

Mid-Term Review of the DFID/IDRC Climate Change Adaptation in Africa (CCAA) Research and Capacity Development Programme

Final Report

On behalf of IDRC Canada and DFID

Prepared by:

Andrew Watkinson (Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research)

Smail Khennas (Practical Action Consulting)

Alison Misselhorn

Anthony Footitt (Tyndall Centre for Climate Change Research)

October 2008

Page left intentionally blank

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	iii
ACRONYMS IN THE MAIN REPORT	iv
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Objectives	1
1.3 Structure of the Report	2
2. METHODS USED IN THE MTR IN ADDRESSING THE ABOVE QUESTIONS	3
2.1 Project Level Assessment	3
2.2 Project Level Assessment	3
2.3 Strategic Level Assessment	4
2.3.1 Overview	4
2.3.2 Review of Documentation	4
2.3.3 Consultation with Programme Staff and External Experts	5
2.3.4 Formal and Informal Interviews, Discussions and Field Visits	6
2.3.5 Comments on Strengths and Weaknesses of Approaches	7
3. KEY FINDINGS	8
3.1 Overview	8
3.2 Purpose	8
3.2.1 Degree to Which CCAA Mission and Objectives Are Still Valid	8
3.2.2 Progress towards Achieving Objectives	9
3.2.3 Likelihood of Achieving Objectives within Time Frame	10
3.2.4 Value for Money	11
3.3 Outputs	12
3.3.1 Degree to Which Achieved	12
3.3.2 Quality of Outputs	15
3.3.3 Gender Dimensions	16
3.4 Partnership and Management	16
3.4.1 General Comments	16
3.4.2 IDRC/DFID Partnership	16
3.4.3 Advisory Board Role	17
3.4.4 Links with Other Programmes and Institutions	17
3.4.5 Risk Assessment	17
3.4.6 Effectiveness of M&E systems	17
3.5 External Perceptions	18
3.5.1 Wider Views of Experts and Stakeholders	18
3.5.2 Views on Programme Objectives and Priorities from the Survey	18
3.5.3 Views on Alignment, Targeting and Contribution to the Issues	19
3.5.4 Capacity Building	19
3.5.5 Interactions with Policy and Policymakers	20
3.5.6 Education and Awareness	20
3.5.7 CCAA Approach to Research	20
3.5.8 Views from Informal and Formal Discussions and Interviews	20
4. KEY MESSAGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS	22
4.1 Strategy	22
4.2 Time frame	22
4.3 Start up phase and pre-selection process	22
4.4 Participatory Action Research (PAR)	23

4.5	Capacity building	23
4.6	Knowledge sharing and networking	24
4.7	Outcome mapping	25
4.9	Gender	25
4.9	Monitoring	25
4.10	Programme Management.....	25
5.	CONCLUSIONS	27
Annex One: Project Level Review of the Climate Change Adaptation in Africa and Capacity Development (CCAA) Programme		
Annex Two: Strategic Level Review of the Climate Change Adaptation in Africa and Capacity Development (CCAA) Programme		
Annex 3 – Questionnaires:		
Part 1 – Project Level Questionnaires and Field Visit Interview Guidelines		
Part 2 – Strategy Level Questionnaires and Table of Strategic Issues used for Development		
Annex 4 – Terms of Reference for:		
Project Level Review		
Team Leader		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of the mid term review (MTR) of the Canadian International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID) Climate Change Adaptation in Africa research and capacity development programme (CCAA). It aims to inform on-going work and provide lessons that could be applied to other adaptation initiatives. The report has been prepared by four scientists tasked with evaluating, measuring and reporting on the performance of the Programme to date, suggesting adjustments and commenting on the appropriateness of the current time frame. There have been two core aspects to the work: a 'project level' review of project activities and progress; and a 'strategic level' assessment to critically assess how the objectives, approaches, outputs, and progress in general, meet the needs and climate change priorities for Africa and to assess perceptions of CCAA amongst experts and stakeholders.

The review concludes that the establishment of the CCAA Programme is a timely and significant development in addressing climate change in Africa. The stated objectives remain worthwhile and generally well targeted at the longer-term challenges of climate change adaptation, and capacity building in the region. At the same time the review concludes that there are a number of refinements and improvements that could be made to the delivery of this ambitious programme to help ensure that the programme achieves the stated objectives. In particular, there is a need to place greater emphasis on adaptation to future climate change impacts as opposed to current climate variability.

In general, we consider that the Programme strategy would benefit from refinement in the light of lessons learned from the early stages of the Programme and changes in context since the Programme was originated (such as the availability or lack of outputs from parallel initiatives such as ClimDev). Attention needs to be given to clarifying and 'fleshing out' Programme deliverables, making the elements and tasks (and links between elements) pursuant to these more explicit. Here we consider that the Programme is at a point which calls for defining more precisely what CCAA should and can best deliver. This should include further consideration of how, and the extent to which, it can more robustly address future climate change and climate variability issues. Here we believe that harnessing climate change expertise in South Africa and other international institutions (such as in the UK) would contribute to improving the climate change focus of the programme; increasing support networks within Africa and outside the region; building the much needed research capacity; and, ultimately, devolving 'ownership' of the Programme to African institutions. Here, a clear strategy is needed, including a timeline, to devolve 'ownership' of the CCAA Programme work to African institutions.

The Programme has successfully contributed to capacity building among the institutions and individuals it has touched. The training workshops held under the CCAA have, for example, been particularly beneficial in building the capacity of project teams and encouraging strategic thinking about climate change adaptation. However, more work and more time are required to deliver the strong and geographically widespread capacity of expertise required for sustained impact and effective devolution. Here, there is an inherent contradiction between the Programme and its timescales, namely that the Programme is aiming to develop capacity, but this is fundamentally a long term activity. As such, the investment in building a 'critical mass' of capacity should be viewed as a longer term venture rather than the discrete five year package of the current mandate.

The review provides numerous observations on and specific suggestions for refinements to the programme and its delivery. These include the need to establish stronger networks between the CCAA projects and, in addition between CCAA projects and other climate change adaptation projects and initiatives in the region. Here there is a need to have a better map of the capacity in Africa and the networks that would support climate change adaptation. There is a need to better support the adaptation projects with a platform of climate science and to build the capacity to provide such science from within Africa. Greater use of existing expertise in, for example, South Africa, as well as stronger linkages with expertise outside the region may benefit both the performance of the individual projects under the Programme and promote the development of longer term and sustained capacity in Africa.

ACRONYMS IN THE MAIN REPORT

CCAA.....	Climate Change Adaptation in Africa
DEFRA.....	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom
DFID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
IDRC	International Development Research Centre (Canada)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Mid Term Review
OM	Outcome Mapping
PAR	Participatory Action Research
PMU.....	Program Management
PO.....	Programme Officer
TOR	Terms of Reference
UK.....	United Kingdom
UKCIP	United Kingdom Climate Impacts Programme

ACRONYMS IN ANNEX 1

AfDB	African Development Bank
CILSS:	Permanent Inter-States Committee to Control Drought in the Sahel
CMA.....	Catchment Management Agency
ECCAS /CEEAC,	Economic Community of Central African States
ECOWAS.....	Economic Community of West African States
ENDA-Maghreb	Environment and Development- Maghreb
IDID-ONG	Initiative pour un Développement Durable, Organisation non Gouvernementale, Benin
INERA	Institut de l'Environnement et Recherche Agricoles (INERA)
MGC	Memorandum of Grant Conditions
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
PARBCC	Projet de renforcement des capacités d'Adaptation des Acteurs Ruraux Béninois face aux Changements Climatiques (project 104142, Benin)
UNECA	United Nations Economic Commission for Africa
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
VAT.....	Value Added Tax
WAEMU (UEMOA)	West African Economic and Monetary Union

ACRONYMS IN ANNEX 2

AMCEN.....	African Ministerial Conference on Environment
AMCOW.....	African Ministers' Council on Water
FEMA.....	Forum of Energy Ministers of Africa

CCAA.....	Climate Change Adaptation in Africa
DEFRA.....	Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom
DFID	United Kingdom Department for International Development
IAC.....	Integrated Assessment Models
IDRC	International Development Research Centre (Canada)
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
MTR	Mid Term Review
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
OVI.....	Outcome Verifiable Indicators
MOVs.....	Means of Verification
PAR	Participatory Action Research
PMU.....	Program Management
TOR	Terms of Reference
UK.....	United Kingdom
UKCIP	United Kingdom Climate Impacts Programme

Page left intentionally blank

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

The Climate Change Adaptation in Africa (CCAA) research and capacity development Programme was launched in 2006 and is jointly funded by the Canadian International Development Research Centre (IDRC) and the UK Department for International Development (DFID). It is hosted and managed by IDRC from headquarters in Ottawa and three regional offices in Africa. Its current mandate is for five years of programming activity gradually devolving to African institutions, with initial funding of approximately £ 33 million.

The CCAA has four main objectives:

- To strengthen the capacity of African scientists, organizations, decision-makers and others to contribute to adaptation to climate change.
- To support adaptation by rural and urban people, particularly the most vulnerable, through action research.
- To generate a better shared understanding of the findings of scientists and research institutes on climate variability and change.
- To inform policy processes with good quality science-based knowledge.

These are supported by a variety of initiatives and activities under the general headings of:

- Participatory action research (PAR);
- Communications and networking; and
- Education and training.

When DFID and IDRC signed a Memorandum of Understanding initiating the five year CCAA Programme they agreed that a mid term review (MTR) would be completed during 2008. This timing was to ensure that the MTR would inform the on-going CCAA program, and that lessons from CCAA's initial stages could be applied to the start-up of similar IDRC/DFID climate change adaptation Programmes in Asia and Latin America.

