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**Abbreviations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACCCRN</td>
<td>Asian cities climate change resilience network</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIP</td>
<td>Project Implementation Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMART</td>
<td>Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLD</td>
<td>Shared Learning Dialogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCCR</td>
<td>Urban Climate Change Resilience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Key concepts and terms**

**Climate change resilience** is the capacity of an individual, community, or institution to dynamically and effectively respond to shifting climate impact circumstances while continuing to function at an acceptable level. Simply, it is the ability to survive, recover from, and even thrive in changing climatic conditions. It includes the ability to understand potential impacts and to take appropriate action before, during, and after a particular event, such as a typhoon, major flooding or prolonged drought, to minimize negative effect and maintain the ability to respond to changing conditions.

1 **Executive summary**

**Objectives:** This paper describes learning by the Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network (ACCCRN) program in Indonesia on how to build a rigorous Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) system for a multi-stakeholder climate change adaptation project at the city level.

**Background:** With 240 million people, over 80,000 kilometers of coastline and over 17,500 islands, Indonesia is one of the most vulnerable countries to the effects of climate change. ACCCRN in Indonesia was launched to support two of Indonesia’s most vulnerable cities in the process of increasing resiliency to meet the challenges of increasing climate change impact.
**Methodology:** ACCRN utilizes the Theory of Change to develop its programming. The Theory requires a rigorous linkage between assumptions, activities, outcomes and outputs to achieve a change that will lead to the accomplishment of the overall goal.

**Study Site Description:** In Indonesia, ACCRN is working in the cities of Bandar Lampung in south Sumatra and Semarang in central Java. Because both cities lie on the coast in low-lying delta regions, they are extremely vulnerable to future climate change impacts and a variety of natural disasters.

**Challenges:** The major challenges faced through the implementation of an M&E framework in the multi-stakeholder ACCRN project are as follows:

- Unequal importance placed on the value of M&E across stakeholders
- Lack of consensus on important terminology
- Difference in approaches to M&E
- Asymmetry in interests for each M&E project
- Lack of proper funding and resources allocated to M&E

**Strategies:** ACCRN developed a multi-pronged strategy to address these challenges. The main points of the challenge are as follows:

- Socialization to the importance of M&E
- Coordination of M&E efforts by various stakeholders
- Management of Political Interests
- Development of User-Friendly Tools
- Formalization of M&E in each stakeholder organization

**Expected Results and Opportunities:** Because of the ability to proactively identify and address challenges through an effective M&E framework, ACCRN will be able to continually improve its strategy and ultimately be better able to achieve its program outcomes. Furthermore, a strong system of accountability will be developed not only within organizations but across the system of stakeholders involved in ACCRN, a critical piece of ensuring the future success of the program.

### 2 Objectives

The overall goal of the study focuses on addressing the challenges and strategies of stakeholder involvement in building a rigorous M&E system for ACCRN climate change adaptation projects at the city level. This goal will be addressed through the demonstration of the following objectives of this study:

1. Improve City Team capacity to build a M&E system that supports climate change adaptation project implementation.
2. Identify the challenges to and opportunities for multi-stakeholder involvement in the M&E system.
3. Provide recommendation strategies to cope with the challenges and proposed actions to implement an effective M&E system inclusive of a variety of stakeholders.

3 Background

3.1 Climate change vulnerability in Indonesia

Indonesia is a country that is prone to natural disaster and climate change, based on the UNDP Indonesia report in 2007, “The temperature rise ... in Indonesia will make many of our existing climatic problems worse. We are already subject to many climate-related hazards, including floods, droughts, storms, landslides and wildland fires. Now these will become more frequent or more severe. Climate-related hazards in Indonesia are also caused by the location and movement of the tropical cyclones in the eastern south Indian Ocean (January to April) and the eastern Pacific Ocean (May to December). In some parts of Indonesia, this can result in very strong winds and heavy rainfall that can last for hours or days. Strong winds often also occur during the transition between the Northeast and the Southwest monsoons.” So, as the impact of climate change increases, Indonesia faces greater risks, such as increased loss of life and economic loss.

