

# Annex F: Country note summaries

## Bangladesh

### Mainstreaming

**Climate adaptation was increasingly prioritised and, under the climate resilience and sustainable energy programme, became a thematic priority from 2016.** In 2010-2015, the Danish country programme promoted climate change mainstreaming in its thematic programmes, mainly in the agriculture sector programme but also through project investments in the governance sector, whereas climate resilience and sustainable energy became a thematic programme in its own right in the 2016-2021 country programme. While not covered in the 2005-2009 Danish country policy paper for Bangladesh, climate change was introduced as a cross-cutting issue in the 2010-2015 country policy paper and further elevated as a thematic programme in the 2016-21 country programme paper, although the prominence was somewhat reduced in the 2019-2021 country policy paper. Three development engagements under the 2016-2021 Bangladesh Country Programme had an explicit focus on climate change adaptation: a) Climate Resilient Rural Infrastructure Project (CRRIP), b) Strengthen Community Resilience to Climate and Environmental Change in Chittagong Hill Tracts (CCRP), and c) HYSAWA. Moreover, climate change was mainstreamed into the Governance and Rights thematic programme with support to local level adaptation under the Sustainable Democratic Union Parishad Project (SDUP). It was also mainstreamed into the Inclusive Agricultural Growth thematic programme with the establishment of climate field schools. In the growth and employment programme, Danida encouraged the inclusion of climate change, whereas in the governance and rights programme, this was mainly driven by the implementing partners.

**While climate mainstreaming was promoted in the Danish development strategies, the guidelines and methodologies provided to the embassy was limited, and the technical support to the embassy was not systematised.** Embassies were provided with a template for screening development engagement designs vis-à-vis climate change, but no guidelines, tools or methodologies were made available on how to mainstream climate change adaptation in different sectors and development processes. The technical support on climate change adaptation provided by the Danish MFA to embassies was mainly provided by the Technical Quality Service (TQS) in the form of appraisals of a) project designs, and b) project reviews. Responses were given on an ad-hoc basis to questions from embassies. This changed in 2018, with a more supportive TQS role in project identification, and to a lesser extent implementation – however, TQS staffing, and thereby capacity to provide technical advice, has been reduced over the period under evaluation.

**The guidance and support provided to implementing partners on how to mainstream climate change was limited, and to a large extent, they developed their own climate change approaches – the depth and comprehensiveness of climate mainstreaming was often insufficient.** The embassy's capacity to provide guidance and support to implementing partners on mainstreaming was limited by low staff numbers managing a large portfolio and limited in-house climate change adaptation expertise. Hence, the primary option for the Embassy vis-à-vis providing guidance to their implementing partners was to hire consultants, but this option appears not to have been used systematically to support partners on mainstreaming, other than through inputs to the formulation of development engagements. In 2008/9, climate change adaptation screening and management planning support was carried out for the ASPSII (agriculture sector support) and WSSPSII (WASH sector support). The climate change development engagements were in a number of cases added as a

continuation of ongoing cooperation, such as the support to HYSAWA in the WASH sector and the support to LGED (CCAP) for infrastructure in areas vulnerable to disasters (cyclones, floods). It was up to the implementing partners to identify options to engage in climate change adaptation and mobilise the required technical inputs, which was done to different levels of depth and comprehensiveness: HYSAWA raised the plinth in their WASH facility designs to ensure they remained operational during floods and cyclones, but no assessment was carried out to establish future climate change and its implications for the future functionality of the WASH infrastructure. HYSAWA also completed community-based vulnerability mappings and integrated climate change in their WASH stakeholder training and school education activities and materials. CCAP specifically targeted vulnerable coastal areas, and the infrastructure was designed with high water levels in mind and contributed to enhanced resilience with better road access to marketplaces, schools and cyclone shelters and temporary employment for poor in construction; some climate change training was carried out, but the climate awareness had not increased significantly in the locations visited, indicating that the main focus of CCAP (and CRRIP) was on the infrastructure construction itself rather than climate change. In the growth and employment sector, climate change awareness and measures were promoted and tested in farmer field schools, adaptive research on saline and drought tolerant crop varieties was carried out. In the governance sector, the still ongoing SDUP implemented by UNDP specifically promotes the integration and prioritisation of climate change adaptation measures in local development plans at union level and provided capacity development for union-level standing committees; as a result a number of, but not all, plans currently have climate change adaptation-related measures included in their priorities.

**There was less focus on climate mainstreaming in the governance thematic programme from Danida's side, but a number of implementing partners embraced a robust climate adaptation approach largely on their own initiative.** With the exception of SDUP, Danida did not have expectations of significant mainstreaming in its support to the governance sector. Nonetheless, a number of implementing partners in the sector engaged in climate change on their own initiative. UNDP integrated climate change in the “Chittagong Hill Tracts Development Facility” mobilising women in the construction of climate-resilient rural infrastructure, the “Preparation of Electoral Roll with Photographs” with management procedures to prevent the loss of voter lists during disasters, and the “Bangladesh National Human Rights Commission Capacity Development Project” carried out training on climate change as part of the Universal Periodic Review process. Transparency International Bangladesh has since 2014 developed a strong body of work on climate finance governance through support from Danida under the co-financed BIBEC project.

### Targeted action

**The climate change adaptation projects mainly focused on infrastructure, not innovation.** The projects labelled as climate change adaptation interventions overall had a strong focus on infrastructure, an area in which Bangladesh already had considerably experience, with less attention given to innovation and other important elements of adaptation and building a resilient society. The Transformational Change Learning Partnership (TCLP) of the Climate Investment Funds has identified nine building blocks/areas of intervention required to transform the response required to strengthen climate resilience, namely: 1) financing; 2) governance and engagement; 3) institutions; 4) knowledge and information; 5) markets; 6) natural capital; 7) policies; 8) practices and mindsets; and 9) technologies and infrastructure (see Annex C). In Bangladesh, the Danish support in particular focused on infrastructure, such as roads, embankments, drainage and marketplaces CCAP supply and sanitation

(HYSAWA); and cyclone shelters, embankments and grain silos (BCCRF). Infrastructure for disaster resilience is an area where Bangladesh has considerable expertise, and where other development partners (e.g. the World Bank, ADB) are providing considerable support. Other areas of engagement, such as reforestation (BCCRF), savings groups (BCCRF, HYSAWA) and income-generating activities (BCCRF), also built on existing expertise. Overall, the projects mainly built on existing partnerships and approaches and as such, there was little innovation and the added value of the Danish support was mainly funding for continuation and upscaling of ongoing work of the implementing partners, albeit with additional attention given to climate change adaptation. Reasons for the focus on continuing existing partnerships and engagements include the urgency of deploying the Climate Envelope, whereas in Bangladesh it is not uncommon that it requires up to 2-3 years to develop new partnerships and engagements before implementation can commence.

In terms of capacity development, the projects engaged stakeholders at the local level (local government and communities), e.g. vis-à-vis local planning (SDUP, AAB) and the development of specific skills, e.g. in relation to the construction of infrastructure (HYSAWA, LGED, AAB), and livelihoods, agriculture and natural resource management (UNDP, CCA-DRR). BCCRF did not contribute to the anticipated enhanced readiness for climate funding, due to design weaknesses and insufficient government involvement and ownership. Some projects contributed to new knowledge, e.g. through studies (BCCRF, CCRP) and community-based research (CCRP). None of the projects engaged (significantly) in policy development, the development of market/private sector-based approaches to adaptation, or mobilising adaptation financing. This also reflects the experience of Danida and other donors that the scope for engaging and influencing policy processes in Bangladesh is diminishing.