1.2 Objectives

Between March and August 2008, a team of four scientists were tasked with evaluating, measuring and reporting on the performance of the CCAA Programme to date and, therein, producing the MTR. In so doing, the broad purpose has been to measure and report on performance to date and, based on this, to indicate adjustments that may need to be made to ensure the success of the research Programmes. The MTR has also sought to assess the appropriateness of the current five-year time frame, given the program's overall purpose and strategy, plus its outputs and progress to date.

In considering this, there were two core aspects to the work, with two team members undertaking a 'project level' review of activities and progress, and assisting the other two individuals as appropriate with a more strategic review of the Programme and its objectives.

Work on the MTR has been guided by the Terms of Reference (TOR) and discussions with a steering group comprised of IDRC and DFID representatives (and Advisory Board Members). The TOR is provided in Annex 4 and the following areas of enquiry were developed from it and discussions with the Steering Group:

In reviewing the CCAA purpose:

1. Degree to which CCAA's mission, goals and objectives remain valid.
2. Progress toward achieving the mission, goal and objectives.
3. Likelihood of them being achieved during the period of the Programme, and after the current grant period.
4. Extent to which the Programme represents value for money.

In reviewing the CCAA outputs:

1. Degree to which the outputs have been achieved and likelihood of achieving them by the end of the current grant period.
2. Quality outputs to date as perceived by the appropriate sectoral/regional experts, intended audiences, users and/or stakeholders.
3. Degree to which the outputs capture the gender dimensions of the research topic.

In reviewing partnership and management:

1. The effectiveness of the IDRC / DFID partnership in supporting the Programme.
2. The role and contribution of the Advisory Board to the CCAA program.
3. Links with related research or influencing Programmes or institutions that would increase the probability of the Research Programme meeting its objectives.
4. Lessons from the start-up process involving DFID, IDRC and African experts, which could be relevant in the development of future climate change and adaptation programs.
5. Effectiveness of CCAA's M&E systems.
6. Risk assessment of the research Programme.

1.3 Structure of the Report

The report is structured as much possible around the lines of enquiry given above and incorporating the requirements for the report outlines in the TOR; namely that it should be no longer than 26 pages but should describe the methodology used (and its limitations), the findings and the conclusions, and recommendations that can be drawn from these.

Accordingly, Section 2 describes the methodological approaches in both the project and strategic level reviews while Section 3 summarises findings from this work. Here, findings have been drawn from material presented in the Annexes. For the purposes of clarity, the project and strategic level assessments (provided in Annexes 1 and 2 respectively) have been provided as much as possible as standalone documents. As such, given the restricted space in this main report, the findings presented in Section 3 represent a brief synopsis of what we regard as the key messages. There is, inevitably, additional information in the Annexes that will be of use in considering possible refinements and improvements to the Programme and its delivery and it is recommended that this main report is read in conjunction with the Annexes.

Section 4, provides key messages and recommendations, and Section 5 a brief summary conclusion.

2. METHODS USED IN THE MTR IN ADDRESSING THE ABOVE QUESTIONS

2.1 Overview

As noted in Section 1.2, work on the MTR has been divided into questions concerning performance of the Programme at a project and project management level, and also at a more strategic level.

2.2 Project Level Assessment

The project level assessment of the MTR made use of a range of methods with the aim of yielding a balanced view of the CCAA Programme's progress and performance.

A number of research questions were developed from the TOR and CCAA documentation, and these were tabulated and used to guide all the MTR activities in their assessment of both components of the review (project level and strategic level assessments). The principles of Outcome Mapping were also considered in the development of the questions. These tabulated questions, developed at the outset, offered a valuable, common reference document for all the proceeding work.

The activities of the project level assessment of the MTR included the following, which are described in more detail in Appendix 1:

- A desktop study of secondary information sources. This included a review of available Programme documentation, including, but not limited to, the inception phase report; the Program's risk assessment; results frameworks and monitoring data; project portfolio; research Programme annual reports; and project outputs, particularly communications materials and outputs that aim for policy influence.

The IDRC sent a CD via mail to each member of the MTR team which contained many of the documents reviewed for the MTR. In addition, access was granted to the IDRC Intranet. These sources offered considerable secondary information. A weakness, however, was the documents on the CD took some time to 'get around'. Access to the intranet was also considerably delayed due to technical problems, and once access was gained it was not always easy to find the useful links amid the vast amount of information, while at the same time information about some projects was limited or missing altogether.

- Administration of a 'Project Manager' questionnaire. This was employed as a formal interview tool during field visits, and was also administered via email and/or telephone to those projects that were not visited.

This comprehensive questionnaire drew valuable views from project managers and project teams on the full spectrum of issues required to be addressed by the MTR. One challenge, however, was that some projects had to be excluded from the evaluation due to inability to get responses from the Project Managers. This may have been in part due to the necessarily comprehensive nature of the questionnaire. Also, due to time constraints, the multi-regional projects were excluded from this evaluation, with the exception of the Burkina Faso project.

- Administration of a 'Programme Officer and Programme Manager Questionnaire'. This was employed as a formal interview tool during field visits, and was also administered via email and telephonically where necessary.

- Interviews with project teams as well as other stakeholders on field visits.

In considering the strengths of the field visits: they provided a very rich source of information for the review, enabling nuanced glimpses of project contexts, and the development of a flow of communication between project leaders and the assessors, and in some cases between other stakeholders and the assessors.

In considering weaknesses: due to time and cost constraints and the limited availability of the MTR team members and Project Managers, as well as other logistical issues, not all those projects visited fitted the selection criteria perfectly (see Annex 1). (For example, MTR team members made use of unrelated visits to CCAA countries to meet with any available CCAA Project Managers if possible.)

- Inherent in all of these approaches and activities was an examination of how projects were addressing gender issues. In reflecting on the strengths and weaknesses of the methods, gender was very difficult to assess using the methods developed and probably required the development of a specific tool tailored for its examination. Under the time constraints of the MTR this would not, however, have been possible.

2.3 Strategic Level Assessment

2.3.1 Overview

The Strategic Level Assessment element of the MTR has sought to gain wider insight into the issues, problems, successes and shortcomings associated with developing and implementing the CCAA Programme as a whole. In so doing, the principal objectives of this element of the MTR have been to quickly, but critically:

- assess how the Programme objectives, approaches, outputs (and progress in general) meet the needs and climate change priorities for Africa; and
- evaluate perceptions of CCAA amongst experts and stakeholders.

From the outset it is important to be aware that the all elements of the MTR are necessarily constrained by time and budget. The resources granted to the two individuals conducting the strategic element of the MTR amount to a total of 20 days to include the drawing together of findings from the project level review, the production of reports, delivery of early findings at the Advisory Board meeting and a three day field visit – reducing the number of days to actually undertake the research component substantially. Given the obvious constraints on time, the approach to the strategic analysis was tailored specifically to cover as much ground in the shortest time possible. For this reason the approach was forced to rely heavily on questionnaire surveys to elicit views from the largest number individuals/stakeholders possible. The approach taken can be summarised in terms of the following three interrelated work elements:

- review of Programme and other documentation;
- formal consultation with Programme staff and external experts/stakeholders using questionnaire surveys; and
- formal and informal interviews (including a field visit) and 'testing of the waters' with a range of experts and expert groups.

Work and the approach taken under these various elements are described briefly in the subsections below.

2.3.2 Review of Documentation

Review of documentation was the first (and critical) element of the review since it was this that guided the parallel process of consultation. The team were given access to both the IDRC Intranet and the 'Livelink' records server and a variety of other documentation. These

resources amount to several hundreds of documents on a variety of issues associated with the Programme.

Clearly, within the time and days available, a thorough review of every document would not have been feasible and the review of documentation was prioritised towards documents that could provide detailed information on, and clearer insights into, issues including:

- where the Programme came from;
- why the objectives and goals were identified;
- how the Programme was set up to address these objectives and goals;
- what issues/obstacles needed to be addressed/overcome; and
- how these issues have been or are being addressed.

Such core information provided the background detail and issues for consideration as part of the wider consultation and, in particular, the drawing up of questionnaires targeted to specific Programme issues and objectives for further exploration and examination.

2.3.3 Consultation with Programme Staff and External Experts

Overview

As noted earlier, the approach was forced to rely heavily on questionnaire surveys to elicit views from the largest number individuals/stakeholders possible on specific programme issues in the shortest time possible. This survey approach was combined with a number of formal and informal open-ended interviews with a number of individuals on the subject of the programme and the issue of climate change adaptation and Africa as a whole. The mixture of specific questions and open-ended discussions was thought to be the most likely to satisfy the criteria of wide scope and detail within the short time available.

Documentation and Information Supporting the Development of Questionnaires

The review of documentation was prioritised towards providing input to the development of a questionnaire that would cover all of the issues and permit the measurement of progress and the successes and limitations of the Programme to date.

Thus the most important documents were the Programme Strategy (and the accompanying 'Logframe' of indicators) and the Report summarising the consultation on the initial proposals for the CCAA Programme. Particular attention was paid to isolating exactly what CCAA was seeking to achieve, how it was seeking to achieve it, what the issues and constraints were, and how these were expected to be overcome within the Programme.

When reviewing these it quickly became apparent that the strategy and Logframe is not presented in a way that is conducive to explicit measurement of objectives or determining whether or when these objectives will be met. As such, the task of gauging levels of 'successful contribution' in progress and performance in relation to the Programme required for this MTR demanded an alternative approach. This approach drew instead on a thorough review of the strategy to isolate to the extent possible what actions had been identified in pursuance of the objectives and how these linked together to meet both the specific objectives and general goal of the programme.