Indonesia has a population of about 240 million people, half of whom are poor or vulnerable to poverty, with almost 42 percent of households clustered between the US$2 and US$1 per day poverty lines (ICLEI Oceania report, 2008). The impoverished are the most vulnerable to climate change impacts, as they have very limited socioeconomic resources to deal with hazards and risk and recover from disaster. Furthermore, most live in areas with high exposure to climate-related hazards, i.e. next to river basins, drainage areas, coastal areas, flood-prone areas, etc. Flood for example, has become one of the most frequent disasters that happen each year in many cities in Indonesia. Each year the scale of flooding gets wider, impacts more areas and affects more people, as it is the case in Jakarta. Jakarta has regular flooding each year, but in 2007, the flooding lasted for 22 days, killed 57 people and forced 422,300 to leave their homes, of which 1,500 were destroyed (ICLEI Oceania report, 2008).

Flood is not the only threat for approximately 42 million Indonesians living in densely-populated areas that are less than 10 meters above the average sea level. Many Indonesians live in part of the 80,000 kilometers of coastline that makes up the country’s 17,500 islands (IIED, 2007). Other potential climate change impacts include more frequent and stronger storms, coastal erosion, sea level rise, diminishing biodiversity, salinity in freshwater aquifers and major threats to public health, such as increases in the incidence of diseases like malaria and dengue fever (UNDP Indonesia Report, 2007).
3.2 Overview of ACCCRN

Asian Cities Climate Change Resilience Network (ACCCRN) was launched in 2008 with funding by the Rockefeller Foundation to increase cities’ resiliency to climate change impact, specifically in poor and vulnerable communities. ACCCRN is a network of ten cities in Indonesia, India, Thailand and Vietnam. It is piloting a range of activities that will collectively improve the ability of cities to withstand, prepare for, and recover from current and future impacts of climate change, as well as to decrease the level of future uncertainty. ACCCRN represents a unique initiative to develop, test and demonstrate practical strategies to respond to the impacts of climate change in urban areas.

As ACCCRN aims to implement city climate change resilience and facilitate shared learning around regional best practices to leverage policy incentives and investment funds to improve infrastructure, services management and preparedness strategies. The ultimate goal of ACCCRN Indonesia is “catalyzing the attention, funding, and action around climate necessary to build the resilience of poor and vulnerable Indonesian urban communities.”

Mercy Corps is the Country Coordinator for the ACCCRN program implementation in two cities in Indonesia, Bandar Lampung and Semarang, to meet the following objectives:

- Build city capacity in planning, financing, and implementing climate change resilience strategies.
- Coordinate and manage multiple work teams and activities at the city and country level to elevate the ACCCRN program.
- Serve as the in-country focal point to build and maintain engagement with donors, national government stakeholders and regional partners.

3.3 ACCCRN phases and projects

ACCCRN has completed its Phases I and II. The main goal of Phase I was the selection of city partners in India, Indonesia, Thailand and Vietnam through a rigorous review on a number of cities. This phase involves assessment of climate change impact profiles and mapping of physical, social, political and economic contexts of the four countries. Shared learning dialogues (SLDs) were the main activity of Phase II, which engages a wide range of city stakeholders. This activity promotes city-level engagement and capacity building (ACCCRN Documentation Report, 2011).

Currently, ACCCRN Indonesia is in Phase II with the purpose to increase the capacity of Indonesian cities, more specifically in its areas of focus; Semarang city in Central Java and Bandar Lampung city in South Sumatra. It involves the implementation of selected interventions identified in the climate change resilience action plan. The particular interventions were selected based on their ability to enhance city’s resilience towards
climate change impacts by considering information gathered in urban systems, climate risks and vulnerability developed in the preceding phases. This phase requires the city partners to work closely with both local and international partners. Since interventions are often required on multiple levels, they may include institutional and social responses, as well as infrastructure and ecosystem improvement.

