NAPA Questions/Indicator Components

NAPA 1:

Promoting Community-based adaptation through Integrated Management of Agriculture, Water, Forest and Biodiversity

- **1.1** Ecosystem-based approaches: Have integrated watershed approaches to land and water management been developed for the Churia?
- **1.2** Agricultural water conservation: Have on-farm soil and water conservation activities been initiated for mountain communities.
- **1.3** Integrated basin management: Have municipal authories adopted basin-wide approaches to water management.
- **1.4** Integrated flood management: Have flood management initiatives adopted integrated water shed approaches.
- **1.5** Mutli Use Systems (MUS): Have MUS been implemented in poor and vulnerable communities in the mid-hills and Churia?
- **1.6** Non-conventional irrigation: Have non-conventional irrigation systems been developed in water stressed areas.

NAPA 2:

Building and enhancing adaptive capacity of vulnerable communities through improved system and access to services related to agricultural development

- 2.1 Access to agricultural services: Do rural communities have improved access to agricultal services
- 2.2 Improved production systems: Have rural communities experienced an increase in production or improved market systems.
- 2.3 Linking farming communities: has the flow of goods and services between highland and lowland communities been enhanced.
- 2.4 Sustainable groundwater use: irrigation management initiatives been implemented that conserve or promote the sustainable use of groundwater.
- 2.5 Livestock management: Have climate resilient breeds of livestock been introduced or promoted.

NAPA 3:

Community-based disaster management for facilitating climate adaptation

- 3.1 Community DRM: Do target communities have an increased capacity to cope with climatic hazards/climate induced disasters
- 3.2 Water storage infrastructure: Have water retaining structures been developed and used to manage extremes in water availability.

3.3 Rehabilitation of traditional water sources: Have traditional water sources and water supply schemes been rehabilited and conserved.
3.4 Community DRR: Have the risks of climate-induced disasters been reduced or are communities better prepared.

NAPA 4:
GLOF Monitoring & Disaster Risk Reduction

4.1 GLOF monitoring: are water levels and volumes of target glacial lakes being monitored and temporal-variations better understood.
4.2 Early Warning Systems: are early warning systems in place for target communities downstream of glacial lakes
4.3 Mainstreaming CC into DRR: Do agencies and institutions working in DRR have enhanced capacity to understand and integrate climate change into DRR.
4.4 GLOF Hazard mapping: Have hazard maps been developed and used in disaster management plans.
4.5 Hydromet MIS services: Has DHMs hydro-met network been improved and hydromet services been upscaled.
4.6 Research: Has scientific understanding of glacial lake dynamics and GLOF occurrence advanced.

NAPA 5:
Forest and Ecosystem management for supporting climate-led innovations

5.1 Agro-forestry practices: Are agro-forestry practices designed to conserve trees being employed in public an private land outside forest complexes.
5.2 Fuel wood plantations: are plantations being used to supply fuel wood to dependent rural communities.
5.3 Biomass energy technologies: are new energy technologies being used or upscaled in fuel-wood dependent communities.
5.4 Fire management: Are innovate community-based approach being developed and used in the mid-hills and Terai areas.

NAPA 6:
Adapting to climate challenges in public health

6.1 Evidence based research and pilots: are the links between health epidemics and climate conditions better understood.
6.2 Empowering community knowledge and resistance: Are public education programs being used to empower communities to manage climate-related health impacts.
6.4 Disease management programs: are effective management options for vector, water and food being trials?

6.5 Strengthening forecasting/early warning systems: Is government better equipped to forecast and respond disease outbreak.

NAPA 7:

Ecosystem management for climate adaptation

7.1 Rangeland management: are improved pasture and rangeland approaches being used to rehabilitate degraded mountain zones.
7.2 Managing ecosystem products: are ecosystem adaptation approaches being used to conserve medicinal and NTFP products
7.3 Wetland management: Have integrated wetland management techniques been employed in the Terai.
7.4 Biodiversity corridor mangement: are biodiversity corridors being expanded or improved for mountain and Terai regions.

NAPA 8:

Empowering vulnerable communities through sustainable management of water resources and clean energy supply

8.1 Lake conservation & management: are the ecological services of lakes supplying water to urban areas being adequately conserved and sustainably managed.
8.2 Promoting rain water harvesting: Have options for rain water harvesting been developed, tested or promoted.
8.3 Source conservation: Have the water sources of existing water supply schemes been conserved and managed for enhanced reliability (quality and quantity).
8.4 Urban groundwater management: is there a monitoring system for groundwater abstraction, backed by sufficient regulatory measures.
8.5 Improving micro-hydro: have micro-hydropower projects been established or enhanced with a greater capacity to manage acute water shortages.
8.6 Multiple use water mills: have water mills been developed or refurbished to enhance their mutli-use potential.