Questionnaire Development and Approach – 'Internal' CCAA Programme Staff

Core strategic documents were reviewed for information on approaches, objectives, assumptions, constraints, etc. Questions relating to each issue were developed with a view to identifying the progress, success, completion and issues for each element. The resulting list of questions was inevitably long, detailed and covered a variety of issues that, in most cases, could only be answered (within the timescales) by those managing and implementing the Programme. The number of questions was distilled down into a questionnaire developed for 'internal' stakeholders (provided in Annex 3). This was sent to 13 CCAA program staff and leaders at IDRC, three collaborating staff from other parts of IDRC, and four directors. In

addition, the questionnaire was sent to eight DFID staff involved with the Programme. All were offered the opportunity to respond confidentially (and several respondents did so on this basis).

There were some complaints as to the detail of the questioning (which we see as unavoidable given the balance between the large quantity of information required and the modest resources for the study). However 14 responses were received of which 12 answered all or the majority of questions in detail. Responses were principally from the core IDRC staff that we expected, in any case, were most likely to have most of the answers to most of the questions. Two of the 14 responses were received from DFID. However, a meeting with the core DFID staff was undertaken later in the study to gain their insights on the Programme.

The response rate was not quite as high as anticipated from the Programme level staff but the responses do, nonetheless, provide some good insight into the issues.

Questionnaire Development and Approach – ‘External’ Stakeholder Perceptions of CCAA

A part of the team’s remit was to identify the profile that CCAA has developed amongst wider experts and stakeholders and their perceptions of it (and its successes and shortcomings). A questionnaire was developed based on a split level of questioning. The first part asked five simple general questions concerning the objectives, priorities, targeting, and perceptions of the Programme and the second (optional) part asked more detailed questions for those with the time, inclination and knowledge. The questionnaire is provided in Annex 3.

In terms of the ‘external’ stakeholders consulted, a master list of consultees was developed by identifying conferences, workshops and other events that have taken place in recent years on the subject of climate change and adaptation in Africa. The result was a final list of some 450 individuals, the vast majority of which are Africans working in Africa on climate change at varying levels (and including those 50 or so individuals consulted as part of work on the initial proposals). All were given the option to provide a confidential response (which several did).

From the 450 sent out, close to 50 completed questionnaires were received, 36 failed to reach their intended recipients (email failures), and six responses indicated that the respondents didn’t have sufficient knowledge of CCAA to be able to comment on the programme. As discussed in Annex 2, there is some evidence from both the questionnaire returns and from our informal discussions to suggest that a lack of awareness of the programme and its objectives may be at least partly responsible for the relatively low response rate (despite the two reminders that were sent out).

2.3.4 Formal and Informal Interviews, Discussions and Field Visits

In addition to work reviewing documentation and wide consultation with questionnaires, a number of formal (organised) and informal discussions took place with a view to exploring issues and perceptions of, particularly, external stakeholders and experts.

More formal (organised) discussions have included meetings with DFID representatives, the CCAA Advisory Board as well as interviews undertaken in relation to field visits (reported on in the Annex on Project Level investigations). Andrew Watkinson also visited projects in Benin and discussed multi-region training projects in Geneva with Annie Roncerel.

In addition to events and meetings organised specifically to discuss CCAA, more informal discussions on the Programme have been a feature of visits to a variety of climate change events and meetings in the UK and, for example, Southern Africa. These have included:

- Global Humanitarian Forum (Geneva);
- Ecosystem Services and Poverty Alleviation workshop (Cape Town);
- DFID Advisor’s retreat (Cambridge);
- Met Office Climate Change Workshop (Exeter); and
- DFID/DSA Policy Forum (Greenwich).

These meetings enabled discussions with representatives from a range of organisations including government (Defra, DFID, and Dar es Salaam City Council), Universities (e.g. Cambridge, Cape Town, Edinburgh, Sussex) and the third sector (e.g. Christian Aid, Oxfam, Rockefeller Institute, South South North).

2.3.5 Comments on Strengths and Weaknesses of Approaches

In terms of the strengths and weaknesses of the approaches taken, the need to rely heavily on surveys to cover the issues at a sufficient level of detail with a broad range of stakeholders in a short time introduces a level of risk with achieving a large enough return. As noted previously, the reliance on surveys was forced in part by the relatively small number of days allotted to the Strategic Review and Team Leader task as a whole. In the event, the quality of the returns was high and the number of returns sufficient to deliver far more (and consistent) information on individual stakeholder's views on a range of topics than could have been gathered by the next best alternative, namely interviews. There would have been benefit to following up questionnaires with interviews but, in the event, there was neither time nor budget to permit this. The development of questionnaires from the strategy documents and initial work to establish the Programme worked well and, we believe, highlighted a number of issues in relation to the direction of the Programme that might otherwise have remained 'buried'. In doing this we followed a number of 'leads' and 'impressions' gathered from initial discussions with a few individuals, a request to the Advisory Board members and internal documentation (such as minutes). This allowed us to retain a freedom and independence to pursue issues that we believed needed investigating and, we believe, has identified some important and useful findings. The formal and informal interviews and the field visit all helped to bring the elements together, developing a greater appreciation of the issues and contexts as well as identifying issues and explanations for observations made elsewhere.

3. KEY FINDINGS

3.1 Overview

A summary of work and findings from the project level and strategic level assessments is provided in Annexes 1 and 2 respectively. This section of the report provides the key findings from the assessments.

As noted in Section 1.3, given the restricted space in this main report, the findings presented in this section represent a brief synopsis of what are regarded as the key messages. Additional information in the Annexes is likely to be of use in considering possible refinements and improvements to the Programme and its delivery. It is thus recommended that this main report is read in conjunction with the Annexes, which provide further detail and background. It should be noted that the MTR has focussed on areas for potential improvement in the Programme and thus, inevitably, there is a tendency to focus more on specific areas of weakness rather than specific strengths. Here, we believe that the establishment of the CCAA Programme is a significant and valuable development in addressing climate change in Africa, and its overall objectives remain worthwhile and generally well targeted at the long term challenges of climate change adaptation in the region.

As much as possible reporting of findings has been organised under the general headings of purpose, outputs and partnership and management as per the general structure of enquiry set out in Section 1.2 and as required of MTR reports.

3.2 Purpose

3.2.1 Degree to Which CCAA Mission and Objectives Are Still Valid

Project level perspective

For the project level component of the MTR, projects reviewed appear to have objectives that are firstly still directly in line with the overall objectives of the CCAA Programme, and secondly which are generally still in line with the needs of those whom the projects aim to benefit.

However, there are a number of additional needs that have come into focus. This is partly because as some needs begin to be addressed (such as capacity building), needs naturally begin to shift. It may also be because as people's awareness of climate change issues increases, so does their capacity to accurately assess and voice their own needs.

Strategic level perspective

From a strategic perspective, the objectives are not only valid but are worthy and are likely to continue to be so indefinitely. The need for adaptation research is rising rapidly up the political agenda and, key documents such as the recent IPCC report on climate change in Africa (<http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar4/wg2/ar4-wg2-chapter9.pdf>) have highlighted that climate change and variability and associated disaster risks have the potential to seriously hamper future development and the attainment of the Millennium Development Goals.

In addressing the issue of adaptation to climate change and variability the IPCC report also identifies that *'urgent' and 'creative' interactions (e.g., greater interactions between users and producers of science, stakeholder interactions, communication, institutional design, etc.) will be required. Much could also be gained by greater interactions between those from the disaster risk-reduction, development, and climate-science communities.* The establishment of the CCAA Programme was therefore timely and responding to a clearly identified need.

3.2.2 Progress towards Achieving Objectives

Project level perspective

For the project level assessment, among all the projects, CCAA objectives have only been achieved to varying degrees. This is attributable to the timing of the Mid Term Review, to unexpected training needs delaying the start of some projects, and in some instances to 'teething' problems with financial arrangements (Please see Annex 1).

It is clear from the project level review that the Programme has significantly raised awareness about climate change adaptation among their stakeholder groups. However, a significant shortcoming to date is the absence of networking between CCAA projects as well as between CCAA projects and other climate change adaptation projects in the region.

Strategic level perspective

The Programme is clearly ambitious in its objectives and wide in scope. In common with the PAR approach that is embedded within it, the Programme and Programme staff have themselves been involved in a 'learning by doing' exercise, making fine adjustments to focus, priorities and approach as the Programme has progressed. In this way, and as might be expected from such an ambitious Programme, the management and operation of the Programme itself has had to adapt to the situation on the ground in order to deliver success. For example, despite the initial groundwork done in developing the Programme, the levels of capacity to undertake climate change adaptation research were lower than expected and more time and instruction was required to develop the initial proposals submitted by researchers.

The Programme strategy, as currently presented, perhaps reflects the rather 'fuzzy' nature of what was known about conditions on the ground at start-up but also the nature of the objectives, namely to build capacity, for which identifying what constitutes 'enough' capacity is clearly difficult at best. Accordingly, the phrasing of the objectives of the Programme and the elements supporting them is more along the line of statements of intent rather than specific and measurable objectives supported by explicit tasks. The 'open-ended' wording of the Programme strategy (described above) is also reflected in the Logframe indicators which, from the perspective of monitoring effectiveness are also rather vague, largely open ended and only provide a quick insight into distance travelled. They say little about whether the route taken is an optimum one and whether more could be done to optimise efforts. A further aspect of the Logframe is that few of the Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs) and associated Means of Verification (MOVs) differentiate between benefits specifically delivered by the CCAA Programme versus those (also) generated from elsewhere or by a general motivation towards incorporating climate change into decision making, policy documentation etc. There is also no obvious baseline from which measure progress. Thus, at present, it is difficult to estimate the magnitude of benefits/effectiveness of the programme itself and isolate this from any general moves.

