Assessing UK International Climate Finance Actions Against the Global Goal on Adaptation

Neil Bird and Robin Mace-Snaith

December 2020

Catholic Agency for Overseas Development

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for peer review comments received from ICF government departments (FCDO, BEIS and Defra). Subject matter specialists from civil society organisations also provided helpful comments on earlier drafts of the paper. The authors would like to thank all peer reviewers for their valuable and thoughtful feedback and suggestions.

The contents of this publication, including any errors and omissions, are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views and opinions of either CAFOD or ODI.

Funding

This paper was funded by CAFOD through a grant to ODI.

About the authors

Neil Bird is a Senior Research Fellow within the Climate and Sustainability Programme at ODI. (n.bird@odi.org.uk)

Robin Mace-Snaith is Policy Lead – Climate Change and Energy at CAFOD. (rmace-snaith@cafod.org.uk)

Front and back cover photos credited to Charmaine Chitate

Assessing UK International Climate Finance Actions Against the Global Goal on Adaptation

KEY MESSAGES

- The UK is one of the world's leading providers of climate finance and the co-host of the 2021 UNFCCC climate negotiations (COP26), which means that its approach to reporting on climate finance is particularly important.
- Public reporting on climate change adaptation by the UK's ICF is not commensurate with the level of funding being committed.
- The extent to which the ICF portfolio is contributing to the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) cannot be independently assessed at the present time.
- The Development Tracker web portal is deficient as a public reporting tool for programme-level information that would demonstrate ICF's contribution to the GGA.
- A longstanding emphasis on the value-for-money metric appears to have come at a cost of far less attention being given to the metrics of equity, subsidiarity, equitable participation, 'do no harm', and environmental sustainability in ICF climate investments.

SUMMARY

This paper addresses a pressing concern: how does international action funded by developed countries contribute to the global goal of adapting to climate change? The paper focuses on the UK's International Climate Finance (ICF) and examines whether ICF actions are supporting the Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) of the Paris Agreement. The UK is one of the world's leading providers of climate finance, with a commitment to an even split in support for mitigation and adaptation. Scrutiny of this commitment is therefore important as the UK prepares to host the 2021 UNFCCC COP meeting in Glasgow.

An introduction and some background context are provided in **Sections 1 and 2**, and the paper then examines the publicly available information to assess whether the ICF is transparent in its public reporting and therefore accountable to citizens in the UK and in ICF partner countries.

Section 3 introduces an assessment framework as a means of judging whether ICF investments are consistent with the GGA. This is achieved through the development of a hierarchy of principles, criteria and indicators. The framework draws on principles listed in internationally agreed text for climate and development action. The authors identify 12 principles of action and use these as a basis from which to develop criteria and a set of indicators that can be applied to ICF programmes and the overall ICF portfolio.

The application of this framework can quickly demonstrate strengths and weakness of climate change adaptation investments that cannot be gained from current public reporting.

The Global Goal on Adaptation (GGA) of enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change.

CLIMATE PROTECTION
UNFCCC text, Articles 3.1 & 4.1 (g)

NATIONAL OWNERSHIP
Paris Agreement, Articles 7.5 & 9.3

SUBSIDIARITY
Paris Agreement, Article 7.5

EQUITABLE PARTICIPATION
UNFCCC text, Articles 3.1 & 4.1 (i)

TRANSPARENCY
Paris Agreement, Articles 7.5 and 9.7

ACCOUNTABILITY
Busan principles, Paragraph 23

PREDICTABILITY OF FUNDING
UNFCCC text, Article 4.3

TIMELINESS
Busan principles, Paragraph 26 (c)

ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY
Paris Agreement, Article 7.5

DO NO HARM
UNFCCC text, Article 3.4

EQUITY
UNFCC text, Article 3.1

GENDER EQUALITY
Paris Agreement, Article 7.5

“

As a result, the extent to which the ICF portfolio is contributing to the GGA cannot be assessed using this paper's proposed framework based on the information that is publicly available.

”

Section 4 considers public reporting of the ICF portfolio, focusing on three of the ICF Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) relevant to climate change adaptation: adapting to climate change (KPI 1), resilience (KPI 4), and transformation (KPI 15).

Public reporting at the portfolio level in the last five years has been limited to the first of these and is restricted to the sole measure of "number of people supported to better adapt to the effects of climate change as a result of ICF". As a result, the extent to which the ICF portfolio is contributing to the GGA cannot be assessed using this paper's proposed framework based on the information that is publicly available. This would require additional documentation on where this funding is being spent, whether it responds to recipients' concerns and, critically for funding categorized as development assistance, whether it addresses the needs of the most vulnerable by contributing to a reduction in poverty.

Section 5 reviews the evidence reported from four ICF programmes, with investments in Uganda, Madagascar and Ethiopia – all climate-vulnerable countries – together with a global programme. Public information provided by the UK government through its Development Tracker web portal is reviewed against each of the paper's indicators.

The Development Tracker web portal is found to be deficient as a public reporting tool that would allow the ICF's contribution to the GGA to be independently assessed. Some elements of our proposed framework for reporting actions are well documented at the programme level, including predictability and timeliness of funding. Others, such as the principles of equity, subsidiarity, equitable participation, 'do no harm', and environmental sustainability receive far less attention in public reporting. That is not to say that such principles are not addressed in programme design and implementation, but rather the public reporting that the UK government choses to provide about them in ICF programmes is deficient.

The paper concludes that ICF public reporting on climate change adaptation is not commensurate with the level of funding being committed to international climate action. With committed spending of approximately £5.8 billion of ICF between 2016/17 and 2020/21, this represents a significant lack of transparency and accountability of public expenditure. With a projected major increase in ICF spending happening at a time when public spending is coming under considerable strain as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, much improved transparency is urgently needed to respond to the increasing societal concern over climate change.

A longstanding emphasis on the value-for-money metric appears to have come at a cost of far less attention being given to the metrics of equity, subsidiarity, equitable participation, 'do no harm', and environmental sustainability in ICF climate investments. What ICF funds are spent on, who is supported, and the processes by which intended beneficiaries engage with development initiatives supported by the ICF are all important for public reporting if the UK is to demonstrate international leadership in climate change adaptation actions.

The authors make five recommendations to improve the visibility of the ICF as a major bilateral contributor to the GGA. Additional benefits would include providing much greater opportunities for lesson learning and strengthened accountability.

1 Public reporting and knowledge management need significant and immediate improvement for ICF funded programmes. The UK government should undertake a rapid review of how the ICF currently reports, and should then develop a strategy for improved visibility of its funded actions for climate change adaptation.

2 The proposed framework developed in this paper for reporting on actions that aim to support the global goal on adaptation should be considered for both programme and portfolio reporting of ICF investments. This framework would complement the established value-for-money metric.

3 The ICF KPI framework should be subject to external evaluation to determine whether it is fit for purpose in terms of the function it is intended to fulfil. This paper's assessment is that the present KPIs cannot be used to assess the UK's contribution to the GGA.

4 A separate web portal to the Development Tracker portal should be created for the ICF, with each funded programme fully documented. This would make the wealth of knowledge gained through the considerable analytical work financed by the ICF readily accessible for lesson learning and public scrutiny. With internet access improving globally, such a portal would help strengthen accountability to the direct beneficiaries of ICF investments.

5 The ICF should learn from the reporting norms of the global climate funds, where the UK has been a longstanding major player (e.g. the Green Climate Fund). For example, in terms of the reporting process, the GCF has a specific mechanism for civil society observers to follow Board decision-making, whereas the ICF does not.

Photo: Charmaine Chitate

1 INTRODUCTION

With each passing year, individuals, communities and societies are having to adapt to climate change. The Paris Agreement of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, now ratified by 189 Parties worldwide, documents a consensus on the global response to climate change. The Agreement contains a global goal on adaptation (GGA) of enhanced adaptive capacity, strengthened resilience and reduced vulnerability to climate change, with a view to contributing to sustainable development, as defined in Article 7 of the Agreement (see box). For those Parties who have ratified the Paris Agreement there is now an obligation to ensure that their actions comply with this commitment.

This study explores whether the UK's International Climate Finance (ICF) is being directed at actions that conform with principles considered to be elements of the GGA. Specifically, it examines the publicly available information on performance of climate adaptation programmes funded by the ICF against a set of principles developed in this paper. As such, it explores a principle-based approach to assessing how one globally important bilateral climate fund might report its contribution to the GGA. However, it does not imply broader application as to how the GGA might be measured or assessed, a subject that is beyond the scope of this paper.

> “global goal on adaptation of enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change, with a view to contributing to sustainable development.”
>
> **Article 2 of the Paris Agreement**

Article 7 of the Paris Agreement: paragraphs 1 – 5

1 Parties hereby establish the global goal on adaptation of enhancing adaptive capacity, strengthening resilience and reducing vulnerability to climate change, with a view to contributing to sustainable development and ensuring an adequate adaptation response in the context of the temperature goal referred to in Article 2.

2 Parties recognize that adaptation is a global challenge faced by all with local, subnational, national, regional and international dimensions, and that it is a key component of and makes a contribution to the long-term global response to climate change to protect people, livelihoods and ecosystems, taking into account the urgent and immediate needs of those developing country Parties that are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change.

3 The adaptation efforts of developing country Parties shall be recognized, in accordance with the modalities to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to this Agreement at its first session.

4 Parties recognize that the current need for adaptation is significant and that greater levels of mitigation can reduce the need for additional adaptation efforts, and that greater adaptation needs can involve greater adaptation costs.

5 Parties acknowledge that adaptation action should follow a country-driven, gender responsive, participatory and fully transparent approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems, and should be based on and guided by the best available science and, as appropriate, traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems, with a view to integrating adaptation into relevant socioeconomic and environmental policies and actions, where appropriate.

