



Consultation document: the ACCRA Local Adaptive Capacity framework (LAC)

October 2010



WHAT IS ACCRA?

ACCRA is a consortium made up of Oxfam GB, the Overseas Development Institute (ODI), Save the Children Alliance, Care International and World Vision International and funded by DFID. ACCRA aims to increase governments' and development actors' use of evidence in designing and implementing both humanitarian and development interventions that increase poor and vulnerable communities' adaptive capacity. ACCRA has four key objectives:

1. To understand how existing social protection, livelihoods and disaster risk reduction projects by ACCRA members build adaptive capacity to climate change in beneficiaries, and how these approaches can be strengthened.
2. To use the findings to influence donors, development partners and civil society to improve future planning/action.
3. To work together with local and national governments to build capacity to implement interventions which can build communities' adaptive capacity.
4. To encourage learning across countries and disciplines.

Our findings will inform influencing and capacity building activities that encourage other actors to adopt approaches to development that enable people to ensure and secure sustainable livelihoods despite the challenges caused by a changing climate.

ACCRA's key strengths are the novel thinking behind our Local Adaptive Capacity framework, the diversity of our programmes, members and teams, and the in-depth research being undertaken. We're undertaking 11 months of research across 3 countries, using a uniform approach. This will not only strengthen our conceptual understanding of adaptive capacity, but provide a wealth of information on how wider development policies and programmes promote communities' capacity to respond to a changing climate.

THE ACCRA PROGRAMME COMPONENTS

The ACCRA Local Adaptive Capacity Framework (LAC)

A key overarching conceptual tool for our programme is our Local Adaptive Capacity framework, which we are currently using to frame for our research. The ACCRA framework has the potential to be used in a number of different contexts, and for a range of purposes, for example for mainstreaming climate change adaptation, design or evaluation purposes. We're already looking at how it can be used in ACCRA members' policy and programming work, but our ambition is for it to be used much more widely.

ACCRA's capacity building work

ACCRA will implement national level capacity-building activities to support improved policy and practice of government actors. Whilst all countries have committed to national level engagement around key opportunities, each ACCRA country will also select one focus zone in each ACCRA country in which to undertake more direct capacity building support to support governments to successfully implement policy commitments. There is a strong commitment to cross-programme learning across countries and a variety of meetings and exchange visits involving programme and government personnel will enable the sharing of good practices.

ACCRA's in-depth research

We're carrying out detailed research on 11 projects across Ethiopia, Mozambique and Uganda before April 2011 – that's 11 months of research, one in each site. The ACCRA research seeks to test whether existing programmes are already contributing to this adaptive capacity or not, as well as to identify where existing programmatic approaches fall short, in order to inform actions to build adaptive capacity as an integral part of CCA programming. Through our research we'll bring together good practice from Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR), Sustainable Livelihoods and Social Protection programming to better understand how programmes and policies can support communities' and individuals' capacity to adapt to climate change.

Working and learning with others

ACCRA has a strong commitment to working with governments, and for this reason the consortium is fully operational in all 3 countries. We have an ACCRA national coordinator working alongside ACCRA members to build a strong relationship with and support the national government and work with local and national government at each step of the process. We're also working closely with existing civil society networks to ensure ACCRA contributes to their work, and with the wider development community through key platforms and meetings.

How was the Local Adaptive Capacity framework (LAC) developed?

The ACCRA LAC was developed by the Overseas Development Institute working with an Oxfam adviser following an experts' workshop in February 2010. We consulted extensively with governments, civil society members and of course ACCRA members in Ethiopia, Uganda and Mozambique, and amended it significantly. The framework drew on emerging thinking around adaptive capacity, recognising that this is a new area of work that isn't explicitly considered in any programmatic approaches. Climate change adaptation requires more than an integrated programmatic approach to address climatic changes; it also requires creating the enabling environment so that communities can continue to adapt beyond programmatic intervention timelines.

ACCRA will use the framework to carry out research on Social Protection, Disaster Risk Reduction and Livelihoods programmes, recognizing that:

1. Though not deliberately seeking to directly address aspects of climate variability and change, many wider development interventions may contribute to features of adaptive capacity.
2. All approaches seek either to provide, protect or recover assets or to strengthen or create institutions at multiple levels; from this perspective, therefore, they have the potential to contribute towards the community's ability to respond to a changing climate. The assets and institutions that the different approaches support overlap significantly, although each approach tends to have a particular focus.
3. The importance of both formal and informal institutions is emphasised in all approaches, including traditional social networks or safety nets and functioning government and civil society services, in particular health and education.
4. The various approaches typically use different labels for the many of the same community responses and actions.
5. At the programmatic level, each of the approaches is multidimensional: they all operate at, and complement work at, both micro (household and community) and macro (national and international) levels.