NAPA 9:

Promoting climate smart urban settlement

9.1 Building code reform: Have climate resilient building codes been developed and enforced in municipal areas.
9.2 Urban rehabilitation: Has the built form of urban areas been upgraded to safer structures.
9.3 Urban groundwater exploitation: has the efficiency of groundwater use in urban areas increased.
9.4 CDM promotion in municipal waste management: Have municipal waste plants been developed with an additional benefit of revenue generation via the CDM.

9.5 Urban water and energy planning: are local-level institutions capable of efficient water and energy planning and implementation.

CCP Indicators

CCP 1

BCRWME: Building climate resilient watersheds in mountainous ecoregions (PPCR 1):

Indicators:	**Baseline & expected results**:
1. *Impact-level*: Level of food security in project villages	1. By 2025, /insert from project administration manual/
2. *Outcome-level:* Household access to domestic & irrigation water sources. i. Availability of irrigation water during dry season ii. Domestic water collected during the dry season iii. Time women/children spend collecting domestic water during dry season.	2. By 2020, 45,000 households have access to improved domestic and irrigation water sources (baseline: 0) i. At least 0.3 l/s (baseline: 0) ii. Increased by 50% (baseline: 8 l/p.d) iii. Time reduced by 75% (baseline: 3-8hrs/d)
3. *Output 1*: Stability of water source yields	3. By 2020, yield of water spring and surface water sources remains stable or is increased.
4. *Output 2:* Level of adoption of new watershed planning approach by DSCWM staff	4. By 2020, new watershed planning approach adopted by 75% of trained DSCWM.
5. *Output 2:* Level of female & disadvantaged group representation in CDG Committees	5. By 2020, at least 33% female and proportional representation of disadvantaged groups in CDG.
6. *Output2:* Development and adoption of soil & water conservation options responsive to the needs of women and disadvantaged groups by participating communities.	6. By 2020, soil & water conservation options responsive to the needs of women and disadvantaged groups adopted by all participating communities.
7. *Output 3:* number of knowledge products produced.	7. By 2020, 12 new knowledge products are produced, four of which focus on gender & social inclusion.
8. *Output 3:* incorporation of lessons into DSCWM, DWSS and DoI guidelines.	8. Lessons incorporated in DSCWM, DWSS, DoI guidelines.
9. *Output 3:* level of endorsement of the developed monitoring method for project interventions on watershed hydrology.	9. Monitoring method agreed and adopted by government.

CCP 2

BCRH: Building resilience in climate related hazards (PPCR 2)

Indicators: 1. Increased financial sustainability of DHM operations (A). 2. New DHM regulations and business practices (A). 3. Improved transmission of data to WMO and GTS/WIS (A). 4. Improved access to and use of training opportunities (A). 5. Increased accuracy & timeliness of weather forecasts (B). 6. Improved status of surface meteorological observation network (B). 7. Establish National Framework for climate services (Climate Centre) (C). 8. Development and reliable operation of an authoritative public weather service (C). 9. Provision of real time or near real time data to users (C). 10. Increased satisfaction of users with DHM services (C). 11. Introduction of an Agricultural Management Information System (D). 12. Improved access to AMIS data (D). 13. Increased adoption of AMIS tools by farmers (D). 14. Increased extension service and community training (D). 15. Increased satisfaction of users with AMIS services (D).	