The paper is based on a desk review of the annual portfolio publications on UK Climate Finance Results, and programme documentation available on the UK Government's Development Tracker web portal (**https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/**) as this is the official source of publicly available information on ICF programmes.

2 BACKGROUND

Ten years ago, efforts were made to document the defining characteristics of climate finance (e.g. Müller, 2008; Stewart, Kingsbury and Rudyk, 2009). One focus at the time was to identify the underlying principles that could guide major new international flows of public finance directed at supporting the global response to climate change (Bird, 2010; Schalatek, 2010). Much interest focused on how such public funds were to be mobilised, e.g. how closely they would follow the UNFCCC call for climate funds to be 'new and additional'. In that context, the relationship between climate finance and official development assistance (ODA) came under scrutiny (e.g. Brown et al., 2010).

Since then, implementation experience has been building on how to deliver such support. Of the global climate funds, the Least Developed Countries Fund of the Global Environment Facility, the Adaptation Fund, and the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience led the way in gaining early project experiences on climate change adaptation. Early movers at the bilateral level included the UK's Environmental Transformation Fund – International Window, now the UK's ICF and Germany's International Climate Initiative (IKI). These bilateral initiatives had a very close relationship with ODA from the start, and as a result their funding decisions were in part guided by the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness.

> "Bilateral initiatives had a very close relationship with ODA from the start, and as a result their funding decisions were in part guided by the 2005 Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness."

In recent years, less attention has been paid to the underlying principles of climate finance, with project implementation leading to a shift in emphasis to results management through the climate funds' own monitoring and evaluation systems, e.g. the 2018 independent review of the Green Climate Fund's results management framework (IEU, 2018). New independent analysis has been limited, one exception being Brooks et al.'s 2019 paper on tracking climate adaptation. Brooks et al. propose the adoption of climate adaptation monitoring, evaluation and learning systems, drawing on the principles in Article 7 of the Paris Agreement.[1] The present study follows a similar approach, by revisiting principles of climate finance to examine whether climate adaptation projects funded by the UK's ICF have adhered to them in order to strengthen climate resilience and bring about transformation in the societal response to climate change.

However, the principles that underpin the global goal on adaptation remain implicit and what follows is an attempt to draw these principles out and identify them explicitly. The UNFCCC 1992 Convention text, and the subsequent 2015 Paris Agreement, documented a number of guiding principles negotiated upon and agreed to by the Parties to the Convention (UN, 1992; 2015). These are taken as a starting point for the present study. In addition, given that much international public climate finance (and all the UK's ICF) is identified as ODA by the source countries, the internationally negotiated principles of aid effectiveness (in Paris, 2005; Accra, 2008; Busan, 2011; and Addis Ababa, 2015) are also considered.

1 Principles for Locally-Led Adaptation Action are now under development by IIED and the Global Commission on Adaptation.

3 THE GOAL OF ADAPTATION SPENDING AND A GUIDING SET OF PRINCIPLES

The goal of all climate change adaptation projects should be to enhance adaptive capacity, strengthen resilience and reduce vulnerability to climate change. This has been formalised as the global goal on adaptation in the Paris Agreement. So, if climate change adaptation investments do not work towards this goal such spending is not being optimised. Having clarity on the purpose of spending is a prerequisite to identifying the relevant principles that should guide spending decisions and subsequent actions.

Table 1 presents a set of proposed principles to guide climate change adaptation investments that are compatible with the global goal on adaptation. They reflect two stages of investment: the first eight principles guide the design and approach to implementation; the last four principles are outcome-orientated, describing what should be achieved through such investments. A source where each principle is documented is also identified.

Table 1: Proposed principles for climate change adaptation actions

PRINCIPLE	SOURCE	
Climate Protection	UNFCCC text, Articles 3.1 & 4.1 (g)	Principles to guide the design and approach to implementation of climate change adaptation actions
National Ownership	Paris Agreement, Articles 7.5 & 9.3	
Subsidiarity	Paris Agreement, Article 7.5	
Equitable Participation	UNFCCC text, Articles 3.1 & 4.1 (i)	
Transparency	Paris Agreement, Articles 7.5 and 9.7	
Accountability	Busan principles, Paragraph 23	
Predictability of funding	UNFCCC text, Article 4.3	
Timeliness	Busan principles, Paragraph 26 (c)	
Environmental Sustainability	Paris Agreement, Article 7.5	Principles that reflect the outcomes of climate change adaptation actions
Do No Harm	UNFCCC text, Article 3.4	
Equity	UNFCC text, Article 3.1	
Gender Equality	Paris Agreement, Article 7.5	

3.1 The principles

Principles are explicit elements of a goal. As such, they represent truths or assumptions that relate to the goal, which can then form the basis of a hierarchical chain of reasoning, allowing for criteria and indicators to be identified (Lammerts van Bueren and Blom, 1996). Taken together, a set of principles should cover the full meaning of the goal as it is currently understood. This raises a challenge for climate change adaptation as there remains ambiguity over what adaptation entails.[2] In addition, and by their very nature, principles are normative concepts and acquire credibility only by securing consensus through the dual political processes of international negotiation (e.g. at the UNFCCC) and national determination. They can be contested. So, the set of principles that follows makes no claim of universality, but represents what the authors consider to be consistent with the global goal on adaptation. The basis for choosing each proposed principle is briefly described:

Climate protection: this first principle draws on the motivation for adaptation as a response to climate change. It is what sets adaptation apart from development actions that have either ignored climate change or have assumed constant climate conditions.

National ownership: ownership of development came to prominence in the Paris Declaration of Aid Effectiveness, with its commitment to respect country leadership. It is also captured in the UNFCCC text that reaffirms the principle of sovereignty of States in international cooperation to address climate change.

Subsidiarity: the aid effectiveness agenda recognises the need to involve sub-national authorities and civil society to secure local ownership of the development process.

Equitable participation: decision-making achieved through broad consultative processes is recognised in the UNFCCC text, which encourages the widest participation in national processes, including local communities and those expected to be beneficiaries of climate action.

Transparency: a commitment to adopting a fully transparent approach for climate adaptation action is made in the Paris Agreement and reflects a recognition that programme implementation should be visible to the broad constituency of stakeholders affected by climate change, and to vulnerable groups in particular.

Accountability: this principle lies at the heart of all publicly funded actions to ensure oversight of programme implementers' actions and allow citizens to see, and question, the processes and outputs of adaptation actions.

Predictability of funding: actions that contribute to the global goal on adaptation often require multi-year investments which therefore rely on funding to be maintained over time. At the very least, this is required over the immediate programme cycle.

Timeliness: funding is also required to be made as and when it is needed to allow for adaptation actions to respond to needs. As the science of climate change advances our understanding of what needs to be done, speed of action is becoming increasingly important.

2 For the purpose of this study, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) definitions of adaptation and resilience have been adopted:
Adaptation is "the process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects. In human systems, adaptation seeks to moderate or avoid harm or exploit beneficial opportunities." (IPPC, 2014: 1758)
Resilience is "the capacity of social, economic, and environmental systems to cope with a hazardous event or trend or disturbance, responding or reorganising in ways that maintain their essential function, identity, and structure, while also maintaining the capacity for adaptation, learning, and transformation." (IPPC, 2014: 1772)

Environmental sustainability: climate change is one manifestation of a lack of concern for environmental sustainability in economic development. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) represent the latest global commitment to address environmental degradation and this concern is reflected in the Paris Agreement's commitment that all Parties shall promote sustainable development and environmental integrity.

Do no harm: this principle acknowledges that climate adaptation action should be integrated with national development and, at a minimum, should not undermine the attainment of national and international development goals (e.g. the SDGs). Key concerns include ensuring that programme investments do not lead to 'maladaptation' that would increase vulnerability to future climate change, as well as fulfilling the SDG pledge of leaving no-one behind.

Equity: developing countries are particularly vulnerable to the adverse effects of climate change, yet these countries have made the least contribution to global carbon emissions and as such it is advanced economies, such as the UK, that bear most responsibility for global action.

Gender equality: there is broad consensus that climate change adaptation strategies need to respond to climate vulnerabilities that are differentiated by gender.

Photo: Caritas Philippines (NASSA)

3.2 The Criteria

In our hierarchical framework, criteria occupy the level immediately below the principles. By establishing criteria it is possible to identify characteristics of each principle that allow it to be assessed and a verdict to be reached on the degree of compliance in an actual situation. The key attribute of a criterion is to provide a means of judging whether a principle has been respected by the action under consideration; it should be the unambiguous logical consequence of the principle. Table 2 lists the criteria selected by the authors for each of the proposed climate adaptation principles (others might identify other criteria).