For more detailed information on the synergies between different approaches, you can also read the ODI working paper "Responding to a changing climate: Exploring how disaster risk reduction, social protection and livelihoods approaches promote features of adaptive capacity": <http://community.eldis.org/.59d669a7/txFileDownload/f.59d669a7/n.ODIWP.pdf>. You can also access the ODI Background Note on the LAC: <http://community.eldis.org/.59d669a7/txFileDownload/f.59d669a7/n.Background.pdf>. Keep track of ACCRA and our publications and join our eldis group for monthly updates at: <http://community.eldis.org/accra>

How can you contribute?

The ACCRA LAC has the potential to be used in a number of different contexts, and for a range of purposes, for example for mainstreaming, design or evaluation purposes. We'd welcome your feedback and participation to help us develop it:

- 1) Volunteers who are willing to test the LAC to assess if their projects contribute to adaptive capacity and feed back to us. We have extensive and detailed participatory tools which turn the framework into action: we'd welcome interest in testing these and feeding back to us.
- 2) Do you have comments/views on our characteristics of adaptive capacity? What works, and how could we improve them?
- 3) Inputs on what you like about the LAC and question guide, and how they could be improved?
- 4) How can you see yourself using the LAC if we developed it further? As a design or assessment tool? As a useful conceptual framework? For mainstreaming?
- 5) Stay up-to-date with our findings and feed them into your work: <http://community.eldis.org/accra>

Please email jlofthouse@oxfam.org.uk to feed back to us, or write to ACCRA at Oxfam GB, P.O. Box 6228, Kampala, Uganda.

ACCRA's five characteristics of Adaptive Capacity

The ACCRA consortium identifies **five** characteristics of adaptive capacity to analyse people's own adaptive capacity in the face of a combination of hazards and stresses and to analyse how different programming approaches **either support or hinder** adaptive capacity. The five characteristics include:

1) The Asset Base: the various financial, physical, natural, social, political and human capitals necessary to best prepare a system to respond to a changing climate. This category incorporates the importance of various capitals, often informal, non-monetary and reliant on various social networks.

[Examples: Physical Capital: Sand dams, flood defence schemes, boreholes etc; Financial Capital: household savings, access to financial loans, livestock and household wealth etc; Natural Capital- Forest resources, access to water resources, etc.]

2) Institutions and Entitlements: The ability of system to ensure equitable access and entitlement to key resources and assets is a fundamental characteristic of adaptive capacity. Given that entitlements to key resources needed to adapt can be differentiated along age, ethnicity, class, religion and gender (to name but a few), an institutional environment that allows equitable opportunities to all groups, particularly the marginal, and most vulnerable to the impacts of climate change is essential to building the capacity to adapt. Representation and participation in key institutions is also emphasized to enable equitable distribution of resources. Access to key resources, participation in the decision-making process, and empowerment are key elements of the characteristic.

[Examples: Local norms and rules that regulate access to natural resources or water points (e.g. who's animals and how many are allowed to which water point during which season); religious rules that prevent women from ploughing, social norms that encourage wealthier households to support poorer neighbours in times of stress or crisis, etc.]

3) Knowledge and Information: Successful adaptation requires information and understanding of future change, knowledge around adaptation options, the ability to assess them, and the capacity to implement the most suitable interventions. In the context of climate change it is important to ensure that systems are in place to distribute relevant information at both national and region scales. In addition, forums for dialogue and discussion amongst all stakeholders must be made available. *[Examples: Flood Early Warning Systems; Meteorological data and forecasting; climate impact data].*

4) Innovation: A key characteristic of adaptive capacity relates to the system's ability to support innovation and risk taking. Innovation can be planned, high-tech orientated, and geared towards large scale innovations; or it can be autonomous, local-level initiatives that help innovate or adapt to changes to the local climate. An enabling environment that promotes and allows for experimentation and the exploration of niche solutions is required to take advantage of new opportunities and to confront challenges presented by climate change. The environment also needs to protect against risks of failure associated with innovation. *[Examples: Changing crop types, adopting new farming practices, switching livelihoods, taking advantage of new opportunities presented in the face of a changing climate].*

