

Revised adaptation scoreboard indicator list and methodology for assessing them

Policy Framework				
A	Adaptation strategies	A1	A national adaptation strategy has been adopted	
		A2	Number and scope (% of population or territory covered) of adaptation strategies adopted at relevant subnational levels, in line with national multilevel governance arrangements	
B	Adaptation action plans	B1	A national adaptation action plan has been adopted	
		B2	Number and scope of adaptation action plans adopted at local or relevant subnational levels	
		B3	Adaptation action plans adopted at sectoral level, or embedded in sectoral strategies	
Scoreboard				
Adaptation policy making process	Main area of performance	N°	Key domain of relevance	Criteria for positive and "in progress" replies, Categories of information sought, and Notes for better focus
Step 1: Preparing the ground for adaptation	1. A country-wide governance system is in place for adaptation policy making and vertical and horizontal coordination arrangements are in place between governmental bodies	1a	A central administration body officially in charge of adaptation policy making	- Country Fiches (CF) to provide details on the coordinating administration and its role
		1b	Horizontal (i.e. sectoral) coordination mechanisms exist within the governance system, with division of responsibilities	<p>YES = evidence that systematic coordination is in place (depending on the implementation phase)</p> <p>- CF to present clearly what is the case (i.e. coordination only during drafting the NAS or continued during the implementation phase)</p> <p>IN PROGRESS: Some coordination activity between bodies responsible for relevant sectors, but with no clear division of responsibilities, or incomplete sectoral coverage.</p>

		1c	Vertical (i.e. across levels of administration) coordination mechanisms exist within the governance system, enabling lower levels of administration to influence policy making.	<p>YES = Idem 1b</p> <p>- Additionally, CF to also present details if – cooperation only in certain sectors (e.g. water); specific delegation mechanisms are in place, e.g. for devolving power & responsibilities to regions.</p> <p>IN PROGRESS: Some coordination mechanisms between relevant levels of administration, but with incomplete coverage or incomplete implementation.</p>
2. Stakeholders (e.g. interest groups, scientists and general public) are involved in the preparation of adaptation policies	2a	A dedicated process is in place to facilitate stakeholders' involvement in the preparation of adaptation policies	<p>- CF to provide details on the processes used (e.g. public consultations, involvement in working groups etc.)</p> <p>- CF to indicate what categories of stakeholders have been consulted (e.g. industry representatives, organised civil society, etc.)</p> <p>If at the time of preparation of the CF, the policy cycle is in a stage where stakeholder involvement is not relevant (e.g. just after the adoption of a strategy or a plan), the CF should seek evidence from the last stakeholder involvement period.</p>	
	2b	Transboundary cooperation is planned to address common challenges with relevant countries	<p>YES = stable cooperation mechanisms are in place (ideally described in or driven by the NAS)</p> <p>- CF to present details on the specific cooperation mechanisms (do not have to be formal governmental processes, e.g. macro-regional strategies count as well)</p> <p>- CF to present details re. the specific sectors / fields of cooperation (e.g. flood risk management)</p> <p>- CF to present details on identified transboundary projects and/or other common initiatives (although if this is the only cooperation identified would normally not qualify for a positive assessment).</p>	

Step 2: Assessing risks and vulnerabilities to climate change	3. Systems are in place to monitor and assess current and projected climate change, impacts and vulnerability	3a	Observation systems are in place to monitor climate change, extreme climate events and their impacts	<p>YES = observation systems are in place, records on extreme events are being kept, and these records include figures on impacts (e.g. casualties, damages, financial losses etc.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to present details on what observations systems are in place for monitoring climate events, as well as their impacts. - CF to present details on what kind of records regarding climate impacts are being identified. - CF to try identifying what and how the climate-related impacts are captured (e.g. loss & damage figures, surface/areas affected, no. of people affected etc.). <p>IN PROGRESS: observation systems are in place only in some sectors.</p>
		3b	Scenarios and projections are used to assess the economic, social and environmental impacts of climate change, taking into account geographical specificities and are based on latest best available science (e.g. in response to revised IPCC assessments)	<p>YES = projections are available, and based on most recent science; and are being used for assessing impacts (even if only preliminary vulnerability screenings are being carried out)</p> <p><i>Note: Indicators 3b and 3c should be looked at together. 3b tends to have a geographical scope, while 3c has a sectoral one.</i></p> <p>Initial analysis will present a simple schema of the coverage of scenarios and projections. In due course, further detailed information could be added by desk officers or Member States on (i) the projections available in the MS: source (domestic research or international sources) and how are they maintained, singular or ensembles, RCM or downscaled GCM, available resolutions; (ii) whether an overall/aggregated risk & vulnerability assessment was carried out across several sectors or one of a national coverage was done; (iii) optionally, details on any existing sub-national/regional assessments are useful for complementing the sectoral perspective</p> <p>IN PROGRESS: not country specific enough, old scenarios, not based on recent science</p>

