

Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD) Multi-Country Workshop Edinburgh, 19th to 21st March, 2013

Summary

Workshop participants discussed how Pakistan, Kenya, Nepal, Ghana, Mozambique and Cambodia are currently assessing climate adaptation, and how TAMD can enhance the measuring of development in the context of adaptation to climate change. Agreements were reached upon ways to test evaluative frameworks tailored to the needs of each country. This report outlines the content and outcomes of the different workshop sessions. Actions and thematic issues arising are listed. Links to TAMD resources are provided in the text.

Workshop Purpose

The purpose of the workshop was to share insights on how countries are assessing climate adaptation and agree upon ways to properly test evaluative frameworks tailored to the needs of each country.

The workshop enabled the people who have been working on the TAMD appraisal and design phase over the last year to come together to discuss findings. They presented the evaluation frameworks they propose to test for feasibility and utility in the second phase of the initiative, over the coming year.

Introductory links:

TAMD webpages <http://www.iied.org/tracking-adaptation-measuring-development>

IIED TAMD Framework briefing

[http://pubs.iied.org/search.php?k=TAMD%3A+A+framework+for+assessing+climate+adaptation+and+development+effects&z="+](http://pubs.iied.org/search.php?k=TAMD%3A+A+framework+for+assessing+climate+adaptation+and+development+effects&z=)

Workshop Participants

The participants were as follows:

Dinesh Devkota	Policy Advisor, Integrated Development Society, Nepal
Fawad Khan	Senior Associate, Institute for Social and Environmental Transition, Pakistan
Muhammad Ijaz	Additional Secretary, Ministry of Climate Change, Pakistan
Luis Artur	Eduardo Mondlane University, Mozambique
Irene Karani	Director, LTS Africa, Kenya
Emanuele Cuccillato	M&E Technical Advisor, Cambodia Climate Change Alliance, Ministry of Environment, Cambodia
John Mayhew	Independent Consultant, Kenya

Nicolina Lamhauge	Climate Adaptation team, OECD
Johan Schaar	Co-director Vulnerability and Adaptation programme, WRI
Anika Olsson	Adaptation Advisor, Climate and Environment Department, DFID
Barry Smith	Independent Consultant, Ghana
Ian Tellam	Adaptify
Nick Brooks	Director, Garama 3C Ltd
Ian Burton	Visiting Fellow
Neha Rai	Researcher, IIED Climate Change group
Susannah Fisher	Researcher, IIED Climate Change group
Nanki Kaur	Senior Researcher, IIED Climate Change group
James Pattison	Independent consultant, Kenya
Simon Anderson	Head of IIED Climate Change group
Sibongile Pradhan	Independent consultant

Workshop Session Overview

The workshop took place over 3 days, with morning and afternoon sessions as follows:

Session 1: TAMD update and meta-analysis of the country appraisals

Session 2: The Scottish case and climate change adaptation M&E in different contexts

Session 3: The TAMD operational framework paper

Session 4: Applying the TAMD framework to cases

Session 5: The results of applying the TAMD framework to selected situations

Session 6: Planning the work of feasibility testing in the case countries (phase 2)

Session 1: TAMD Update and Meta-Analysis of the Country Appraisals

Description

An update of the TAMD initiative was presented.

TAMD resources to date include the preparation of:

- The [Concepts Paper](#) in July 2011,
- A [Summary Report](#) of the Scoping Studies from the 5 case countries carried out in July 2012,
- The five country [Reports of the Appraisal and Design Phase](#) of TAMD development in February 2013,
- The [Meta-Analysis](#) of the five Appraisal and Design reports in February 2013,
- The [Operational Framework Paper](#) in March 2013.

The country prototypes are under development. These consist of the interventions that the framework will be applied to, the candidates for Track 2 data-sets, and the partners involved in the work.

Key questions that have arisen during the design and appraisal phase include:

- What do we mean by climate risk management?
- How can we characterize climate adaptation?
- Can TAMD be operated at sub-national levels for local authorities?
- Can the TAMD causal model be worked in 'two directions' i.e. the developmental outcomes of adaptation and adaptive outcomes of development?

The preliminary ideas for the Meta-analysis of the Appraisal and Design country reports were presented, along with an examination of key issues arising [[report](#) and [presentation](#)]. The analysis uses the building blocks framework for climate change mainstreaming [[building blocks paper](#)], i.e. the policy frameworks and institutional frameworks for development planning, political will and climate information services plus other parts of the enabling environment, and the resource envelope including the programme and project portfolio.

