

TAMD Climate Change Indicator - Methodological Note

Short title	INDICATOR 4. INSTITUTIONAL KNOWLEDGE/CAPACITY <i>Level of knowledge and training of key personnel in climate change issues and mainstreaming processes</i>
Type or Indicator	<i>Scorecard; output or outcome depending on how applied</i>
Technical definition/ Methodological summary	<p>This indicator is designed to capture the extent to which development and adaptation planning is informed by knowledge of climate change in general and specific knowledge relating to methodologies for integrating or mainstreaming climate change into planning, and the extent to which planning staff are trained in relevant areas.</p> <p>The indicator can be used to assess the performance of an individual capacity building programme, through evaluation of the target system (e.g. ministry, sector, institution) at the beginning, during, and at the end of the programme.</p> <p>The indicator may also be used to assess institutional knowledge in systems targeted by multiple programmes.</p> <p>Where the aim is to evaluate the effectiveness of capacity building interventions 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.</p> <p>The indicator is most likely to represent an <u>outcome</u> indicator, as it examines the outcomes at the level of the target system resulting from the outputs of programmes.</p> <p>The indicator could also be used as an <u>output</u> indicator, if it is adapted to measure the numbers of staff in an institution/organisation meeting the criteria described in the questions (see scorecard below).</p> <p>The indicator takes the form of a scorecard based on five criteria relating to the extent to which relevant personnel within an institution are knowledgeable about climate change and integration/mainstreaming processes. 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”).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>The indicator scorecard is set out in <u>the table below</u>.</p>

INDICATOR 4. Institutional Knowledge/Capacity			
CRITERIA/QUESTIONS	NO	PAR-TIAL	YES
1. Does planning involve individuals with some awareness of climate change?			
2. Does planning involve individuals with formal training in climate change issues?			
3. Does planning involve individuals who have attended accredited courses on climate change, development, planning and "mainstreaming" issues?			
4. Is integration of climate change into planning overseen by individuals with in-depth knowledge of integration/mainstreaming processes?			
5. Are numbers of people with required training involved in planning processes adequate?			
<i>SCORE (No. of "YES" answers x 2, plus no. of "PARTIAL" answers x 1)</i>			
<p><u>Methodological points to note</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. While this indicator has been developed in the context of climate change adaptation, it is sufficiently flexible that it could be applied in mitigation/low-carbon development (LCD) contexts. Where this indicator, or adapted versions of it, is/are applied to the coordination of both mitigation/LCD and adaptation activities it is recommended that mitigation/LCD and adaptation are addressed separately, particularly where mitigation activities (e.g. regulation of greenhouse gas emissions) are more advanced than adaptation activities (e.g. cross-sectoral adaptation initiatives that might integrate, for example, adaptation in the agriculture and water sectors), 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. This indicator focuses heavily on capacity/knowledge for mainstreaming climate change adaptation into development planning. Mainstreaming typically involves screening of initiatives for climate risks; commissioning external climate risk assessments (CRA) for high-risk initiatives; evaluating the viability of high-risk initiatives; identifying, prioritising and implementing risk reduction (i.e. adaptation) measures for initiatives that are viable but where risks have been identified; the development of monitoring and evaluation frameworks for tracking progress; and evaluation and learning. 4. Awareness of climate change [Question 1] refers to general awareness of the existence of climate change and its potential impacts at different scales. 5. Formal training in climate change [Question 2] includes graduate-level training or professional training that includes climate change components/content. Such training may focus on the scientific aspects of climate change without extending to the implications of climate 			

	<p>change for development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Accredited courses [Question 3] are courses that have been approved by the institution in question or partner organisations (e.g. donors) engaged in mainstreaming issues, and should address the links between climate change and development, with specific attention to adaptation and the integration or mainstreaming of climate change into development planning and practice. 7. Integration or mainstreaming [Question 4] is an emerging field of practice and knowledge in its own right, and it is important that those responsible for ensuring that climate change is addressed in planning have sufficient knowledge of mainstreaming processes. Integration of climate change adaptation into planning will be more effective where it is overseen by individuals with a knowledge of these processes than where integration is managed by non-specialist staff who simply seek input from those trained in integration/mainstreaming. Question 4 is wider in scope than Question 3, as it addresses experience of mainstreaming that may have been gained in contexts other than through formal training as addressed in Question 3. 8. Climate change mainstreaming and effective risk management will require that a sufficient number of staff, at a variety of levels, understand climate change contexts, risks and mainstreaming processes, and are able to address these in the development and implementation of planning processes [Question 5]. Previous questions address general knowledge and awareness of climate change, and the capacity of key staff involved in or in charge of mainstreaming; Question 5 addresses the extent to which knowledge of mainstreaming is commonplace throughout an organisation. <p>Guidance on answering the questions that make up the indicator is provided in the table below.</p>
--	--

	Conditions necessary for answer of:		
Q	NO	PARTIAL	YES
1	There is little or no general awareness of climate change issues among planning staff.	Some staff are aware of climate change issues but awareness is limited, in terms of both numbers of staff and depth of knowledge. Climate change is still seen by some/many as an environmental issue.	There is a high level of awareness of climate change and (i) what it means in terms of potential risks to development.
2	No staff have any formal training in climate change.	A few staff have training in general climate change issues (e.g. science, policy), but they are not in key roles and impact of their knowledge is limited.	Many and/or key staff have formal climate change training (e.g. science, policy, etc).
3	No staff have attended accredited courses dealing with climate change adaptation and mainstreaming.	A few staff have attended accredited courses dealing with climate change adaptation and mainstreaming, but influence is limited due to their not being in key positions.	Key staff in positions of influence have attended accredited courses dealing with climate change adaptation and mainstreaming.
4	No staff have experience, knowledge or training in mainstreaming processes.	Some staff have experience, knowledge, or training in mainstreaming, but they do not have responsibility, or are not empowered, to promote mainstreaming.	Mainstreaming of climate change is overseen by staff with relevant experience, knowledge or training (see previous Qs), who are empowered to integrate climate change into planning.
5	The number of staff with relevant and sufficient training in climate change issues is small (or zero), and these staff have very limited impact.	A proportion of staff have relevant training, but they are insufficient in number to ensure routine integration of climate change into planning.	Staff are generally familiar with climate change issues and comfortable with mainstreaming processes, with many having relevant training.
Rationale	For planning processes and mechanisms to be implemented effectively, planning staff need to have a grasp not only of climate change issues at large (scientific contexts, impacts, adaptation, mitigation, etc), but also of mainstreaming/integration processes and mechanisms. This includes familiarity with screening processes and climate risk assessments (CRAs) (e.g. the different ways of doing a CRA, how to prepare terms of reference for an external CRA, etc), as well as the identification, prioritisation, implementation and evaluation of risk reduction/ adaptation measures. These are areas of expertise in their own right, and the emerging nature of these areas means that significant capacity building specifically targeted at mainstreaming will be required for the effective integration of climate change into planning.		
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		

	<p>government or other relevant personnel.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>
<p>Data included and data aggregation</p>	<p><i>Support to a single institution, sector, mechanism or process</i> 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.</p> <p><i>Support to multiple institutions, sectors, mechanisms or process</i> 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).</p> <p><i>Interpretation</i> In all cases, scores should be presented alongside qualitative information related to attribution (see data included and aggregation).</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Most recent baseline</p>	<p>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</p>

	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	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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) <p>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.</p>
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.