**The climate change adaptation interventions were in general effective in targeting the vulnerable.** The Danish-supported climate change adaptation development engagements were effective in targeting the poor. Firstly, they targeted areas that were vulnerable to climate change and disasters, such as coastal areas vulnerable to flood and cyclones (BCCRF, CCAP, HYSAWA, CCA-DRR) or drought and land degradation (CCRP, CCA-DRR). Secondly, the projects aimed at reaching vulnerable people, such as female-headed households, landless and ethnic minorities, either through specific selection criteria (BCCRF, CCA-DRR, CCRP), or through consultation with local authorities and communities (HYSAWA, CCAP). WASH in particular often fall under women's responsibility in Bangladesh and HYSAWA implemented menstrual hygiene measures, and CCAP provided temporary construction work for marginalised women, including landless and female headed households.

**A significant contribution was made by the climate change adaptation interventions vis-à-vis providing year-round accessibility and access to WASH services, even during cyclones, floods and drought.** BCCRF, HYSAWA and CCAP made significant infrastructure-based contributions to enhancing the climate- and disaster resilience of the benefitting communities, which were provided with access during cyclones and floods to shelters, health facilities, schools and markets, and to safe water and sanitation. Moreover, embankments and drainage infrastructure has reduced the risk of losing assets to floods and saltwater intrusion. And, food storage facilities have likely contributed to larger grain reserves to meet post-disaster food needs.

**A contribution was also made by the climate change adaptation interventions vis-à-vis livelihoods resilience and diversification, albeit to a lesser degree.** BCCRF reduced the vulnerability of an estimated 300,000 households. HYSAWA has reduced the vulnerability to disease by improving access to safe water for domestic consumption, livestock and homestead gardens, and, to a

lesser extent, sanitation – with access during cyclones, floods, and drought. CCAP provided temporary construction work incomes for poor, in particular women (60%) and landless; LDEG reports that 1.1 million labour days were generated for 15,000 persons, whereas Danida reports 527,109 labour days for 7,496 women and 710 men (49,030 days). At a smaller scale, CAA-DRR enabled a 1.5-fold increase in rice production on 19 plots, and generated incomes derived from selling vegetables from homestead gardens.

## Transformation

**Transformational change has not been an explicit goal of Danida project design for climate change adaptation in Bangladesh.** The likelihood of transformational impact is much reduced without it being an objective of the intervention, with associated key performance indicators. Amongst the project sample, climate change adaptation considerations were largely added to existing project interventions through new phases of activity that continued doing “business as usual” within the existing mandates of the project partners. Any explicit attempt in the project design to secure transformational systemic change was missing. However, it should be kept in mind that it is difficult to promote transformation in Bangladesh, especially at the national level, e.g. due to the above-mentioned difficulties of influencing policy.

**Danida has not capitalised on its investments in international climate funds in Bangladesh to secure transformation in climate resilience.** Development partners working on climate change adaptation in Bangladesh, including Danida, have been characterised as tending to work in a siloed manner, with a predominant focus on project implementation. Working through international climate funds is one possible channel for securing large-scale collective action, but Danida has not demonstrated a proactive strategy in terms of working with the GCF, LDCF or PPCR in Bangladesh. MFA has not asked the embassy to comment on project proposals submitted by the Bangladesh government to these global funds.

**Transformational potential has been identified at the local government level through support provided by Danish project activity.** If the right mechanisms for capacity building and awareness creation can be put in place, then local government institutions can be supported and coached to make quite rapid progress in climate change adaptation practices, as demonstrated by SDUP. This project has supported the climate proofing of Union Parishad (UP) development plans. By 2019, approximately half of the country’s most climate vulnerable UPs had included climate change adaptation actions in their most recent iteration of these plans. UPs are in a unique position to facilitate climate change adaptation because they have first-hand knowledge of local conditions and are directly accountable to their constituents.

**The potential for securing transformational change appears good when working through national CSO partners.** The only project identified that incorporated significant innovation in project design, intended to secure deep change in planning processes by incorporating the views of the intended beneficiaries in the project design and implementation actions, was CCA-DRR from 2008. Implemented by a national CSO, ActionAid Bangladesh, this agency with its focus on social justice, gender equality and poverty eradication was a strategic partner for Danida to bring about significant change.

## Global landscape

**Denmark engaged with other development partners on climate change adaptation in Bangladesh, but not to the full potential.** Other agencies, both multilateral (e.g. the World Bank, ADB) and bilateral (e.g. Germany, Sweden) have little awareness of Danish support for climate change adaptation, despite the longstanding Danida experience of working to strengthen climate resilience in Bangladesh. These agencies expressed interest in understanding the contribution that Denmark might be able to offer. Denmark is not seen as an active member of the Local Consultative Group on Environment and Climate Change. In part, this can be explained by staffing constraints within the embassy and the fact that the group has only convened very sporadically in recent years.

**With limited information received from the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the embassy has not been able to track Danish-supported projects in Bangladesh through global mechanisms.** A strategic opportunity is lost in the absence of communication between MFA and the embassy. One example of this is that the embassy was unsighted on relevant project activity funded through the LDCF, PPCR and GCF. The last fund, which attracts global attention, has four projects approved for implementation in Bangladesh, yet the embassy had not been asked to comment on these projects prior to GCF Board approval (despite the embassy having strong knowledge on the capacities of implementing partners).

## Burkina Faso

### Mainstreaming

**National strategies and policies, particularly in the rural development sector, have gradually become more relevant to CCA, especially after 2012.** These orientations received the support of relatively coordinated cooperation efforts, to which Danish cooperation has contributed, particularly in the water sector. This increasing national priority to addressing climate change is specifically illustrated by commitments to “green growth” and other environmental priorities<sup>1</sup>. A “green economy and climate change” strategic pillar – with a clear mitigation focus - has been integrated to the 2016 - 2020 rural development strategy (PNSR II – National Rural Sector Program), advocating for more resources to be invested on CC, and a dedicated Direction was established within the Ministry of Environment.

**Denmark’s response to the evolving mainstreaming opportunities was guided by a green growth approach from 2013 and from 2016 through an increasing focus on economic growth.**

The 2013-2018 Denmark - Burkina Faso partnership policy responded to national strategic orientations formulated in the Strategy for Accelerated Growth and Sustainable Development (SCADD 2011-2015) and the PNSR (2011-2015). The partnership policy orientation paper highlighted four thematic priorities: (1) democracy, human rights and governance; (2) security and stability, (3) green growth and employment; and (4) gender. Adaptation to climate change was acknowledged as a priority, to be primarily addressed through the green growth and employment strategic program. A scoping study on “green growth promotion in Burkina Faso” was conducted in 2014, advocating for a transformative approach to green growth<sup>2</sup>, presented to be addressing both climate change adaptation and mitigation priorities.