		3c	Sound climate risks/vulnerability assessments for priority vulnerable sectors are undertaken to support adaptation decision making. The selection of vulnerable sectors may be based on a lighter pre-screening vulnerability assessment.	<p>YES = comprehensive risk & vulnerability assessments are carried out in (a critical mass of the) priority sectors identified;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to present details on what sectors were analysed, the level of detail in the analyses, and information on the studies supporting these assessments - CF to seek details whether the analyses were coordinated at a central level, were sector-driven carried out independently, or were separate research projects carried out independently <p>IN PROGRESS: some evidence of good quality risk and vulnerability assessments in some sectors; but sectoral coverage is partial</p>
		3d	Climate risks/vulnerability assessments take transboundary risks into account, when relevant	<p>YES = transboundary risks are taken into account in a coordinated manner, ideally enshrined in NAS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to provide details on how and where transboundary risks were considered (i.e. for which sectors), and if this coordinated by the NAS or is sector-driven (e.g. in water mng'nt and flood risk), or project-driven <p>IN PROGRESS: Transboundary risks are taken into account by some sectors, but gaps exist in relevant sectors.</p>
	4. Knowledge gaps on climate change and climate change adaptation are tackled	4a	Work is being carried out to identify, prioritise and address the knowledge gaps	<p>YES: gaps are identified and work is ongoing to address them (not checking if all relevant sectors are addressed)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to provide details on the processes employed for periodically tackling the knowledge gaps and mention if this is driven by NAS or other arrangements are in place; - CF to provide details on any preliminary identification of knowledge gaps being carried out (e.g. identified in NAS). - CF to provide details on the publicly-funded research programmes or mechanisms identified (e.g. proper prioritisation, specific research centres created); - CF to provide details on any sector-driven (e.g. water management, agriculture etc.) or project-driven (EU funds available) research for identifying knowledge gaps <p>IN PROGRESS: gaps are only identified, no work to address them</p>

5. Knowledge transfer processes are in place to build adaptive capacity across sectors	5a	Adaptation relevant data and information is available to all stakeholders, including policy makers (e.g. through a dedicated website or other comparable means).	<p>YES = highly visible sources of information on adaptation are available and contain: general climate data (e.g. climate projections), vulnerability and risk assessments, adaptation tools and examples, information on adaptation policy and related institutional and legal frameworks etc. A centralised (Climate-ADAPT type) platform is desirable, but a limited set of de-centralised sources complementing each other could also satisfy the need (provided that they are easily identifiable and well established in their specific sectors).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to provide details and links on the following categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - adaptation general info - specific platforms or adaptation sections in the wider climate change platforms; - NAS/policy oriented adaptation pages; and - climate projection repositories (e.g. from the met offices or research projects). - additionally specific adaptation projects' web sites could be identified. - CF to provide details on the identified science-policy interfaces falling into one of the categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - stable processes and/or organisations (e.g. research and/or expertise centre acting as a focal point, partnership structure between organisations, programme run by the central administration consisting of systematic meetings, workshops etc.). To mention if specific action in NAS/NAP supports this; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ad-hoc process (e.g. for drafting the NAS) <p>IN PROGRESS: adaptation relevant data available to some stakeholders, but with significant groups not targeted.</p>
	5b	Capacity building activities take place; education and training materials on climate change adaptation concepts and practices are available and disseminated	<p>YES = systematic actions on capacity building, carried out in a coordinated way, usually driven by the NAS or NAP.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to provide details on the identified mechanisms falling into one of the categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - systematic and coordinated activities, usually driven by the NAS or NAP (e.g. an established support service offering assistance to authorities, training programmes etc.). To mention if specific action in NAS/NAP supports this; - ad-hoc process carried out by various organisations, but not coordinated by a specific programme or action in the NAS. - CF should try to identify capacity building actions in: public administration,