This was followed by guided focus-group discussions and open plenary discussion.

Actions to be taken

- Information on climate change across planning cycles to be provided to Neha Rai by email.
- Neha Rai to incorporate missing information into the meta-analysis as identified in box 1 below.

Areas identified as needing further exploration and development

- Developing technical capacity to implement TAMD and thereby enhancing national climate change M&E systems.
- Making full use of existing government data (rather than gathering new data), and ensuring effective information sharing, through the facilitation and strengthening of the roles and identities of the different service providers.
- Ensuring there is clarity as to adaptation indicators and what data to collect for the indicators.
- Identifying variables and ascertaining how comparable are they.
- Incorporating TAMD into national planning and providing and / or highlighting tools to do that.
- Ensuring TAMD includes systems for two-way interaction and highlighting what is already happening to support this.
- Working around the lack of horizontal and vertical linkages, eg Centre-Province and Province-Province.
- Linking the indicators for Track 1 and Track 2, and working with the overlap.
- Choosing and getting mutual agreement on a set of national adaptation / development indicators by taking indicator suggestions from all ministries in a way that appears inclusive and fair.
- Looking out for development that hinders adaptation and adaptation that impairs development (rather than assuming to find positive development outcomes of adaptation and adaptation outcomes of development).
- Remembering that adaptation is a means to an end, a journey, and being clear about exactly who pays the costs, who adapts, who develops and who benefits.
- Considering longer-term development implications as regards to modernity and / or wellbeing.

- Ensuring TAMD helps shed light on the details within, highlighting what is being developed, for whom, and with what outcomes.
- Considering the resources invested and the value for money of instruments developed.
- Considering the value and dis-benefits of the aggregation of information.
- Ensuring TAMD is seen as an approach for policy and interventions at all levels - national, regional and more local levels.

Box 1. Comments regarding how well the meta-analysis reflects the reality in each country

- Generally the analysis reflects the situation well, but in some cases there are omissions or there have been later developments that are not included.
 - Mozambique has online portals.
 - Mozambique suggestions: As each ministry should have a focal point for cross-cutting issues, climate risk should have a focal person in each ministry, or there should be a unit established.
 - Kenya: there are many climate adaptation indicators because of the close association between development and climate change. The development / adaptation data is there, but there is a question of how to make best use of it from a climate adaptation perspective.
 - Kenya: A climate change action plan is to be launched, and a climate change information repository to be developed.
 - Pakistan additional information: there is a climate change Task Force, that has been developed slowly and steadily through a 'home grown' approach to climate change and adaptation.
 - Important to reflect the value of 'home grown' in the meta-analysis report; that countries pushed by donors, such as Nepal, may appear further ahead, but Pakistan's development may be better grounded because it is home grown.
 - Nepal additional information: the role and value of NAST.
 - Nepal questions: How to reflect that having institutions and policies in place may differ from the reality of how they work in practice? How to match the great changes in policy that are taking place in certain sectors and the general practice across all sectors, and across changing political situations?
 - We need to be humble around the uncertainty; we need openness.
 - There is implied judgment or evaluation in the meta-analysis. Agreement was reached that we do not want to imply that some systems are better than others, when in fact we want a diversity of approaches in this piloting phase.
- Action: consider the implied values when framing the conclusions of the report.

Session 2: The Development of the Scottish Adaptation Programme, and Climate Change Adaptation M&E in Different Contexts

Description

Members from [ClimateXChange](#) and Adaptation Scotland presented the Scottish Adaptation Framework. They described the Scottish Climate Change Adaptation Programme, the framework for monitoring and evaluating action in local government areas, and research into developing indicators and baselines for monitoring climate change adaptation in Scotland.

[Presentations: [Scottish Climate Change Adaptation Programme](#), [Adapting to climate change: Monitoring and evaluating local action](#), and [Monitoring climate change adaptation: Developing indicators and baselines](#).]

An informal presentation was given, by a member of the Climate Adaptation team at the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, on an approach to assessing climate adaptation effectiveness and the preliminary findings of a study looking at the UK, Germany, Nepal and Mozambique.

The discussion that followed was based around identifying tasks and challenges of climate change adaptation M&E in different contexts.

