



ADAPTATION FUND

AFB/EFC.13/4  
24 October 2013

---

Adaptation Fund Board  
Ethics and Finance Committee  
Thirteenth Meeting  
Bonn, Germany, 29-30 October 2013

Agenda Item 4

## **RESULTS TRACKING**

## Introduction

1. In June 2010, at the tenth meeting of the Adaptation Fund Board (the Board), the Board approved the Strategic Results Framework for the Adaptation Fund (the Fund) (Decision B.10/13). The results framework is structured around the overall objective to reduce vulnerability and increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability at local and national levels. The Fund-level framework includes seven key outcomes and associated outputs to facilitate aggregation and present Fund level results that contribute to the overall goal and objectives of the Fund.

2. With over two years of practice and an increasing demand for Fund-level results, it has become evident that the Fund would benefit from a modification to its approach for collecting results as well as examining ways to add impact-level indicators that a majority of the Fund's projects could report on. The ability to aggregate results and provide data on a portfolio level is important for the Fund to provide accurate information on performance, to demonstrate progress toward the Fund's stated goals, and to coordinate and streamline performance information. All of this will help the Fund in its drive for transparency and will aid in demonstrating value for money.

3. At its twenty-first meeting, the Board approved a proposal for steps to take to improve the Fund's results tracking system. The present paper prepared by the secretariat provides an update of the work done to date and introduces the inclusion of the accreditation of national and regional implementing entities (NIEs and RIEs) more systematically as part of the Fund's results system.

## Current results tracker

4. As was outlined in document AFB/EFC.12/3, the secretariat has found that the indicators selected and how they are measured is not always comparable across projects/programmes. Thus even if two projects/programmes are targeting similar outcomes, it becomes difficult to aggregate indicators across projects/programmes. As a first step to improve reporting, the secretariat has adjusted the indicators that fall under each of the seven key outcomes and their associated outputs to better aggregate these indicators across projects/programmes (for example, figures should be reported in absolute terms versus relative terms). Annex I provides the changes that have been made to the original indicators.

5. The secretariat is currently working to adjust its excel based tracker to incorporate these changes and develop a modified guidance document to project/programme proponents on how to select, measure, and report on key indicators.<sup>1</sup>

6. The secretariat has also modified the Project/Programme Performance Report (PPR) screening process. The secretariat has found when screening the first PPR of a project that the results tracker is not always appropriately completed. Since baselines must be complete during the first year of project/programme implementation, this is a critical point to have accurate indicators and targets set and reported on. A check for the completion of the results tracker for the first year of implementation has been integrated into the PPR screening checklist.

---

<sup>1</sup> This would be an abridged version of the 123 page *Results Framework and Baseline. Guidance* document available on the AF website (<https://www.adaptation-fund.org/sites/default/files/Results%20Framework%20and%20Baseline%20Guidance%20final%20compressed.pdf>) and would focus on what the Fund is asking for in practical terms.

## Core impact indicators

7. The secretariat has seen that although most of the projects/programmes approved to date align well with the seven key Fund-level outcomes, it is difficult to aggregate these indicators at the portfolio level. The diverse nature of the Fund's projects and programmes covering six different sectors and a myriad of activities on the ground makes it particularly challenging to provide aggregated quantitative results for the portfolio. This challenge has become more acute given the flexible nature of the Fund's results framework whereby project and programme proposals are only required to report on one Fund level outcome indicator.

8. The secretariat is proposing that the Board adopt two impact level results to track. These are:

- i. Increased adaptive capacity of communities to respond to the impacts of climate change
- ii. Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change induced stress

9. The secretariat has been coordinating with other climate funds to try and harmonize what is being measured elsewhere for climate change adaptation. The secretariat has also been following work being done at the international level on measuring resilience and adaptive capacity. This includes the work being done by the DAC-EPOC Joint Task Team on Climate Change and Development Co-operation,<sup>2</sup> the Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group (TWG), under the Food Security Information Network (FSIN),<sup>3</sup> and the UK's International Climate Fund (ICF) work on monitoring and evaluation climate finance.<sup>4</sup>

10. Out of this work the secretariat has identified a preliminary set of six indicators to track under each of these impacts. These may change however as work on the methodology for each indicator begins. The preliminary indicators are presented below (Table 1).