The 2016-2020 CP formulation and the PCESA (Agriculture Growth Sector Support Program) Mid-Term Review (MTR) marked a change reflecting evolving Danish cooperation priorities. CCA was still presented a priority, but primarily attached to the Integrated Water Resources Management (PAGIRE) cooperation program<sup>3</sup>. If the IRWM priorities remained largely unchanged, the Danish policies changes led to strategic and operational adjustments to the agriculture program, associated with a growing focus on economic effectiveness and efficiency<sup>4</sup>. Beyond the development of a civil society support programme to integrate Human Rights Based Approach (HRBA) priorities into water management practices in Burkina Faso, there was little integration of CCA priorities into the Governance sector, both in Burkina Faso and Niger. One of the reasons appears to be the limited MFA guidance available on how to practically mainstream CCA into this sector.

**Attention to mainstreaming of climate change adaptation was explicit within Danish support to the water sector both for Burkina Faso and Niger.** Water policies and strategy development have received continuous attention through several cycles of sector wide support; with Danish cooperation supporting the preparation of water laws both in Niger and Burkina Faso. Institutional development

<sup>1</sup> A comparison of the 2011-2015 and of the 2016-2020 PNSR demonstrates that environmental and climate change adaptation-related priorities (Sustainable land and water management, environmental management, access to water, green economy) have gained importance in the later plan.

<sup>2</sup> The implementation of an Inclusive and Sustainable Green Growth policy is a commitment which implies an in-depth development of sectoral policies, of the macroeconomic framework and beyond the governance of the country's development. (...) However, such a political orientation has implications of which the Burkinabé government must be fully aware, in terms of the transfer of powers to local authorities and the delegation of management of services or public goods to the private sector. This is a strong political commitment which will have to be sustained over the long term if we refer to the IWRM process initiated since 1998. (...)

<sup>3</sup> MFA (2015: programme-pays Danois pour le Burkina Faso 2016-2020, Rapport d'appréciation préalable. [2016-2020 Embassy Appropriation Note (CPBF-9)].

<sup>4</sup> MFA (2016): Burkina Faso. Programme de Croissance Economique dans le Secteur Agricole PCESA (2013-2018). Aide-mémoire de la revue à mi-parcours. (BF2-5).

and support to decentralized capacities has been a central orientation of the IWRM Danish cooperation programme so far, with financial and technical support, but also dedicated strategic analytical work. However, despite significant and sustained support to National Water Information Systems (SNIE) over that last decade, the National Water Information System is still underperforming in Burkina Faso. As a result, the PAGIRE monitoring and evaluation system does not effectively track and report on higher level results<sup>5</sup>. The Danish support to IRWM largely follows an “*opportunity approach*”, considering that progress on water resources management is largely aligned with positive outcomes in terms of CCA.

**Opportunities for mainstreaming of climate change adaptation were initially targeted in the agriculture sector.** The PCESA is a sector support program, including support to the private sector (Advisory services and Credit lines - respectively component A1<sup>6</sup> and A2), and to the public sector (B1: institutional capacity building, primarily for sector finance management; B21: quality and sanitary norms for specific value chains; and B22 investments in public market infrastructures). As such, it addresses agriculture growth priorities with support through the three dimensions of: policies and strategies, capacities, and investments. The main dimension of CCA sensitivity of the original design followed an “*opportunity logic*”<sup>7</sup> through targeting investments in specific value chains (relying on sustainable natural resources management (particularly for gum arabic, shea nut, cattle meat) and for which a large proportion of the populations at the production nodes are vulnerable to climate risks. Investments in infrastructures also promoted “*do no harm*”<sup>8</sup> and “*climate proofing*”<sup>9</sup> approaches through the promotion of environmental sustainability norms, most noticeably through support to locally available building materials for specific investments. The Green Fund<sup>10</sup> was primarily oriented towards CC mitigation objectives. The original PCESA institutional arrangements also promoted capacity building of national institutions, particularly that of the MEBF (Maison de l’Entreprise du Burkina Faso) in relation to the project scope and objectives.

**There was no evidence of CCA mainstreaming in the peace and stability programs both in Niger and in Burkina Faso.** Limitations are reported to relate to limited available guidance as well as of uncertainties about the relevance prioritizing CCA mainstreaming into peace and security objectives in the Sahelian context.

**Mainstreaming implementation performance in the agriculture sector was mixed; main factors related to institutional weakness of partners, inadequate M&E and a change in Danish priorities.** Gum Arabic projects were not implemented due to lack of organisation of the value chain, and the MTR led to a reorientation of the project prioritizing efficiency and economic effectiveness: relaxing of targeting on specific regions (urban centres are now included) and value chains, management of the advisory services and of the green fund through Danish technical assistance (Fund manager) rather than the MEBF, reducing the CCA sensitivity of the project logic. Very small scale enterprises did not benefit from advisory services and credit lines and were not directly targeted anymore after the MTR, the Green Fund was largely underspent, and the MTR noted risks on maintenance and sustainability of public infrastructure developed with the project support. Finally, the project M&E system was not designed to track CCA priorities, and the Danish support did not push

---

<sup>5</sup> Results oriented indicators are: (1) the number of conflicts related to the management and use of water resources prevented and resolved, and (2) the availability of annual syntheses of water resources monitoring from 2016 to 2020. (1) is not available, and (2) annual synthesis are available but not circulated to target user groups.

<sup>6</sup> The A1 component also covered the « Green Fund », a subsidy mechanism to support « green investments » with low immediate economic profitability.

<sup>7</sup> Targeted contribution to reduction of climate risk or vulnerability over time.

<sup>8</sup> Mitigation of potential negative impacts on resilience and adaptation by Danish ODA.

<sup>9</sup> Strengthening sustainability of Danish investments despite climate change prospects.

<sup>10</sup> See footnote 7.

for the integration of CCA indicators into the sector national systems. According to a recent Niger Country Program evaluation, Danish support to agriculture growth in Niger also lacked attention to CCA mainstreaming.

CCA mainstreaming was considered in strategic and operational support analysis provided by the MFA. However, the MTR of the Country Program (2018) and of the PCESA (2016) encouraged a higher priority to the efficiency of implementation and economic efficiency, to the detriment of targeting the smallest businesses and the sectors deemed most relevant to the objectives of adapting to climate change. These orientations are analysed as reflecting both the MFA attention to cooperation programs implementation effectiveness as well a reduced prioritization of CCA mainstreaming over employment and growth at MFA policy level in the course of the evaluation period. Embassy programme officers highlighted the relatively limited and eroding pool of international technical experts (francophone and familiar with the national context) readily available for support.

### Targeted action

**Most sampled projects approached CCA with a strong focus on governance and engagement, knowledge management and information, practices and mind-sets.** *Strengthening CCA financing mechanisms* was not explicitly part of the UNDP, IUCN and INERA projects. Linkages and synergies between these innovation-oriented projects and Danish sector support projects have been underexploited. Despite the project name, the Oxfam ibis project “West African Dialogue on Private Climate Financing” (WADPCF) did not clearly contribute to reshaping the CCA financing environment. The agriculture growth programme included a subsidized credit component. However, beyond targeting of specific value chains and regions during the first years of the project, economic viability was the only criteria used to select projects. Moreover, the Green Fund was largely underspent and will not be renewed for the next phase of the PCESA, while an environment intervention fund was launched by the Government in 2013 and has recently become accredited by the GEF. The IWRM sector support in Burkina Faso makes a contribution to a multi-donor basket fund to support the development of sector level financing mechanisms; including the implementation of a “polluter pays” principle in the water sector (see below progress on the CFE (Financial Contribution to Water)). However, the share of Danish and Swedish financial contribution to the IWRM subsector is still very high (60%), and the National budget contribution reaches less than 20%.