The climate change adaptation projects which are being implemented in Bandar Lampung city and Semarang city are based on city-level Vulnerability Assessment and City Resilience Strategy to climate change. The first phase of the climate change adaptation projects has been completed in 2011: the *Integrated Solid Waste Management Master Plan to Increase Climate Change Resilience* project in Bandar Lampung city and *Pre-feasibility Study of Rainwater-harvesting Systems to Reduce Climate Change Vulnerability* project in Semarang city. Both were completed with multiple stakeholders that included the municipal government, universities, local NGOs as well as the private sector.

The 2nd phase of climate change adaptation project implementation at the city level will incorporate lessons learned from previous projects to address gaps that existed previously. For the 2nd phase of climate change adaptation projects, there are three projects. The first is the *Strengthening and Empowerment of Teachers and Student Capacity in Urban Climate Change Resilience (UCCR)*, where Bandar Lampung city will build understanding, awareness and adaptive behavior through education. The second is *Groundwater Conservation through the Application of Biopore Infiltration Hole (LRB) Technology for Climate Change Adaptation*, where Bandar Lampung city will reduce flood potential and increase groundwater quantity, by implementing an artificial groundwater recharge method in the forms of biopores. The third is *Flood Forecasting and Warning System as Climate Change Adaptation Measures through Flood Risk Preparedness* project, where Semarang city aims to reduce vulnerability, injury and casualties caused by flooding through the development of a flood information system, early warning systems, evacuation strategies and the identification of temporary shelter for those who are most vulnerable.

4 **Methodology**

ACCCRN is using the Theory of Change to improve its programs and projects to achieve its goals. The Theory of Change advocates that a program should have assumptions to explain how activities will produce a change that contributes to the achievement of the output, how outputs will produce a change that contributes to the achievement of the outcome and how outcomes will produce a change that contributes to the achievement of the overarching goal. It requires the demonstration of program causal pathways. “Theory of Change is a way to describe the set of assumptions that explain both the ministeps that lead to the long-term goal of interest and the connections between program activities and outcomes that occur at each step of the way” (Carol Weiss, 1995)
5 Study site description

5.1 Bandar lampung city

Bandar Lampung city is the capital of Lampung Province in south Sumatra, with a population of 881,801 people (BPS, 2010). Bandar Lampung city is geographically located at 5°20’-5°30’ latitude and 105°28’-105°37’ longitude. Bandar Lampung city has an area of 19,722 hectares consisting of 13 sub-districts (kecamatan) and 98 villages (kelurahan). The city is traversed by two great rivers, the Way Kuala and Kuripan, and 23 small rivers. All of these rivers form a watershed located in the area of Bandar Lampung city and most of it leading to Lampung Bay. Several artificial drainage networks connect the river system. The function of this drainage network is to reduce surface runoff due to excessive rainwater. Drainage network systems that have been installed in Bandar Lampung city include Teluk Betung, Tanjung Karang, Panjang and Kandis.

The port city of Bandar Lampung is located in a bay, so generally high waves caused by strong winds will not directly hit the city. However, in some coastal areas, there has been coastal abrasion caused by waves. In some locations, coastal areas are densely populated. To meet the demand for housing, citizens build homes in reclamation areas thus causing the acceleration of abrasion. Many of the settlers do not have legal evidence of land ownership.

Bandar Lampung city is extremely prone to natural disasters, which include flooding, landslide, high tide causing coastal flash floods and large waves, tsunami, earthquake and drought. Abrasion, erosion and sedimentation also occur in coastal areas. Flood and drought are the most common disasters and greatly impact the community. Flooding has the greatest impact on the health sector; drinking water, housing, fisheries and public works (the destruction of drainage facilities and other infrastructure). While the most affected sectors by drought are drinking water, health, and agriculture (Vulnerability & Adaptation Assessment, Bandar Lampung city, 2010)

Bandar Lampung city has various stakeholders including City Government with its numerous departments, Local NGOs that work on diverse field, Universities and private sectors. In this city, ACCCRN program is working with those multi-stakeholders.