Put simply, whilst there may be nothing wrong with the strategic thinking behind the programme, the strategy as written lacks detail on exactly how each aspect is best achieved and how issues will be dealt with and the accompanying Logframe indicators may be too general to be able to identify specifically where the Programme might be able to perform better.

Now that the Programme is 'off the ground'; there is a clearer picture of how the territory lies and how the contexts have changed since the Programme was originated (such as the fact that other initiatives such as ClimDev have not yet come to fruition), there is the opportunity to consider more precisely what CCAA should (and can best) deliver and revisit, flesh out and refine the strategy into the specific sub-objectives, goals and tasks that support this. Here, there is a need to map out and make the links between the different elements more explicit so as to more easily identify how the elements slot together, which elements are conditional on one another, what progress is being made with each, where more (or less) effort is required, and, therein, how best to optimise efforts. In our view, the Logframe indicators should be based on any appropriate quantitative or semi-quantitative measures of performance/success that can be attached to the sub-objectives and tasks. One could consider the use of a Multi-

Criteria Analysis approach to assess overall performance if that is what is required of the Logframe.

In terms of commenting on progress with objectives, a number of activities underpin and deliver the objectives and thus comment on progress is provided in the section on outputs (Section 3.3). Overall progress with objectives has been judged from the survey of Programme Officers and external stakeholders. Here, Programme Officers' responses suggest that most progress has been under the objective of "strengthening capacity to contribute to adaptation to climate change and least to informing policy with science based knowledge". Consistent with this, the responses suggest that informing policy with science based knowledge needs to be given greater priority. The following brief observations can be made about progress and achievement under each objective:

- ***Strengthening the capacity of African scientists, organizations, decision-makers and others to contribute to adaptation to climate change*** – Most progress in CCAA has been under this objective but, in future, perhaps while not reducing the priorities, greater emphasis needs to be given to other objectives as well. Programme Officers' responses indicate average 77% likelihood that the objective will be achieved within the timescales.
- ***Supporting adaptation by rural and urban people, particularly the most vulnerable, through action research*** - Progress has been made (although less than above) and efforts need to be maintained. Respondents recorded an average 63% chance that the objective would be accomplished within the timescales, although there is a significant amount of disagreement between respondents concerning this, with 30% of responses indicating a less than 40% chance.
- ***Generating a better shared understanding of the findings of scientists and research institutes on climate variability and change*** - Progress has been made and efforts need to be maintained. Respondents recorded an average 70% chance that the objective would be accomplished within the timescales, although there is some disagreement between respondents concerning this.
- ***Informing policy processes with good quality science-based knowledge*** - Progress is much slower and greater priority needs to be given to this objective. Respondents recorded an average 53% chance that the objective would be accomplished within the timescales, although there is some disagreement between respondents concerning this and half the respondent's record 50% chance or less.

In addition to objectives, Programme Officers were asked to indicate the relative priorities for the different activities supporting the objectives (PAR, Communications and Networking, and education and training). Programme Officer's responses suggest that much emphasis has been given to the PAR aspects of meeting the objectives and respondents combined view is that more emphasis also needs to be given to the development of communications and networking and also education and training (while not scaling down efforts on PAR). This may reflect the fact that the Programme is still only part way through its five year period since more emphasis on the PAR elements might be expected before the communications, education and training are developed further. These elements of communication, education and training are partly aimed at disseminating outcomes and lessons to other areas and as such also speak to the objective of developing a 'critical mass of researchers'.

3.2.3 Likelihood of Achieving Objectives within Time Frame

The objectives of the Programme all relate to capacity building. Whilst the CCAA has already contributed to the development of capacity, as noted previously it is difficult to determine at what point 'enough' capacity has been developed to consider the objectives achieved.

However, it is clear from both project level and strategic level reviews that the Programme needs to be given more time than is currently assigned to it to achieve its stated objectives. More time is needed, for example, to deliver the 'critical mass' of researchers that will ensure

that “the additional expertise/capacity gained by training young African scientists/experts is sustained in the longer-term and within Africa”. In particular, the likelihood of successful devolution of ‘ownership’ of projects or project goals by African institutions is extremely unlikely within the timeframe. From project level feedback, it was expressed repeatedly that further support would be necessary beyond the life of the project for devolution to become a reality. Ongoing training (beyond the current time frame), and the identification of African institutions / ‘centres of excellence’ will be necessary if the CCAA Programme is to make a real and sustainable contribution to the long term capacity of the region to adapt to climate change. In addition, it will be necessary to allow time to forge and/or strengthen linkages between climate change adaptation efforts in Africa and between African institutions in all spheres; i.e. civil society; science and research institutions; government organisations etc.

More time is also required for true participatory research and learning, since this takes many years of relationship building and institutional linkages, and there is a risk that the time frame precludes the long term benefits of PAR becoming apparent.

A further concern with the timeframe is that the last 36 month research projects CCAA will be closing in the same period as the whole program, and this implies potential risks of hurried project closures, the loss of lessons learned, and problems with devolution.

In light of the above there is a clear risk that the relatively short life span of the projects in relation to the very long term goals of the Programme will leave the CCAA Programme objectives unmet.

3.2.4 Value for Money

Value for money is extremely difficult to assess without having the time or tools to answer the broader questions such as ‘What are the alternative ways of spending the same amount of money?’ and ‘How do you assign a worthwhile monetary value to capacity building and setting in place foundations for stronger capacity to adapt in years to come?’

From both components of the review it is clear that the Programme represents a high investment in a potentially high return area. This investment is likely to be worthwhile if:

- institutional linkages are strengthened;
- the question of mechanisms in the Programme to facilitate devolution of ownership is attended to urgently; and
- support is not withdrawn before adequate foundations are in place to ensure long term returns.

More broadly, the Programme has set out to achieve the delivery of better and self sustaining capacity in Africa and, as such, value for money is contingent upon ultimately achieving the ‘critical mass’ that is required (see notes about the timeframe above). In this way, a failure to make the appropriate investments to achieve this would risk the long term loss of capacity already developed. This implies that not only are more time and a longer-term investment required, but also that the strategy might seek to refine and define its boundaries in terms of, say, what might constitute ‘enough’ capacity, what mechanisms and institutional arrangements CCAA would like to leave in place, etc.

In this way, commenting on value for money of the programme implies two questions, namely, does the Programme represent value for money? and are there refinements that could be made that would make it better value for money?

The answer to the first is an issue of whether investment to date in the Programme has been worthwhile, to which the short answer is yes for all of the reasons that we have outlined in other sections and, in particular Section 3.2.1 which identifies the fact that the Programme seeks to address identified needs in respect of climate change and adaptation. As noted there, In addressing the issue of adaptation to climate change the IPCC report identifies that *‘urgent’ and ‘creative’ interactions (e.g., greater interactions between users and producers of science, stakeholder interactions, communication, institutional design, etc.) will be required.*

Much could also be gained by greater interactions between those from the disaster risk-reduction, development, and climate-science communities". On this basis, one can conclude that the Programme represents value for money in the context of whether the investment is worthwhile but would add the caveat that, as regards timescales, to achieve the best value for money one should be regarding the investment as being longer term rather than a discrete, one-off package of a five year programme.

As regards the second question, namely whether refinements could be made that might maximise the (cost)-effectiveness of the Programme, we believe that there are always ways of maximising benefits and, throughout the report, we have provided a number of areas where we believe further refinements might be sought

3.3 Outputs

3.3.1 Degree to Which Achieved

Project level perspective

As noted above, the timing of the MTR means that many of the planned outputs have yet to be achieved. At present, from the project level evaluation, it remains to be seen whether the CCAA Programme will effectively support adaptation by rural and urban people, particularly vulnerable groups, and inform relevant and beneficial policy development. However, on the whole, the inclusion of key stakeholder groups appears to have been adequately addressed by most projects, and this is likely to provide a strong grounding for the achievement of the CCAA objectives. There has been a clear effort by project teams to develop relationships with key government institutions as well as civil society organisations.

As noted above, the likelihood of successful devolution of 'ownership' of projects to African institutions, however, is less clear. It was expressed repeatedly that further support would be necessary beyond the life of the project for devolution to become a reality.

Finally, no question in the Project Manager or Programme Officer questionnaires was directed at this issue of distinguishing long term climate change with 'normal' or cyclical *climate variability*. The Malaria prediction model project (104707) and the South African project on Managing Climate Risk to Agriculture and Water Resources (104150) have a more clearly defined focus on climate change than those projects that are working more directly with rural communities to strengthen adaptation. This is also because the latter projects are interested in, among other foci, current and historical community adaptation strategies to both climate variability and (where applicable) climate change and such strategies are frequently indistinguishable.

Strategic level perspective

In terms of strategic level perspectives, the Programme's objectives are supported by a range of activities and an effort has been made to isolate and identify progress, areas for attention, further work and linkages. Findings for each are provided below.

Researcher and Institutional Capacity

With the experience gained over the first years of operation, there is now the opportunity within the Programme to frame capacity issues more explicitly and to plan accordingly. As is noted above, at present the strategy does not make it explicit how the various elements are linking (or will link) together to develop the whole package.

In terms of the research capacity, Programme officers (and external stakeholders) believe that CCAA is having some impact on the increase in the number of researchers with the necessary skills and capacity. However, there is a need for more targeted groundwork to identify more deliberately where the existing capacity is that can be enhanced, and where it needs to be developed. From here it may be possible to identify how best to use one to develop the other.