				<p>academia, business sector, and awareness-raising actions for the wider public.</p> <p>IN PROGRESS: systematic actions on capacity building but not in a coordinated manner.</p>
Step 3: Identifying adaptation options	6. For priority sectors, a range of adaptation options is considered, consistent with the results of sectoral risk assessments and taking into account good practices and measures	6a	Adaptation options address sectoral risks identified in 3c, the geographical specificities identified in 3b and follow best practices as defined in similar contexts	<p>YES = detailed/elaborated risk assessments used to identify adaptation options for (a majority of) the priority sectors.</p> <p><i>Note: The reply should be correlated with the ones for the indicators 3b and 3c.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to identify whether all or only some of the priority sectors have risk assessments and adaptation options identified. If latter, to mention which sectors have detailed risk assessments; - CF to mention whether indicative adaptation actions are identified based only on lighter processes (e.g. stakeholder consultations, expert judgement); - CF could analyse the 'horizontal' actions and seek information on how they were derived (e.g. based on good practices).
		6b	The selection of priority adaptation options is based on robust methods (e.g. multi-criteria analyses, stakeholders' consultation, etc.) and consistent with existing decision-making frameworks	<p>YES = a prioritisation mechanism is clearly indicated and/or prioritisation tools/guidance/criteria are made available for being used during project selection.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to indicate how selection and prioritisation of adaptation options was made: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - using processes (e.g. expert judgement, consultations among organisations or with stakeholders), and/or - using tools and methodologies (MCA, CBA, guidelines for prioritisation); - CF to specify whether the prioritisation was made at the sectoral level (i.e. choosing priority actions per sector), or across sectors (i.e. choosing priority sectors for kick-starting actions), or both; - CF to indicate whether specific prioritisation tools have been published (e.g. guidelines for selection, MCA etc. which would be used for all measures); - CF to identify further plans for carrying out specific prioritisation (e.g. to prioritise in the context of specific actions, sectors, geographical areas; to develop new tools (CBA, MCA) etc.

		6c	Mechanisms are in place to coordinate disaster risk management and climate change adaptation and to ensure coherence between the two policies.	<p>YES = (at least) bi-lateral mainstreaming (i.e. DRR in NAS and climate change in DRR). Institutional arrangements supervising the exchange would be a plus, since this indicator focuses mainly on 'mechanisms' and needs to differentiate from the indicator 8b.</p> <p>- CF to bring details on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how DRR planning is taking into account climate change impacts and projections; - how NAS/NAP includes DRR measures; - any institutional frameworks and/or procedures entailed for coordination (e.g. special working groups, climate change specialists involved in DRR policy-making, or DRR practitioners involved in adaptation planning). <p>IN PROGRESS: at least one of the three is present but not all</p>
	7. Dedicated and adequate funding resources have been identified and made available to implement adaptation action	7a	Funding is available to increase climate resilience in vulnerable sectors and for cross-cutting adaptation action	<p>YES = actions in NAS or the relevant priority sectors receive consistent funding for implementation. Reliable multi-annual funding commitments (e.g. through ESIF) for some sectors could lead to a positive assessment, while a mere identification in NAS of indicative funding sources without clear evidence of funds disbursed should not.</p> <p>CF to provide details on which of the 2 cases above would apply – budgets attached to NAS/NAP or separate funding for priority sectors. If the latter, it should try to identify what are the sectors and where the funding comes from (e.g. national/regional, via line ministries, ESIF etc.). For the funding to be taken into account in the CF, adaptation does not have to be the main objective of the intervention, but it should feature among the stated objectives.</p> <p>CF to identify whether the NAS provides for funding cross-cutting adaptation action also (e.g. national scenarios and climate services, capacity building, website)</p> <p>IN PROGRESS: if adaptation is only financed in a few sectors or there is no funding for cross-cutting adaptation action</p>
Step 4: Implementing adaptation	8. Climate change adaptation is mainstreamed into priority and key	8a	Consideration of climate change adaptation has been included in the national frameworks for	- CF to provide details regarding both EIA and SEA national legislation