*Approaches to strengthening CCA governance and engagement* ranged from mobilising (1) stakeholders around CCA priorities through information sharing and sensitisation, (2) support to developing CCA discourses by stakeholders involved in public policy influencing circles, (3) strengthening public information systems, (4) support to local natural resources management plans, (5) support to strengthening sector planning and budgeting, (6) support to control services<sup>11</sup> development, and (7) support to the integration of HRBA through support to the civil society. The Danish IWRM sector support in Burkina Faso and Niger covered all these dimensions, while governance support in the agriculture growth sector in Burkina Faso was much more patchy and lacked overall coherence in relation to CCA.

*Institutional development* was part of RECSC-PANA (IUCN) and ACC-ASHBF (UNDP). The CSO network setup with RECSC-PANA has received subsequent support for the Swedish cooperation, has further developed and contributed to shape CCA related national policy developments Institutional

---

<sup>11</sup> So-called « water police ».



development has been at the heart of the Danish IWRM sector support for the last three decades in Burkina Faso, with particular attention to developing and strengthening capacities of decentralized institutions.

*CCA knowledge and information* development and dissemination were widely used within the Danish cooperation portfolio in Burkina. Such approaches often sustained other objectives such as improving governance and engagement, policies, and changing practices and mind-sets. Practice (BF5) or policy (BF3) oriented action-research was conducted, and strategic analysis supported (BF6) and well documented by related projects. Knowledge and information was at the heart of RECSC-PANA and ACC-ASHBF project design and generated a widely shared catalogue of CCA practices. However, it is not clear how such results were integrated in further Danish cooperation programming.

*Support to market development* was an approach mostly adopted by the bilateral cooperation programs PCESA and PAGIRE. The PCESA supported quality and environmental norms for specific value chains, as well as investments in market infrastructures. Actual use and enforcement of norms developed is yet to be ensured. The implementation of a “polluter pays” principle has been supported over several programming cycles. While the mining industry actors are still reluctant to pay for the water they use, the CFE (Financial Contribution to Water) has progressed significantly over the last few years, and the parliament recently adopted regulation that may facilitate further control over its implementation. WADPCF documented the potential for market oriented CCA sensitive investments but did not contribute further to their development.

*Natural capital* – Supporting interventions on natural or agro-pastoral systems was not an approach widely adopted by the Danish cooperation. RAPPKBF (INERA) included direct investments on shea tree parks (as well as on their governance) and PAGIRE supported water plants cleaning, but on a relatively small scale. A weakness of PAGIRE is its limited contribution to investments, in contrast to PASEHA in Niger, which contributes throughout wider support to the whole WASH sector.

*Policy development support* is one of the key entry points of the IWRM cooperation in Burkina Faso, which not only supported the development of water management related laws and strategies but also the implementation of some of their key principles (e.g. decentralized management, polluter pays, water resources knowledge development). This dimension was much less systematized in other projects. PCESA originally included a component on rural development policy development support, but it was deemed ineffective and inefficient and abandoned after the MTR. The Oxfam Ibis project ambitioned to influence regional policies through the WASCOF civil society forum, but attribution of results by the final project evaluation appears to be optimistic given the large number of stakeholders that actually defended similar views, and since the ECOWAS Environment Policy - that the project was aiming to influence - has not been updated since the end of the project.

*Influencing practices and / or mind-sets* toward more CCA sensitive behaviours, norms and beliefs, was an approach largely shared within the Danish portfolio. Often related to governance and engagement related objectives (see above), several sampled projects directly supported actions to raise awareness on adaptation challenges and approaches (BF1), potential contribution by the private sector to adaptation objectives (BF3), and natural resources management practices (BF5). However, lessons and experiences from these NGO or UN partners' projects were not well integrated to Danish sector support to agriculture growth, with the exception of shea tree park management practice developed with Tree Aid, which was replicated by PCESA on a limited scale. While the IWRM approach adopted by the MEA (Ministry of Water and Drainage) is being criticized for its limitations in terms of community level

empowerment, the Danish cooperation launched a scheme to support the civil society to develop and enforce HRBA in the water sector (including drinking water).

*Technologies & infrastructure.* The INERA action research project on shea tree park regeneration under RAPPKBF contributed to support the INERA research programme on the development, testing and dissemination of improved varieties, and as such contributed to technological development. However, this rather is a contribution to support INERA's programme of work on shea nut than an innovation developed with this short (three years) Danish support. Significant PCESA resources were invested in storage infrastructures (grains, animal feed, etc.), with the potential to contribute to climate risk vulnerability reduction. Use of locally available and low energy materials (laterite bricks) was promoted for a pilot construction scheme. However, economic viability and governance related risks were not sufficiently addressed. Danish cooperation invested on data collection and analysis capacity for water resources monitoring but results at this level are mixed despite years of support.

**The effectiveness of targeting vulnerable populations has not been systematic across the sampled projects.** Despite several decades of support, the results in terms of empowering vulnerable populations are still considered by several authors as a weakness of the IWRM approach<sup>12</sup>. This reinforces the relevance of the civil society support programme developed to mainstream an HRBA into water sector interventions. However, the HRBA programme operational arrangements didn't ensure effective and efficient management. Some positive results were achieved in terms of political actions organised to defend the rights to water and sanitation, but mostly in urban or peri-urban areas.

Prioritization of specific value chains for the agriculture growth programme ensured indirect targeting of small scale farmers, and particularly women for shea nut and gum arabic trees. This value chain targeting was abandoned, but projects mostly remained indirectly favourable to small scale farmers (e.g. promotion of drought resistant sorghum varieties). However, relaxing of geographic targeting (large urban centres were included after the MTR) meant that credits directly benefited actors further down the value chains, and the extent to which projects benefited smallholder farmers and or urban vulnerable populations is not established. Quality and sanitary norms have been translated in local languages; however, the relevance of such norms to informal businesses - concentrating most vulnerable people - was questioned. It is not clear whether such norms have the potential to add or transfer value to vulnerable groups or solely further down the value chains. Finally, procedures used for the decision making of public infrastructure investments largely excluded value chain representatives. The RAPPKBF project on supporting regeneration of shea tree parks clearly targeted vulnerable populations, particularly women. ACC-ASHBF and RECSC-PANA targeted vulnerable populations. However, the RECSC-PANA project report suggests that women have not been well represented within the direct beneficiaries.

**Projects supported by Denmark failed to systematically document results on productive systems, ecosystems and livelihoods.** This difficulty is related to several factors: (1) the nature of the interventions: their strong focus on governance and engagement, knowledge management and information, practices and mind-sets renders the results measurement productive systems, ecosystems and livelihoods particularly complex; (2) the limited performance of M&E systems, particularly that of sector level projects, which hardly go beyond output monitoring, and; (3) the absence of evaluation or thorough stocktaking work at the level of productive systems, ecosystems and livelihoods. For the PAGIRE, available research hardly informs about the impact of IRWM policy at this level. NGO or UN organisations work has not been very instructive either in terms of livelihood level results

---

<sup>12</sup> Bio Mohamadou Torou, Liza Debevec et Dapola Évariste Constant Da, « La difficile territorialisation de la gestion de l'eau au Burkina Faso : une lecture au filtre de la théorie de la proximité », Développement durable et territoires, Vol. 9, n°1 | Mars 2018 ; Vers une gestion intégrée des ressources en eau au Burkina Faso Rapport, PRESA, ODI, 2017.

measurement, despite the existence of widely disseminated Household Economy Analysis methods in the country.