Programme officers' responses also suggest some uncertainty as to whether there is sufficient contingency in CCAA at present to sustain ongoing activity and ensure that "the community of practice on climate change adaptation" is able to sustain itself beyond the current timescale of CCAA. The fact that a number of respondents believe that the time taken to deliver the 'critical mass' of researchers that is key to delivering this is likely to take longer than the five initial years of CCAA, reflects an inherent contradiction in the Programme (and its timescales). Namely, as noted by the Programme Leader, the Programme is aiming to develop capacity, but - especially in the light of the chequered history of capacity development in Africa - this is fundamentally a long term activity.

Survey responses indicate that CCAA could more successfully build links between the people/institutions with existing and new capacities and on-going and/or new projects. Clearly, the more that CCAA can successfully build links between the people/institutions with existing and new capacities and on-going and/or new projects, build networks and develop centres of excellence, the more likely it is that capacity will be retained, that a 'critical mass' will be reached, and that CCAA will have a strong more self sustaining legacy. It is worth noting that the inevitably wide geographical coverage of the CCAA spreads efforts fairly thinly on the ground and there may be a risk that pockets of developed capacity are separated by geography and context enough to impede the development of a critical mass of researchers. Consideration may need to be given to the extent to which networks and centres of excellence can overcome this, versus the need to perhaps focus efforts more on a selection of areas that can act as 'beacons' for good practice, capacity and the ongoing dissemination of knowledge and expertise to other areas.

In terms of developing centres of excellence within Africa, as with other elements of CCAA, it is still early in the Programme to judge progress, but responses from Programme officers suggest that there is a little progress in developing virtual centres of expertise in Africa as part of delivering a longer term legacy from the Programme. However, the survey of external stakeholders suggests less confidence concerning the development of centres of excellence, and here confidence in the legacy of CCAA is not as strong. In light of this, effort needs to be taken to ensure that as much researcher capacity as possible is retained once it is developed. Further, while negative external responses may be an issue of perception only, together with points raised previously this nevertheless emphasizes the need for the Programme to raise its profile outside those not intimately involved with it and, in particular, with professionals working on climate change in Africa and elsewhere.

Finally, with regard to the role of institutions and expertise outside Africa, responses suggest that there has indeed been some limited use of international collaborations. While a few instances of collaboration with international institutions have been identified to us, we still regard this as representing a limited use of the resources that reside outside Africa. There is an opportunity to make use of such resources, whether they be on climate modelling, climate impact prediction, vulnerability, adaptation or other and, in so doing, promote the transfer of knowledge and expertise to individuals and institutions in Africa. A particular area where expertise would be beneficial would seem to be climate prediction where, as noted elsewhere, there is an issue as to the extent to which the Programme and its projects are addressing existing climate variability versus future climate change (and variability). Clearly, when seeking to engage and capture expertise from outside, there are issues and difficulties of ensuring that overall control remains with individuals and institutions in the region of work and that the transfer of knowledge and expertise is permanent. However, it will be worth considering how these might best be overcome as part of opening the flow of appropriate information and expertise where it is otherwise lacking or low. Capacity cannot be built in isolation and without appropriate regional and international support networks.

Networks, Dissemination and Capacity

In relation to the exporting of knowledge gained from undertaking projects and disseminating findings, the Programme is only part way through and is thus still generating this knowledge and findings.

In general, the nature of the research methods (PAR) promotes the forging of links between people and institutions at a project level. The added value of CCAA lies in the extent to which it can make the links between the various project teams, institutions and individuals involved in the Programme as a whole, and individuals and stakeholders outside the Programme. Work in this area is ongoing and development of networks has been identified in the survey of Programme officers as a priority for future work. Here it can be expected that as projects develop in number, maturity and outputs, developing of networks will be facilitated. It is important to nurture these as soon as possible and to engage the research community more explicitly.

As is alluded to above, as well as sharing information and promoting knowledge transfer, the development of networks is important in binding the 'community of practice' together and retaining the capacity developed under CCAA. Networks are likely to be a critical way of delivering the longer-term goal of CCAA and they require careful planning to ensure inclusion of different types of practitioners and stakeholders together with researchers. Although work is acknowledged as ongoing, there is perhaps a need for greater awareness inside and outside CCAA of, for example, the 'D-group' where discussions on climate change adaptation are held and is open to all who enrol.

Organisational Capacity Building and Devolution

The ultimate devolution of the Programme to Africa is an underlying goal, as well as an indicator of Programme success. In part, devolution is partly dependent on the level of individual and institutional capacity that is developed over the lifetime of the Programme. The devolution strategy was to be produced in March 2008 pursuant on eventual devolution of the Programme in 2010; but the strategy has not been completed and it is unclear when it will be. The devolution strategy clearly requires tighter integration with other elements of the Programme strategy and as part of a clear work Programme for delivery (whether within the original 2010 timescale or beyond it).

Research & Research Focus

The initial consultation suggested that there was a need to draw from research on vulnerability to climate change in Africa in order to identify important results, lessons learnt and research gaps to be filled by CCAA. Drawing on Programme Officers views, it is clear that while this has been undertaken, there is much room for more work to identify vulnerabilities in different regions and sectors (including beyond the 'usual suspects' such as agriculture) and an accompanying greater focus on the issues of greatest concern. Here, for example, the links and disconnections between existing climate variability and future climate change may need to be made more explicit to better identify research needs and opportunities.

In terms of the groundwork for the above, the initial consultation identified a number of studies/types of studies that could/should be undertaken as part of and to inform CCAA. Work is ongoing or complete for all of these with the exception of the production of improved and downscaled regional climate predictions/scenarios, clearly a core element of identifying future needs and priorities at Programme and project level. This element was to be delivered through the 'sister' Programme ClimDev which is still to be agreed, finalised and put in place. This would seem to be most unfortunate and probably serves to reduce the effectiveness of CCAA or at least make it much more difficult for CCAA to identify and/or demonstrate that its efforts are directed at clearly identified climate change priorities. While CCAA and CCAA staff have advanced the Programme and got CCAA 'off the ground', it would benefit immensely from its sister Programme particularly if this draws on CCAA experiences and is formulated in such a way as to optimise crossover between the two.

Doing Participatory Action Research (PAR)

The assumption (in the strategy) that stakeholders are willing to engage in dialogue and are open to shared learning is holding in practice. As might be expected, some stakeholders

appear less willing than others (with academics as well as policymakers being mentioned in the survey). However, CCAA seems to be making progress on bringing disparate groups together. While it is still early, it seems that success is likely to breed greater success in future as the Programme builds momentum.

In terms of the extent to which PAR projects are successfully drawing from/making use of scientific research, Programme Officers believe that CCAA is moderately to highly successful owing partly to the fact that the PAR inherently aims to bring scientists and practitioners together.

In terms of the success of the Programme at exporting learning/solutions/adaptation options identified through action research, projects have not yet reached the point of having findings to disseminate. The general view from Programme Officers is, however, that the projects will be successful at disseminating findings across the various boundaries where they are linked to the development of appropriate networks for dissemination and discussion.

Engaging and Communicating With Policymakers

Getting people (not just Scientists and policymakers) to talk in a 'language' that they all understand was identified in the consultation as a key requirement. As with other aspects of this review, in most cases it is too early to judge the effectiveness of transferring the outputs of research into wider policy outcomes and, at present, engagement with policymakers is principally at the project level.

At the same time it is clear that CCAA Programme staff are well aware of the need to engage policy and policymakers more widely and are in the process of developing a strategy to deliver this. As well as linking the project research outputs with policymakers, it will be important to raise the profile of CCAA more widely beyond the bounds of those intimately connected with CCAA work. Again, the development of networks will facilitate better policy integration and awareness. It can be hoped that the raised profile of both the Programme and its project outputs will build momentum in raising the awareness of policymakers more generally and contributing to both the need and the means of mainstreaming climate change into policymaking.

Education and Awareness

As part of its activity CCAA seeks to carry out education and training activities to strengthen policymakers' capacity to use research results and communicate their experiences more effectively.

As has been reported elsewhere, the Africa run and based training events undertaken in CCAA have been warmly welcomed and appear to be having an impact. In terms of the media and the profile of CCAA, Programme Officers view that CCAA is being moderately successful at engaging the media and raising the profile of adaptation in Africa. As noted above, however, awareness of the Programme and its objectives is still low and the Programme would benefit from further raising its profile especially now that it has projects underway that help to put 'flesh' on the ideas and objectives.

3.3.2 Quality of Outputs

The project level review reflected a very strong effort among project teams to undertake rigorous and meaningful work. It is clear that the training workshops have been pivotal in shaping the quality of these efforts and the high level of commitment among project teams to their goals. The support received during start up has received much praise. The workshops were an excellent form of capacity building for the project teams and enabled them to strengthen their proposals and build knowledge enormously.

Less clear from the project review has been evidence of effective linkages to community level capacity building. This is the biggest challenge of PAR. It may be at least partly because the evaluation here is of projects that have not been completed.

The clear division between Francophone and Anglophone in terms of institutional linkages and support is an important area to consider addressing. It is encouraging that the Programme may have begun to address this divide.

3.3.3 Gender Dimensions

Awareness of the gendered nature of climate change vulnerability has clearly been increased through the training workshops. This awareness is likely, however, to be fairly superficial until projects reach the stage of identifying and/ or implementing adaptation options and strategies that truly address gender related vulnerability. Further inputs and training might also be required to ensure that there is a clear understanding of gender among all the member teams.

3.4 Partnership and Management

3.4.1 General Comments

Project level perspective

In the project level review, support from IDRC was noted as absolutely critical to the success of all projects. The support of IDRC appears to have been particularly valued during the proposal development phase, as well as in the training workshops which have without exception been highlighted by interviewees as extremely beneficial.