Table 2: Proposed principles and criteria for climate change adaptation

PRINCIPLE	CRITERIA
Climate Protection	■ Project design uses climate information to identify supporting actions
National Ownership	■ Project design responds explicitly to national strategies and plans
Subsidiarity	■ Funding decisions incorporate the views of local authorities and the intended direct beneficiaries where project activity is planned
Equitable Participation	■ Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures
Transparency	■ Financial contributions are disclosed publicly and in a timely manner ■ Project monitoring reports are published
Accountability	■ Project implementers are accountable for the results they produce to the direct beneficiaries and the communities of which they are part ■ A redress mechanism or process is established
Predictability of funding	■ Project funding is known over a multi-year, medium-term funding cycle
Timeliness	■ Disbursement of funding takes place as planned
Environmental Sustainability	■ Project activities do not cause damage to the environment
Do No Harm	■ Investment decisions do not imperil long-term sustainable development objectives ■ Investment decisions do not violate human rights
Equity	■ Financing is improved for the most vulnerable population groups ■ Technology access is improved for the most vulnerable population groups ■ Capacity is improved for the most vulnerable population groups
Gender Equality	■ Project planning considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women ■ Fund disbursement considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women

3.3 The indicators

The lowest level in the hierarchical framework underpinning the criteria, consists of indicators. These are quantitative or qualitative parameters that can be assessed in relation to each criterion, demonstrating the extent to which the criterion is fulfilled, and the related principle respected. Assessment of project performance focuses on the indicators, with each indicator being framed to enable an unambiguous evaluation of its application. Table 3 lists 18 indicators determined by the authors to demonstrate compliance with the proposed principles of action for climate adaptation. The choice of indicator is subjective; others may identify different attributes. The challenge is to have a credible logical chain between the selected indicators, criteria and principles, recognising that each step rests on certain assumptions.

Table 3: Proposed indicators for demonstrating compliance with principles

INDICATORS *(If we find…)*	**CRITERIA** *(then we can say that…)*	**PRINCIPLE** *(which demonstrates compliance with…)*
1. Project documentation that contains an analysis of climate information	Project design uses climate information to identify supporting actions	Climate Protection
2. Project purpose refers to National climate change strategy /National Adaptation Plan/NDC	Project design responds explicitly to national strategies and plans	National Ownership
3. Local government and community representatives participate in project funding decisions	Funding decisions incorporate the views of local authorities and the intended direct beneficiaries where project activity is planned	Subsidiarity
4. Project mechanisms exist to ensure broad participation in project management 5. Record maintained of participants attending project management meetings	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	Equitable Participation
6. Annual reporting of budget commitment and disbursement amounts 7. Annual project monitoring report	Financial contributions are disclosed publicly and in a timely manner Project monitoring reports are published	Transparency
8. Project strategic decision making is documented 9. Conflict resolution procedures are documented	Project implementers are accountable for the results they produce to the direct beneficiaries and the communities of which they are a part A redress mechanism or process is established	Accountability
10. Annual budget estimates are available by a known date each year	Project funding is known over a multi-year, medium-term funding cycle	Predictability of funding
11. A record of project spending is available	Disbursement of funding takes place as planned	Timeliness
12. Project design incorporates environmental risk analysis 13. A record of environmental performance is available that includes the rehabilitation or restoration of degraded ecosystems	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	Environmental Sustainability
14. Project implementation records how social risks are addressed 15. Records are kept of all project-related conflict resolution incidents	Investment decisions do not imperil long-term sustainable development objectives Investment decisions do not violate human rights	Do No Harm
16. Project beneficiaries are identified and their change in status (financial, technological, capacity) due to project implementation is documented	Financing is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Technology access is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Capacity is improved for the most vulnerable population groups	Equity
17. Gender analysis is part of the project design 18. Gender responsive disbursement guidelines exist	Project planning considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women Fund disbursement considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women	Gender Equality

3.4 Utility of the PCI framework

This framework can be used as a basis for analysing the performance of the ICF at two levels: (i) the overall ICF portfolio, and (ii) individual programme investments. The portfolio analysis focuses on three of the current UK ICF Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) that are relevant for climate change adaptation: adapting to climate change, resilience, and transformation (KPIs 1, 4 and 15). The alignment of these ICF KPIs to the principle-based indicators that have been developed in this study can be examined to identify perceived gaps or redundancies in the ICF KPIs. Following the portfolio analysis, an assessment of a small sample of ICF-funded climate adaptation programmes is made to assess their compliance with the identified principles of action. This twin approach will allow the impact of the current ICF spend to be assessed against the proposed framework as it relates to supporting the needs of the most vulnerable and poorest to build their resilience to climate change, and hence the ICF contribution to the global goal on adaptation.

4 ASSESSMENT OF THE ICF KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Results achieved by the ICF have been reported annually online since 2015.[3] The latest report was published on 19 August 2020. This annual publication is limited to a portfolio summary of a sub-set of the ICF's KPIs developed for programme reporting. Sixteen KPIs were initially developed, of which half were reported in the 2015 ICF report. From 2016 onwards, only six KPIs have been reported, and these have been the same each year: KPIs 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12. In a presentation made in October 2019, reference was made to the fact that following an internal government review, it was decided that six of the KPIs "were unlikely to provide sufficient evidence quality and/or quantity to be 'portfolio-level' indicators" (although programmes were encouraged to continue to use them).[4] This review is not available publicly.

> These disaggregated data have never been publicly reported at the portfolio level. One additional disaggregation category – income distribution – has not been prioritised. This severely constrains the evidence base for demonstrating that vulnerable people and communities are targeted for support.

KPIs 4 and 15 (on climate resilience and transformation) have never been reported in this series of annual reports on the ICF portfolio. This is despite the publication of methodology notes online, suggesting that a system is in place that collects and collates programme-level information. In addition, two of the KPIs identified as priorities in the 2019 presentation referred to above (KPIs 8 and 10) have neither methodology guidance published on the ICF webpage, nor have these KPIs featured in the annual portfolio reporting. Both refer to land-based ecosystem results, where adaptation co-benefits can often be an element of programme activity.

It is notable that there has been no portfolio reporting on KPIs 4 and 15 in the last five years. The methodology notes for both KPIs appear to be quite academically orientated attempts to measure climate resilience at the individual level, and transformation at the programme level. They lack clarity in defining these complex concepts yet offer mechanistic approaches for their assessment (including the numeric weighting of proxy criteria for transformation). The content of both publications suggest that these are themes that require further peer-reviewed academic study rather than the publication of methodology notes. Reliance on the latter implies that credible and replicable scores can be attained through self-assessment by programme staff, which is a major challenge.

Table 4 lists the three KPIs. The methodologies for KPIs 1 and 4 use the same unit of measurement, namely number of direct beneficiaries, disaggregated into four categories of sex, age, geography and disability. These disaggregated data have never been publicly reported at the portfolio level. One additional disaggregation category – income distribution – has not been prioritised.[5] This severely constrains the evidence base for demonstrating that vulnerable people and communities are targeted for support. As all ICF funding is sourced from the UK's aid budget, which has a legal requirement under the 2002 International Development Act to address poverty reduction, this appears to be a strategic weakness in data collection and reporting.

3 https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/uk-climate-finance-results
4 http://climatechangecompass.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/KPI-15-Transformational-Change-Webinar-FINAL-18Oct19.pptx
5 The methodology notes for both KPI1 and KPI4 state "As of August 2018, HMG is prioiritising these four data disaggregation axes. However, it is committed to ultimately disaggregating data to the full suite of eight axes (i.e. income, age, sex, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability and geography) advocated by the UN. As such, disaggregation guidance may be expanded in the coming years, probably beginning with income."

Table 4: UK ICF Key Performance Indicators

KPI	DEFINITION	UNIT OF MEASUREMENT
KPI 1	Number of people supported to better adapt to the effects of climate change as a result of ICF	Absolute number of people, with direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender, disability, urban/rural, and age
KPI 4	Number of people whose resilience has been improved as a result of ICF	Absolute number of people, with direct beneficiaries disaggregated by gender, disability, urban/rural, and age
KPI 15	Extent to which ICF intervention is likely to lead to transformational change	Numeric score: 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4

In the absence of any reporting on KPIs 4 and 15, progress towards the global goal on adaptation at the ICF portfolio level can only be gauged for KPI 1. Table 5 presents the published results, which suggest that since 2011, 66 million people have been supported through a total of 87 ICF programmes to better adapt to the effects of climate change. Although the 2020 report cautions against simple year-on-year comparisons because historical data are "updated to reflect the best available information on achievements", Table 5 indicates a steady increase in the number of programmes reporting this KPI, whilst the rate of increase in the number of new beneficiaries appears to have been falling since 2018.

Table 5: KPI 1 results reported in the ICF Climate Finance Annual Reports

	KP1			
Year	Number of people (millions)	Annual increase (millions)	Annual increase (%)	Number of programmes reporting
2015	15			22
2016	21	6	40%	29
2017	34	13	62%	49
2018	47	13	38%	61
2019	57	10	21%	76
2010	66	9	16%	87

Note: Cumulative results are reported each year, from a baseline of April 2011, with the first report in September 2015.

This brief overview of ICF portfolio public reporting demonstrates that such reporting is minimal (e.g. DFID, 2020). With committed spending of approximately £5.8 billion of ICF between 2016/17 and 2020/21 this represents a significant lack of transparency and accountability of public expenditure. With a projected major increase in ICF spending happening at a time when public spending is coming under considerable strain as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, much improved transparency is urgently needed to respond to the increasing societal concern over climate change.

At present, for ICF programmes that are investing in climate change adaptation actions, public reporting is restricted to only one KPI, and that is limited to a global estimate of the number of people supported to cope with the effects of climate change. Public information on the ICF portfolio does not allow for independent analysis of the extent to which it is contributing to the global goal on adaptation. This would require documenting where this funding is being spent, whether it responds to recipients' concerns and, critically for ODA-funding, whether it addresses the needs of the most vulnerable by contributing to a reduction in poverty. None of this paper's proposed indicators can be assessed at the portfolio level, so in order to explore this issue further, a review of programme reporting is necessary.

