

## **Supplementary background material for session SP043 “Understanding practice, progress and lessons learned in adaptation – approaches to monitoring, reporting and evaluation at national level and the way forward”**

### **Intro and background**

Countries are increasingly required to report on their efforts to adapt to climate change e.g. through their international commitments to the Paris Agreement (UNEP Adaptation Gap Report, 2017<sup>1</sup>). Assessments of emerging practice of national level adaptation monitoring, reporting and evaluation (MRE) in Europe (EEA Technical report No 20/2015), the latest OECD Climate Change Expert Group Paper No. 2017(3) (Insights from national adaptation monitoring and evaluation systems) and a comparative study by GIZ & IISD (2014)<sup>2</sup> have shown that while adaptation priorities and climate risks vary across countries, the challenges of understanding progress in adaptation are often shared. Recently the evaluation of the EU Adaptation Strategy found that most EU Member States have plans for periodic reviews of their national adaptation policies.<sup>3</sup> Whilst evidence of practical experiences remains limited, there is a pressing need to facilitate spreading of lessons learnt and sharing of experiences across countries.

As countries gain more experience in developing and implementing national climate change adaptation strategies and plans, the need for understanding their progress and effects is also increasing, especially through indicators for monitoring and evaluation of adaptation to climate change at national level. The Technical Paper “Indicators for adaptation to climate change at national level - Lessons from emerging practice in Europe”<sup>4</sup> contributes to the evolving knowledge base in this field and is accompanied by an annex including an Excel database of national adaptation indicator sets from five European countries collected in 2017 (Austria, Finland, Germany and the United Kingdom) and 2018 (Scotland).

The following background material on national monitoring and evaluation processes is based on the information provided under reporting of the Monitoring Mechanism Regulation, Article 15 (section on Monitoring, reporting and evaluation) and has been further supplemented by session presenters.

### **Austria**

A progress report was published by the Federal Ministry of Sustainability and Tourism (BMNT in 2015 on the state of implementation of the measures described in the NAP)<sup>5</sup>. Monitoring and evaluation of the NAS/NAP is pragmatic and comprises two modules: 1) a self-assessment approach using a

---

<sup>1</sup> Chapter 2 summarises the reporting obligations under the Paris Agreement: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321151757\\_Adaptation\\_in\\_the\\_Paris\\_Agreement\\_and\\_provisions\\_for\\_review\\_and\\_reporting](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/321151757_Adaptation_in_the_Paris_Agreement_and_provisions_for_review_and_reporting)

<sup>2</sup> This study compared ten national adaptation M&E systems including from UK, Germany and Norway [http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/?wpfb\\_dl=163](http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/?wpfb_dl=163)

<sup>3</sup> Evaluation of the EU Strategy on adaptation to climate change - SWD(2018)461 <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=SWD:2018:461:FIN>

<sup>4</sup> [https://cca.eionet.europa.eu/reports/TP\\_3-2018](https://cca.eionet.europa.eu/reports/TP_3-2018)

<sup>5</sup>

[https://www.bmnt.gv.at/umwelt/klimaschutz/klimapolitik\\_national/anpassungsstrategie/Fortschrittsbericht.html](https://www.bmnt.gv.at/umwelt/klimaschutz/klimapolitik_national/anpassungsstrategie/Fortschrittsbericht.html)

stakeholder survey based on the NAP and sent to the key actors mentioned therein; 2) an indicator-based approach with qualitative and quantitative data collections.<sup>6</sup> The results from the progress report show that implementation and mainstreaming of adaptation is increasing in Austria with a different level of progress in the various areas of action. The results were of high relevance for the first updated version of the Austrian Adaptation Strategy and its Action Plan as of 2017.

## **Finland**

Finland adopted its first National Adaptation Strategy in 2005 and in late 2014 it was replaced by the current National Adaptation Plan 2022. In addition to the NAP, sector administrations have their own adaptation action plans for which monitoring and evaluation efforts are also carried out<sup>7</sup>.