Relationships between project leaders/ project teams and Programme Officers appear to be mixed; noted as very strong between some but poor between others. This is partly attributable to the high work load of the POs, and their travel schedules, but also possibly to specific communication/ relationship shortcomings in some instances.

Strategic level perspective

The overall impression was that the Programme and individual projects were being generally well run. There are a few issues that are raised here:

1. It was difficult to develop an informed opinion about some of the projects in the project level assessment because of no response to communications in a few instances.
2. There were some concerns over the slow response from IDRC to communications from projects. IDRC needs to review its communications to ensure that matters are dealt with in reasonable time. Nevertheless, there was a general positive recognition of the role played by IDRC, Africa.
3. Otherwise communications and coordination have been satisfactory given the inevitable problems in communications technology and the difficulties of working in a dispersed, virtual team. There have been occasions when coordination has broken down - an inevitable consequence of high workloads, travel schedules, and multi-tasking? One of the respondents indicated that "As the relationships mature we trust each other more, and the partnerships strengthen"
4. The start up of the multi-regional projects has been rather slow. It needs to be ensured that these projects are up and fully running as soon as possible.
5. Following the initial consultation phase the start up phase of the Programme was extremely rapid. This in part led to an over-estimation of the research capacity in Africa to support the Programme. A slower staggered phase would probably have been beneficial with an initial review of capacity. More thought should also have been given to the climate science support network.

3.4.2 IDRC/DFID Partnership

It is widely recognised that DFID does not have the capacity to manage projects and that the partnership with IDRC is, therefore, a very positive one from a project management

perspective. However, this appears to have led to a lack of visibility of DFID and a general association of the Programme with IDRC rather than IDRC and DFID. The relationships between IDRC Canada and Africa appeared to be working well.

3.4.3 Advisory Board Role

There was positive feedback on the role played by the African led Advisory Board, although there were suggestions that it could perhaps play a more robust and critical role. This would perhaps require some greater technical input to the Board.

3.4.4 Links with Other Programmes and Institutions

It emerged clearly from the project level component of the MTR that linkages between projects and between coordinating institutions and other institutions is a weak area within the CCAA Programme. Related to this, the establishment of an African Network was flagged strongly as a challenging area within the CCAA.

A clearer sense of the whole CCAA Programme – possibly a ‘project tree’ (including descriptions of people involved and their expertise for each project, and whether or not there are linkages between projects) - would facilitate capacity building, stronger linkages between institutions, knowledge sharing, behavioural change, and better M&E. Such a broad picture would also encourage tighter linkages with IDRC and its management processes and facilitate the accessing of information from IDRC. Some interviews found information about the CCAA and its projects currently very difficult to access and make use of.

Stronger linkages with expertise outside the region is also likely to benefit the performance of the projects under the Programme (where these are also discussed in Section 3.3.1), but paradoxically it was noted that such linkages risk undermining the ownership of growth and change and may also undermine the development of solutions that are relevant to the social, cultural, economic, political and biophysical context of climate change vulnerability in Africa. The wedding of western and African expertise thus needs to be undertaken; but with the greatest of consideration and caution.

3.4.5 Risk Assessment

The quality of the risk assessment processes across the Programme’s projects appears to be highly dependent on the protocols of each project’s coordinating institution as well as the levels of experience of the project managers and team members. In most projects risks were encountered that had not been anticipated. Some of these may have been better anticipated if training in financial management as well as risk management had received a tighter focus during the start up phase of the CCAA Programme.

3.4.6 Effectiveness of M&E systems

The M&E systems that have been put in place for the CCAA projects have been received and used by project teams with mixed success. Some project teams have found the M&E systems quite time consuming and in some instances confusing.

The Outcome Mapping process is widely recognised by teams as addressing aspects of change that have hitherto generally been neglected in assessing the success of interventions. However, OM has also been found to be a very new concept, difficult to assimilate on top of the new challenges of the project, and time consuming to implement. It appears likely that the training of use of OM, and possibly OM methodology itself, requires more careful consideration and possibly modification in order for its potential value to M&E to be realised.

Consideration may also need to be given to monitors being led by someone who fully understands IDRC procedures. Similarly, there is need to ensure that all the monitors operate on the same level of understanding, and are well qualified for the purpose.

At the level of the program, it emerged from the project level review that M&E has been time consuming, and it still has a way to go to be fully effective. From a strategic perspective we have made comment (in Section 3.2.2) on the need to flesh out the strategy (and the Logframe) in greater detail.

3.5 External Perceptions

3.5.1 Wider Views of Experts and Stakeholders

In terms of wider perceptions of the Programme amongst external stakeholders, as noted elsewhere, the Programme has yet to achieve wide awareness of its work even though people may be aware of its existence. There is a need to raise the profile of the Programme as a whole. It would also confirm that there is perhaps a need for to 'flesh out' the strategy in more goal and deliverable oriented terms making it much clearer what CCAA is (and is not) seeking to achieve and making more explicit exactly how it is seeking to achieve this and how each part fits together. We believe this will contribute to increasing the effectiveness of the Programme and the monitoring of its effectiveness but it will also increase its transparency and provide opportunities for better communicating how the programme works as well as what it is seeking to achieve to, in particular, the professionals and experts who may be able to contribute expertise and also policymakers who may be able to make use of the expertise and outputs in any efforts to address climate change at a policy level.

3.5.2 Views on Programme Objectives and Priorities from the Survey

Respondents were asked to indicate the relative priority they attached to the Programmes objectives as set out in the CCAA strategy. They were also given the opportunity of adding four of their own objectives and indicating the relative priority that they attached to these compared with the Programme's actual objectives.

59% of the respondents chose to add one or more additional objectives. 62% of these objectives were ranked as being equally or more important than the others including the CCAA objectives. That said, it should be noted that the vast majority of the additional objectives that were identified are actually already embedded into the medium and longer-term objectives and workings of CCAA.

This would suggest two things. Firstly, that CCAA already aims to address a large number of the issues that external stakeholders identified. Secondly that, because respondents identified things that are already a part of the Programme, this would suggest a need to voice objectives and supporting actions with greater clarity (and more widely).

In terms of the actions and objectives identified by external stakeholders, one that comes across fairly strongly is the need to develop the kind of institutional capacity that can influence policymakers and demand (and supply) the kind of responses (and information) at policy level that will draw attention to the issue and deliver 'buy in' from policymakers and integration with development policies more generally. As has been noted earlier, the networking aspect of CCAA will be crucial in this respect and it will be important to develop this in the coming period to obtain the 'added value' that CCAA seeks to achieve.

Where there are objectives that are not strongly represented in CCAA these tend to reflect wider needs in the area of climate change and adaptation that CCAA cannot, in itself, address or were supposed to be addressed by other initiatives such as ClimDev. In relation to the latter, for example, there are a number of responses that highlight the need for better and clearer analysis of climate change outcomes and priorities from regional downscaling models. Clearly, as CCAA cannot independently undertake all of these things there may be a need to ensure good connectivity with other existing and new initiatives so that, to the extent possible, the aggregate effect is to 'pull in the same direction' and thus improve the effectiveness as a whole.

3.5.3 Views on Alignment, Targeting and Contribution to the Issues

In terms of general views on the Programme and its contribution, the consensus is that CCAA is well targeted at the issues of real concern (although there is a minority that view CCAA as being not particularly well targeted). In terms of 'contribution', the responses are more distributed (partly owing to the need to use the word 'contribution') but this tends towards a positive 'strong to significant' contribution.

Respondents provided a number of additional comments and views on how they would improve the Programme. Core areas identified for improvement include:

- more effective engagement of policymakers;
- focussing efforts more (both geographically and on key climate vulnerabilities) rather than spread resources and efforts thinly;
- and raising the profile of CCAA and improving networking.

The Programme is broadly welcomed by all external stakeholders and a number of positive comments were made, samples of which include:

"I think that the CCAA Programme is timely and has a lot of potential to have desired impacts on many people's livelihoods. It also has the potential to generate new- useful knowledge on climate change science- with respect to adaptation issues in Africa- and further boost international recognition and support for adaptation in Africa."

"We believe the Programme is timely and useful in such a way it primarily attempts to build the capacity of African scientists- organizations and decision makers to play crucial role in the adaptation to climate change".

There were a few less positive comments, for example: *"I suspect that the Programme is too small to make much of a difference to actual policies and decisions- but could undertake some good basic research".* As with other aspects of the consultation with external stakeholders, it is difficult to judge the extent of knowledge of the Programme where this would, again, suggest a need to raise the Programme profile.

3.5.4 Capacity Building

There was some variation in external stakeholders' perceptions on whether CCAA is successfully building on and enhancing any existing capacity in various institutions, NGOs and public bodies but there was general agreement that it is, or at least that it has the potential to do so. In terms of CCAA's impact on the number of researchers with the capacity to undertake applied research on adaptation, with only a few exceptions, the view would seem to be that it is, but it is difficult to identify the scale of success.

In terms of establishing the kind of structures that will "ensure that the additional expertise/capacity gained by training young African scientists/experts is sustained in the longer-term and within Africa", the external responses suggest that there is uncertainty as to whether or not CCAA will deliver such structures either in the form of networks, centres of excellence or both. This may reflect a misperception or a lack of clarity concerning exactly how CCAA will sustain the capacity in the longer-term. This, again, may relate to a lack of clarity in the strategy itself or, alternatively, strategic thinking in progress as these matters may be yet to be determined.

On the related question of centres of excellence, the majority of external respondents identify that CCAA will bring this a little closer, and some a lot closer. However, there is also a substantial part of the response (30%) that indicates that CCAA does not bring centres of excellence much closer. This reinforces the need to think hard about how this added value element of CCAA will be delivered and communicate this better to the outside world as part of wider efforts to raise the profile of the Programme and its objectives.