5) Flexible Forward-thinking Decision Making and Governance: Informed decision-making, transparency, and prioritisation each form key elements of adaptive capacity. Ensuring that local organisations are informed on future climate impacts and take appropriate measures to plan for the future. Similarly, flexibility to allow for systems, and the institutions that govern them, to evolve and adapt to a changing environment is a crucial characteristic of adaptive capacity. *[Examples: Land use regulations that protect floodplains while allowing moderate use, and that are re-assessed every planning period against new climate change evidence; regulations that have reporting requirements of the land owner/user to report on certain changing conditions].*

Guidance on reading the LAC framework

Table 1 on page 3 below presents the basic structure of the research framework developed for ACCRA.

- The first column presents the five key characteristics of adaptive capacity.
- The second column provides some additional illustrative elements and examples as to what is meant by the rather abstract formulation of the characteristics.
- Columns 3 and 5 focus on the key questions 1 and 2 above (1 - *How are different livelihood groups currently affected by climate hazard/variability change? And 2 - In what ways is the intervention (SP, DRR, L/H, CCA) contributing to managing vulnerability to current hazards in a changing climate and build adaptive capacity?*) and are to be filled in using the question guide provided in Annex 1.
- Column 4 and 6 are focusing on questions relating to barriers and opportunities.

Guiding Questions: As well as an overarching framework, ODI (ACCRA's research lead) has developed a question guide to give guidance on how to drill down into the 5 characteristics of adaptive capacity. This covers which questions to ask, and whom to ask them to. The questions listed in the guide are meant to illustrate a range of suitable questions that could be asked at the national, local and community levels, to government, communities and programme staff. The list is meant to be further modified to reflect the communities' make-up, sensitivity and exposure to climate hazards. It's important to remember is that the guiding questions are by no means exhaustive.

ACCRA LOCAL ADAPTIVE CAPACITY FRAMEWORK

| Characteristics of Adaptive Capacity | Illustrative elements to look for when assessing interventions within the ACCRA project example | A. Current situation <i>How are different livelihood groups currently affected by climate hazards/variability/change and how they are adapting / coping?</i> | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> | B. Project Intervention <i>In what ways is the intervention (SP, DRR, L/H, CCA) contributing to managing vulnerability to current hazards in a changing climate and build adaptive capacity?</i> | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> |
|--|--|---|--|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Asset Base <i>Availability and interplay of key assets that allow the system to respond to evolving circumstances in a changing climate</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The combination of appropriate human, social, financial, physical, natural capital to best prepare the system to respond to a changing climate. - The interplay of appropriate assets in light of a changing climate | <p><i>Refer to question guide for specific questions asked</i></p> | | <p><i>Refer to question guide for specific questions asked</i></p> | |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutions and Entitlements <i>Institutional environment that allows equitable access and entitlement to key assets</i> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Local institutions and informal organisations that ensure equitable access and entitlement to key resources by all groups, including those marginalised (<i>i.e. gender, caste, ethnicity</i>) - Active participation by all groups in the planning and decision-making process - Empowerment and voice to generate opportunities as a basis for adaptation | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>• Knowledge and Information The system has the ability to collect, analyze and disseminate knowledge and information in support of adaptive activities</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Appropriate systems for data gathering, informational analysis, and dissemination - Climate related information is reaching key stakeholders - General awareness raising - Key stakeholders are using knowledge and information to adapt | | | | |
| <p>• Innovation The system creates an enabling environment to foster innovation, experimentation and the ability to explore niche solutions in order to take advantage of new opportunities</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A willingness to adapt, learn and fail - Ability to create new ideas, skills, technology. - Ability to take advantage of new opportunities. - Availability of assets and institutions to help foster innovation. | | | | |
| <p>• Flexible forward-thinking Decision Making and Governance The system is able to anticipate, incorporate, and respond to changes with regards to its governance structures and future planning.</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ability of formal organisations to be responsive in light of changing circumstances - Actions and coordination by stakeholders at multiple levels (horizontal, vertical, inter-sectoral) - A transparent and accountable planning and decision-making process | | | | |