Actions to be taken

- TAMD team to look at incorporating elements of the Adaptation Scotland approach into the operational framework.
- A dialogue will be maintained between Adaptation Scotland and TAMD as both frameworks are further developed and implemented.

Areas identified as needing further exploration and development:

- The sense and sensibilities of using climate projections as a basis for climate adaptation priorities and to set baselines for M&E. Setting climate risks from down-scaled data in developing countries is not as effective as basing climate adaptation priorities on development needs and climate vulnerabilities as set out for National Adaptation Plans by the UNFCCC Dec 5 CP.17.
- Why climate risk assessments have not taken account of concurrent socio-economic changes. Climate risk management mainstreaming as an indicator of government performance is not used in UK, but are proscribed by the PPCR.
- How it is that the learning and development time for climate change adaptation M&E is recognized in European countries, but a forced pace is being imposed on developing countries through global climate programmes. A PEA should look at the different schedules.
- The knowledge transfer that needs to be established among domestic climate agencies and development cooperation agencies of European countries on M&E climate change adaptation.
- An assessment of the benefits of centralizing climate change adaptation M&E within government.
- The development of the skills needed for processing available data and information.
- The value of creativity in using data, of making good use of what is already there.
- An assessment of the relative emphasis – natural environment, sectors, vulnerability, poverty – across country contexts.
- The importance of communicating results – common to all contexts.
- The explicit integration of climate change into public policy areas, and how it translates in different countries.

Session 3: The TAMD Operationalization Framework

The [technical paper](#) on an Operational Framework for TAMD was presented [[presentation](#)]. It illustrated mapping outputs, outcomes and impacts in the two tracks, and indicators at the different levels. It described the overarching indicators and gave examples of indicator score-cards with sub-indicators. It discussed attribution, and TAMD in a quasi-experimental mode. It provided a TAMD check-list and outlined next steps for the development of the framework. Discussion followed. Comments on the framework are in Box 2 below.

Several of the points below resulted from **Session 4** where small country specific groups applied the TAMD framework to their own situation. More comments resulted from **session 5** and have been incorporated here.

Actions to be taken

- Incorporate comments from the participants (the list below and box 2) into the operational framework (Nick Brooks). Give more thought to indicators at the bottom of track 2 (all). Feedback on using the indicator score-cards in practice to be given to Nick Brooks over coming months.
- Develop a single set of indicators rather than balanced number groups, and put up on website as an alternative to the current grouped sets (Nick Brooks).

Areas identified as needing further exploration and development

- Track 2 outcomes – higher level outcomes that only happen at aggregate levels – not just a summation e.g. landscapes, local economies.
- Track 2 outcomes reflect / refer to international development indicators. Country specific communication of findings related to national development objectives.
- Attribution not addressed so directly in annex 1 country examples. Emergent properties of Climate Risk Management improvements can be taken as outcomes.
- The capture of autonomous adaptation within the framework.
- Development interventions that challenge climate resilience. Important to keep indicators disaggregated to reveal interactions.
- Means towards use of counterfactuals – value added by these approaches and costs.
- Interventions – currently cover projects and sectors; consider national level also.
- Determining whether quasi-experimental designs require longer timescales.
- The use of data uncertainty (i.e. availability x reliability) as an indicator in itself.
- Need to in each country examine coherence of development policy and climate responses.
- Equity of distribution of costs and benefits – targeting, coverage. Public good creation – whether it happen and if so how. How we assess the rivalous and exclusivity aspects of adaptation outcomes.
- Constructing indicators from what is important on the ground, then identify data that is used to track changes.
- Value of doing this across a whole sector rather than specific projects within a sector, and issues of how to do this in practice and how to develop valid counterfactuals.
- Important not to overlook the issue of the effectiveness of targeting the climate vulnerable poor through climate adaptation interventions.
- Suggestion to do a meta-analysis or relationship assessment within each country.
- How Track 1 can also be used as a capacity development needs assessment.
- Need to balance track 1 that has lots of detail and track 2 with less (Nick Brooks - there is an assumption that it exists for track 2).
- External factors as risks / assumptions to adaptation effectiveness. Identified through the theories of change. Leads to vulnerability assessment to include exogenous factors (developed through guidance on vulnerability assessment and risk guidance notes.) Non-climate risk drivers (minimum needed).
- Track 1 often capacity related that comes before more sensitive areas of track 2. Time needed for track 2 is high.
- Track 1 allows monitoring of 'larger' parts of systems in terms of coherence of climate risk management and M&E of adaptation.