3.5.5 Interactions with Policy and Policymakers

Responses from external stakeholders on interactions with policymakers imply a need for further work to address the climate change/policy interface and to improve the profile of the Programme. As was noted elsewhere, there are already moves afoot to develop the strategic thinking on CCAA concerning the policy interface. Once established, these should be publicised.

3.5.6 Education and Awareness

In terms of the success of education and raising awareness under CCAA external stakeholders have a diversity of views but the general perception is towards the 'being successful' end of the scale.

3.5.7 CCAA Approach to Research

In terms of CCAA's approach to research, virtually all external stakeholders believed the PAR approach to be the right one. As to its success in bringing together the various actors to do this, there was less confidence. Whether this is perception or reality is unclear, but if it is merely a misperception there is clearly a need to address it, perhaps by publicising more project profiles and raising awareness of the Programme as a whole (as has already been mentioned).

In terms of what, if anything, respondents would add or change in relation to CCAA's focus on 'Action research' a few comments were provided with these indicating "nothing more" in general but there are one or two comments concerning the need to be more aggressive with policymakers and also to compliment the 'needs research approach' with a 'knowledge needs investment'.

3.5.8 Views from Informal and Formal Discussions and Interviews

A number of recurring themes emerged from the discussions and interviews that are listed below.

- 1) Interviewees were positive that the Programme had been established.
- 2) Unless respondents were directly associated with the CCAA Programme, there was a general lack of awareness of the existence of the Programme or Programme details. This is perhaps to be expected for a relatively young Programme where there are few results to date, but nevertheless contrasts strongly with a number of ventures that have built a considerable profile despite their age. This points to a lack of visibility of the Programme through the web, conferences and workshops.
- 3) There was a surprising lack of awareness of the CCAA Programme amongst DFID staff in Africa and a lack of involvement of in-country personnel and cross-over with other DFID work.
- 4) Concerns were often expressed that the Programme lacked a) a strong base in climate science information and b) expertise in climate change adaptation research. Several people indicated that the need for a climate science base had been identified early on in the Programme development and that the Programme had perhaps been disadvantaged by slow progress on ClimDev.
- 5) There was positive recognition of the role played by IDRC Africa, although concerns that it was slow to respond, perhaps because of a lack of capacity. In terms of the life-time of the Programme it is of concern, for example, that the multi-regional projects are only just starting.

- 6) No clear picture emerged of how project information was being shared and particularly of how information was being shared with other initiatives, especially across the language divide in Africa.
- 7) Concerns were expressed from several quarters that CCAA had over-estimated the capacity available for the Programme and that more of the resources should initially have been allocated to capacity development. In the development of the Programme the lack of capacity had been confounded by the rapid start up of the Programme.
- 8) It was recognised that the involvement of IDRC was promising from a devolution perspective, although concerns that the devolution pathway had not been more clearly identified at this stage. This particular issue also links to concerns that the Programme may be spread very thinly and that there will be issues scaling up from a range of unconnected projects.
- 9) Related to (2) is a concern that there is a lack of climate change expertise and climate change adaptation expertise in IDRC and DFID, although it is apparent that DFID's expertise has increased substantially since the inception of the project. It is not clear that full advantage is being made of this.
- 10) Concerns were expressed that use was not being made of the climate change research capacity in South Africa to help build the Programme or indeed the capacity in the UK, either in the university sector or elsewhere (e.g. UKCIP).

4. KEY MESSAGES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section provides a summary of more specific key messages and recommendations emerging from all evidence of the MTR (where this is provided in Annexes 1 and 2), focusing on areas where there is room for improvement.

4.1 Strategy

- The overall strategy remains valid: to strengthen capacity, to support adaptation by rural and urban people through action research, to generate a better shared understanding of climate variability and change, and to inform policy processes with good quality science-based knowledge. We would however highlight a number of issues and recommendations that relate to the strategy:
 1. Most importantly the evidence indicates that the strategy has very open ended objectives, making it difficult to measure performance. There is a need for verifiable indicators in the logframe and a narrative for the project as a whole. This is a priority action.
 2. The open ended objectives together with the open bidding process have resulted in a Programme that lacks focus and which is spread very thinly. Whilst demand led, this inevitably threatens the legacy of the project as there is a lack of critical mass to address particular topics related to adaptation or to build adaptive capacity within a region. Consideration should be given to the identification of research priorities either by region or sector.
 3. The strategy identifies both climate change and variability as issues that need to be addressed. The relationship between these two aspects of climate change need to be more clearly defined.
 4. The strategy identifies the needs of both the rural and the urban populations. However, to date most of the projects are directed towards the rural population (the traditional heartland of development studies). The growing urban population is largely ignored. Consideration needs to be given to how develop the urban profile of the Programme, whilst taking (2) into account.
 5. Climate change is just one of the stresses that the region faces. Adaptation to climate change is likely to be most successful where it also addresses other stresses in the system. While the need for integrated assessment was recognised within the consultation phase of CCAA, the importance of this issue has largely been ignored to date. There is relatively little capacity for such studies in Africa.

4.2 Time frame

- The Programme needs to be given more time for foundations than currently assigned to it if it is to truly begin to address its ambitious objectives.

4.3 Start up phase and pre-selection process

- A possible weakness of the Programme is that there are just four Programme officers. In future projects, a higher Programme Officers to project ratio needs to be considered.
- The start-up phase was very intensive, with a newly recruited team walking straight into a huge workload. Demands made on project teams in terms of drafting and redrafting proposals to meet standards were high. More human resources and a more stepped approach to the start-up phase would have made the program more effective and efficient.
- While the support of IDRC through proposal development and training workshops has been widely found invaluable, in similar Programmes it might be worth initiating training before the call for proposals, and also developing capacity through training over a longer period of time, before projects commence.
- Given the extensive financial investment of the Programme, a field visit to the project during the project selection phase would be a worthwhile investment on the part of the funders.

- It may be worth considering a more rigorous narrowing in the call of proposals – possibly by region, but definitely by climate change needs. There is, however, a risk here that IDRC/DFID may begin to drive the research priorities for the region rather than these being identified internally.
- There may also be a call for widening interpretations of adaptation to include broader economic and social issues, and that may also cushion groups from falling into vulnerability in the face of a changing climate. (For example urban issues? health issues? sectors other than agriculture?)
- The project application process disadvantaged those not fluent in English or French, or used to preparing competitive grant proposals. Inevitably, the use of competitive open calls for proposals in the context of strengthening research capacity favoured the objectively best written proposal. This means that areas where capacity and research are most needed are unlikely to receive support.
- It might be preferable to support projects and project teams with the best potential for significant improvement in performance -there were a number of potentially good projects and teams that were overlooked in favour of institutions with proven capacity. We strongly suggest recruiting the team in advance of launching the first call for proposals, and giving them sufficient time to build up activities gradually and logically in areas where there is a clear lack of capacity.
- It might have been preferable to develop the range of capacity strengthening activities in advance of the research projects, have a scoping study to help structure the first call for proposals, spend more time considering how to disseminate the first call for proposals, and work with potential organisations for devolution from the beginning of the program.

4.4 Participatory Action Research (PAR)

- Participatory action research has been identified as a key methodology in CCAA. The advantage of this approach, as demonstrated, is that it can be demand led and involves key stakeholders. Essentially it is learning by doing. There are however a range of pitfalls. We highlight three issues and recommendations here that were raised during interviews and discussions (undertaken by Professor Andrew Watkinson):
 1. The technique appears to be being used in a relatively uncritical way. There is a need to ensure that the approach contributes to and constitutes research as opposed to providing a means of stakeholder engagement.
 2. By its nature adaptation research tends to be local in nature and the PAR approach reinforces this. Insufficient thought may have been given to upscaling from the thinly spread and disparate projects. Consequently further consideration may need to be given to upscaling and the likely potential for this perhaps even at the project proposal stage.
 3. Further consideration needs to be given to how PAR can better contribute to and integrate with efforts to raise capacity of academic and professional bodies as well as civil and society organisations where there appears there to be more of an emphasis at present.
 4. There is a risk that the relatively short life span of the projects in relation to the very long term goals of the Programme will leave the CCAA Programme objectives unmet. True participatory research and learning takes many years of relationship building and institutional linkages. This suggests that more time is needed in the proposal phase to allow for the development of PAR in projects that will lead to community level adaptation to climate change, which is going to be a slow and co evolved process.

4.5 Capacity building

- In future Programmes of a similar nature, capacity building workshops should come earlier so that participants incorporate lessons and concepts learned right from start. It may be more effective to devote an initial time period (for example a year) to building capacity, and then devote a second phase to developing projects and putting capacity to the test.