ACCRA LACF QUESTION GUIDE

Situational Context

- 1
 - What are the main livelihood groups/strategies within the proximate area?
e.g. pastoralism, agro-pastoralism, farmers, fishers, etc.
 - What are the main climate-related hazards/variability/change that affect livelihood groups within the proximate area?
e.g. drought, landslide, flooding, El Niño, changes in rainfall pattern and timing, increases in ambient temperature etc.
 - Are there resulting consequences and impacts of any observed climate-related changes on livelihoods practices/strategies?
e.g. impacts of prolonged drought on farming actions/choices/timing, dependency on NGO support, decrease in farm productivity
- 2
 - Are there certain livelihood/social groups that are particularly vulnerable to the impacts of climate hazards/variability/change in comparison with the wider community? If any differences in impact, for what reasons?
e.g. women/youth/poor/socially marginalised, etc.
 - Have any observable changes occurred with regards to climate within the proximate area, in comparison to a generation ago?
e.g. drought, rainfall, erratic seasons, shortening of rainy seasons, change in volume and intensity, temperature, etc.
 - Are there any local indicators that reflect/demonstrate any observed changes in climate?
e.g. agro-ecological zones moving, changing wind directions, loss of grass species/wildlife
- 3
 - Are there any impacts of observed climate variability/hazards/change on conflict at both household and community levels?
e.g. conflict over scarce resources, increase tribal/community conflict over access to water resources, Migration (temporary and permanent) etc.
 - In what ways do any observed changes and adaptation strategies relate to non-climatic shocks and stresses?
e.g. conflict, population increase, urbanisation, degrading land use practices etc.
- 4
 - What measures, if any, have livelihood groups taken in-order to adapt to any observed climate-related changes?
e.g. diversify crop varieties, adopting new livelihood practices, migration
If no adaptation occurring, what are the barriers to change?
 - Have any climate-related changes been beneficial to livelihoods groups?
e.g. opportunities to cultivate different crop types, increased in agricultural/livestock productivity etc.

1. Asset Base

| Current Situation A. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> | Project Intervention B. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> |
|--|--|---|---|
| <p>1</p> <p>- What impacts do climate-related variability/hazards/change have on essential livelihood assets <i>see below</i>:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Natural Capital <i>e.g. forest resources, adjacent river resources, water resources, pasture, soil quality and productivity etc.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Physical Capital Household: <i>e.g. livestock, crops, household infrastructure, livelihood tools, etc.</i> Community: <i>e.g. flood defence schemes, sand dams, boreholes, etc.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Financial Capital <i>e.g. sale of livestock, household savings, financial loans</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Social Capital <i>e.g. neighbour/family networks, community support, social networks, local institutions</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">Human Capital <i>e.g. human resources, health infrastructure, schools</i></p> | | <p>- Have project interventions helped to reduce the impacts of climate-related vulnerability/hazards/change on essential livelihood assets? <i>e.g. promotion of irrigation/construction of sand dam to irrigate farmer's crops during drought, diversification of assets</i></p> <p>- Have project interventions contributed to the various assets, <i>listed adjacent</i>, in helping to reduce vulnerability and increase capacity to adapt to observed changes in climate?</p> <p>- Have project interventions supported the diversification of key assets needed to reduce vulnerability and support adaptation to observed changes in climate?</p> | <p><i>If interventions have not succeeded in reducing the impacts, for what reasons?</i></p> <p><i>Have project interventions resulted in any noticeable negative impacts upon the various capitals e.g. degradation of natural capital, environmental impacts, restricting access to key resources</i></p> |
| <p>2</p> <p>- Identify the key assets and resources, <i>as categorised above</i>, that are relied upon to prevent, cope with, and recover from the impacts of climate hazard/variability/change?</p> <p>- Does climate-related variability/hazards/change affect the individual's ability to produce food for their family on a daily/seasonal basis?</p> | | <p>- Are project interventions contributing to the assets base of livelihoods needed to prevent, cope with and recover from the impacts of climate hazard/variability/change?</p> | <p><i>What further assets are needed to secure resilience to climate hazard/variability/change?</i></p> |

3

- Which livelihood/social groups are most at risk of climate-related variability/hazard/change impacting upon their livelihood assets, compared with the wider community?

- Do all livelihoods/social groups have equitable access to key assets needed to prevent, cope with, and recover from the impacts of climate hazard/variability/change in comparison with the wider community?

*If unequal, for what reasons?
Social/political/financial etc.*

Have project interventions supported and promoted equitable access to key assets needed to prevent, cope with, and recover from the impacts of climate hazard/variability/change?