## Transformation

**Danish support is largely relevant to CCA transformation objectives of the IWRM sector.** It meets most criteria characterizing a transformative approach:

- Danish support responds to national sector policy commitments and strategies and has consistently contributed to supporting public policy reforms in Burkina Faso. In supporting the sector for several decades in Burkina Faso and Niger, Danish cooperation has assisted with analytical work, including on institutional arrangements that Danish cooperation has contributed to establish, and has supported civil society in its vigilance role with regards to mainstreaming of HRBA in the water sector. The long term commitment of the Danish cooperation in the sector is clearly contributing to its ability to simultaneously play supportive and critical roles in relation to transformation of the IWRM sector in general and of the integration of CCA objectives in particular. The Danish cooperation has effectively sought to develop strategic alliances to support cooperation in the IWRM subsector, particularly with Sida (joint programming and basket funding) in Burkina Faso and Luxe (delegated cooperation) in Niger.
- In both countries, the Danish support to the IWRM sector takes the form of a sector wide support programme (IWRM, and drinking water and drainage subsectors in Burkina Faso, overall water sector in Niger). It therefore contributes to the implementation of a nationwide policy in both cases and supports the development of common funding mechanisms in both cases.
- The Danish support to IWRM has been particularly oriented on institutional capacity development and has supported the development of decentralized governance systems, including at the communal level. It acknowledges a gap in terms of empowerment of the population and functionality of CLE (Local Water Committee). Danish cooperation supported the deployment of key innovations such as the implementation of a “polluters pay” principle through the CFE.
- The National Water Monitoring Information System (SNIEau) has been supported to enable better planning and evidence base policy making, but with mixed success.
- The priority given to conflict sensitivity is relevant to the structural transformation for stronger CCA mainstreaming. This has been done through the water police, support to the civil society to play a watchdog role in monitoring the mainstreaming of HRBA in the sector, and the introduction of a high level water related conflicts indicator in the programme logframe. However, CCA is not explicitly integrated into the theory of change for WASH projects in Niger and Burkina Faso. The current formulation process in Burkina Faso aims to address this gap.

**There is evidence of Danish contribution to impacts in terms of institutional development, sector planning and governance in the IWRM subsector.** Key challenges remain in achieving financial autonomy and strengthening the administrative autonomy of the regional river basin management agencies, and their ability to support communal structures (CLE) to pursue decentralization. There are also gaps in reinforcing public policies to steer capacities through strengthening of impact monitoring of IWRM policies and strategies on water management practices and behaviours (including water related conflicts).

**The agricultural growth support programme does not include a clear transformation strategy for CCA.** Moreover, initial elements relevant to CCA transformation have been abandoned throughout the implementation.

- The PCESA aligns with national strategic orientations of the PNSR I and II (particularly with Axis 2: Access to markets, competitiveness of the agro-sylvo-pastoral, fish and wildlife sectors, and to some extent with Axis 3: Environmental governance, promotion of sustainable development and management of natural resources; subprogramme “green economy and climate change” through the “green fund”). Yet, the PCESA followed a project based approach and Component B1 that supported institutional development of the sector (including financial management and planning) was abandoned after the MTR. The PCESA is supported by EU delegated funding since 2018, but this cooperation does not particularly focus on CCA relevant elements of the PCESA.
- Support through Fast track projects (e.g. RECSC-PANA, ACC-ASHBF) have not been pursued, with some interventions continued with other Development Partners support (e.g. Sida for IUCN support to civil society network).
- The programme design did not strongly build on previous experiences of CCA specific action supported by the Danish cooperation in the agriculture sector (ACC-ASHBF, RECSC-PANA), and limited linkages have been developed with other interventions during the PCESA implementation period (WADPCF, RAPPKBF).
- Termination of the partnership with the MEBF reduced the possibility to pursue initial capacity building objectives with respect to mainstreaming green growth and climate change into extension services. It should also be noted that the fund was underutilized.

There is limited evidence results of the Danish cooperation in terms of transformation of the agriculture sector related to CCA objectives. Limited strategic continuity over CCA objectives, lack of focus of the bilateral programme PCESA and limited synergies with other projects within the sector, were constraints to achieving transformational changes relevant to CCA objectives. **The ongoing formulation of a community resilience support programme aims to rebalance the Danish cooperation programme with Burkina Faso, allowing better consideration to CCA in a context of increasing fragility.** A key challenge will be to develop linkages and synergies between the two sides of the program. To address this, it is envisaged to have a link between the credit lines and the resilience engagement. Part of the funds will be allocated to micro finance institutions or institutions working with vulnerable groups.

## Global landscape

Limited analysis could be conducted at this level. Yet, a few elements can be highlighted:

- Strong commitment to multi-donor coordination, particularly in the IRWM sector.
- Sustained efforts on learning and knowledge management in the IWRM sector, documented through research work published by other actors<sup>13</sup>, and interrelated with global level support on this theme.
- Contribution to regional policy debates (WADPCF) and facilitation of the contribution of Burkinabe stakeholders to global forums (RECSC-PANA – civil society representatives participation to COP 15 and 16, and WADPCF, civil society representatives participation to COP 21).

<sup>13</sup> E.g. Vers une gestion intégrée des ressources en eau au Burkina Faso Rapport, PRESA, ODI, 2017.

## Ethiopia

### Mainstreaming

**Climate change adaptation (CCA) mainstreaming into rural development sectors has been a strategic orientation of Danish cooperation with Ethiopia.** Building on lessons from an earlier programme channelled through DFID, strengthening climate resilience was identified as a priority for Danish cooperation with Ethiopia from the beginning of the bilateral programme. CCA mainstreaming (through promotion of Climate Smart Agriculture – CSA) in the agriculture and forestry sectors was one of the main pillars of the GATE thematic programme, combining Development and Climate Envelope funding to support a coherent programme. The 2018-2022 Country Programme continues to prioritise CCA mainstreaming into the agriculture and forestry sectors, with the aim of contributing to building climate-resilient livelihoods. Additional resources on resilience building programmes through the national Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) and the World Food Program have deepened CCA mainstreaming into Danish cooperation with Ethiopia. While the thematic focus remains relatively narrow<sup>14</sup>, the growing Danish financial commitments offer opportunities for geographic complementarities across the programme<sup>15</sup>. CCA mainstreaming into the governance and human rights programme was not prioritized.

**Building on national policy commitments and opportunities offered by recent institutional developments, CCA mainstreaming support in the agriculture sector adopted a public sector support approach mixing policy dialogue, capacity building support at different levels, and innovative investments.** The Ethiopian policy environment was conducive, with increasing attention to climate change in national policy priorities over the last ten years. Development of the Agriculture Transformation Agency<sup>16</sup> (ATA, 2010) as well as the adoption of the Climate Resilient and Green Economy (CRGE) strategy (2011) were identified as opportunities for engagement by Danish Cooperation. Investment projects channelled through the ATA and the CGRE Facility were all oriented on sustainable agriculture and forest management, with some addressing climate-related risks and vulnerabilities. CCA was one of the priorities of which mainstreaming into planning and monitoring was supported through ATA, the CRGE Facility (CRGEF), and the Ministry of Agriculture.

