate change planning involves all relevant stakeholders, in terms of both “vertical” representation (i.e. across different levels of governance from national to community level) and “horizontal” representation (i.e. across a diversity of relevant stakeholders at any particular level but particularly the community level).</p> <p>The indicator can be used to assess the performance of an individual capacity building programme, through (i) evaluation of the quality of participation in initiatives managed by a target system (e.g. ministry, sector, institution) at the beginning, during, and at the end of the programme, or (ii) evaluation of participation within the context of the programme itself, where the nature of the programme makes such an approach relevant (i.e. where there is significant stakeholder engagement at multiple levels and scales, such as in an intervention to build capacity at the local level).</p> <p>The indicator may also be used to assess the quality of participation in initiatives managed by systems targeted by multiple programmes.</p> <p>The indicator may represent an <u>outcome</u> indicator, examining the outcomes at the level of the target system resulting from the outputs of a programme or programmes.</p> <p>The indicator may also represent an <u>output</u> indicator when it is used to evaluate the quality of participation in a specific programme that targets stakeholders at multiple levels.</p> <p>The indicator takes the form of a scorecard based on five criteria relating to vertical and horizontal representation, with specific attention to those stakeholders most likely to be affected by climate change or to benefit from measures to address climate change. 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 7. Participation			
CRITERIA/QUESTIONS	NO	PAR-TIAL	YES
1. Are all relevant levels of governance (national, provincial/district, local/community) represented?			
2. Are those who might be adversely impacted by climate change initiatives represented?			
3. Are those most in need of / likely to benefit from measures to address climate change represented?			
4. Are the poorest and most marginalized members of society represented?			
5. Is the participation of all the above groups sustained throughout planning and implementation (i.e. at the start, end and throughout an initiative)?			
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"> 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/low-carbon development (LCD) contexts. Where it is applied to the coordination of both mitigation/LCD and adaptation activities it is recommended that these adaptation and mitigation are addressed separately, particularly where mitigation activities (e.g. regulation of greenhouse gas emissions) are more advanced than adaptation activities, or vice versa. 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). Modified versions of this indicator might also be used to report on the outputs of a specific programme or project, in which case the questions should be related to the how participation is addressed within the programme itself: i.e. has the programme engaged the appropriate stakeholders and has engagement been sustained through programme design and implementation. The scorecard might also be modified to constitute a (set of) quantitative indicator(s), addressing how many people from different interest/stakeholder groups have participated in the design and implementation of a programme or project. Question 1 addresses the various 'vertical' levels of governance represented by stakeholders with an interest in an intervention or set of interventions (depending on precisely what the indicator is evaluating). These include stakeholders at all levels who are likely to be affected by the intervention(s) in question, whether directly or indirectly, with the types of effects ranging from impacts on policy regimes at the level of national government, to impacts on livelihoods and access to resources at the local level. Question 2 focuses on the potential adverse impacts of <i>initiatives</i> (i.e. adverse impacts of a programme/project on certain groups, the environment, or society at large), which may involve (i) increases in 			

	<p>poverty or marginalisation (e.g. due to displacement or restriction of access to land or other resources); (ii) increases in vulnerability to climate change (e.g. restriction of pastoralists' access to grazing lands used in times of drought - these might be developed for irrigated agriculture in the name of climate resilience as droughts become more frequent); (iii) wider maladaptation (e.g. where initiatives risk increasing dependence on resources that are potentially threatened by climate change, with the possible result of a systemic increase in societal or economic vulnerability).</p> <p>6. In Question 3, those most in need of and likely to benefit from measures to address climate change are (i) for adaptation initiatives, those who are most vulnerable to / risk from the impacts of climate change, (ii) for LCD initiatives, those most in need of access to (clean) energy sources or of assistance to manage resources that deliver mitigation benefits (e.g. forests).</p> <p>7. Question 4 addresses the poorest and most marginalised members of society/community, regardless of climate change. While these people are likely to be among the most vulnerable to climate change due to poverty, poor access to resources, low adaptive capacity, etc, poverty does not map precisely onto vulnerability. For example, vulnerability might be related to reliance on or ownership of climate-sensitive assets or livelihoods. Vulnerability metrics related to such assets will exclude those with no assets, who may still benefit from climate change initiatives with a poverty-reduction element.</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	Planning is top-down, with little or no participation or buy-in from local/community (and/or, in the case of nationally-driven initiatives, district/provincial) level.	Some integration across different levels but extent to which planning informed from all levels (particularly from lower to higher levels) is limited.	Good integration across different levels of governance, with good balance between “top-down” drivers and “bottom-up” informing of planning process.	
2	Those who might be adversely affected by initiatives have little or no voice.	Consultation with those who may be adversely affected by initiatives; some impact on planning processes & outcomes, but limited.	Those potentially adversely affected by initiatives have strong voice and can influence planning processes & outcomes; mechanisms such as compensation in place and widely accepted; maladaptation issues addressed by inclusion of stakeholders who might be affected indirectly.	
3	Poor matching of climate change initiatives & measures to those most in need / likely to benefit from them; these groups not included in planning processes.	Those most in need and likely to benefit from climate change initiatives & measures play role in planning processes and are targeted to some extent, but further action needed to improve their representation & efficient targeting of measures.	Effective targeting of climate change initiatives & measures to those most in need and most likely to benefit from them; these groups play key role in planning processes & identification, prioritisation & implementation of measures.	
4	Poorest & most marginalised excluded from planning processes.	Some representation of poorest and most marginalised, but impact on representation on planning and poverty/marginalisation outcomes is limited.	Poorest & most marginalised brought into, and influence, planning process, resulting in poverty reduction and improved integration into society/community.	
5	Participation is not sustained beyond an initial consultation phase.	Some stakeholders remain involved in planning and implementation process throughout lifetime of initiatives, but others fall out of participatory process.	All or majority of stakeholders remain engaged throughout planning and implementation phases, affecting how initiatives evolve.	
Rationale	<p>Climate change initiatives are most likely to be accepted by the public and those within the relevant institutions, and to deliver sustained benefits, where there is widespread participation and “buy-in” throughout the design and implementation processes. Where initiatives are intended to deliver community benefits (either in the form of LCD or adaptation), measures to deliver these benefits will be most appropriately tailored to local contexts and needs where they are informed or driven by community participation.</p> <p>While the need for participation is not limited to climate change initiatives, it is important that such initiatives address climate-specific vulnerabilities and</p>			

	needs. This is reflected in Questions 2 and 3.
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 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>
Data included and data aggregation	<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>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</p>

	systems in general. Attribution of outcomes to outputs will be assessed through the use of complementary qualitative information.
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 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 target systems (within or across 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, and these might be based on an adaptation of the outcome version of the indicator described here.