CCP 3 **Mainstreaming Climate Change risk management in development (PPCR 3)**	
Indicators: 1. *Impact-level*: Number of households affected by floods and landslides. 2. *Impact-level*: Loss of livestock from floods and landslides. 3. *Outcome-level:* Level of application of risk screening tools and methods for projects in irrigation, flood protection, roads, water supply and sanitation, urban development. 4. *Outcome-level:* Number of trained focal points in CC risk management in counterpart agencies (DWIDP, DWSS, DoI, DUDBC, DoR, DoLIDAR, MoFALD). 5. *Output 1:* Number of guidelines, manuals and standards that include CC risk management by the end of year 5. 6. *Output 1:* Number of approved projects which have applied revised guidelines by end of year 5. 7. *Output 1:* Application of MOSTE CC Risk Management Framework by core-sector agencies. 8. *Output 1:* Inclusion of local adaptation practices by core sector-agencies in CCRM training. 9. *Output 1*: Number of DDC Adaptation Plans developed. 10. *Output 2:* Number of universities incorporating new academic curriculum for climate change science and adaptation. 11. *Output 2:* Number of secondary and higher secondary schools incorporating new academic curriculum for climate change science and adaptation. 12. *Output 2:* Number of published research articles posted in Nepali and global web portals.	**Baseline & expected results**: 1. By 2021, number of households affected by floods and landslides reduced (2010 baseline: 14,226). 2. By 2021, number of livestock losses from floods and landslides reduced (2010 baseline: 747). 3. By 2016, 50% of approved projects are assessed for climate change risk (baseline: 0) 4. By 2017, seven trained focal points in CC risk management in each sector agency (DWIDP, DWSS, DoI, DUDBC, DoR, DoLIDAR, MoFALD).(baseline: 0). 5. By 2017, some guidelines, manuals, standards include CC risk management (baseline: 0). 6. By 2017, 50% of approved projects from core sector agencies apply revised guidelines (baseline: 0). 7. By 2017, 4 out of 7 core sector agencies adopt and use MOSTE CC Risk Management Framework (baseline: 0). 8. By 2016, 5 out of 7 core sector-agencies include local adaptation practices into CCRM training (baseline: 0). 9. By 2016, trained DDCs develop adaptation plans for 100 communities (baseline: 0). 10. By 2016, 2 of 4 universities incorporated newly developed curriculum (baseline: 1). 11. By 2016, some secondary and higher secondary schools incorporated newly developed curriculum (baseline: 0). 12. By 2017, 25 new research articles published. 13. Two CCP media briefings conducted annually. 14. By 2014, results of climate change programs in Nepal are tracked through well-established MIS.

13. *Output 3:* Number of CCP media briefings conducted annually 14. *Output 3:* Results of climate change programs in Nepal are tracked through well-established MIS.	

CCP 4 **Building climate resilient communities through private sector participation (PPCR 4):**	
Indicators: 1. Farm-based household income. 2. crop yield. 3. Number of loans obtained from FI by farmers and supply chain members. 4. Farmer's knowledge on weather, agronomic practices/conditions, market information improved. 5. Numbers of farmers adopting new technologies/improved farm practices to better cope with climate variability. 6. Launch of ICT product to disseminate weather data/agronomics launched. 7. Number of farmers trained by lead firm extensionists. 8. Number of demonstration plots developed. 9. Number of financial products developed and launched. 10. Level of integration of risk management procedures into supply chain. 11. *kW/MW of electricity protected*. 12. Amount of investment in climate proofing infrastructure.	**Baseline & expected results**: 1. Increase in farm-based household income 2. Target farmers have 20% higher yield compared to control group. 3. Farmers and supply chain members avail loan from partner FI 4. /to be specified/ 5. Some farmers (50% women) adopt new technologies/improved farm practices to better cope with climate variability. 6. Launch of ICT product to disseminate weather data/agronomics launched 7. Some farmers (50% women) trained by lead firm extensionists. 8. XXX demonstration plots established. 9. XX financial products launched by project end. 10. Risk management procedures implemented. 11. XX kW/MW of electricity protected 12. USD XX invested in climate proofing infrastructure.

CCP 5 **Enhancing climate resilience of endangered species (PPCR 5):**	
Indicators: 1. Reports and plans regarding climate change impacts on the natural habitats and populations of critically endangered species. 2. Acres on which climate resilient management plans or practices are implemented. 3. Number of people/women benefitting from alternative livelihoods schemes.	**Baseline & expected results**: 1. /to be specified/ 2. /to be specified/ 3. /to be specified/

CCP 6 **Ecosystem's based adaptation in mountain ecosystems of Nepal**	
Indicators: 1. Number of EbA related **guidance materials** available on mountain ecosystems of Nepal 2. **Landscape level management plan** with EbA options. 3. **Total landscape area** where EbA is being implemented through community participation. 4. **Number of communities and households** benefiting from the adoption of EbA. 5. **Analysis on business case** for EbA for mountain ecosystems. 6. Number of **government agencies promoting EbA** through policy, plans and programmes. 7. **Number of higher level government officials** (Joint Secretary, Under Secretary) participated in capacity building activities. 8. EbA **knowledge products** and exchange.	**Baseline & expected results**: 1. Specific guidance materials not available for Nepal mountains EbA At least four guidance materials on EbA will be available 2. Specific EbA plans at landscape level unavailable in Nepal Locally endorsed landscape plan with EbA for a mountain landscape covering at least 270,000 ha in Panchase 3. No landscape level EbA implementation Implementation of EbA in Panchase area (e.g. 25 ha of land restoration, plantation in 17 VDCs, water conservation, conservation farming and livestock) 4. Limited communities receiving benefits from EbA actions At least 5000 HH in Panchase area involved and benefiting from EbA (e.g. PES mechanism developed, commercialization and market linkage of NTFPs)