Box 2: Comments on the framework:**Purpose:**

- Need clarity on TAMD focus / purpose, and the balance of national vs project level.
- Need to ensure that the framework also says *why* and *how*.
- It seems that overall we are looking for an increase in wellbeing indicator values.

Indicators:

- Do we need all the indicator sub-questions, or is there duplication / redundancy?
- Indicators and sub-indicators need to be better delineated, and clarity is needed as to whether the sub-indicators must be used as a suite or can be chosen from.
- There is a need to include narratives, as indicators will not capture everything.
- Technical indicators / contextual indicators contribute towards socio-economic scores.
- How can we jump from one intervention to an aggregation?
- Perhaps MDGs can be used, or vulnerability indicators.
- Vulnerability definitions can be context specific, so it is important for TAMD to use the most appropriate.

Score-cards:

- A need to discuss overall methodology with respect to the score cards.
- Consider a scoring system rather than the 'no-partial-yes' options; perhaps 5-score rather than the 3-score.
- How the indicator question cards can be modified to make them applicable at local level.

Comparability:

- Important to remember the aim is sampling to enable comparability.
- Comparability is important if TAMD is to add value – insight to improve programmes, compare across programmes and between programmes.
- Unit-less scores can enable the framework to be used for comparability between sectors.

Communication:

- Important to explain the purpose of the framework.
- How will the TAMD outcomes be communicated?
- How do we use the framework to flag up issues to policy makers?

Data challenges:

- There are challenges of determining indicators and of establishing a baseline.
- It may be difficult to find the data (both using existing data and gathering new).

Approach:

- Different strategies required for TAMD framework for a) existing projects / programmes, b) new projects not yet started.
- How the links are made if TAMD is applied at different levels. Without a TAMD-compatible national level system how do sub-national uses fit in? Hoped that socio-economic situation can be assessed across a range of projects / programmes.
- TAMD will vary with who the users are.
- TAMD needs to look outwards as well as inwards. How to incorporate what is happening outside the triangles?

Session 5: Results of Applying the TAMD Framework for Selected Situations and

Session 6: Planning the Work of Feasibility Testing Phase in Case Countries

Country groups presented their results of pre-applying the TAMD operational framework to a specific intervention in their country. Questions and discussion followed (points incorporated above).

Each country group outlined a TAMD prototype and their plans for feasibility testing over the coming year. These are modifications of the ones described in the [Appraisal and Design phase reports](#).

Final Session

Participants identified focus areas for assessing the outcomes of the TAMD feasibility-testing phase (see box 3). Participants discussed the steps to be taken over the second phase of TAMD development (March 2013 – March 2014).

Box 3: Criteria (or focus areas) for assessing the feasibility / utility phase outcomes:

- The utility for different stakeholders, in different contexts and with different users.
- The buy-in of government staff, agencies, development partners and practitioners.
- The value-added over and above intervention-level evaluation – its utility for comparison.
- The robustness or availability of counterfactuals.
- The cost effectiveness of putting TAMD in to practice.
 - Cost effectiveness of the exercise regarding the M&E of the intervention
 - Incremental cost of enhancing M&E with TAMD
 - Greater utility of existing data
- The utility at, before, during and after implementation.
- The incremental requirements for TAMD in terms of human resource and additional data.
- Whether the application of Track 1 can lead to institutional improvements identification - including changes in practices of development partners.
- Whether TAMD leads to improved decision making.
- Whether the learning process has been explicit and institutionalised.

Note the conflicts of interest that can arise while assessing these.

Actions to be taken - next steps:

- Workshop findings are written up and circulated.
- TAMD communication and information sharing takes place on 'Basecamp'.
- TAMD development dialogue continues on the TAMD web pages.
- A template for the country reports on testing TAMD feasibility and utility is developed, and, based on this, templates for the quarterly reports are prepared (Neha Rai).
- In each case country meetings take place with government and research partners to agree a short list of interventions for testing prototype.
- A preliminary round of feasibility testing takes place on short listed interventions.
- Each case country holds a workshop to launch the feasibility-testing process on a final choice of 2 or 3 interventions.
- Feasibility and utility testing takes place.
- Feasibility testing concludes in January 2014 and findings are promoted.
- A workshop to share experiences and learning takes place in March 2014.