In early 2015, work started to develop monitoring of the National Adaptation Plan. Work focused on developing a monitoring system and a set of adaptation indicators. A first list of key adaptation indicators was compiled in 2015-2016. The indicators were discussed in a dialogue with stakeholders in 2017 and their further development is an ongoing process.

A mid-term evaluation of the NAP was carried out in 2018 and its results were published in April 2019 (English translation forthcoming). The evaluation followed a two-phase process. In the first phase, a facilitated self-evaluation was carried out among sector administrations at the national level, consisting of group interviews with representatives of ministries and associated agencies and national research institutes in eight sectors, as well as key regional and local level representatives. The second phase focused on engaging stakeholders beyond the national level administration. Regional and local stakeholders from 11 different sectors were consulted via an online survey, and five regional stakeholder workshops were organised around the country to discuss progress of adaptation work from a regional perspective. The mid-term evaluation assessed progress in implementing the NAP and proposed further actions to enhance its implementation for the years leading up to 2022.

Earlier, a classification of adaptation levels for different sectors was used in the mid-term evaluation in 2008-2009 and in 2013 in broader assessment of the 2005 NAS. The classification was used to assess the progress in adaptation in 15 different sectors. The adaptation levels indicator operated on a scale of 1 to 5. The adaptation level was defined for each sector based on four components of the indicator: 1) Awareness: recognition of adaptation needs, 2) Knowledge: level of adaptation research, 3) Adaptation measures: launch of adaptation measures, and 4) Cross-sectoral cooperation: co-operation with other sectors.<sup>8</sup>

## **Portugal**

The operationalization of the NAS is essentially based on the Biennial Implementation Plans which aggregate the planned actions of the NAS thematic areas and sectoral WG. In the end of each biennium an interim report is published covering the progresses made considering the contents on the Biennial Implementation Plans. Two interim reports were published (2015-16 and 2017-18) and an evaluation and final report is planned to be published in the end of 2020. This last report will be

---

<sup>6</sup> Concept for progress description [BMNT, 2014](#)

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Action Plan for the Adaptation to Climate Change of the Environmental Administration: <http://julkaisut.valtioneuvosto.fi/handle/10024/79789>

<sup>8</sup> Further details are available in: [Evaluation of the Implementation of Finland's National Strategy for Adaptation to Climate Change 2009](#)

an important input to guide the revision of the NAS. These monitoring, reporting and evaluation activities are covered within the activities of the thematic area financing and implementing adaptation. One its objectives is precisely the establishment of effective reporting mechanisms, namely in the context of international obligations. It is within this thematic area that activities such as reporting to the UNFCCC and to the European Commission are held. In the NAP it is planned to establish a monitoring system with measurable indicators of two kinds: achievement and outcome. The achievement indicators are intended to measure the level of implementation of the proposed actions. These indicators are based on the monitoring framework and respective targets of the financial mechanisms that support the Lines of Action of the NAP. The outcome indicators are largely derived from current sectoral planning instruments and aim to measure the contribution of the NAP, directly or indirectly.

## **Spain**

Monitoring reports on the progress of the Spanish National Climate Change Adaptation Plan are carried out periodically by the OECC (Spanish Climate Change Office), in coordination with the GTIA (Working Group on Impacts and Adaptation with regional administrations), and adopted by the CCPCC and the CNC. Up to date, four monitoring reports, 2008, 2011, 2013 and 2018, have been produced. The Fourth Monitoring Report analyses the ongoing and completed activities undertaken in the period 2014-2018<sup>9</sup> (). Monitoring reports are structured according to the architecture of the PNACC (its axes and pillars) and they form the basis to follow up the progress in the implementation of the PNACC. In addition, an in-depth evaluation of the Plan has been launched in 2018 with a view to its possible review for the period 2020-2030. The process is part of the activities included in the LIFE SHARA project and among the means planned for its development stand out:

- Creation of an external advisory group, with the participation of technicians from administrations and other experts to guide the evaluation process.
- Carrying out of a survey to gather the assessments and recommendations of the agents interested in the PNACC and its development.
- Definition of a series of indicators that contribute to the evaluation of the Plan.
- Promotion of autonomous assessments by stakeholder groups.