**Approaches adopted for CCA mainstreaming into M&E were not sufficiently clear.** CCA mainstreaming into ATA M&E systems was an identified gap at the inception phase of the GATE programme. Yet, Danish support (which included a complex GATE initial log frame that was not sufficiently results-orientated) failed to adopt and promote an appropriate approach for CCA mainstreaming into M&E. While this gap largely remains, the new phase of Danish support will put a stronger emphasis on results tracking. Socio-environmental risks associated with investments made under the “green growth” banner have been identified (monopolistic relationships associated with contract farming, misuse of fertilizers). Assessment of such risks was conducted by the ATA for each project implemented with the GATE support through ex-ante environmental and social screening.

**Danish support contributed to policy, planning and budgeting developments relevant to CCA mainstreaming but implementation has lagged behind.** CCA relevant policy commitments were adopted during the GATE implementation period<sup>17</sup>. ATA and CRGEF have contributed through technical support. The planning, budgeting, and contracting systems of ATA and the CRGEF have developed over the GATE implementation period, and Danish support is reported to have contributed

<sup>14</sup> Above 90% of resources planned for the 2018-2022 period are directed at the rural development sector, with a CC focus.

<sup>15</sup> The PSNP programme supports lowland regions, while the ATA support programme has largely focused on the highlands.

<sup>16</sup> An initiative of Prime Minister Meles Zenawi, with a mandate to develop and facilitate the implementation of the transformation of Ethiopian agriculture.

<sup>17</sup> This include deepening commitments to sustainable natural resources management investments into the national development plan, GTP II.

to mainstreaming of socio-environmental issues into these developing systems. The GATE programme also supported implementation of mainstreaming strategies and guidance through institutional support (including institutional reforms of ATA towards better mainstreaming capacity, such as the development of “delivery units” within the MoA). However, implementation of mainstreaming guidance into MoA systems is reported to have been limited and variable across MoA subsectors<sup>18, 19</sup>. Integration of lessons from innovative investments and scaling up prospects varied across the investments made. While the CRGEF has so far mainly channelled ODA, the GoE is reported to be considering supporting the Facility with national resources.

**Instability of political leadership, institutional issues, and capacity constraints are reported as key factors hampering the effectiveness of CSA/CCA mainstreaming into public policies.**

Research<sup>20</sup> and technical reports<sup>21</sup> suggest that sustainable natural resource management and resilience remain a low priority compared to growth in the agriculture sector, and that implementation of CCA-related commitments (e.g. Climate Smart Agriculture) still lags behind policy engagements. Beyond coordination<sup>22</sup> and implementation capacity limitations<sup>23</sup>, authors consider that political commitment to CCA mainstreaming into national policies and programmes remains an important hurdle. The lack of stable leadership in the agricultural sector was highlighted as a constraint to the consistent priority being given to mainstreaming CSA into agriculture policies.

## Targeted action

**The building blocks for climate change adaptation were put in place in the projects supported by Denmark, with a focus on institutions, governance and engagement, knowledge and information, and natural capital including productive systems, but less so on policy development.**<sup>24</sup> It should be noted that approximately 95% of CCA-relevant Danish funding is allocated to the GATE programme, whereas the three remaining sampled projects are small in comparison.

In Ethiopia, Danish support has focused on: a) improving management of natural resources, such as land, water and forests; b) strengthening institutional capacity (e.g. GATE-ATA, GATE-CRGEF, SCI-LDCF, SSD); and c) community engagement. Capacity building was key to all the project interventions, and projects engaged stakeholders from the community (SSD, ILRLSRLP, GATE-CRGEF, GATE-ATA) to the federal level (GATE-CRGEF, GATE-ATA). The two NGO implemented projects constructed protective infrastructure (e.g. an irrigation scheme to protect farmlands from flash floods and erosion hazards, and land protected from riverbank erosion) and improved the disaster risk management capacity of the targeted communities. The GATE programme did not focus much on building resilience infrastructure, except for a few ATA projects where grain storage facilities were constructed. GATE-ATA contributed to policy development through inputs into the national development plan (GTP II) and the GATE-CRGEF-supported projects developed some local bylaws, but the other – but much smaller in terms of allocated resources – projects did not work on policy development. ATA and the CRGEF mobilised additional funding by engaging other implementing partners, whereas this was not a focus of the other projects. Support to the CRGEF – Ethiopia’s

<sup>18</sup> Agricultural Development / [Livestock resources sector](#) / [Natural resources and food security](#) / [Agricultural inputs and production](#)

<sup>19</sup> An institutional audit of the ATA is currently taking place.

<sup>20</sup> Linn Järnberg, Elin Enfors Kautsky, Linus Dagerskog, Per Olsson, Green niche actors navigating an opaque opportunity context: Prospects for a sustainable transformation of Ethiopian agriculture, Land Use Policy, Volume 71, 2018, Pages 409-42.

<sup>21</sup> FAO, 2016. Ethiopia Climate-Smart Agriculture Scoping Study. By Jirata, M., Grey, S. and Kilawe, E. Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.

<sup>22</sup> Including coordination issues between ATA and federal ministries, which might improve with the ATA now reporting to Ministry of Agriculture of the Agricultural Transformation Agenda

<sup>23</sup> Reported to be weaker in the Forestry sector, as well as at the decentralized levels.

<sup>24</sup> The Transformational Change Learning Partnership (TCLP) of the Climate Investment Funds has identified nine building blocks/arenas of intervention required to transform the response required to strengthen climate resilience : 1) financing; 2) governance and engagement; 3) institutions; 4) knowledge and information; 5) markets; 6) natural capital; 7) policies; 8) practices and mindsets; and 9) technologies and infrastructure (see Annex C).

national climate fund – was strategic, in that it helped to strengthen the Facility’s project management systems.

**Most projects (GATE-CRGEF, GATE-ATA, ILRLSRLP, SSD) had a focus on the sustainable use of natural resources (water, soil, land, forest) through improved rangeland/agricultural practices and improved watershed management, and the rehabilitation of degraded areas (GATE-CRGEF, ILRLSRLP, SSD).** As noted in the final ATA report a main challenge for the implementation of sustainable agricultural practices among smallholder farmers is “*little attention given to natural resource conservations such as soil, water and environments*”. Danish support contributed to a more sustainable and productive use of natural resources by promoting improved rangeland/agricultural practices, improved watershed management and rehabilitation and protection of natural resources. The GATE-CRGEF forest sector project resulted in: i) 1,732 ha of land under various community-based watershed management practices; ii) 2,542 ha of land covered by various climate smart crop and livestock interventions; iii) 23,000 ha of the core zone of a biosphere reserve protected from deforestation and illegal encroachment; and iv) 80,000 ha of buffer zones protected through participatory interventions. At a smaller scale, ILRLSRLP and SSD rehabilitated land by planting tree seedlings.

**The projects generally targeted vulnerable communities but achieved varying success in mainstreaming gender.** Farmers (male and female) are the main beneficiary group in the sample projects. The GATE programme targeted four high-potential regions in Ethiopia (Tigray, Amhara, Oromia and the Southern Nations, Nationalities and People Regions) and the total number of farmers that directly benefited from various projects supported by the GATE interventions is estimated at over 3,000,000, of which 30% are women. Farmers in these areas are believed to be better off than farmers in the less productive and more risk-prone areas of Ethiopia (however with huge variabilities, as the four regions cover a major part of Ethiopia). For the GATE-ATA projects, it is noted that mainstreaming gender remains the main challenge in promoting gender sensitive technologies and maintaining equality in agricultural transformation efforts due to low levels of awareness among agricultural stakeholders. The GATE-CRGEF targeted most-in-need communities and the poorest of the poor. The number of women in the training events was generally low, something which the embassy noted, and project indicators were not gender sensitive. For the second phase of the Danish support, this is being addressed through the hiring of a social inclusiveness expert by the CRGEF.

