

## HOW DO WE MEASURE PREPAREDNESS?

Long timescales, uncertainties, and the multi-faceted nature of climate change adaptation makes monitoring progress in this field inherently challenging; there is no simple way to determine how well prepared we are for current and future climate change impacts. This contrasts with climate change mitigation, for which greenhouse gas emissions can be considered a universal indicator, and there are clear guidelines for preparing and analysing greenhouse gas inventories. The result is that national State of Environment (SOE) reports have tended not to provide a clear picture of progress in climate change adaptation. Encouragingly, some countries, notably Samoa (2013), Cook Islands (2016), Republic of the Marshall Islands (2016), and Federated States of Micronesia (2018), have begun to develop their own adaptation indicators for their SOE reports; however, at present, there is no regional set of indicators for adaptation and preparedness.

The lack of a consistent methodology for assessing adaptation and preparedness is perhaps surprising given that, in the 2018 Boe Declaration on Regional Security, Pacific Leaders reaffirmed that “*climate change remains the single greatest threat to the livelihoods, security and wellbeing of the peoples of the Pacific*”. Developing a simple set of preparedness indicators could help to fill this void, enhance future SOEs, and support countries in their national and international climate change reporting requirements.

The indicators outlined in Table 4.1 have been developed by the IMPACT Project through a detailed review of existing climate change adaptation indicators (including those developed for the SDGs and Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction) and climate change adaptation monitoring frameworks/scoreboards (such as the Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development Framework currently being applied in Fiji as well as the EU Adaptation Preparedness scoreboard). Following this review, a shortlist of indicator categories and indicators were developed and refined in collaboration with SPREP’s Climate Change and Resilience (CCR) and Environmental Monitoring and Governance (EMG) teams. In doing so, alignment with the *Framework for Resilient Development in the Pacific* was considered in addition to ensuring that the indicators were relevant, measurable, objective, and realistic (that is, could be assessed as a desk-based exercise using information that is publicly available online in a realistic amount of time).

## APPLICATION OF THE INDICATORS

The indicators have been compiled into a scorecard format with each assessed against “No”, “Partial”, or “Yes” criteria, developed to be as objective and unambiguous as possible to allow the practitioner to impartially determine a robust answer. In addition, progress towards each indicator can be described in more detail in a brief narrative section. An example of these assessment criteria can be seen in the table below; please note that the assessment criteria for the remaining indicators have been defined and are ready for use, although not shown here.

### Example of an indicator assessment

INDICATOR	‘NO’	‘PARTIAL’	‘YES’
Indicator 5.1 (M&E)	No M&E framework or system for adaptation in place at national level	An M&E framework or system for adaptation being developed at national level but not yet completed or being implemented	An M&E framework or system for adaptation in place at national level

Once the indicator scorecard has been completed, it can be verified by the country, for example using a telephone interview with the Climate Change Focal Point or other suitably qualified individuals. The country scores can then be combined to give an overall picture of the regional trends and areas for improvement, while allowing for the national situation to be described if so desired.

This scorecard approach will be piloted in 14 Pacific island countries in 2020 and will provide a means of more comprehensively understanding climate adaptation and preparedness in future SOEs.

Ella Strachan and Patrick Pringle led the development of this scorecard and summary. For more information about the pilot application in 2020, please contact SPREP [filomenan@sprep.org](mailto:filomenan@sprep.org)

**TABLE 4.1: Assessing national preparedness using standard indicators and criteria.**

DRAFT INDICATORS FOR THE PACIFIC CLIMATE CHANGE PREPAREDNESS SCORECARD		NO	PARTIAL	YES
<b>Adaptation Planning</b>				
1.1	An up-to-date national adaptation plan (NAP; or Joint National Action Plan including an implementation plan) has been published and is being implemented.			
1.2	Adaptation action is coordinated at a sectoral level evidenced by sector adaptation plans or mainstreaming of adaptation into sector plans and policies.			
1.3	Mechanisms are in place to facilitate inclusive involvement of stakeholders in national adaptation planning, including incorporation of views from sectors (horizontal) and sub-national level (vertical).			
1.4	A systematic prioritisation of adaptation activities (such as a Country Programme or project pipeline) has been undertaken with indicative costs and potential funders identified, endorsed by the relevant authority.			
1.5	Actions to address climate change adaptation are supported by a national level authoritative financial entity (such as a Ministry of Finance) which is able to facilitate access to international climate finance. <sup>1</sup>			
<b>Addressing Impacts and Vulnerabilities (including Early Warning Systems)</b>				
2.1	Observation systems are in place to monitor climate change, extreme climate events, and their impacts with data publicly available (Regional indicator).			
2.2	Up-to-date scenarios and climate projections are used to inform national adaptation planning.			
2.3	A consistent approach to vulnerability assessments is used at an island level with a standardised methodology.			
2.4	The region has a comprehensive multi-hazard monitoring and forecasting system, with analyses of risks involved that are effectively communicated to countries.			
2.5	There is a clear process in the country for the activation of emergency plans to prepare and respond to hazards and warnings, including the dissemination of timely warnings.			
<b>Mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation</b>				
3.1	Climate change adaptation considerations are included in the country's Environmental Impact Assessment legislation (or in the developments approval document/consent licenses/approval conditions).			
3.2	National Development Plans (national strategic plans, national sustainable development plans, frameworks, or similar) consider the impacts of climate change.			
<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>				
4.1	A monitoring and evaluation (M&E) system or framework has been developed and implemented specifically to track climate change adaptation progress at national level (e.g. an M&E system for a NAP or JNAP).			
<b>Information Knowledge Management and Brokerage</b>				
5.1	Climate change information and knowledge (including climate science; vulnerability and risk assessments; policies and plans; traditional knowledge; and information from civil society) is being collated and organised and has been made available in accessible formats.			

<sup>1</sup> International climate finance is defined here as the financial mechanisms of the UNFCCC (i.e. Global Environment Facility [GEF], the Green Climate Fund, and the Adaptation Fund)