## **UK**

### **England and Reserved Matters**

Work is carried out across Government to regularly track implementation of the National Adaptation Programme (NAP). The Adaptation Committee of the Committee on Climate Change (CCC) ASC has a statutory duty to assess the progress in implementing the NAP, reporting to Parliament every two years. Their next Progress Report is scheduled for summer 2019. The ASC Adaptation Committee also has evaluated and provided advice to Government on the Adaptation Reporting Power.

### **Scotland**

As required by the Climate Change (Scotland) Act 2009, the Scottish Government has reported annually to the Scottish Parliament since 2015 on progress on adaptation, and commissioned two

---

<sup>9</sup> [https://www.adaptecca.es/sites/default/files/documentos/2018-4informe\\_de\\_seguimiento\\_pnacc\\_anexo\\_ccaa.pdf](https://www.adaptecca.es/sites/default/files/documentos/2018-4informe_de_seguimiento_pnacc_anexo_ccaa.pdf)

independent assessments of the Scottish Adaptation Programme by the Adaptation Committee of the Committee on Climate Change CCC in 2016 and 2019.

### Wales

The new, draft Climate Change Adaptation Plan for Wales sets out a framework to report our progress every two years. A monitoring and evaluation framework will be published with the final plan to provide clear structure and consistency. Welsh Government intends to work with the UK Committee on Climate Change to allow for independent evaluation.

### Northern Ireland

NICCAP2 will incorporate lessons learnt and findings of an end-of-programme evaluation of NICCAP1. An initial set of measurable indicators, which are statistical datasets, have been assigned where possible, against a relevant NICCAP2 outcome objective. These will act as an evaluation mechanism to gauge the progress made towards delivering the outcome objective. NICCAP2 will be subject to a mid-programme review (expected in 2022) and an end of programme evaluation (expected in 2024). The mid - programme review will provide an assessment on the progress of the implementation of the delivery plans - actions, the appropriateness of the assigned indicators, and the progress towards delivering the programme's outcome objectives.

### International reflections

By now more than 40 countries from all continents have developed or are developing national adaptation M&E systems (UNEP Adaptation Gap Report, 2017, Chapter 4). The systems differ significantly across countries due to different governance structures and climate risks. Yet, only a handful of countries have reached the stage of fully operational systems. Countries face similar challenges during the development process including clarification of the exact purpose of M&E, securing buy-in from stakeholders (in particular line ministries), availability and reliability of data, and elaborating the institutional arrangements. In addition, developing countries, in particular Least Developed Countries, often struggle to find the necessary human and financial resources to build and sustain comprehensive adaptation M&E over time. Experience shows it often takes several years to finalise the design of national adaptation M&E systems and requires capacity building<sup>10</sup> and stakeholder engagement. A guidebook with key questions for the development of adaptation M&E systems has been compiled by GIZ & IISD in collaboration with UNFCCC's LDC Expert Group and the Adaptation Committee (GIZ & IISD, 2015<sup>11</sup>). Country-specific adaptation M&E systems offer benefits for both domestic use and international reporting under the Paris Agreement (UNEP Adaptation Gap Report, 2017, Chapter 4). Countries are also linking their M&E systems to progress monitoring of their national climate commitments (NDCs) and to national monitoring of the SDGs and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction.<sup>12</sup> A critical gap often remains the linkage between national and sub-national adaptation M&E and reporting (Leiter, 2015<sup>13</sup>).

---

<sup>10</sup> A training course on adaptation M&E has been developed and conducted in multiple countries including Thailand, Jordan, Grenada, the Philippines, Mexico, Bolivia and South Africa.

<http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/trainings/adaptation-me-training/>

<sup>11</sup> [http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/?wpfb\\_dl=268](http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/?wpfb_dl=268)

<sup>12</sup> See Adaptation M&E Policy Briefs: <http://www.adaptationcommunity.net/monitoring-evaluation/policy-briefs/>

<sup>13</sup> <https://www.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/ev.20135>