- Most indications are that the projects reviewed have engaged well with stakeholders. It would however be useful to have a more integrated picture of stakeholder engagement across the whole Programme. The evidence from the projects points largely to interactions with local stakeholders and policy makers. Stakeholder mapping would be useful from a Programme perspective.
- It may be necessary to consider funding infrastructure development in future projects. For example, if those undertaking climate change research don't have basic infrastructure such as laboratories for climate risk assessment, high speed computers for modelling, electricity generating devices, software etc, the research platforms initiated will not be continued.
- The training workshops were a key mechanism in building capacity of teams and encouraging integrity of thinking about climate change adaptation. There was overwhelming agreement over their benefit among all interviewees. However, it might be necessary to hold more follow up workshops to sustain their benefit.
- The inclusion of a distance learning component to reach more people and make the training materials available to the learners and their colleagues sooner was suggested.
- Further scientific research appears to be necessary to ensure that alternative options to climate change and/or climate variability are based on shared scientific evidence.
- Further assistance with expertise on risk identification was also called for among project teams
- South Africa has significant climate change expertise and indeed is a world leader in a number of aspects of climate science. If capacity is to be built in Africa as a whole then greater use needs to be made of that capacity.
- The success of climate change adaptation research in many countries is based on solid platform of climate science. In the UK, for example, much of the climate change research in universities and other institutions is based on and informed by the climate change knowledge that is embedded in the UKCIP reports. There is a need to better support the adaptation projects with a platform of climate science.
- Stronger linkages with expertise outside the region is likely to benefit the performance of the projects under the Programme. However it must be noted that the wedding of western and African expertise needs to be undertaken with the greatest of caution.
- As the Programme and projects progress it will be necessary to take on board addressing changing as well as new needs in the area of adaptation

4.6 Knowledge sharing and networking

- A significant shortcoming observed is the absence to date of networking between CCAA projects as well as between CCAA projects and other climate change adaptation projects in the region. This is weakening the overall capacity of the Programme to make a real contribution to capacity development and knowledge sharing, and is also reducing the effective utilization of resources.
- A 'project tree', including descriptions of institutions and people involved, their expertise for each project, and any linkages to other projects would facilitate capacity building, stronger linkages between institutions, knowledge sharing, behavioural change, and better M&E.
- Related to the above points, the establishment of an African Network was flagged strongly as a challenging area within the CCAA that requires more attention.
- There is a clear need to have a better map of the capacity in Africa and the networks that would support climate change adaptation. This has only partly been accomplished.
- A framework needs to be considered to better support sharing of knowledge in climate change and general project management expertise – especially for those projects starting on field work - in order to start more effectively learning from other CCAA projects and even wider projects and Programmes. In line with the inputs of one Project Manager, a clear allocation of money for this in the projects such that teams are required to share the knowledge in conferences etc might be beneficial.

4.7 Outcome mapping

- The methodology of Outcome Mapping is recognised widely as raising important perspectives on progress and change in relation to adaptation. However, it appears likely that the training of use of OM, and possibly OM methodology itself, requires more careful consideration and possibly modification in order for its potential value to M&E to be realised. The success of OM will probably require long term training, application and feedback for the necessary cognitive shifts to take place among project leaders and team members.

4.8 Gender

- Only a superficial attention to gender is likely to have been achieved so far among projects. A true addressing of gender issues is likely to take some time as it requires a deep shift in understanding and behaviour that is necessarily a long term process.
- Further expertise might be required to ensure that there is a clear understanding of gender among all the member teams.

4.9 Monitoring

- Consideration should be given to an independent peer review for the most important pieces of research.
- The load of projects that Programme officers have may need to be reviewed. The Programme is ambitious by virtue of the fact that it is continental. The number of projects requires heavy M&E by Programme officers. As the Programme grows it will be necessary to carefully consider how to distribute the responsibilities as we may start to see losses in M&E quality going forward.

4.10 Programme Management and Focus

- Building capacity and networks/integration are key to the success of the CCAA project. Review of the individual projects indicates that capacity is being built, but there are a number of key messages from our review.
 1. The thinly spread nature of the projects, discussed above, does not aid the building of capacity. There is a danger that isolated projects by sector and region will not facilitate the development and maintenance of capacity because of a lack of critical mass.
 2. Concerns were expressed from several quarters that CCAA had over-estimated the capacity available for the Programme and that more of the resources should initially have been allocated to capacity development. This was apparent at the bidding stage. In the development of the Programme the lack of capacity had been confounded by the rapid start up of the Programme.
 3. Concerns were often expressed that the Programme lacked 1) a strong base in climate science information and 2) expertise in climate change adaptation research. Several people indicated that the need for a climate science base had been identified early on in the Programme development and that the Programme had perhaps been disadvantaged by slow progress on ClimDev.
 4. Climate change adaptation research is a relatively new area of research. Capacity is generally low in Africa, apart from South Africa, and the UK is one of the leaders in the field. It was disappointing to see the extent to which CCAA was facilitating the transfer of knowledge from the institutions with expertise whether they are in the university (e.g. Tyndall Centre, Walker Institute) or government sectors (e.g. Hadley Centre, UKCIP). There is far too great an emphasis on the traditional model of development research, with suspicion concerning the involvement of northern researchers. CCAA must ask the question of how it expects knowledge to be transferred and capacity built if it does not engage these institutions more fully in a partnership.
- The legacy and devolution of the Programme is critical to the success of CCAA. It was recognised that the involvement of IDRC was promising from a devolution perspective, although concerns that the devolution pathway had not been more

clearly identified at this stage. This particular issue also links to concerns that the Programme may be spread very thinly and that there will be issues scaling up from a range of unconnected projects. We are somewhat doubtful that the more challenging aspects of institution building and devolution could be achieved within the program's lifespan, and there is a need to think carefully about how to manage the transition.

- A sustainable plan needs to be put in place that can, first, move projects further toward meeting their long term objectives as well as overall CCAA objectives, and second, allow for devolution of capacity and stewardship to beneficiaries.
- In some cases, large amounts of funding had to be spent quite quickly by project teams. This created pressure for the project teams who didn't necessarily have the absorptive capacity to spend these effectively. In future it would be beneficial to develop this more slowly.
- With regard to fund management: some projects have found that the management of funds through their institutions has been complex and at times inhibited project progress. It may be worth, if possible, considering channels or mechanisms for future projects that simplify funding so that it can flow more directly to the projects.
- More careful channelling funds through credible less bureaucratic institutions might be considered in order to smooth access to funds by project teams
- Training in the costing of projects and in the management of funds would be beneficial to those being funded.
- The program might continue under the coordination of African organisations, for the objectives to be fully reached. Coordination with other programs will also be needed.
- In addressing the issue of adaptation, a process that relies entirely on bottom up initiatives that are not co-ordinated in terms of either sector or region can lead to a highly fragmented Programme. Greater consideration needs to be given to some top down control to create a more integrated Programme. Experience from the Tyndall Centre to a certain extent mirrors that of CCAA. An initial open ended strategy coupled with a bottom up bidding process resulted in a fragmented Programme. Top down adjustments in the second year provided a much greater degree of integration and allowed longer term capacity to be developed. Integrated assessments, where climate change is viewed in the context of other drivers of change, also requires some degree of top down control. It is important that CCAA reviews its portfolio of projects and develops a clear strategy to deliver climate change adaptation in Africa.
- There is a lack of clarity in the relative importance of climate change versus variability in addressing the issue of adaptation. Moreover, the extent to which projects related to current climate variability will aid adaptation to climate change is not clear and more importantly has not been analysed in relation to a number of the projects. There is a strong argument to be made in relation to the fact that adaptation to current climate variability is a pre-requisite to long term adaptation. Here, adapting to current variability might be used to inform future responses but cannot be taken as a proxy for adaptation to future climate change. Consequently a number of the projects appear to be essentially straight development projects – they would be just as valid in a non-warming world. All research projects need to relate climate variability to future climate change.
- In our view, harnessing climate change expertise (on climate and impact prediction as well as adaptation) in South Africa and International institutions (such as in the UK) would contribute to improving the climate change focus of the programme; increasing support networks within Africa and outside the region; building the much needed research capacity; and, ultimately, devolving 'ownership' of the Programme to African institutions. Here one might consider links with institutions such as the Hadley Centre, Tyndall and UKCIP. Given China's increasing influence in the region, it might also be worth investigating any capacity in China.
- If the Programme ends after 5 years there is a real danger that the merging adaptation strategies will fail to develop. Judging the extent to which the Programme will achieve its objectives is further compounded by the lack of clear objectives.
- Outside of those intimately associated with the project, the CCAA Programme has a relatively low profile. The Programme even has a low profile within Dfid and is generally perceived as an IDRC Programme, largely due to its management of the Programme and hosting the web site. Interviews with Dfid staff indicate that they need to give more thought to their role within the project.

- The general lack of awareness of the existence of the Programme or Programme details was a little surprising but not totally unexpected. However, the Programme is relatively young and there are few results to date. Nevertheless, it is felt that more can be done to raise the profile of CCAA.

5. CONCLUSIONS

The establishment of the CCAA Programme is a significant and valuable development in addressing climate change in Africa, and its overall objectives remain worthwhile and generally well targeted at the long term challenges of climate change adaptation in the region. However, the Programme strategy, including its objectives, would benefit from refinement in the light of lessons learned from the early stages of the Programme, and towards clarifying Programme deliverables.

The Programme has clearly contributed to capacity building among the research institutions it has touched. The training workshops held under the CCAA have been particularly beneficial in building the capacity of project teams and encouraging integrity of thinking about climate change adaptation. But more work and more time are required to strengthen capacity building to ensure wider change, and to build the foundations for sustainable impact and effective devolution. Moreover, delays in starting some of projects, the lack of capacity at the start of projects, and the absence of clear cut devolution plans, make it additionally unlikely that the objectives of the Programme will be achieved during the current time frame.

A further significant weakness in the Programme is the poor attention to date to networking between CCAA projects as well as between CCAA projects and other climate change adaptation projects in the region.

At the project level, indications are that stakeholder and policy maker engagement has mostly been good, although the more integrated picture of stakeholder engagement across the whole Programme is less clear.

In conclusion, three priority areas require consideration in strengthening the achievements of the CCAA Programme going forward:

1. The Programme is at a point which calls for defining more precisely what CCAA should and can best deliver. The Programme strategy and objectives need revisiting and refining into specific sub-objectives, goals and tasks to clarify the deliverables of the Programme
1. The establishment of stronger linkages between projects and with other climate change efforts, and initiate support networks involving South Africa and the UK, is an area needing more attention
2. A clear strategy is needed, including a timeline, to devolve 'ownership' of the CCAA Programme work to African institutions.