*If interventions haven't succeeded in promoting equitable access, for what reasons?
Are some benefiting more than others?*

2. Institutions and Entitlements

| Current Situation A. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> | Project Intervention B. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> |
|--|---|--|---|
| <p>1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What are the most important local institutions and informal organisations do livelihoods depend on in the proximate area <i>e.g. Community networks and cooperatives, market access and arrangements, women’s support groups, social networks, CBOs etc.</i> - Which local institutions and informal organisations are relied upon for livelihood support specifically during times of climate variability/hazard/change? <i>e.g. Family/Neighbour support networks, community support groups/safety nets, local farmer associations</i> - How do local institutions and informal organisations regulate access to key resources/assets during times of climate stress and shock? <i>e.g. Traditional customs, water rights, etc.</i> | <p><i>Are all social groups able to equitably access the support provided by local institutions and informal organisations in times of climate stress and shock?</i></p> <p><i>Do some benefit more than others?</i></p> <p><i>Is resources regulation and access equitable amongst livelihood/social groups?</i></p> <p><i>Do some benefit more than others?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do project interventions support local institutions and informal organisations in assisting livelihood groups during times of climate variability/hazard/change? If so how? <i>e.g. district government services, traditional resource management mechanisms, social support mechanisms?</i> - Have any project interventions supplemented/substituted the traditional roles played by local institutions and informal organisations relating to climate variability/hazard/change? | <p><i>If so, have changes led to tangible improvements in light of observed climate related changes?</i></p> |
| <p>2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have local institutions and informal organisations themselves been affected by climate-related changes? - Are there social/livelihood groups that are more heavily dependent on outside support from local institutions and informal organisations during times of climate stress and shock in comparison with the surrounding community? <i>e.g. women farmers, young pastoralists, fishers</i> - Are there social/livelihoods groups that lack equitable access to key resources during times of climate variability/hazard/change? | <p><i>If so, for what reasons?</i></p> <p><i>If so, where do the constraints arise from?</i></p> <p><i>Political/economic/social causes?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do project interventions support groups that lack equitable access and entitlement to key resources during times of climate variability/hazard/change? - Do project interventions help provide equitable access and entitlement to key resources for those marginalised during times of climate shock and stress? | <p><i>How successful has any such intervention been in ensuring equitable access?</i></p> <p><i>If so, have project interventions been successful in doing-so? What are the barriers?</i></p> |

3

- What roles do local institutions and informal organisations play in informing/supporting/determining adaptation strategies for livelihood groups in response to climate variability/hazard/change?
e.g. local farmer collectives informing farmers on suitable crop varieties or livestock

- Are there local rules and norms that prevent certain livelihood/social groups from undergoing adaptation strategies in light of climate variability/hazard/change?
e.g. women/youth unable to perform certain livelihood activities due to local customs, traditional/cultural restrictions on certain adaptation options

- Have local institutions and informal organisations undergone any changes/transformations in-order to accommodate for observed climate-related changes?
e.g. changes in support/advice/structure.

Are suggested adaptation strategies widely adopted within livelihood groups?

Have changes been successful?

Is there resistance to change amongst livelihood groups?

If no changes made, for what reasons?

- Do project interventions provide any support to local institutions and informal organisations in helping to regulate access and entitlement to key resources during times of climate stress and shock?

4

- How are different livelihood / social groups represented within key local institutions needed for support during times of climate shock and stress?
e.g. local councils, farmers collectives, water user groups

- How participatory is decision making within local institutions?
e.g. Are the views of women, youth, and marginal groups taken into account

- What climate-related information, both formal and informal, do individuals use to guide their livelihood practices?
e.g. indigenous farmer knowledge of rainfall timing/seasonality, radio broadcasts of weather patterns, flood early warning systems

- What kinds of systems are in place for data gathering, information analysis and dissemination in relation to climate hazards/variability/change relevant for the area?
e.g. weather data, flood early warning systems, information on climate change impacts.

Are formal means of climate information trusted and acted upon? If not, for what reasons?

Is traditional climate information held in higher regard than formal information and knowledge?

- Are projects interventions assisting in the collection, interpretation or dissemination of information and knowledge relating to climate-related hazards/variability/change?