5 ASSESSMENT OF ICF PROGRAMME REPORTING

There is no published list of ICF funded programmes. This contrasts with the practice of the multilateral climate funds such as the Adaptation Fund[6] and the Green Climate Fund[7], as well as other bilateral climate funds, such as Germany's International Climate Initiative.[8] The absence of a list of relevant programmes is a failing in transparency of the ICF that has been reported upon.[9] Without such a listing, public information has to be gleaned from the UK Government's Development Tracker portal, where an internet search on 30 October 2020 using the search string "ICF" produced 96 results. However, these programmes are a combination of actions that aim to support climate mitigation and climate adaptation, so without going through all project entries manually it is not known how many of these programmes contribute to the global goal on adaptation. The following four programmes have been selected from the ICF portfolio on the basis that they may contribute to the global goal, and have reported on KPIs 1, 4 or 15.[10]

> "The absence of a list of relevant programmes is a failing in transparency of the ICF that has been reported upon previously."

5.1 Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja programme in Uganda

The Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja programme in Uganda was designed in 2013 and implemented over a four-year period between 2013 and 2017. Public reporting of this £53 million ICF investment is contained in six documents on the UK Government's Development Tracker portal (see box below). However, progress is reported for only the first two years, leaving a major gap in the public record for this programme. The programme description on the portal webpage describes its purpose as follows: "to increase the resilience of targeted communities to climate extremes and weather events. The programme will support 700,000 people to cope with the effects of climate change." Significant resources were allocated in the Business Plan for independent monitoring and evaluation, research and analysis and one of the five programme outputs was "increased evidence and learning". The 2015 annual review refers to three studies undertaken in that year, with an additional three studies planned. However, none of this information is available on the Development Tracker portal. This is a significant barrier to programme accountability, as well as being a major loss of knowledge for broader learning.

Documentation available from Development Tracker on Enhancing resilience in Karamoja Uganda Programme – IATI Identifier: GB-1-203603

1. Business Case and Summary (published December 2018)
2. 2014 Annual Review (published October 2014)
3. Programme Logframe (August 2015 Update) (published September 2015)
4. 2015 Annual Review (published April 2016)
5. Contract: DFID 7189 Development and use of transformational indicator Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Programme (ERKP) Uganda (published September 2015)
6. Contract: Development and use of transformational indicator Enhancing Resilience in Karamoja Programme (ERKP) Uganda – Contract Amendment No (published August 2016)

Source: DevTracker search results https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-203603/documents accessed 20 November 2020

6 https://www.adaptation-fund.org/projects-programmes/
7 https://www.greenclimate.fund/projects
8 https://www.international-climate-initiative.com/en/projects
9 https://www.carbonbrief.org/mapped-how-uk-foreign-aid-is-spent-climate-change
10 Three of these programmes started before the 2015 Paris Agreement (and hence the GGA). However, they all aim to strengthen the climate resilience of the programme beneficiaries.

> Whilst the programme aimed to increase the climate resilience of vulnerable communities in an unstable part of the country, public reporting is silent on the views of the beneficiaries the programme aimed to support.

The programme's Business Case (which was published after the closure of the programme) refers to ICF indicators 1 and 15 as potential programme indicators. The 2015 logframe suggests an unusual framing for KPI 1 at the impact level: "early warning and preparedness systems operational at national and local level across Karamoja (population coverage 1.2 million)", whereas KPI 15 is labelled "to be determined". The programme then invested £193,591 in 2015–2016 to develop a transformation indicator appropriate to the conditions in Karamoja. There is no record of what was developed. Programme reporting against these two ICF KPIs cannot be considered commensurate with a £53 million investment.

The contribution of this programme to the global goal on adaptation may have been significant. However, public reporting on the Development Tracker portal does not provide the information necessary to make such a judgement (see Annex 1 for an assessment against this paper's proposed indicators). In terms of our framework, the climate protection principle and gender analysis are strengths of the programme design, and the financial resources provided in support of implementation are well documented. What is missing is any reporting on how the intended beneficiaries' views on climate resilience fed into programme design and were subsequently incorporated in the programme governance structures. No record of project or programme conflict resolution procedures was found. So, whilst the programme aimed to increase the climate resilience of vulnerable communities in an unstable part of the country, public reporting is silent on the views of the beneficiaries the programme aimed to support.

5.2 Blue Forests (Blue Ventures) Programme in Madagascar

The Blue Forests Programme was recommended to the study team by Defra officials as a programme that has transformational intent. It aims to design a holistic model for mangrove forest conservation and sustainable development. It began in January 2017 for a planned funding period of seven years with a budget of just over £10 million. Public information available on the Development Tracker website is listed in the box below.

Documentation available from Development Tracker on the Blue Forests Programme – IATI Identifier: GB-GOV-7-ICF-P0001-BV

1. International Climate Fund Business Case for investment in Blue Ventures ICF Business Case (without annexes)
2. Blue Ventures Grant Agreement December 2016
3. Annual Review – Blue Forests (Blue Ventures) Programme 2017
4. Blue Ventures Change to Grant Agreement April 2018
5. Annual Review – Blue Forests (Blue Ventures) Programme Year 2 2018

Source: DevTracker search results https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/search?query=ICF+Blue+Forests&includeClosed=1 accessed 31 October 2020

Neither the Business Case document nor the programme logical framework contained in the 2018 annual review refer to KPIs 1 and 4. However, the programme aims to report against KPI 3, which estimates the number of forest-dependent people with livelihood benefits protected or improved as a result of ICF support. An intention to support increased climate resilience of coastal communities can also be inferred from the proposed use of KPI 10 on ecosystem services. However, how the programme responds to nationally determined needs is unclear: the 2017 annual review stated that "lack of engagement from the Madagascan Government (i.e. to incorporate mangroves into national climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies)" was an "outstanding

> Perhaps of most significance is the absence of any analysis of climate information for the programme sites in Madagascar.

programme risk". This suggests that, in the absence of publicly available evidence to the contrary, an explicit strategy for climate change adaptation that responds to national needs may be missing in this programme.

The programme's documentation on the Development Tracker portal emphasises the economic benefits likely to delivered by the project. The value-for-money metric is repeatedly emphasised. What is not given similar attention in reporting is the expected contribution of the programme to the global goal on adaptation, as measured by this study's indicators (Annex 2). Perhaps of most significance is the absence of any analysis of climate information for the programme sites in Madagascar. This contrasts with the Madagascan 2016 NDC[11] that had identified mangrove destruction due to floods as an example of an impact already observed regarding current climate trends. The publicly available programme documentation does not provide evidence of this programme being embedded within the national climate change strategy, raising questions about the national ownership of this initiative. There are also questions left hanging as to the accountability of the programme to the intended beneficiaries: no record was found of conflict resolution procedures, despite strong evidence presented on mechanisms to ensure broad participation of local stakeholders. This likely reflects gaps in reporting rather than the absence of such measures on the ground.

5.3 Climate High-Level Investment programme in Ethiopia

The Climate High-Level Investment Programme (CHIP) in Ethiopia was designed in 2012 and implemented over a five-year period between 2012 and 2017. Public reporting of this £26 million investment is contained in six documents on the UK Government's Development Tracker portal (see box below). The project description on the portal webpage describes the very ambitious purpose of the programme as being "to invest in activities which will build climate resilience and promote low carbon growth in Ethiopia. This will help 1.5 million people to cope with the effects of climate change by 2015, help Ethiopia to protect livelihoods, services, infrastructure and energy supplies from the effects of climate change, and establish its green growth path". The programme's Business Case detailed the economic appraisal, commercial, financial and management considerations that went into the design of CHIP. As with the Blue Forest Programme, strong prominence was given to the value-for-money metric, and its component measures of economy, efficiency, effectiveness and cost-effectiveness.

Documentation available from Development Tracker on the Climate High-Level Investment Programme – IATI Identifier: GB-1-202597

1. Climate High-Level Investment Programme (CHIP) Business Case. DFID Ethiopia. August 2012
2. Memorandum of Understanding for non-Budget Support Financial Aid. (Unsigned and undated)
3. Annual Review – Climate High-Level Investment Programme (CHIP). January 2014
4. Annual Review – Climate High-Level Investment Programme (CHIP). January 2015
5. Annual Review – Climate High-Level Investment Programme (CHIP). January 2017
6. Logical Framework. August 2016

Source: DevTracker search results https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-202597/documents accessed 14 November 2020

11 Nationally Determined Contribution to the UNFCCC: https://www4.unfccc.int/sites/ndcstaging/PublishedDocuments/Madagascar%20First/Madagascar%20INDC%20Eng.pdf

> As with the Blue Forest Programme, strong prominence was given to the value-for-money metric, and its component measures of economy, efficiency, effectiveness and cost-effectiveness.

The 2016 update of the programme logframe includes reporting against KPIs 1 and 15 at the programme impact level. The number of people supported to cope with the effects of climate change is based on self-reporting made by the programme implementation partners (without citing means of verification). The reporting on KPI 15 appears indicative: "evidence of investment decisions that increase the scale or effectiveness of mainstream development programmes on Ethiopia's climate response", again without stating any means of verification. Although the 2017 annual review highlighted that "the programme was accompanied by independent monitoring to understand what did and didn't work", no record of this independent monitoring is available on the programme portal webpage. In contrast, independent evaluations of the work of global climate funds are clearly signalled on these fund's websites (e.g. the Independent Evaluation Unit of the GCF[12] and the Technical Evaluation Reference Group of the Adaptation Fund[13]).

This programme's contribution to the global goal on adaptation cannot be determined. Whilst the programme explicitly addresses the impacts of climate change and demonstrates how it fits into the national climate change strategy, much less attention is given to how issues of environmental sustainability, equity and gender would be addressed (see Annex 3 for our assessment of all proposed indicators). No evidence was found of any subsidiarity in decision making. Whether the views of the intended beneficiaries were considered when funding decisions were made is unknown. A principle for which information is particularly lacking is that of equity. Public reporting of equity issues appears biased towards anecdotal evidence rather than providing a systematic record of whether the most vulnerable population groups were supported in terms of finance, technology access or capacity-building to cope with climate change.