action	national planning and sectoral policymaking		environmental impact assessments	
		8b	Prevention/preparedness strategies in place under national disaster risk management plans take into account climate change impacts and projections	<p>YES = projected future climate extremes are factored in the DRM plans and associated risk analyses, while historical climate extremes should normally be covered by all risk analyses and DRM action plans.</p> <p><i>Note: Attention to be granted to correlating this answer with the one given for 6c.</i></p> <p>- CF to analyse DRM plans and the associated risk analyses.</p>
		8c	Key land use, spatial planning, urban planning and maritime spatial/urban planning policies take into account the impacts of climate change	<p>YES = clear evidence that land use and spatial/urban policies at Member State level explicitly address climate impacts, and require or encourage adaptation; and evidence that the policies are followed in practice across the majority of the Member State.</p> <p>- CF should provide details regarding the type of mainstreaming:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - spatial planning, urban planning, maritime spatial planning; - geographical scope – national, regional or local.
		8d	National policy instruments promote adaptation at sectoral level, in line with national priorities and in areas where adaptation is mainstreamed in EU policies	<p>YES = evidence of mainstreaming in sectoral policies is identified. The mere mentioning of a sector in the NAS is not enough, unless is being backed by actual policy instruments identified in that sector that include adaptation.</p> <p>- Provide details regarding:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what sectors are currently including adaptation considerations; - what policy instruments are promoting adaptation in each sector; - was the NAS the driver for mainstreaming in these sectors or something else triggered an autonomous adaptation (e.g. EU acquis or policy)? <p>IN PROGRESS: individual sectoral policies promote adaptation, but coverage is patchy, with significant gaps</p>
8e	Adaptation is mainstreamed in insurance or alternative policy instruments, where relevant, to provide	<p>YES = evidence of insurance (or guarantee) schemes that are incentivising investments in enhanced resilience and risk prevention is identified in both the national framework (NAS/NAP) and as being active in the field.</p> <p>Insurance schemes available for current extremes are available in many</p>		

			incentives for investments in risk prevention	<p>places, but by themselves would not qualify for a positive assessment. Furthermore, schemes for ensuring the affordability of insurance (for e.g. flood risks) do not incentivise adaptation per se.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF to mention what specific objectives or actions on insurance are contained in the NAS. - CF to provide details on how the insurance schemes are incentivising adaptation.
9. Climate change adaptation policies and measures are implemented	9a		Adaptation policies and measures are implemented, e.g. as defined in action plans or sectoral policy documents	<p>YES = only if coordinated implementation of NAS/NAP is underway, and clear evidence of adaptation priorities identified being put into effect.</p> <p><i>Note: actions such as effective mainstreaming in sectors (confirmed by the indicator 8d) and further/detailed vulnerability and risk assessments should be seen as concrete implementation, provided they are required as such by the NAS/NAP</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF should mention if national / sectoral / regional action plans are drafted, or the NAS is the only programmatic document governing adaptation - CF should provide a brief account on what actions are being implemented (e.g. mostly horizontal, sectoral – if yes, in which sectors, etc.) - CF should mention in what stage is the implementation (recently started, several years past etc.), if progress reports have been issued,. - CF could mention notable examples of autonomous adaptation action being implemented <p>IN PROGRESS: evidence that the NAS/NAP is being implemented, but with gaps in key sectors or in some actions identified as priorities.</p>
	9b		Cooperation mechanisms in place to foster and support adaptation at relevant scales (e.g. local, subnational)	<p>YES = only if cooperation (with regions and cities) is actually active during the implementation. From that point of view this indicator should be correlated with 9a which shows that implementation has started. If the cooperation is made possible by frameworks in place (this should be correlated with the indicator 1c on vertical integration), but no implementation is underway the assessment should be negative. However, in this latter case a separate mention should be made in the CF. The same, if the NAS/NAP are calling for such a vertical cooperation.</p> <p><i>Note: This indicator should be seen as focused on the adaptation actions carried out at regional and local levels, supported by formalised collaborative frameworks. It differs from indicator 1c which shows rather how</i></p>