5.2 Semarang city

The city of Semarang is the capital of Central Java Province with a total administrative area of about 374 km². The population in 2009 was 1.5 million people (BPS, 2009). It is located in Central Java’s north coast at 6.93° – 7.13° latitude and 110.27° – 110.50° longitude. The topography of the coastal area is flat with an elevation of less than 3.5 meters above average sea level. The south has topography with a slope of between 2 and 40% and elevation between 90 and 200 meters above average sea level. The rivers that flow in the City of Semarang include Garang, Kreo and Kripik rivers.
Semarang city is located on an open coastal plain. In open coastal plains, high waves resulting from strong winds may hit the coast with greater force. In some coastal plains, flooding associated with high tides has been experienced at an increasing level, which can disrupt residents’ economic activities. Center of economic activities in the coastal areas of Semarang city are among others focused in the area of Tanjung Mas Port. In this coastal area, there are also several fishing activities, such as cultivation ponds. Semarang also faces the problem of land subsidence.

Flood and drought are two common extreme events that hit Semarang city. Flooding commonly occurs in locations with lower elevations in coastal areas or basins or with poor drainage system. Erosion and landslides occur in the hills and mountains that have a high slope. Floods provide the greatest impact on the housing, transportation, health, agriculture, fisheries, drainage and infrastructure sectors. Meanwhile, drought impacts the drinking water, health, agriculture and fisheries sectors (Vulnerability & Adaptation Assessment, Semarang city, 2010).

Just like Bandar Lampung, Semarang city also has various stakeholders; City Government with its numerous departments, Local NGOs that work on diverse field, Universities and private sectors. In this city, ACCCRN program is also working with those multi-stakeholders.

6 Challenges and strategies of building M&E systems for multi-stakeholders climate change adaptation projects

The intervention projects for climate change adaptation deals with various stakeholders at different level; at the donor level which is the Rockefeller Foundation, the Country Coordinator level for ACCCRN program in Indonesia which is Mercy Corps and City Team at the city level which consist of city government, local NGOs and Universities. Internally within the intervention project itself, has involvement of local NGOs and Universities. Besides, in order to gain support on the project implementation, the project will also need to advocate, coordinate as well as collaborate with various departments in city government as well as the private sectors at the city.

6.1 Challenges to multi-stakeholders projects’ M&E

Due to having multiple stakeholders involved at different levels, the ACCCRN program is a challenging one. At the city level, the stakeholders include the municipal government, universities and local NGOs. For the intervention projects for climate change adaptation, universities and local NGOs are the main stakeholders. The involvement of multiple stakeholders at different levels of involvement has caused the existence of overlapping challenges between the group of stakeholders and within the group on coordination, delineation of roles, responsibilities and commitment. Those problems were identified
during the first phase of climate change adaptation projects where the Pre-Feasibility Study of Rainwater-Harvesting Systems to Reduce Climate Change Vulnerability project in Semarang was implemented and the Integrated Solid Waste Management Master Plan to Increase Climate Change Resilience project was implemented in Bandar Lampung during 2011.

The previous M&E of the project was not effective and sufficient enough to address existing challenges: coordination, roles, responsibilities and commitments. It was due to another internal challenge; there were different levels of awareness, terms, approach, methods, tools, accountability, commitments and interests on the M&E among the stakeholders involved.

The major challenges detailed below are as follows:

- Unequal importance placed on the value of M&E across stakeholders
- Lack of consensus on important terminology
- Difference in approaches to M&E
- Asymmetry in interests for each M&E project
- Lack of proper funding and resources allocated to M&E

**Value of M&E:** As not all of the stakeholders involved have a strong level of awareness on the importance and benefits of having a proper M&E system in place, they place little importance on M&E. This lack of importance placed on M&E was a practice similar to what each stakeholder enforced in their respective workplaces. They did not internally practice M&E as a tool to help them to improve their performance through the identification and documentation of best practices, risks and failures as an aiding tool for decision making process.