TABLE 1: PRELIMINARY CORE INDICATORS

Impact	Potential Indicators
<i>Increased adaptive capacity of communities to respond to the impact of climate change</i>	i) No. of direct beneficiaries; ii) No. of early warning systems developed; iii) Increased income, or avoided decrease in income iv) Assets produced, or protected from damage
<i>Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change induced stress</i>	v) km of coastline protected vi) ha of natural habitat protected or rehabilitated

11. The Fund-level outcome and output indicators will still be used to analyze sub-sections of the portfolio or to undertake qualitative analysis. Implementing entities will be requested to submit data on the additional indicators but for many these indicators are already being tracked at the project level. These indicators are either not explicitly reported on or if reported on are done under a wide range of methodologies that makes aggregation difficult.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.oecd.org/dac/environment-development/dac-epoctaskteamonclimatechangeanddevelopmentco-operation.htm>

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.fsincop.net/topics/resilience-measurement/technical-working-group/en/#sthash.ApqJhBs2.dpuf>

<sup>4</sup> <https://www.gov.uk/government/policies/taking-international-action-to-mitigate-climate-change/supporting-pages/international-climate-fund-icf>

## Integration of Direct Access into Results

12. One of the most innovative features of the Adaptation Fund is its mandate to pilot direct access. This major pillar of the Fund however has not been integrated into the Fund's results framework. The basic quantitative indicators for direct access are already being tracked:

- i. Number of NIE applications received
- ii. Number of NIEs accredited
- iii. Number of proposals submitted by NIEs
- iv. Number of project approved by NIEs

13. These output level indicators are essential to track; however, there is much more impact that the accreditation process has for the Fund as a whole. The benefit for a country goes beyond merely having an entity accredited or implementing one project. The secretariat has had discussions with entities about these benefits; however a systematic recording of entities' experience with the process has not been done. To begin tracking data on this experience, the secretariat will develop an exit survey for accredited entities to take. The survey will help to collect basic qualitative measures on the process. In addition, one of the main aspects of an overall evaluation of the Fund should be to examine the accreditation effects on national institutions and the potential broader impact of the Fund on strengthening their capacity to mobilize climate finance. The evaluation should draw lessons and develop in-depth a few case studies on the impact of the accreditation process on entities.

## Timeframe for Completion

14. There are several elements that are still in process or need further research to complete. The table below provides the time frame for when the secretariat will aim to complete each activity.

TABLE 2: TIMEFRAME TO COMPLETE CHANGES TO RESULTS TRACKING

Activity	Date to Complete
1) Complete changes to results tracker	December 2013
2) Develop modified guidance document	January 2013
3) Develop methodology for core indicators	February 2013
4) Develop exit survey for accreditation process	February 2013

15. The secretariat will continue to follow the latest trends in resilience measurement and feedback lessons learned from the Fund's experience with projects/programmes on the ground.

## Annex I: Changes to Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Indicators

The Adaptation Fund Strategic Results Framework includes the long-term goal, outcomes, outputs, and a small set of indicators for the Fund as a whole. The Adaptation Fund works toward the achievement of the overall goal and outcomes. Consequently, any project or programme funded through the AF must align with the Fund's results framework and directly contribute to the overall objective and outcomes outlined. The results architecture for the Fund is framed as follows:<sup>5</sup>

**Objective: Reduce vulnerability and increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability at local and national levels.**