				<i>regional and local levels are feeding back into the national actions (NAS, NAP).</i>
		9c	Procedures or guidelines are available to assess the potential impact of climate change on major projects or programmes, and facilitate the choice of alternative options, e.g. green infrastructure	<p>YES = only if guidelines and procedures refer specifically to projects and programmes. Spatial development could be assimilated, as it forms the basis of development programmes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF should specify who is promoting the guidelines (i.e. gov'nt bodies, other organisations, or they are results of projects) and if they are actually used in practice (as opposed to simply being made available). - CF should note if NAS/NAP include specific actions for publishing and applying such guidelines or procedures.
		9d	There are processes for stakeholders' involvement in the implementation of adaptation policies and measures.	<p>YES = if the involvement of stakeholders is already happening. The stakeholders are seen here as 'non-public administration' bodies.</p> <p><i>Note: It is important to notice that this indicator refers to stakeholders actually implementing adaptation actions, not only participating in monitoring and evaluation (since the indicator 11b is specifically reserved for that)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF should provide details on what categories of stakeholders are involved (e.g. academia, research, business sector, NGOs etc.) and how are they involved (e.g. implementation of specific actions, steering & consultations, selection of projects etc.). - CF should note if NAS/NAP provide specific mechanisms/forums for involving the stakeholders.
Step 5: Monitoring and evaluation	10. Systems are in place to monitor and report on climate change adaptation, including adaptation-related expenditures, via relevant indicators	10a	Monitoring and reporting: Information on NAS/NAP implementation is monitored and the results of the monitoring are collected and disseminated.	<p>YES = if reports on the implementation of NAS/NAP are being published.</p> <p><i>Note: This indicator should be seen as referring to national centralised reporting on the progress of adaptation action (i.e. implementation of NAS/NAP).</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - CF should provide details on the national reports: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - year(s) of publication and periodicity, latest report number; - body that published the report; - type of reporting – quantitative (based on indicators), qualitative on the progress, or both; - availability of financial information on allocated budgets and the costs of actions;

				- sources of information – e.g. reports from sectors/stakeholders, own monitoring carried out by the central adaptation body etc.
		10b	Monitoring and reporting: The integration of climate change adaptation in sectoral policies is monitored and the results of the monitoring are disseminated.	<p>YES = if reports on adaptation in certain sectors are being published, whether it is a centralised single report or different reports for each sector. In the latter case, the reports should cover enough sectors, as counted against the priority sectors identified in the NAS.</p> <p>Availability/development of indicators is a detail that should be added, but the lack of it should not result in a negative assessment.</p> <p><i>Note: This indicator should be seen as having a sectoral focus, looking at monitoring and reporting on progress.</i></p> <p>- CF should provide details on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how sectoral mainstreaming is monitored and reported: coordinated centrally or by the sectors themselves; - what types of reports are being published: central report with details on sectors, or separate sectoral reports; - type of sectoral reports (if is the case) – are they only about adaptation, or adaptation is just a topic among others addressed in that report? (If only centralised reports are published, those are presumably pure adaptation ones).
		10c	Monitoring and reporting: Information on regional, sub-national or local action is monitored and the results of the monitoring are collected and disseminated	<p><i>Note: This indicator should be seen as having a regional/local focus, looking at specific reporting carried out by sub-national administrations. It should be looked at in correlation with indicator 1c on vertical coordination.</i></p> <p>-CF should present if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the sub-regional level is reporting to the national one on their progress on adaptation; or - the sub-regional level issue their own progress reports independently, addressed to the wider public; or - no formal reporting is carried out, but feedback from sub-national to national level is done via other mechanisms (e.g. sub-national presence in national coordination committees for adaptation). These mechanisms should lead to having national reports that include information on adaptation action carried out at sub-national levels.

	11. An evaluation framework is in place to assess whether adaptation policy objectives are met and a periodic review of the adaptation strategy is planned	11a	A periodic review of the national adaptation strategy and action plans is planned	<p>YES = if clear mechanisms are in place for reviewing at least one of the NAP or NAS. Full reviews NAS and NAP constitute even stronger mechanisms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is an important indicator to understand a central part of the adaptation governance in the MS. As such, the CF should aim to explain the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how is the evaluation planned and/or carried out – on NAP, on NAS, or both; - what is the frequency of the evaluations and when is the next one planned; - how is the revision planned and/or carried out – on NAP, on NAS, or both; - what is the frequency of the revisions and when is the next one planned; - how is the review timeline determined – i.e. provisions in the legislation on adaptation, in the NAS or NAP themselves, or ad-hoc revisions based on the findings of (planned) evaluations.
		11b	Stakeholders are involved in the assessment, evaluation and review of national adaptation policy	<p>YES = if structured involvement is identified in any of the 2 processes (monitoring and review). 'Involvement' should be understood as stakeholders actively participating in monitoring and/or review, as opposed to them only providing information (via e.g. public consultations or reporting).</p> <p><i>Note: In case reporting is identified, this should be linked to indicator 9d, as it relates to implementation.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Proposal: the term 'assessment' should be replaced by 'monitoring'. 'Evaluation' should be deleted, as is seen as an integral part of the 'review'.</i> - CF should provide details on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - how stakeholders are involved (e.g. describe what coordination/review committees are they part of). Identify whether these are central committees overseeing national adaptation action, or sectoral committees for priority sectors of action; - which processes are they involved in – monitoring, evaluation, revision of NAS/NAP.