5.4 The Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters programme

The Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters (BRACED) programme was a flagship ICF investment of £136 million that ran between 2013 and 2019. The aim of BRACED was to develop and scale up best practice in terms of climate adaptation, resilience and disaster risk reduction. It was a multi-year programme that eventually saw over 15 projects in over 15 countries implemented by a consortium of international NGOs, most with a UK presence. Nine programme documents are listed on the Development Tracker portal (see box).

Documentation available on the Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters (BRACED) – IATI Identifier: GB-1-202921

1. BRACED Business Case and Summary. DFID. September 2014
2. Addendum to the Business Case. DFID. December 2017
3. Logical Framework. August 2018
4. Annual Review – BRACED. January 2014
5. Annual Review – BRACED. August 2015
6. Annual Review – BRACED. September 2016
7. Annual Review – BRACED. December 2017
8. Annual Review – BRACED. December 2018
9. Project completion review – BRACED. June 2020 – [FILE CORRUPTED - unable to retrieve]

Source: DevTracker search results https://devtracker.fcdo.gov.uk/projects/GB-1-202921/ accessed 14 November 2020

12 https://www.greenclimate.fund/about/accountability#evaluation
13 https://www.adaptation-fund.org/about/evaluation/

BRACED reporting against the ICF KPIs is problematic. This can be exemplified by reporting against KPI 1, where the annual reports simply document the number of beneficiaries supported to cope with climate change impacts. The 2018 annual review claimed that nearly 3.5 million people were directly supported (with indirect beneficiaries estimated at 7.8 million). However, no evidence is provided to show how these estimates were calculated. With regard to KPI 15, the 2015 annual review states that "BRACED aims to contribute to transformational change in the countries in which it operates", yet no evidence of transformational change at country or community level is cited.

"The 2018 annual review claimed that nearly 3.5 million people were directly supported (with indirect beneficiaries estimated at 7.8 million). However, no evidence is provided to show how these estimates were calculated."

Nor do the published annual reviews provide enough information to address all of this paper's analytical framework. Therefore, public reporting by the UK government on the contribution made by BRACED to the global goal on adaptation cannot be fully understood (see our assessment in Annex 4). To undertake this task would require a review of the wealth of information contained in the project's own website, which contains over 220 publications or resources, ranging from project stories to programme level synthesis reports such as mid-term and final evaluations. The scope of this task immediately raises barriers, constraining the understanding of such a large and complex ICF investment.

In terms of one of this paper's principles, that of subsidiarity, no evidence was found of the involvement of intended beneficiaries in funding decisions at the programme level. This can be seen by the strict criteria for proposals and grants that DFID applied, with DFID ultimately retaining control over project design through its strategic priorities and aims. This contrasts with the approach taken by some multilateral climate funds, e.g. the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience, which work through multi-stakeholder consultative processes to develop and implement country-led investment plans.[14] Evidence of adherence to the principle of climate protection, by contrast, is well developed, with BRACED documentation including the type of climate information needed to design and implement adaptation activities, rarely seen to the same scale elsewhere.

However, the way that public reporting is implemented may seriously underplay the significance of this programme (as well as the other sampled programmes). The preceding critique is therefore not directed at programme performance, but rather at the public reporting that the UK government chooses to make on these ICF investments.

14 https://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/sites/cif_enc/files/knowledge-documents/evaluation_of_the_cif_progammatic_appproach_final_report_and_management_response.pdf

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

> "The strategy of devolving ICF indicator measurement and reporting to the project level appears a high risk and ineffective approach for global climate action that leads to inconsistent reporting across programmes."

> "At the programme level, the UK government Development Tracker portal, as the principal source of public programme-level information, is deficient as a public reporting tool. Reporting is not commensurate with the level of public funding being committed."

This paper aimed to assess whether public reporting on the UK's ICF could demonstrate its contribution to the global goal on adaptation, which is part of the Paris Agreement. An analytical framework of principles, criteria and indicators was developed by the authors to assist with this task, and employed at both ICF portfolio and programme level. The framework, whilst not offered as a general assessment tool, draws on principles listed in internationally agreed text for climate and development action.

The results are stark. The annual publication of ICF KPIs provides a very incomplete measure of the performance of the UK's ICF. Reporting is not commensurate with the level of public funding being committed to international climate action. Specifically, the contribution of the ICF towards the global goal on adaptation cannot be independently verified. The strategy of devolving ICF indicator measurement and reporting to the project level appears a high risk and ineffective approach for global climate action that leads to inconsistent reporting across programmes. As the need for speed of response to climate change adaptation becomes more pressing with each passing year, this represents a major failing in ICF portfolio management and limits the UK's ability to demonstrate the efficacy of its spending on adaptation – and hence its climate leadership – in the run up to the 2021 COP 26 meeting in Glasgow.

At the programme level, the UK government Development Tracker portal, as the principal source of public programme-level information, is deficient as a public reporting tool. For the programmes assessed in this paper, documentation appears incomplete, some evidence appears anecdotal and lacking in detail, independent evaluations are not listed, and investments made in research and learning are lost. How much this is indicative of the entire portfolio would require more in-depth analysis that was outside the scope of this paper. The absence of a separate web portal for the ICF means that public reporting continues to be limited, in both the UK and in partner countries. The contribution of the ICF programmes to the GGA cannot be ascertained from information in the Development Tracker portal, and as this represents the official source of publicly available information on ICF programmes, this represents a major gap in transparency. This is despite the portfolio likely containing significant innovation and examples of good practice in what is a rapidly evolving field of development.

A longstanding emphasis on the value-for-money metric appears to have come at a cost of far less attention being given to the metrics of equity, subsidiarity, equitable participation, 'do no harm', and environmental sustainability in ICF climate investments. The framework developed in this paper has highlighted gaps in public reporting at portfolio and programme level reporting through the use of an explicit framework that directly relates to the ultimate goal of ICF investments, namely more climate resilient societies. The value-for-money metric rose up the agenda of development agency reporting in response to large ODA commitments warranting assurance of 'money well spent'. However, money well spent goes beyond financial controls and minimising costs: what the money is spent on, who is supported, and the processes by which beneficiaries engage with development initiatives matter just as much to the many tax-paying citizens who support climate action.

> A longstanding emphasis on the value-for-money metric appears to have come at a cost of far less attention being given to the metrics of equity, subsidiarity, equitable participation, 'do no harm', and environmental sustainability in ICF climate investments.

Recommendations

The following recommendations are targeted at both the inter-ministerial Board of the ICF for their consideration as the ICF moves into its next funding cycle and the individual government departments undertaking strategy development at the programme level for ICF investments.

1 Public reporting and knowledge management needs significant, and immediate, improvement for ICF funded programmes. The UK government should undertake a rapid review of how the ICF currently reports and then develop a strategy to improve the visibility of its funded actions.[15]

2 The proposed framework developed in this paper for reporting on actions that aim to support the global goal on adaptation should be considered for both programme and portfolio reporting of ICF investments. This framework would complement the established value-for-money metric.

3 The ICF KPI framework should be subject to external evaluation to determine whether it is 'fit for purpose' in terms of the function it is intended to fulfil. This paper's assessment is that the present KPIs cannot be used to assess the UK's contribution to the GGA.

4 A separate web portal to the Development Tracker portal should be created for the ICF, with each funded programme fully documented. This would allow the wealth of knowledge gained through the considerable analytical work financed by the ICF to be readily accessible for lesson learning and public scrutiny. With internet access improving globally, such a portal would help strengthen accountability to the direct beneficiaries of ICF investments.

5 The ICF should learn from the reporting norms of the global climate funds, where the UK has been a longstanding major player (e.g. the Green Climate Fund). For example, in terms of the reporting process, the GCF has a specific mechanism for civil society observers to follow Board decision making, whereas the ICF does not.

> With a projected major increase in ICF spending happening at a time when public spending is coming under considerable strain as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, much improved transparency is urgently needed to respond to the increasing societal concern over climate change.

15 This recommendation mirrors a similar recommendation made by the 2019 Independent Commission for Aid Impact report on the ICF: "UK ICF should present a clear public narrative about the ambition and value of the UK's climate investment to support its demonstration and influencing objectives as well as to improve visibility and public accountability" (ICAI, 2019). This recommendation was written with a focus on ICF climate mitigation investments, but it holds equally true for adaptation investments.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Anon. (2011).
Busan partnership for effective development co-operation. 4th high level forum on aid effectiveness. 29 Nov – 1 Dec, 2011, Busan, Korea.

Bird, N (2010).
An equitable governance framework for climate finance. Commonwealth Finance Ministers Reference Report 2010. Commonwealth Secretariat, London.

Brooks, N, Anderson, S, Aragon, I, Smith, B, Kajumba, T, Beauchamp, E, d'Errico, S and Rai, N (2019).
Framing and tracking 21st century climate adaptation: monitoring, evaluation and learning for Paris, the SDGs and beyond. IIED Working Paper. IIED, London.

Brown, J, Bird, N, Schalatek, L (2010).
Climate finance and additionality: emerging definitions and their implications. Climate Finance Policy Brief No. 2. ODI, London and Heinrich Boell Foundation, Washington DC.

DFID (2020).
2020 UK climate finance results. August 2020. DFID, London.

Independent Commission for Aid Impact (2019)
International Climate Finance: UK aid for low-carbon development. A Performance Review. ICAI, London.

Independent Evaluation Unit (2018).
Independent review of the GCF's results management framework. Evaluation report No. 1/2018. GCF, Songdo, South Korea.

