TAMD - Climate Change Indicator - Methodological Note

Short title	**INDICATOR 8. AWARENESS AMONG STAKEHOLDERS** *Awareness of climate change issues, risks and responses*
Type or Indicator	*Scorecard, output or outcome depending on how applied*
Technical definition/ Methodological summary	This indicator is designed to evaluate awareness of climate change issues, risks and potential response options, and actions to promote such awareness, in different contexts. The indicator can be used to evaluate the performance of an individual capacity building programme, through evaluation of the target system (e.g. ministry, sector, institution, general population, community, etc) at the beginning, during, and at the end of the programme. The indicator may also be used to evaluate the evolution of awareness of climate change in systems targeted by multiple programmes. Where the aim is to evaluate the effectiveness of capacity building interventions intended to improve institutional knowledge and capacity to address climate change, assessments will need to be supported by evidence that any improvements are attributable to the programme(s) in question. In its current form, the indicator represents an outcome indicator, examining the outcomes at the level of the target system resulting from the outputs of a programme or programmes. The indicator may be modified so that it represents an output indicator for the evaluation of specific programmes or projects that address awareness-raising, for example through the use of quantitative and/or categorical data relating to the numbers of people reached by awareness raising activities, mechanisms established, etc. The indicator takes the form of a scorecard based on five criteria relating to the extent to which methodologies for addressing uncertainty are employed in planning, and for ensuring that planning can be updated with new information. 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"). 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. The indicator scorecard is set out in the table below.

INDICATOR 8. Awareness among stakeholders			
CRITERIA/QUESTIONS	**NO**	**PART IAL**	**YES**
1. Stakeholders aware of climate change and its potential implications for society.			
2. Stakeholders aware of potential, available, or ongoing climate change response options.			
3. Relevant information reaching key stakeholders in climate-sensitive sectors.			
4. Institutional mandates to raise awareness of and			

disseminate information about climate change (risks, impacts, responses, etc).			
5. Adequate funding available for awareness raising.			
SCORE (No. of "YES" answers x 2, plus no. of "PARTIAL" answers x 1)			

Methodological points to note

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/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.
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. Modified versions of this indicator might also be used to **report on the outputs of a specific programme or project that has components that explicitly address awareness of climate change**. The existing questions could be modified to measure how many stakeholders have been reached by programme-related awareness raising initiatives to sensitise people to climate change risks [Question 1] and to raise awareness of potential response (e.g. adaptation or mitigation) options [Question 2]; how many stakeholders have been reached by the initiatives to disseminate climate information [Question 3]; whether or not institutional mechanisms for awareness raising and information distribution have been established [Question 4]; how much has been spent on awareness raising and information dissemination.
4. Levels of awareness [Questions 1 and 2] may be assessed subjectively and qualitatively (based on judgment of programme staff), or through surveys or questionnaires targeted at stakeholders, that may be completed at different stages of a programmes lifetime, or at regular intervals where the indicator is targeting a "system".
5. "Relevant information' [Question 3] might include scenarios of future conditions over appropriate timescales; seasonal forecast data; information about adaptation measures, resources and initiatives in which stakeholders can participate; etc. Whereas Questions 1 and 2 are intended to address levels of awareness at a given point in time, Question 3 is intended to capture the existence of channels through which information reaches stakeholders so as to give them access to new and updated information.

Guidance on answering the questions that make up the indicator is provided in the table below.

Q	NO	PARTIAL	YES
	Conditions necessary for answer of:		
1	Stakeholders not aware of / exhibit no increase in awareness of climate change issues & risks.	Some awareness / increase in awareness of climate change issues & risks.	Widespread awareness / significant increase in awareness of climate change issues & risks.
2	Stakeholders not aware of / exhibit no increase in awareness of potential options for responding to climate change.	Some awareness / increase in awareness of potential options for responding to climate change.	Widespread awareness / significant increase in awareness of potential options for responding to climate change.
3	Stakeholders in climate-sensitive sector, areas, activities do not have / show improved access to climate change information.	Some access to climate information, but of limited coverage and/or use (e.g. due to way information is presented/ packaged, and lack of engagement with stakeholders to tailor information to their needs).	Widespread access to climate information in form that is useful to stakeholders, as result of engagement that enables information to be tailored to needs of stakeholders.
4	No institutions given formal mandate for raising awareness of climate change issues, risks & response options.	Institution(s) tasked with raising climate change awareness, but this is additional responsibility not matched by additional support.	Institution(s) given formal mandate for climate change awareness raising, with significant support (financial, technical, etc) to achieve this.
5	No funding for climate change awareness raising.	Funded activities raise awareness of climate change, but this is not main or explicit purpose of these activities.	Dedicated funding targeted specifically at climate change awareness raising.

Rationale	For effective action on climate change, government personnel, staff in key institutions, key stakeholders and the public at large need to be aware of climate change and associated risks, and responsive to initiatives intended to address climate change through adaptation and/or mitigation/low-carbon development. Where information on climate change risks and response options (e.g. seasonal forecasts, climate projections, information on adaptation options) is made available to stakeholders, this information needs to be in a form that they can understand and use. Awareness is most likely to be enhanced, and useful information produced, where key institutions are given mandates to raise awareness and generate and distribute information while engaging with stakeholders and the public at large.
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 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. 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).
Data included and data aggregation	*Support to a single institution, sector, mechanism or process* 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. *Support to multiple institutions, sectors, mechanisms or process* 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). *Interpretation* In all cases, scores should be presented alongside qualitative information related to attribution (see data included and aggregation). 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.
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 (options)	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) 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.
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.