3. Knowledge and Information

| | Current Situation A. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> | Project Intervention B. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| 1 | <p>- What climate-related information, both formal and informal, do individuals use to guide their livelihood practices? <i>e.g. indigenous farmer knowledge of rainfall timing/seasonality, radio broadcasts of weather patterns, flood early warning systems</i></p> <p>- What kinds of systems are in place for data gathering, information analysis and dissemination in relation to climate hazards/variability/change relevant for the area? <i>e.g. weather data, flood early warning systems, information on climate change impacts</i></p> | <p><i>Are formal means of climate information trusted and acted upon? If not, for what reasons?</i></p> <p><i>Is traditional climate information held in higher regard than formal information and knowledge?</i></p> | <p>- Are projects interventions assisting in the collection, interpretation or dissemination of information and knowledge relating to climate-related hazards/variability/change?</p> | <p><i>If so, has the information/knowledge been incorporated and acted upon?</i></p> <p><i>Do people trust it?</i></p> |
| 2 | <p>- Are livelihood groups using climate related information and knowledge (formal and informal) in their decision-making processes? <i>e.g. does climate information and knowledge influence collective decision-making at the local level?</i></p> <p>- Is relevant climate-related data reaching key stakeholders in the appropriate form so that it can be used in a timely and appropriate manner? <i>(e.g. accessible dissemination of drought early warnings to farmers prior to planting)</i></p> | <p><i>If climate information not used in decision processes, for what reasons?</i></p> <p><i>Is information being translated into positive and effective action? If not, for what reasons?</i></p> | <p>- Have project interventions increased the awareness of climate hazards/variability/change? <i>e.g. climate change education and awareness programmes</i></p> | <p><i>Is information provided through awareness and education programmes trusted? If not, for what reasons?</i></p> |
| 3 | <p>- Are livelihood groups provided with knowledge and information on appropriate adaptation strategies relevant to their livelihood and region? <i>e.g. climate change impacts and adaptation strategies for pastoral herders relevant to region/livelihood</i></p> <p>- What additional information relating to climate variability/hazard/change is needed to help guide livelihood groups to adapt to climate-related changes?</p> | <p><i>Are individuals acting on advised adaptation strategies? If not, for what reasons?</i></p> | <p>- Are project interventions assisting in the provision of knowledge and information on relevant adaptation strategies and practices for livelihood groups?</p> | <p><i>Is adaptation related project intervention assistance and advice being acted upon? If not, for what reasons?</i></p> |

4. Innovation

| | Current Situation A. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> | Project Intervention B. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> |
|----------|---|--|---|--|
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To what extent have any noticeable climate-related changes led to the adoption of new practices within each livelihood group? <i>e.g. adoption of drought resilient crops, alteration in planting seasons, change in livestock herd composition</i> - Have any climate-related changes led to the adoption/switching of new livelihood strategies? <i>e.g. switching partially or fully to another livelihood</i> - What effects have any new practices had on livelihood, both positive and negative? <i>e.g. HH income, natural resource base, social relations etc.</i> | <p><i>If no new practices observed, why not?</i></p> <p><i>Are there new successful opportunities/practices that were not viable in the past?</i></p> <p><i>What factors assist/hinder local populations in adopting new practices</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have project interventions supported new practices to enable livelihood groups to adapt to climate-related changes? <i>e.g. supplying technical expertise for the cultivation of new/more-suitable crops</i> - Have the project interventions supported the adoption of new livelihood strategies? <i>e.g. provide training and skills for alternative livelihoods</i> | <p><i>Is the support provided by the project intervention sufficient to foster new practices within the livelihood group?</i></p> <p><i>Will the supported livelihoods be sustainable in the long-term future?</i></p> |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How able and willing are different livelihood groups to adapt and adjust to climate-related changes? <i>e.g. some groups unable/reluctant to change traditional practices</i> - Are livelihood groups within the community taking risks and exploiting new opportunities presented by any climate-related changes? <i>e.g. are farmers attempting to plant a range of crops and varieties during both good and bad years?</i> - Do livelihood groups have access to new and improved technology needed to cope with climate-related changes? <i>e.g. more efficient irrigation system, solar/wind technology etc.</i> | <p><i>If certain groups more willing to adopt new practices and implement changes, for what reasons?</i></p> <p><i>If no risks taken, why not?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have project interventions supported assets, institutions, or policies that foster and support innovation and risk taking in light of climate-related hazards/variability/change? <i>e.g. safety nets for innovation and risk taking in light of climate-related hazards/variability/change?</i> - Has project interventions increased the availability and use of relevant technology needed to cope climate-related changes? | <p><i>Which safety nets are most important for supporting innovation?</i></p> |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>3</p> <p>- Do climate-related hazards/variability/change influence the risks taken within each livelihood? <i>e.g. risks taken after the impacts of flood or drought events- trying new livelihood options/strategies, sale of assets etc.</i></p> <p>- Are there mechanisms in place to accommodate for, and promote the sharing of risk and innovation within livelihood groups and the wider community? <i>e.g. farmer insurance schemes, collective innovation and risk taking, local support systems</i></p> | <p><i>If none in place, which interventions would best support the sharing of risk?</i></p> | <p>- Do project interventions help support and diversify adaptation strategies amongst livelihood groups?</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p>- What are the ideal conditions needed in-order to foster innovative action, diversification, and try new practices within each livelihood? <i>e.g. no conflict, local farmer networks and indigenous knowledge sharing of suitable crop/livestock varieties?</i></p> | | <p>- Which interventions or combination of interventions has been most successful in supporting innovation, diversification, and risk taking?</p> <p>-</p> <p><i>If none, for what reasons?</i></p> |

