



PRIORITIES FOR M&E OF ADAPTATION

Nicolina Lamhauge, Environment Directorate, OECD



Why M&E of adaptation

- Global commitment to provide USD 100 billion per year by 2020 for adaptation and mitigation
- Adaptation specific initiatives are still relatively recent
 - Important to learn what approaches are effective in reducing climate vulnerability
- The *primary* objectives of M&E differ across stakeholder groups:
 - *Country governments*: to ensure that development objectives are climate resilient
 - *Development partner agencies*: to demonstrate value for money (and to ensure compliance with aid effectiveness principles)





M&E AT THE PROJECT / PROGRAMME LEVEL



Lessons from development agencies

- M&E of adaptation relatively recent
 - but established approaches for M&E of development in climate vulnerable sectors and areas
- An OECD review of 6 development agencies showed that:
 - Agencies aim to quantify the impact of adaptation interventions
 - Use a range of indicators and increasingly apply standard fund / programme indicators
 - Impacts are measured against baselines & targets but these generally do not account for climate change





Remaining challenges

1

How to measure the attribution of adaptation, especially when it is a relatively small component of an intervention

2

How to set baselines and targets – the role of climate projections compared to trend analysis

3

How to deal with the long time-horizons of climate change and when to conduct impact evaluation





M&E AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL



National level M&E of adaptation

- A step increase in adaptation programmes, plans and strategies in recent years
 - In part due to the NAPA and NAP supported processes in the LDCs
 - But similar progress seen in other developing and developed countries
- Lag between planning and implementation of policies and the formulation of M&E frameworks
 - But a lot of emerging experience
 - M&E of adaptation at the national level often disconnected from project/programme audits and impact evaluations
- OCED comparative analysis examines M&E approaches in:
 - Germany, Mozambique, Nepal and the UK





Emerging national level approaches 1/2

- Noticeable differences between the M&E frameworks in OECD member and non-member countries
- In part explained by the different policy approaches and funding mechanisms
 - OECD countries:
 - Integrated approach to adaptation
 - Overall assessment of change over time focusing on priority areas
 - LDCs:
 - Priority adaptation objectives outlined in the NAPAs.
 - Greater emphasis on assessing the enabling political environment and value-for-money



Emerging national level approaches 2/2

- Data availability and the capacity to use it is essential for good M&E of adaptation
 - Data collected on a regular basis using statistically robust methodologies
 - The capacity to use the data to evaluate change and to inform policy design and implementation processes
- Different timelines:
 - OECD countries: legal frameworks introduced in 2008 - first assessments planned for 2014-2015
 - LDC countries: legal frameworks introduced in 2011/2012 – first assessment (in Mozambique) planned for 2014



Priorities for national level M&E of adaptation

- M&E frameworks must reflect national priorities and be grounded in domestic capacities
- Build on stakeholder consultations from the outset
 - To ensure relevance and buy-in of the M&E framework
- Align the M&E frameworks of development partners to national approaches
 - When needed, harmonise M&E frameworks across partner agencies
- Improve data collection
 - Data is key to M&E but often limited in developing countries
- Enhance M&E capacity
 - To effectively use the data available





THANK YOU!

Nicolina.Lamhauge@oecd.org