IPCC (2014).
Climate Change 2014. Impacts, adaptation, and vulnerability. Part A: Global and Sectoral Aspects. Working Group II Contribution to the fifth assessment report of the IPCC. Cambridge University Press.

Lammerts van Bueren, E and Blom, E (1996).
Hierarchical framework for the formulation of sustainable forest management standards. Tropenbos Foundation, the Netherlands.

Leiter, T, Olhoff, A, A l Azhar, R, Barmby, V, Bours, D, Clement, V W C, Dale, TW, Davies, C and Jacobs, H (2019).
Adaptation Metrics: Current Landscape and Evolving Practice. Background paper for the Global Commission on Adaptation. UNEP DTU Partnership, Rotterdam and Washington, DC

Müller, B (2008).
International adaptation finance: the need for an innovative and strategic approach. Oxford Institute for Energy Studies, Oxford.

Pendleton, A and Retallack, S (2009).
Fairness in global climate change finance. Institute for Public Policy Research, London.

Shalateck, L (2010).
A matter of principle(s). A normative framework for a global compact on public climate finance. Heinrich Boell Stiftung, Washington DC.

Stewart, R B, Kingsbury, B and Rudyk, B (2009).
Climate Finance: key concepts and ways forward. Harvard Project on International Climate Agreements. Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs, Harvard Kennedy School

United Nations (1992).
United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. FCCC/INFORMAL/84. GE.05-62220 (E) 200705. United Nations, New York.

United Nations (2015).
Paris Agreement. United Nations, New York.

ANNEX 1

Documented evidence of adherence to proposed principles: Enhancing Resilience in the Karamoja Programme (ERKP), Uganda

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
1. Project documentation that contains an analysis of climate information	Climate change risks feature prominently in the Business Case e.g. "Uganda is vulnerable to the impacts of climate change and climate variability. Since 1960, mean countrywide annual temperatures have risen by 1.3o C. Climate projections developed by the Climate Systems Analysis Group (CSAG) suggest increased temperatures of between 2°C and 2.5°C by 2046-2065, together with increased levels of rainfall... Although poverty is the underlying cause of chronic food insecurity and vulnerability, these are exacerbated by extreme climate, and other weather events. Relatively small climate events (erratic rains, dry spells, late / excessive rains) can have a serious impact on livelihoods. Climate extremes and other weather and climate events are likely to become even more important as causes of food insecurity and vulnerability, exacerbating other underlying factors." (1)	Project design uses climate information to identify supporting actions	Climate Protection
2. Project purpose refers to National climate change strategy /National Adaptation Plan/NDC	The Business Case policy context description highlights the government's development framework for the Karamoja region, with its focus on peace, recovery and development. Other relevant policies cited include the national policy for disaster preparedness. The emerging national climate change institutional context is also mentioned: "A Climate Change Unit (CCU) was created in 2008 within the Ministry of Water and Environment (MWE), with the objective of strengthening implementation of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). The Ministry has recently developed a Climate Change policy, and is currently developing a road map for policy implementation. The CCU is currently receiving support from a number of development partners, including in the area of adaptation." (1)	Project design responds explicitly to national climate change strategies and plans	National Ownership
3. Local government and community representatives participate in project funding decisions	The Business Plan recognised the key role played by local authorities in disaster planning and response: "In the short term programmes should support district authorities" (1). However, no documented evidence found during programme implementation.	Funding decisions incorporate the views of local authorities and the intended direct beneficiaries where project activity is planned	Subsidiarity
4. Project mechanisms exist to ensure broad participation in project management	The ERKP was designed to be implemented through the following UN Agencies: UNICEF, WFP and FAO, together with GIZ (after 2015). Detail on project implementation is not available. (1)	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	Equitable Participation

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
5. Record maintained of participants attending project management meetings	The ERKP was designed to be implemented through the following UN Agencies: UNICEF, WFP and FAO, together with GIZ (after 0215). Detail on project implementation is not available. (2) (4)	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	**Equitable Participation**
6. Annual reporting of budget commitment and disbursement amounts	The Development Tracker webpage provides a detailed record of budget and spending by each year of the programme.	Financial contributions are disclosed publicly and in a timely manner	**Transparency**
7. Annual project monitoring report	Annual reviews are available for the first two years only (2014 and 2015). No reports have been posted on the Development Tracker portal for the final two years of the programme (2016 and 2017). (2) (4)	Project monitoring reports are published	**Transparency**
8. Project strategic decision making is documented	The two annual reviews describe strategic decisions taken during each implementation period by DFID. (2) (4)	Project implementers are accountable for the results they produce to the direct beneficiaries and the communities of which they are a part	**Accountability**
9. Conflict resolution procedures are documented	There is no record of project or programme conflict resolution procedures.	A redress mechanism or process exists	**Accountability**
10. Annual budget estimates are available by a known date each year	The annual reviews do not include statements on planned versus actual spend. (2) (3)	Project funding is known over a multi-year, medium-term funding cycle	**Predictability of funding**
11. A record of project spending is available	The Development Tracker webpage provides a detailed record of budget and spending by each year of the programme, which indicate at the programme level actual expenditure was close to the estimated budget. In the final year of the programme there appears to be a significant underspend.	Disbursement of funding takes place as planned	**Timeliness**
12. Project design incorporates environmental risk an analysis	The Business Case includes a section that reports on the results of DFID climate and environment sensitivity analysis. Implementing partners' risk management systems were assumed to monitor and manage project interventions. (1)	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	**Environmental Sustainability**

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
13. A record of environmental performance is available that includes the rehabilitation or restoration of degraded ecosystems	The 2015 annual review commented on how two of the most popular project types may lead to negative environmental outcomes: "Woodlots seen during the annual review were all at an early stage of establishment and required around two hours a day to water... Concerns remain around the suitability of exotic trees (teak and orange); the location of woodlots in respect to water sources; the organisation of groups; and the rules for benefiting from the trees once they mature. Water infrastructure. Hand-dug ponds are the second most popular asset selected by communities. They can provide a valuable water source in the dry season. However, ongoing maintenance is required and there is a challenge to ensure livestock are watered in a separate trough to avoid contamination of the ponds." (4)	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	Environmental Sustainability
14. Project implementation records how social risks are addressed	The second annual review highlighted the challenge that "Karamoja is an operating environment where corruption is endemic. However, building a relationship with UN agencies where corruption management can be openly discussed, reported and properly budgeted for is a challenge. DFID Uganda are currently exploring ways to do this." Elite capture of programme resources undermines sustainable development. (4)	Investment decisions do not imperil long-term sustainable development objectives	Do No Harm
15. Records are kept of all project-related conflict resolution incidents	No documented evidence found.	Investment decisions do not violate human rights	Do No Harm
16. Project beneficiaries are identified and their change in status (financial, technological, capacity) due to project implementation is documented	Overall, the programme location in Karamoja was selected as being among the most food insecure and vulnerable in Uganda. The Business Case value-for-money findings were rated high for equity, based on the expected improved "resilience of mobile as well as settled communities." (1) The first annual review claimed that approximately 273,760 people were supported to cope with the effects of climate change. (2) The second annual review stated a further 272,852 people were supported. (4) In neither year was this headline figure disaggregated.	Financing is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Technology access is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Capacity is improved for the most vulnerable population groups	Equity
17. Gender analysis is part of the project design	Gender analysis formed part of the Social Appraisal section in the Business Case. (1)	Project planning considers the gender-differentiated	Gender Equality
18. Gender responsive disbursement guidelines exist	No documented evidence found.	Fund disbursement considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women	Gender Equality

ANNEX 2

Documented evidence of adherence to proposed principles: Blue Forests (Blue Ventures) Programme

Indicators *(If we find…)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that…)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with…)*
1. Project documentation that contains an analysis of climate information	The Business Case does not cite any climate information for Madagascar, (the initial country location), nor for the countries where expansion was expected (e.g. Indonesia). (1) [The Madagascar first NDC in 2016 had identified "mangrove forest destruction due to floods" as an example of an impact already observed regarding current climate trends].	Project design uses climate information to identify supporting actions	Climate Protection
2. Project purpose refers to National climate change strategy /National Adaptation Plan/NDC	The Business Case cites that the project implementer's work to date had integrated mangroves into the national REDD+ strategy of Madagascar. (1) There is no other reference to national climate change strategies or plans.	Project design responds explicitly to national climate change strategies and plans	National Ownership
3. Local government and community representatives participate in project funding decisions	The Business Case refers to community outreach and awareness-raising, without describing the details of how this will be carried out. (1)	Funding decisions incorporate the views of local authorities and the intended direct beneficiaries where project activity is planned	Subsidiarity
4. Project mechanisms exist to ensure broad participation in project management	The Business Case refers to "Stage 2 activities will focus on community organisation, capacity building and learning exchanges". (1) The 2017 Annual Review states that "The management plans have been validated by the communities and local authorities and are awaiting final approval from the regional forestry government department". (3) The 2018 Annual Review states that "community-led monitoring or management is now in place in eight different fisheries across three sites in Madagascar." (5) Annex A of the 2018 Annual Review describes a field scoping exercise to identify potential partner villages that included: "- social context, including local aspirations, needs and challenges, as well as potential appetite for locally-led marine management; - economic context, including how people earn money, who holds the power in local economies and any recent changes in conditions; - ecological context, including how marine ecosystems have (or have not) changed over time in the eyes of local people and potential reasons for any change." (5)	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	Equitable Participation