EXPECTED RESULTS	INDICATORS
<b>Goal:</b> Assist developing-country Parties to the Kyoto Protocol that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change in meeting the costs of concrete adaptation projects and programmes in order to implement climate-resilient measures.	
<b>Impact:</b> Increased resiliency at the community, national, and regional levels to climate variability and change.	
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Reduced exposure <del>at national level</del> to climate-related hazards and threats	1. Relevant threat and hazard information generated and disseminated to stakeholders on a timely basis
<b>Output 1.1:</b> Risk and vulnerability assessments conducted and updated <del>at a national level</del>	1.1. <del>No. and type</del> of projects/ <u>programmes</u> that conduct and update risk and vulnerability assessments <u>(by sector and scale)</u>
	1.2. <del>Development of No.</del> early warning systems <u>(by scale) and no. beneficiaries covered</u>
<b>Output 1.2:</b> <u>Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems</u>	<u>1.2.1. Percentage of target population covered by adequate risk-reduction systems</u>
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Strengthened institutional capacity to reduce risks associated with climate-induced socioeconomic and environmental losses	<del>2.1. No. and type of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks</del> <u>2.1. Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased</u>
	<del>2.2. Number of people with reduced risk to extreme weather events</del>
<b>Output 2.1:</b> Strengthened capacity of national and <del>regional-sub-national</del> centres and networks to respond rapidly to extreme weather events	2.1.1. No. of staff trained to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events <u>(by gender)</u>
	<u>2.1.2 No. of targeted institutions with increased capacity to minimize exposure to climate variability risks (by type, sector and scale)</u>
<del>Output 2.2:</del> <u>Targeted population groups covered by adequate risk reduction systems</u>	<del>2.1.2. Capacity of staff to respond to, and mitigate impacts of, climate-related events from targeted institutions increased</del>
	<del>2.2.1. Percentage of population covered by adequate risk-reduction systems</del>
	<del>2.2.2. No. of people affected by climate variability</del>

<sup>5</sup> AFB/EFC.1/3/rev.1 June 16, 2010

<b>Outcome 3:</b> Strengthened awareness and ownership of adaptation and climate risk reduction processes at local level	3.1. Percentage of targeted population aware of predicted adverse impacts of climate change, and of appropriate responses
	3.2. <del>Modification in behavior</del> Percentage of targeted population <u>applying appropriate adaptation responses</u>
<b>Output 3:</b> Targeted population groups participating in adaptation and risk reduction awareness activities	3.1.1 <del>No. and type of risk reduction actions or strategies introduced at local level</del>
	3.1.2 No. of news outlets in the local press and media that have covered the topic
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Increased adaptive capacity within relevant development <u>sector services</u> and <u>natural resource sectors</u> <del>infrastructure assets</del>	4.1. <u>Responsiveness of Development development sectors'</u> services <del>responsive</del> to evolving needs from changing and variable climate
	4.2. Physical infrastructure improved to withstand climate change and variability-induced stress
<b>Output 4:</b> Vulnerable <del>physical, natural, and social assets</del> <u>development sector services and infrastructure assets</u> strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	4.1.1. No. and type of <del>health or social infrastructure developed or development sector services</del> modified to respond to new conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by <del>type</del> <u>sector and scale</u> )
	4.1.2. No. of physical assets strengthened or constructed to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by <del>asset type</del> <u>sector and scale</u> )
<b>Outcome 5:</b> Increased ecosystem resilience in response to climate change and variability-induced stress	5. Ecosystem services and natural <u>resource</u> assets maintained or improved under climate change and variability-induced stress
<b>Output 5:</b> Vulnerable <del>physical, natural, and social ecosystem services and natural resource</del> <u>assets</u> strengthened in response to climate change impacts, including variability	5.1. No. <del>and type</del> of natural resource assets created, maintained or improved to withstand conditions resulting from climate variability and change (by type <del>of assets</del> <u>and scale</u> )
<b>Outcome 6:</b> Diversified and strengthened livelihoods and sources of income for vulnerable people in targeted areas	6.1 Percentage of households and communities having more secure <del>(increased)</del> access to livelihood assets
	6.2. Percentage of targeted population with sustained climate-resilient <u>alternative</u> livelihoods
<b>Output 6:</b> Targeted individual and community livelihood strategies strengthened in relation to climate change impacts, including variability	6.1.1.No. and type of adaptation assets ( <del>physical as well as knowledge</del> <u>tangible and intangible</u> ) created <u>or strengthened</u> in support of individual- or community- livelihood strategies
	6.2.1.2. Type of income sources for households generated under climate change scenario
<b>Outcome 7:</b> Improved policies and regulations that promote and enforce resilience measures	7. Climate change priorities are integrated into national development strategy
<b>Output 7:</b> Improved integration of climate-resilience strategies into country development plans	7.1. No., <del>type, and sector</del> of policies introduced or adjusted to address climate change risks ( <u>by sector</u> )
	7.2. No. <del>of</del> targeted development strategies with incorporated climate change priorities enforced