The SSD project targeted a marginalised rural poor pastoral community in the Afar region. After project closure 20% women were leading the irrigation users’ cooperatives and Disaster Risk Reduction committees. The ILRLSRLP project targeted a drought prone and chronically food insecure area (in Wag Himra) with severe land degradation, where the beneficiaries were selected based on an in-depth need’s assessment, targeting the unemployed, school drop-out and landless youth, as well as vulnerable women. Seventy four percent of the project beneficiaries were women.

**A contribution was made to improved climate resilience through livelihood diversification and income generation, but market access remains challenging.** The projects in the sample contributed to livelihood diversification (GATE-CRGEF, GATE-ATA, ILRLSRLP, SSD) and increased income (GATE-CRGEF). The GATE-CRGEF agricultural project increased the average household annual income of project beneficiaries to US\$ 523 in the project areas. For the other projects no documented evidence of increased income has been found. Livelihood diversification was achieved through the introduction of new activities (bee keeping, wild coffee and spice production, introduction of fruit trees) and improved management of natural resources (climate smart agriculture, introduction of drought resistant nutritious crops (amaranth and quinoa) and new varieties of existing crops (Tef), improved post-harvest handling, integrated soil management, and irrigation). Improved access to, and management of, water resources, and improved agricultural and livestock practices, were

provided in most projects. Increased access to micro-finance was established in the two NGO-implemented projects (ILRLSRLP, SSD). However, market access remains a constraint, partly due to the remoteness of the project areas, which lack road infrastructure and linkages with buyers. This is especially a constraint for perishable foods such as avocados and bananas.

## Transformation

**Danish support through the GATE Thematic Programme was a strategic investment, as it aimed to strengthen two institutions critical for furthering the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy developed by the Prime Minister.** This applied to both components of the Programme, namely support to the CRGEF and the ATA. Danish support was provided at an early stage in the institutional development of both the CRGEF and the ATA and helped to steer the climate change adaptation approach of both institutions. Support to the National Meteorological Agency (SCI-LDCF) was also strategic in helping to build the national infrastructure for climate information; however, the embassy's role in this LDCF project was minimal.

**Consideration over how to scale up from early demonstration project activity is evident in the Danish support provided to the ATA, where the agency's systems thinking supported consideration of how to scale-up climate smart agricultural practices in some investment projects.** The ATA is very well resourced in terms of human capacity and this helped to develop an approach that offered to secure change at scale, whereby building on ATA demonstration projects there was potential to exploit the national outreach available to a well-resourced and established line ministry such as the Ministry of Agriculture. The extent to which this has happened has depended on the level of coordination and institutional collaboration between ATA and MoA. Evidence of scaling was also observed in the climate information provision of the LDCF-funded project, which contributed to the strengthening of the national climate information system.

**The ATA is the best example of an implementing partner trying to secure systemic change by engaging directly with national policy processes, in this case the revision of the national development plan.** It is an unusual government agency in this regard as it has the specific mandate to transform the agricultural sector, making the Danish support strategic in helping to advance climate-resilient practices in rural Ethiopia. Danish support to the ATA (GATE-ATA) also happened to be fortuitously timed, in that the additional resources provided by Denmark allowed the ATA to input climate-resilient indicators into the national development plan (GTP II) at the time when the 5-year plan was under review. None of the other project interventions appear to have worked at this level of influencing national policy and planning processes.

**Support for the CRGEF allowed funding for two development projects implemented by the agriculture and forestry ministries; yet how the project beneficiaries have been supported to increase their resilience to climate change is not clear from the evidence gathered.** Both project interventions are natural resource management projects. They do not appear to exhibit a strong, explicit rationale that addresses future vulnerabilities caused by changing climate conditions. Justification for Danish support appears to have been made largely in terms of supporting a new national institution (the CRGEF) that might guide climate change mainstreaming across relevant sectors of the economy, consistent with the national development plan, the Growth and Transformation Plan (GTP II).

**Securing the sustainability of project-initiated activity has long been an important consideration for development interventions. In the context of seeking transformational change, this notion extends to ensuring there is no reversion to the pre-project system state. This remains a challenging goal for Denmark's support to climate change adaptation in Ethiopia.** Whilst evidence of addressing issues that might lead to systems change at the design stage



has been found, particularly in terms of the choice of the partner institutions (e.g. ATA, CRGEF), evidence of systems change, and its sustainability after project closure, has yet to be documented.

## Kenya

### Mainstreaming

**Climate change was a main area of focus of the Danish development cooperation strategy for Kenya, although from 2015 onwards, there was more focus on mitigation than adaptation.** The 2015-2020 country policy and country programme cover both climate change adaptation and mitigation under the “inclusive green growth and employment” strategic focus area/thematic programme, but with a stronger emphasis on mitigation. The earlier country strategy was more explicitly focused on climate and its mainstreaming; whereas the new strategy looked mainstreaming more indirectly with a focus on the integration of business interests (green growth angle rather than natural resources angle). In relation to adaptation, the Fast Start Climate Change Programme (FSCCP, 2011-12) had a strong degree of integration with the country programme, building on, or laying the foundation for, engagements funded through the bilateral programme.

**Mainstreaming of climate change was not given attention in the Kenya country programme or in the regional peace and stabilisation programme.** The 2015-2020 country programme document does not consider the integration/mainstreaming of climate change as a crosscutting issue, and climate change is not addressed in any of the development engagements under the “governance” thematic programme. Moreover, the regional peace and stabilisation programme document and its interventions do not address climate change as a crosscutting issue, although the programme document mentions that *“the conflict drivers are exacerbated by natural disasters, drought and climate change”*. Similarly, while WSTF addressed water access in the ASALs, which is essential for climate change adaptation, it did not implement with an adaptation lens or tools, thereby missing an opportunity to address climate resilience more explicitly.

**Some of the climate change adaptation focused interventions also addressed aspects of broader environmental mainstreaming.** NRT addressed community-based peacebuilding and reconciliation of conflict over natural resources (grazing, water), while also promoting improved and more climate-resilient management of the natural resources, which would contribute to the reduction of tensions due to resource scarcity. NEMA to a lesser extent addressed adaptation as part of the establishment of a regulatory framework and environmental performance indicators for ministries. ALP successfully advocated for, and supported the integration of, community-based adaptation in national policies and plans for development and in county development planning.

### Targeted action

**The climate change adaptation together addressed the key elements for building resilience, but with particular focus on governance, community engagement and institutions, especially at subnational level – and improving the resilience of livelihoods through improved utilization and management of natural resources.** The engagements labelled as climate change adaptation-specific interventions overall had a strong focus on governance, especially at the local level and with emphasis on community engagement and empowerment. The Transformational Change Learning Partnership (TCLP) of the Climate Investment Funds has identified nine building blocks/areas of intervention required to transform the response required to strengthen climate resilience, namely: 1) financing; 2) governance and engagement; 3) institutions; 4) knowledge and information; 5) markets; 6) natural capital; 7) policies; 8) practices and mindsets; and 9) technologies and infrastructure (see Annex C). In Kenya, the Danish support in particular focused on: a) building community participation in

governance, advocacy, planning and implementation (NRT, ALP, and, vis-à-vis implementing community projects, CDTF); and b) enhancing access to, and improving management of, natural resources, such as water and grazing lands for enhanced productivity and sustainability (NRT, WSTF, ALP, CDTF). Resilience infrastructure, mainly water infrastructure, was also constructed (WSTF (which exclusively focused on water services), CDTF, and to a lesser extent ALP). A couple of projects also engaged in national policy development or implementation (ALP, NEMA).