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
5. Record maintained of participants attending project management meetings	No documented evidence publicly available.	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	**Equitable Participation**
6. Annual reporting of budget commitment and disbursement amounts	The Grant Agreement specifies that a "detailed annual financial and operational report" shall be prepared by the project implementer. (2) The project annual budget and disbursements are listed on the Development Tracker website (last updated on 14/02/2020).	Financial contributions are disclosed publicly and in a timely manner	**Transparency**
7. Annual project monitoring report	Two annual review reports (for 2017 and 2018) are available on the Development Tracker website. (3) (5)	Project monitoring reports are published	**Transparency**
8. Project strategic decision making is documented	Two annual review reports (for 2017 and 2018) that are available on the Development Tracker website document project strategic decision making under recommendations (by the funder). (3) (5)	Project implementers are accountable for the results they produce to the direct beneficiaries and the communities of which they are a part	**Accountability**
9. Conflict resolution procedures are documented	No documented evidence publicly available.	A redress mechanism or process exists	**Accountability**
10. Annual budget estimates are available by a known date each year	The project annual budget is documented on the Development Tracker website (last updated on 14/02/2020).	Project funding is known over a multi-year, medium-term funding cycle	**Predictability of funding**
11. A record of project spending is available	The 2018 Annual Review states that "Narrative and financial reporting requirements have been adhered to, with an annual financial report being provided by 30 September, as set out in the project grant agreement." (5)	Disbursement of funding takes place as planned	**Timeliness**
12. Project design incorporates environmental risk analysis	The Business Case states that the project "does not involve activities that are likely to bring about adverse impacts on the environment or local communities" and "The project's monitoring and evaluation programme will track biological, fisheries and socioeconomic impacts on communities, in order to ensure net positive benefits to livelihoods and biodiversity." (1) No further evidence.	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	**Environmental Sustainability**

13. A record of environmental performance is available that includes the rehabilitation or restoration of degraded ecosystems	The 2018 Annual Review reported on the following indicators: number of sites with community-led mangrove management plans; and number of local fisheries management plans developed. (5)	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	**Environmental Sustainability**
14. Project implementation records how social risks are addressed	The 2017 Annual Review states that "a social impact assessment was conducted at Site 2 in 2016 using a mixed methods approach." (3)	Investment decisions do not imperil long-term sustainable development objectives	**Do No Harm**
15. Records are kept of all project-related conflict resolution incidents	No documented evidence publicly available.	Investment decisions do not violate human rights	**Do No Harm**
16. Project beneficiaries are identified and their change in status (financial, technological, capacity) due to project implementation is documented	The Business Case states, "The Blue Forests project is expected to deliver substantial livelihoods benefits to fishermen and in addition will provide other alternative livelihoods through its targeted fisheries improvement and livelihoods programs." (1) Output 3 of the project is 'implementation of viable new livelihood mechanisms', with the following three indicators: 3.1 number of people engaged in alternative livelihoods; 3.2 total income generated; 3.3 number of new alternative livelihoods developed by site. (5)	Financing is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Technology access is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Capacity is improved for the most vulnerable population groups	**Equity**
17. Gender analysis is part of the project design	The Business Case states, "Stage 3 will launch community health service delivery and community outreach and women's empowerment efforts, the latter including efforts to connect local women with opportunities to engage in mangrove management and alternative livelihoods." (1) The 2018 Annual Review states "The program works towards improved gender outcomes, e.g. through the family planning workstream which enables recipients to make their own choices on family size and timing of pregnancies...Further discussion of equity considerations for the program will be possible from 2019 onwards as recipient-focused outputs begin to disaggregate statistics by sex across activity sites. (5)	Project planning considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women	**Gender Equality**
18. Gender responsive disbursement guidelines exist	No documented evidence publicly available.	Fund disbursement considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women	**Gender Equality**

ANNEX 3

Documented evidence of adherence to proposed principles: Climate High-Level Investment Programme in Ethiopia

1. Project documentation that contains an analysis of climate information	The 2012 Business Case refers explicitly to the impacts of climate trends in Ethiopia: "Farmers who already struggle to cope with Ethiopia's unpredictable climate will have to deal with increasingly erratic rainfall, damaging crops and reducing yields. Prolonged droughts will reduce water supplies for communities and for electricity generation from hydropower. Flash floods will wash away roads and homes. Vector-borne diseases, in particular malaria, will spread to the highlands. If these impacts are not mitigated, the changing climate will knock up to 10% off Ethiopia's GDP by mid-century, and push millions further into poverty." And "Recent analysis in Ethiopia puts the cost of adaptation at up to $10 billion a year[16]." (1)	Project design uses climate information to identify supporting actions	Climate Protection
2. Project purpose refers to National climate change strategy / National Adaptation Plan / NDC	The 2012 Business Case identifies how the proposed programme would fit into the national climate change strategy: The Ethiopian Government's Climate Resilient Green Economy (CRGE) initiative wants Ethiopia to become a climate resilient, middle income economy by 2025 with zero net carbon growth...To achieve this ambitious vision, the Government is putting in place a number of institutional building blocks. A national CRGE Strategy will identify investment priorities, both for adaptation and mitigation. A national climate fund (CRGE Facility) will pool and administer climate finance." (1)	Project design responds explicitly to national climate change strategies and plans	National Ownership
3. Local government and community representatives participate in project funding decisions	No evidence has been found of any subsidiarity in decision making made by the federal line ministries, who were the programme's implementing partners.	Funding decisions incorporate the views of local authorities and the intended direct beneficiaries where project activity is planned	Subsidiarity
4. Project mechanisms exist to ensure broad participation in project management	No documented evidence publicly available across all four components of the programme. For the first component, the second annual review noted: "The CRGE Facility has developed a strong governance arrangement. It is also including civil society in the Advisory Board, which contributes to strengthening domestic accountability." (4)	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	Equitable Participation

16 World Bank (2010) Economics of Adaptation to Climate Change: Ethiopia

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
5. Record maintained of participants attending project management meetings	No documented evidence publicly available.	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	**Equitable Participation**
6. Annual reporting of budget commitment and disbursement amounts	The Development Tracker webpage provides a detailed record of budget and spending by each year of the programme (under the Transactions tab).	Financial contributions are disclosed publicly and in a timely manner	**Transparency**
7. Annual project monitoring report	Three annual reviews (for 2013, 2014, and 2016) are available on the Development Tracker website. (3) (4) (5)	Project monitoring reports are published	**Transparency**
8. Project strategic decision making is documented	Project strategic decision making is documented in the annual reviews. However, these are UK Government documents published on the UK Government's Development Tracker web-based portal. The opportunity for beneficiaries to access this information is likely to be limited.	Project implementers are accountable for the results they produce to the direct beneficiaries and the communities of which they are a part	**Accountability**
9. Conflict resolution procedures are documented	The annual review for 2013 contained a note on the development of accountability mechanisms: "Systems to collect direct feedback from the ultimate beneficiaries of DFID's climate investments are under development across the components... In the CRGE Facility, the planned inclusion of a complaints mechanism and the efforts being made to operationalize safeguards and develop M&E systems for the CRGE Facility all point towards the possibility of collecting beneficiary feedback in future and similar efforts to develop safeguards and M&E systems for the REDD+ Secretariat in future should also be used to ensure this occurs. The Climate vulnerability assessment process that will be conducted under the CSI will enable the CSI to collect direct feedback from beneficiaries. Complaints mechanisms exist in the mainstream PSNP and it would also be expected that this will be replicated as part of the CSI." (2)	A redress mechanism or process exists	**Accountability**
10. Annual budget estimates are available by a known date each year	Each annual review included statements on planned versus actual spend. (3) (4) (5)	Project funding is known over a multi-year, medium-term funding cycle	**Predictability of funding**
11. A record of project spending is available	The Development Tracker webpage provides a detailed record of budget and spending by each year of the programme (under the Transactions tab).	Disbursement of funding takes place as planned	**Timeliness**

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
12. Project design incorporates environmental risk analysis	The 2012 Business Case includes a high-level, short climate and environmental risk assessment across the four component programmes. Each was judged to be category C (out of A-D). (1)	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	**Environmental Sustainability**
13. A record of environmental performance is available that includes the rehabilitation or restoration of degraded ecosystems	The annual reviews do not contain project-level information that can demonstrate this indicator is in place.	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	**Environmental Sustainability**
14. Project implementation records how social risks are addressed	The first annual review recognised that "some investments will have potential environmental impact and if safeguards are not understood and implemented rigorously, there are potential environmental and social risks under the CRGE Facility and through REDD. These are mitigated by DFID's strong focus on ensuring safeguards are in place." (3) However, in the second annual review the challenges in developing these safeguards is noted: "The Facility found it challenging to adhere to timelines for monitoring and evaluation system development and implementation of social and environmental safeguards, but credible plans are now in place." (4) The final annual review noted progress made by the CRGE Facility (component 1): "The Facility also developed an Environmental and Social Safeguards Framework (ESSF) which builds on international safeguard systems, but has been customised using Ethiopian laws... The Facility used the ESSF to conduct a retrospective safeguard analysis of the FTIs. The ESSF was also applied during the development of Green Climate Fund (GCF) and Adaptation Fund (AF) proposals." (5)	Investment decisions do not imperil long-term sustainable development objectives	**Do No Harm**
15. Records are kept of all project-related conflict resolution incidents	The annual reviews do not contain project-level information that can demonstrate this indicator is in place.	Investment decisions do not violate human rights	**Do No Harm**
16. Project beneficiaries are identified and their change in status (financial, technological, capacity) due to project implementation is documented	The annual reviews do not contain project-level information that can demonstrate this indicator is in place. The final annual review provides some evidence that efforts were made to identify project beneficiaries by income group, yet with no indication of the impact: "PSNP beneficiaries being the first to be considered in a Ministry of Agriculture project because they are the poorest and need additional support due to the increased frequency of droughts in Ethiopia." (5)	Financing is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Technology access is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Capacity is improved for the most vulnerable population groups	**Equity**