**Defining Terms:** The use of different terms to address a certain element in M&E by different stakeholders also became a challenge, as it often caused confusion and debate, such as objectives and outcomes. Some stakeholders thought that outcome was the same concept as output. Therefore, they would talk about outputs when the discussion was about the objectives. There was debate on whether certain terms actually meant the same thing, and there was still hesitation to believe that the terms actually mean the same concept. This has led to different level of understanding, confusion or misunderstanding among the stakeholders. It became worse when there was no consensus reached on what a specific term meant, as the terms were used over and over again. Each stakeholder continued to have a different understanding of the same term, and therefore shared understanding was difficult to achieve.

**Different Approaches:** Each stakeholder involved used different approaches, methods and tools for M&E. As there were differing opinions on which tool was the proper one for the project, each stakeholder would do their monitoring using their own approach, method and tools. Other stakeholders would doubt whether another's process was an
appropriate one. Furthermore, this uncertainty led to uncoordinated M&E, causing an external credibility issue on M&E information from the stakeholders.

Moreover, it also caused an internal credibility issue. M&E was often used for a specific purpose within one department and was not widely shared throughout the organization. As a result, not all personnel were aware of M&E practices and how they could be used to improve agency performance. The municipal government, for example, had another agency specializing in M&E, and it was not fully participatory. After M&E was completed, the results were not shared throughout related municipal government agencies. From such an example, it is clear why many personnel do not place importance on M&E data, as they have little experience with such data.

**Differing Interests:** There were also some differences in the interests of each stakeholder in regards to the intervention projects’ outcomes. In the ACCCRN result framework structure, the donor was most interested in impact. The Country Coordinator was most interested in building city-wide capacity. The City Team or municipal government was most interested in city resilience. The project implementation unit was most interested in building the activities level. Therefore, for a single intervention project, each type of stakeholder needed a unique results framework. However, this was too complicated for the intervention project implementation unit because of limited capacity and resources.

**Lack of Sufficient Funding:** The challenges detailed above have contributed to the final challenge: there had not been sufficient funding and resources allocated for M&E on the previous projects. As a result, it was difficult to conduct the M&E given the multiple stakeholders involved, especially with the lack of commitment to the implementation of a rigorous M&E program. This weak commitment further contributed to the funding challenge.

### 6.2 Strategy to improve multi-stakeholders project’s M&E

The challenges identified above on the 1st phase of the climate change adaptation project implementation at the city level made it quite challenging to design a strategy to improve M&E for a multi-stakeholders project. Therefore, the discussion and drafting of the strategic process took a long time. It was done through consultations with experts, ARUP and Verulam Ltd, discussion with project officers in the cities and engagement of the ACCCRN team. Furthermore, the process utilized information from discussion and interviews with stakeholders, as well as direct observation to find out how to improve project quality through improving M&E. Then a range of strategies was developed to be tested during the 2nd phase of climate change adaptation project implementation at the city level.

The steps of this strategy were as follows: Socialization, Coordination, Management of Political Interests, Development of User-Friendly Tools and Formalization, steps that
could be replicated in other similarly challenged projects in need of strong M&E framework.

**Socialization:** The initial step of the strategy was to conduct socialization about what M&E is, why it is important, and how to do it. The socialization was done through discussion, formal and informal, with the stakeholders especially in the beginning of the project redesign phase. Through these discussions, M&E was introduced as a tool to support project implementation and decision making, as it is useful as an ‘early warning system’ of the project to make sure to stay on course. It is through the regular monitoring that there is routine data collection, reflection and reporting about project implementation. Therefore, it would be possible for the project to quickly identify any risk or failure potential and make steps to avoid them. Stakeholders also learned that M&E is used to check project performance against expected results or ‘targets,’ so it would be possible to know how much of the project has already been achieved, to ensure compliance with donor regulations.

**Coordination:** Next, a coordinated M&E strategy with guiding principles to achieve a shared understanding of the outcomes was developed. Furthermore, the process of this coordinated M&E was agreed to by all stakeholders involved. In order to achieve shared understanding, with the limitations on knowledge and experience with M&E of the stakeholders, a simple, coordinated M&E approach was necessary. This approach utilized outcomes that were specific, measurable, attainable, relevant and time-bound, according to the SMART principles.

