

# EU Support for Climate Action in IPA II Beneficiaries

**TRATOLOW – Transition towards the low emissions and climate-resilient economy in the Western Balkans and Turkey**

Workshop on Adaptation Monitoring and Evaluation, July 7, 2022

Reference: EuropeAid/140519/DH/SER/MULTI



This project is funded by  
the European Union

umweltbundesamt<sup>®</sup> NIRAS

The project is implemented by the Consortium of  
Umweltbundesamt GmbH (lead) and NIRAS

# Interactive discussion

- What are the approaches used and what is the role of indicators developed and identified?
- Possible approaches for Montenegro and existing data and information for selected sectors?
- What is still missing in order to fully monitor NAP activities and assess relevant information?
- Way of monitoring and reporting on progress and its uptake in the NAP?



# What are the approaches used and what is the role of indicators developed and identified?

- Make use of existing indicators (e.g. indicators from the Sendai Framework for disaster risk reduction as well as SDGs), incorporate them into the existing indicator sets
- Linkage to colleagues in charge of Sendai indicators and Sustainable development
- Monitoring of NAS of Türkiye – mostly qualitative findings – is included in UNFCCC reporting
- Use more synergistic reporting from different agreements / commitments
- Frequency of taking the information and publishing them (e.g. different frameworks like Sendai and SDG) – at a certain frequency this information is being generated/put together – idea: rolling publication of indicator, not just for reporting, but continuously updated (most recent information available) – e.g. health impact of heat available at the beginning of summer or late spring (making adaptation relevant to the public) – continuously having the topic on the agenda at different seasons
- Question: is my country better adapted than before? This is a basic question that we try to answer!
- Measure the investments in adaptation, is the measure successful (not so good at the beginning) – e.g. the case for France – still a challenge to identify, if country is better adapted, less vulnerable or better prepared



# Possible approaches for Türkiye and existing data and information for selected sectors?

- M&E issues shall be thought of as early as possible in the NAS/NAP process
- Set clear objectives and targets of a sectors or a measure
- How to deal with the situation, if no baseline is existing (no data for some relevant indicator) – start with a new indicator (new baseline), if the why and so what can be provided
- Objective sometimes difficult, especially if it is qualitative (depends on the adaptation measure)
- Basic question: how will I know, if we are making progress (at the beginning that question was not asked) – get a better idea on how to monitor progress (depending on formulation of targets)
- Example: Dutch delta-programme – included one section of each publication: learning form implementing measures – this reflection as well as lessons learned is very helpful (needs to be done at a regular basis and compiled regularly)
- Understanding where you can find certain information – being picky about the indicators you are using (scaling ambition level) – relate to available resources – Finland: new climate act emphasises that each sector ministry has the responsibility to monitor the adaptation measures in their area of responsibility (iterative work)



# What is still missing in order to fully monitor NAP activities and assess relevant information?

- Partly data availability
- Ensuring coherence between NAS/NAP with local/sub-national adaptation plans
- Türkiye: geo-data for the territory is available – whole territory is covered (can be used for monitoring purposes) – challenges with the format of the current data – spatial data/statistic data (challenges for transforming data) – challenge for standardisation
- Risk and impact assessment: have data collected in a regular way – assess the data in a regular way – e.g. health sector and information on drought – challenge to correlate that data
- Standardisation of data and time-series of data – also data “homogenisation”
- Availability of data from the private sector remains a challenge (e.g. energy production or others) – they are partly not available for the general public (e.g. Norway quite progressed in that regard with insurance industry)
- Role of NGOs for monitoring – e.g. BirdLife data from Finland (bird species) – number of citizen observers is decreasing – so challenge with this observation data
- E.g. Granularity of data is partly more summarised (the data is too much aggregated, so no details can be derived) – challenge to convince other to take data the way it also helps adaptation requirements



# Way of monitoring and reporting on progress and its uptake in the revision of NAP?

- Risk assessment phase is over
- Next steps on measures and the identification of indicators has started (also new ones are possible) – use most useful indicators for adaptation purposes (pragmatic approach)
- Action plan until 2030 – with an mid-term evaluation
- MRE: integrated in the best possible way – work in the best possible way – need to have a smart system
- From “old” NAP – Monitoring was quite qualitative and has be dropped later – so there is a new approach for the new/ revised NAS/NAP (2011/2012)
- Monitoring on an annual basis – Evaluation will be around the year 2027
- After 2030 a more concrete action plan will be prepared
- France: 2<sup>nd</sup> NAP – smart system used, but question on how to include the sub-national information in reporting systems



# Contact

**Umweltbundesamt**  
Spittelauer Lände 5,  
1090 Vienna, Austria



**TRATOLOW Adaptation Working Group Leader:**

Markus Leitner

+43-1-31304-3536

+43-664-2626-345

[markus.leitner@umweltbundesamt.at](mailto:markus.leitner@umweltbundesamt.at)