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
17. Gender analysis is part of the project design	The 2012 Business case emphasized the differential gender impact caused by climate change: **Ethiopian women and girls are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate change**. Natural disasters and their subsequent impact kill more women than men, or kill women at an earlier age than men[17]. This is for a variety of reasons. For instance, high illiteracy levels among women in Ethiopia pose a serious impediment to their understanding of the drought early warning information[18], and when hard times begin men move away to look for alternative means of survival, leaving women to take care of the household[19]. Social and cultural patterns of inequality, in Ethiopia as elsewhere, are exacerbated in times of crisis." (1)	Project planning considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women	Gender Equality
18. Gender responsive disbursement guidelines exist	Component 2 of CHIP records progress on gender disbursement guidelines: "The programme also focused on gender mainstreaming. Achievements included ensuring 28-30% of the pilot activities targeted women, women's participation in planning processes, and gender mainstreaming guidance. However, more could have been done on disaggregated reporting (4 regional reports did not disaggregate results by gender) and how far gender disparity was fully taken into account was questioned by the external review of the CSI programme." (5)	Fund disbursement considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women	Gender Equality

17 Neumayer and Plümper (2007), 'The gendered nature of natural disasters: the impact of catastrophic events on the gender gap in life expectancy, 1981–2002', Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 97(3): 551-566
18 Flintan, F. (2011) 'The importance of gender in drought and disaster risk reduction', in Reglap, Disaster Risk Reduction in the Drylands of the Horn of Africa - Edition 2. Regional Learning and Advocacy Programme for Vulnerable Dryland Communities
19 Oxfam (2010) The Rain Doesn't Come Any More Poverty, Vulnerability and Climate Variability in Ethiopia, Oxfam international

ANNEX 4

Documented evidence of adherence to proposed principles: Building Resilience and Adaptation to Climate Extremes and Disasters

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
1. Project documentation that contains an analysis of climate information	This Business Case considers climate information, using secondary literature to set out the case for investing in climate resilience, adaptation and disaster risk reduction. The BC speaks to specific regions, such as the Sahel and DFID focus countries in Asia. (1) Climate risk was iteratively and consistently evaluated to ensure mitigation and projects had a degree of flexibility e.g.: "Most projects are using climate information to inform implementation, and some projects are influencing national and local planning processes to ensure that disaster and climate risks are considered together."	Project design uses climate information to identify supporting actions	Climate Protection
2. Project purpose refers to National climate change strategy /National Adaptation Plan/NDC	The Addendum to the Business Case that covered an extension to the project in 2019 stated: "For example, to date, 46 Least Developed Countries are seeking assistance with producing climate adaptation plans. BRACED responds to these needs by demonstrating practical models, and with this extension, will be increasingly able to present this evidence to national Governments...This includes BRACED's practical learning on how to work directly with communities at the local level and apply this at scale, even in fragile contexts, to support a more accountable response by national Governments." (2)	Project design responds explicitly to national climate change strategies and plans	National Ownership
3 Local government and community representatives participate in project funding decisions	"As BRACED is a demand driven fund supporting multiple projects in a range of countries it is not possible to meaningfully include beneficiaries in the fund level governance arrangements. However, all projects are required to have clear mechanisms in place to enable beneficiaries to participate in the design, management and implementation of the project." (1)	Funding decisions incorporate the views of local authorities and the intended direct beneficiaries where project activity is planned	Subsidiarity
4. Project mechanisms exist to ensure broad participation in project management	The Business Case argued that: "Participatory methodologies - including participatory vulnerability analysis will be critical for both understanding vulnerability and designing effective interventions. BRACED funded projects will need to clearly demonstrate a strong track record and commitment to participatory approaches." (1)	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	Equitable Participation
5. Record maintained of participants attending project management meetings	Little direct information or evidence to demonstrate this indicator was met apart from a few statements in the annual reviews e.g.: "Supplementary qualitative analysis of the scorecards suggest all projects are operating at a responsive level (where vulnerable groups are involved in defining challenges) with some examples of inclusion in participatory decision making." (6)	Local stakeholders (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) have voice in project governance structures	Equitable Participation

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
6. Annual reporting of budget commitment and disbursement amounts	The Development Tracker webpage provides a detailed record of budget and spending by each year of the programme (under the Transactions tab).	Financial contributions are disclosed publicly and in a timely manner	**Transparency**
7. Annual project monitoring report	Annual Reviews are published on DevTracker for an aggregate view of the BRACED programme. Individual project reviews are not.	Project monitoring reports are published	**Transparency**
8. Project strategic decision making is documented	Programme accountability appears to have been aimed at top-down learning, not seemingly inclusive of beneficiaries at the portfolio level at least, e.g. "As agreed in the overall evaluation plan each of the 15 projects will deliver a mid-term and final evaluation, all will feed into the KM led (strategic) evaluations. Discussion forum planned for 15th September to help IPs interpret guidance, design for mid-term evaluations to be complete by end November, to take place July – August 2016. In addition, and as described above the KM is facilitating three project impact evaluations." (5)	Project implementers are accountable for the results they produce to the direct beneficiaries and the communities of which they are a part	**Accountability**
9. Conflict resolution procedures are documented	Not in the provided documents.	A redress mechanism or process exists	**Accountability**
10. Annual budget estimates are available by a known date each year	The Business Case set out the overall budget of £140 million will be profiled as £9.7m in financial year 2013/14, £38.1m in FY 2014/15, £38.3m in FY 2015/16 and £24m in FY 2016/17. See Table 31 for an indicative breakdown of costs." (1)	Project funding is known over a multi-year, medium-term funding cycle	**Predictability of funding**
11. A record of project spending is available	The Development Tracker webpage provides a detailed record of budget and spending by each year of the programme (under the Transactions tab). The annual reviews undertake financial review and appraisal.	Disbursement of funding takes place as planned	**Timeliness**

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
12. Project design incorporates environmental risk an analysis	The Business Case has a section titled - Climate and Environment Appraisal (p. 48) which focuses on the appraisal on whether to invest in Disaster Risk Reduction and Adaptation. It states; "By working at individual community level there is a risk of displaced environmental risks from one community to another, for example an activity to improve irrigation and water use could have an impact on water users downstream by increasing the amount of water taken out of the river. It could also have negative impacts on the wider ecosystem. This risk is more acute if individual projects do not work with the national and subnational policy and institutional contexts – ensuring government buy-in at all levels. To address this consideration and mitigation of wider systemic climate and environment risks to the whole region or ecosystem in question will be included as criteria for grant selection." (1) The Business Case refers to a Climate and Environment Assurance Note (Annex B), yet this was omitted from the document published on DevTracker: "More details on the potential risks and negative environmental impacts are given in the Climate and Environment Assurance Note (Annex B)." (1)	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	**Environmental Sustainability**
13. A record of environmental performance is available that includes the rehabilitation or restoration of degraded ecosystems	Little to no information in available documentation allow for this indicator to be deduced.	Project activities do not cause damage to the environment	**Environmental Sustainability**
14. Project implementation records how social risks are addressed	The programme considers risk to the programme in general from internal and external factors. But it does not directly address the risk to sustainable development objectives.	Investment decisions do not imperil long-term sustainable development objectives	**Do No Harm**
15. Records are kept of all project-related conflict resolution incidents	None in available documentation.	Investment decisions do not violate human rights	**Do No Harm**
16. Project beneficiaries are identified and their change in status (financial, technological, capacity) due to project implementation is documented	Annual reviews utilised the KPI 1 methodology to report on the number of people supported to cope (KPI 1), disaggregated by intensity – direct or indirect - and gender. However, the evidence used to make these calculations is not provided. (1) The annual reviews provide very limited elements of project level data on outcomes., e.g.: "The Climate information and Assets for Resilience in Ethiopia (CIARE) project reported 64% of the target community members in Ethiopia have access to scientific climate information and use it effectively in their livelihoods decisions (up from 17% in BRACED year one)." (7)	Financing is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Technology access is improved for the most vulnerable population groups Capacity is improved for the most vulnerable population groups	**Equity**

Indicators *(If we find...)*	**Programme Evidence**	**Criteria** *(then we can say that...)*	**Principle** *(which demonstrates compliance with...)*
17. Gender analysis is part of the project design	The Business Case had a section titled Social and Gender Appraisal (p. 49): "One of the key issues for BRACED will be targeting within the selected countries. In order to do this effectively the selection criteria for potential BRACED-funded programmes will need to give high priority to social dimensions of vulnerability in addition to physical vulnerability. The following will be key requirements for selection: Gender. This needs to include a gendered approach to vulnerability analysis." (1) Gender analysis is also documented in the annual reviews, e.g. "A comprehensive M&E framework has been developed and is in place to enable this to be monitored, including for vulnerable groups such as women and girls, by every project and for the programme overall." (5)	Project planning considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women	Gender Equality
18. Gender responsive disbursement guidelines exist	Aside from the above indicator evidence surrounding grant delivery and the gender responsiveness, no further evidence was found.	Fund disbursement considers the gender-differentiated capacities and needs of men and women	Gender Equality

Catholic Agency for
Overseas Development

The Catholic Agency for Overseas Development (CAFOD) is the official aid agency of the Catholic Church in England and Wales and part of Caritas International.

Charity no 1160384 and a company limited by guarantee no 09387398.

Registered office:
Romero House, 55 Westminster Bridge Road, London SE1 7JB

Tel: 00 44 7095 5348
Email: cafod@cafod.org.uk
Website: cafod.org.uk

Printed on paper from sustainably managed forests