To accomplish this, the intervention project outcomes needed to be effective enough to accommodate different interests on outcomes from a single intervention project, as described in the challenges section. However, the intervention project implementation unit had limited capacity to take on such a challenge. The Country Coordinator provided technical assistance to improve this capacity. Logical frameworks were utilized to map and manage a variety of interests from a diverse stakeholder body. With intensive support to the intervention project implementation unit, the project logical framework was useful to accommodate some of the different interests involved. However, it was necessary to simplify the interests in order for the project implementation unit to both be able to understand and implement it.

**Management of Political Interests:** In addition, political interests on UCCR in the municipal government also needed to be considered as it would influence the sustainability of UCCR initiatives in the cities. Thus the intervention project outcomes should not go against the vision and mission of the mayor and the municipal government. The intervention project outcomes should be essentially approved by the mayor and municipal government.

In order to achieve this, it was important to consider that UCCR was quite new to the Mayor, municipal government and other city level stakeholders. It was only in recent years that they had started learning about climate change. The ACCCRN program had
contributed greatly to this learning through advocacy and mainstreaming activities to improve their capacity on UCCR, such as through workshops and trainings about climate change, as well as SLDs on various topics on climate change adaptation, etc. In order to improve UCCR sustainability, outcomes of the project should support continuous efforts of advocacy and mainstreaming UCCR to the mayor, municipal government and other city level stakeholders.

**Development of User-Friendly Tools:** With the assistance from international engineering firm, ARUP, the existing M&E approach, methods and tools were simplified with consideration of the above challenges. Simplified SMART M&E tools were then introduced to the project implementation candidates through trainings and workshop. During the workshop, M&E terms and definitions were clarified and the project implementation candidates were asked to agree on the terms that would be used for future projects. Enthusiastic about the clarification, guidance and training, the candidates shared their knowledge on their organization’s M&E methods and terms. The candidates also shared their opinions and feedback on the simplified SMART M&E tools for the project M&E framework. Their feedback was then incorporated into the improvement of the M&E process.

After proposals for the intervention projects were approved, during the project redesign phase, technical assistance was given to the intervention project implementation unit to develop their project M&E framework using the simplified M&E SMART tools. During this time, the tools were adjusted again in order to contribute to a more coordinated M&E process. The tools also had the goal of supporting the project in addressing problems on coordination, role and responsibilities and commitments. This project M&E framework became part of Project Implementation Plan (PIP).

**Formalization:** The last step of the strategy was to formalize the commitment and put a reporting system in place. The PIP which had a project M&E framework and reporting system were formalized by including it in the contract as one of the requirements for service payment. By formalizing this process, all stakeholders were encouraged to prioritize M&E, allocate sufficient resources and budget for its achievement.

By having the reporting system in place, the Country Coordinator and City Team were able to monitor achievement based on their level of interest. Through implementation of this strategy, the intervention project implementation unit will have a strong coordinated M&E system for a multi-stakeholders project.

**6.3 Expected results and opportunities**

A strong, coordinated M&E system for a multi-stakeholder project will support the intervention project implementation process. It is through checking progress at each level of implementation that challenges and achievements are determined. This contributes to proactively addressing challenges, learning why the challenges and
achievements came about, and incorporating any learning into further improving the program.

Through the identification of possible risks or challenges, project managers will be able to reflect back on its weak links, asking themselves key questions surrounding the appropriateness of its resources and people, the strength of the strategies and the feasibility of the outcomes. Utilizing the information garnered from this process, these well-informed project managers will be enabled to revise or review their project strategy, taking action to solve implementation problems from their root causes.

Lastly, by keeping the M&E process and results transparent to all stakeholders at all levels, a system of accountability is developed. All stakeholders will be enabled to know what parts of the program are changing in what way and for what reason. Stakeholders will be able to learn from the lessons learned and best practices of other stakeholders. This process of measuring and incorporating learnings will ultimately ensure that donor requirements and expectations are met.
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