5. Flexible and forward looking decision-making and governance

| | Current Situation A. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> | Project Intervention B. | Barriers and Opportunities <i>Questions to consider where appropriate</i> |
|----------|---|---|--|--|
| 1 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do government and local agency provide support local communities to adapting to any observed changes in the climate? - Which formal organisations are associated with the preparing for, coping with, and recovery of individual climate-related vulnerability/hazard/change by livelihood groups? <i>e.g. NGOs and government agencies associated with coping with flood events, which for drought etc.</i> - To what extent do formal organisations communicate, interact, and share information and knowledge with local informal organisations/institutions over issues of climate variability/hazard/change? <i>e.g. Government and NGO interaction and knowledge sharing with local farmer/pastoral collectives</i> | <p><i>If no platforms for interaction, why not? Is institutional interaction deemed necessary?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have project interventions assisted with the mitigation, coping with and recover of individual climate-related shocks and stress upon livelihood groups? | |
| 2 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Do local organisations, as a collective, have the flexibility and capacity to deal with a range of climate-related shocks and stresses? <i>e.g. from drought to flood, landslides to soil erosion</i> - Are formal organisations incorporating and learning from past climate-related events within their decision-making processes? <i>e.g. NGOs and government organisations responding to recent changes in rainfall pattern/rainfall uncertainty</i> | <p><i>If not, for what reasons?</i></p> <p><i>If no learning taking place, for what reasons?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Which aspects of project interventions have been the most successful in promoting flexibility to adapt to climate hazards/variability/change? | <p><i>If not successful, for what reasons?</i></p> |
| 3 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have formal organisations developed plans to help the community deal with climate-related hazards/variability/change? <i>e.g. Community Disaster Response Plans</i> | <p><i>If so, how effective are developed plans? Are there barriers to plan implementation?</i></p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Have project interventions supported the development of community plans for response to climate-related hazards/change? | |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| <p>4</p> <p>- What measures are put in place to accommodate for climate-related uncertainty and future potential new shocks and stress events? Are there systems in place for reviewing and adjusting priorities over time?</p> <p>- Are formal organisations and their policies/plans flexible in their decision-making processes in responding to new threats posed by climate-related changes? <i>e.g., are institutions solely reliant on traditional responses and decision making processes</i></p> | <p><i>If none, for what reasons? Is the future seen as threat?</i></p> <p><i>If not responsive to changes or flexible in their decision making, for what reasons? What are the main barriers?</i></p> | <p>- Have project interventions supported communities in accommodating for climate-related uncertainty?</p> <p>- Have project interventions supported formal organisations and their policies/plans in dealing with new threats posed by climate-related changes?</p> |
| <p>5</p> <p>- Do formal organisations have access to relevant climate information and knowledge in guiding policy and decision-making? <i>e.g. early warning systems, knowledge of relevant adaptation strategies</i></p> <p>- In what ways/do formal organisations take into account projected/likely climate-related changes and incorporate them within their plans and decision-making processes? <i>e.g. using climate projections to guide district DRR planning</i></p> | <p><i>What are the barriers to implementing new policy and decision-making processes?</i></p> | <p>- Do project interventions provide support to formal organisations in both learning from past events and taking into account future projected/potential climate vulnerability/hazards/change?</p> |