Vis-à-vis improving livelihoods resilience, the focus was on enhanced and diversified income generation and food security derived from natural resources (water, rangelands, soil), mainly agriculture and livestock (NRT, ALP, CDTF, WSTF), although efforts were also made to promote alternative income sources through enterprise development, value addition, food banks, tourism, and to a lesser extent gainful employment (NRT, ALP, CDTF).

In terms of capacity development, the projects engaged stakeholders at the local level (communities, CSOs and county governments), e.g. vis-à-vis local planning (ALP), advocacy (ALP), community-based governance (NRT), vocational skills (ALP, NRT), agriculture (ALP, CDTF), and rangeland and natural resource management (NRT, ALP, CDTF). ALP engaged in generating new knowledge and approaches to community-based adaptation, including ensuring that relevant climate and weather information is made available for communities and local decision-making.

**The climate change adaptation interventions were in general effective in targeting the vulnerable.** The Danish-supported climate change adaptation development engagements that engaged at the community level were effective in targeting the poor. Firstly, they targeted areas that were vulnerable to climate change and disasters, in particular arid and semi-arid lands (ASALs) vulnerable to drought and dry spells and land degradation, which are also the poorest areas of Kenya with least income and employment opportunities, including areas affected by conflict (NRT, WSTF, ALP, and to a lesser extent CDTF). Secondly, the projects aimed at reaching vulnerable people, including women, youth and pastoralists from different ethnic groups through specific selection criteria (ALP, CDTF) and geographic targeting of areas affected drought and/or conflict (NRT, ALP, WSTF).

**A significant contribution was also made by the climate change adaptation interventions vis-à-vis livelihoods resilience, income generation and food security.**

Danida-funded CCA projects (NRT, ALP, CDTF and to a lesser extent WSTF) contributed to increased incomes, improved food security and enhanced resilience to extreme weather events (mainly drought and dry spells). This was achieved through increased access to water, better and more sustainable management of natural resources, improved agricultural and livestock practices, income diversification, processing/value addition and enterprise development, gained employment creation (to a lesser extent), improved community-based management, and improved decision-making.

In 2019, NRT reported a total income of Kenyan Shilling (KES) 71.2 million for 1,694 households with average incomes of 8,022 KES/household for beadwork and 109,107 KES/household for livestock. The mango and Fish to Market programmes did not generate any income, and NRT and the conservancies had 1,309 permanent staff and 2,737 temporary jobs; incomes from employment in conservancy management was KES 357 million. 79% of 404,050 NRT conservancy members reported improved socio-economic status in 2019 from new income opportunities and improved market access, and improved grazing and livestock health. However, income opportunities in the ASALs remain low and largely dependent on livestock. 8,500 households benefitted from improved water access provided by WSTF. ALP had a positive cost-benefit returns (social, environmental, economic benefits) of USD

1.45-3.03 per USD invested, and purely economic benefits had a positive return on investment of USD 1.09. By end 2016, almost 1.8 million indirect beneficiaries in the four ALP countries reportedly benefitted from the adoption of CBA approaches and strategies under extension period.

## Transformation

**From 2010, a strategic opportunity was grasped to contribute to transformation and mainstreaming through the support to the office of the prime minister.** The support to the climate change unit in the office of the prime minister led to the development of national strategies and action plans on climate change which have supported transformation efforts across both the public, private and civil society sectors. Climate change was lifted for the first time above the sector ministries which enabled a stronger convening power that was needed to raise the profile and agenda of climate change. Although the office of prime minister fell away once the new decentralisation strategies were put into action, the strategy and documents remain and have been recently updated. They also laid the foundation for a new climate change act (2016) which has far-reaching and transformative aims.

**Transformation was an implicit rather than an explicit part of the design of most projects and to some extent beyond their ambition frame.** Although the project design for the sample projects generally acknowledged and responded to national climate change strategies, transformation objectives were generally implicit rather than explicit. The focus was on creating concrete outputs and results and tools often with the intention of contributing to transformation and systemic change but usually without a strong focus on developing tools and the means for catalysing systemic change. Projects were not designed to enhance the demonstration effect, engage in or support political advocacy and identify and act on strategic entry points that would create change. A through diagnostic of the challenges and obstacles standing in the way of such change was generally missing. Especially after 2015, a strong focus was given to green growth. This was well founded and had the effect of enhancing financial sustainability and incentive to change. However, it tended, understandably, to be translated into support for addressing mitigation rather than adaptation challenges.

**Some of the most promising examples of sustainable transformative change are associated with projects that mobilised communities and enhanced income related incentives.** An example are the conservancy projects under NRT and also the agriculture and livelihood projects under ALP. Where adaptation was strongly linked to clear benefits and an enhanced income stream, there was evidence of scaling up and permanent institutional and behaviour change. Enhancing access to technology, trust building, linking local development to local government plans and improving the information environment including climate related forecasting were among the interventions that supported transformation.

**The focus on transformation at the local government level was sound but constrained by institutional weaknesses and insufficient human and financial resources.** Most of the projects sought systemic change at the county level, not so much aiming at changing policies and planning but attempting to improve compliance with them. This was well-considered although the challenges and dependence on wider improvements in decentralisation were under appreciated. There was a tendency to over burden the counties with planning processes and underestimate the financial and other challenges faced by the counties. The re-orientation of one of the projects under NEMA to focus on enhancing the demonstration effect on a few promising and representative counties where political level support is in place instead of attempting transformation across all counties appears to be sound and built on lessons learnt.

## Global landscape

**The Adaptation Learning Programme implemented through the NGO channel was instrumental in influencing regional African policies and practices and supporting the development of African positions on the UNFCCC.** ALP worked closely with governments and CSOs to influence and inform national policies, country positions for the Africa Ministerial Conference on the Environment (AMCEN) formulation of the African Common Position and direct participation in the UNFCCC negotiation process. ALP supported planning and facilitation of CSO consultations.

**Projects financed through the NGO channel also led to a strengthening of civil society influence on the global landscape.** An example is that in the UNFCCC context, ALP focused on the Nairobi Work Programme on adaptation, adaptation finance instruments (the Adaptation Fund and GCF) and the NAP process. ALP provided input to CARE's global engagement with UNFCCC and adaptation finance processes (CARE was instrumental with others in lobbying for the GCF decision to allocate 50% of its funding to CCA).

**A potential for sharing and transferring Danish experience on climate change adaptation is evident but not implemented to the same extent as it is for mitigation.** It is clear that mitigation with focus on energy efficiency and use of renewable energy provides a strong case for transfer of Danish know how and technology. The case is not as clear for adaptation, but it is apparent from the projects sampled that there is a potential. For example, the support to the National Environmental Authority (NEMA) there is use of the Danish experience on the regulatory environment with an emphasis on more than just command and control. This is evident not just in the project design but also in the results being achieved e.g. with the success of the voluntary compliance scheme with the private sector.