	5. Limited number of government agencies promoting EbA Cost benefit analysis of EbA initiatives as a decision making tool for policy makers to integrate EbA in national plan and policy At least 4 agencies (NPC, MFSC, MOAC and MOE) are actively involved in promoting EbA 6. No government officials received training in EbA or conducted field visits At least 10 officials received training in EbA and visit EbA sites to learn from field initiatives 7. Limited knowledge and exchanges on EbA Knowledge products based on national and local level learning and sharing and shared at international and national level

CCP 7 **Community-based flood and GLOF risk reduction programme for Imja Glacial lake:**	
Indicators: 1. Number of high risk settlements of the GLOF Impact Zone of Solukhumbu district downstream of Imja lake area covered by an Early Warning System (EWS) 2. Number of institutions with increased capacity to minimize human and material losses from potential GLOF events in the High Mountain and climate-related flooding in the Terai and Churia Range.	**Baseline & expected results**: 1. Outcome level 1: /expected result to be inserted. (*Baseline: More than 31,862 people live in the high risk settlements of Imja GLOF Impact Zone and are directly vulnerable to GLOF impacts. They have no EWS. Other forms of disaster preparedness are also limited*.) 2. Outcome level 2: /expected result to be inserted. *(Baseline: Weak system for flood risk management (only construction work is done) in DWIDP and no GLOF risk management committee in Solukhumbu district. Number of trained staff in DHM is limited to work in GLOF risk reduction. DDRC is mostly involved in rescue and relief for post disaster work and their activity in the targeted districts is limited*.)

CCP 8
NCCSP: Nepal Climate Change support programme:

Indicators:	**Baseline & expected results 2015**:
Impact level 1. *Impact-level 1*: Number of people more able to adapt to the impacts of climate change and climate variability. 2. *Impact*-level 2: Number of people living in VDCs with effective adaptation actions and improved gateways to resilience. *Outcome level* 3. *Outcome-level 1:* National climate change strategy is financed and implemented in ways that support the delivery of adaptation priorities of the poorest and most vulnerable. 4. *Outcome-level 2*: No. of DDCs delivering effective adaptation benefits with the integration of adaptation priorities into planning and budgeting processes. 5. *Outcome-level 3:* Local service providers have capacity to provide effective adaptation services to vulnerable households using funds channelled through DEECCS. 6. *Outcome*-level 4: % of HHs adopting adaptation actions to address climate change. *Output level* 7. *Output-1.1*: Number of LAPA priority actions implemented to satisfactory quality. 8. *Output-1.2:* Capacity developed of climate vulnerable poor people to identify and address adaptation needs. 9. *Output-1.3*: No. of climate vulnerable poor people satisfied with performance of LAPA service providers. 10. *Output*-2.1: Number of functional Climate Change Coordination Committees at district, regional and village level 11. *Output*-2.2: Number of Districts with integrated CC and energy plans 12. *Output*-2.3: No. districts with Local adaptation	1. *Impact-level 1*: 73% of total 72,000 HHs (with 212,000 men and 213,000 women) have shifted from a category of higher vulnerability to a category of lower vulnerability by 2015. (*Baseline: Across 14 NCCSP districts, 73% of the total HHs are in vulnerable groups (most vulnerable V4 – 21%, highly vulnerable V3 – 31% and medium vulnerable V2 – 21%).* 2. *Impact-level 2:* 426,000 people living in the 80% of VDCs with effective adaptation and improved resilience gateways. (*Baseline: 0*). 3. *Outcome-level 1:* CC strategy being implemented through CC funding mechanism. (*Baseline: CC Policy but no strategy or funding mechanism*) 4. *Outcome-level 2*: 14 Districts with adaptation integrated and delivering effective benefits more widely to their constituent VDCs/municipalities (i.e. not just the original 70 VDCs). (*Baseline: CCA actions not integrated into any of the 14 district level plans; 2 out of 14 districts place policy in place to allocate funds for CC priorities.)* 5. *Outcome-level 3:* 14 Districts with range of local service providers able to deliver adaptation actions with community satisfaction level 70%. *(Baseline:* 23 NGOs/CBOs presently working on CCA in 28 VDCs in 14 districts). 6. *Outcome –level 4*: 213,000 (50%) living in HHs adopting adaptation actions two years after direct LAPA support ended. (*Baseline: 89,000 (21%). Indigenous nationalities are particularly under-represented (12%)).* 7. *Output-1.1*: 1800 adaptation priorities of the most vulnerable in 69 VDCs and 1 municipality completed with 70% satisfactory. Additional adaptation actions started with mainstream funding (in line with remaining actions from LAPA plans) (baseline: 0).

Fund (LAF) operating with appropriate fiduciary safeguards in place. 13. *Output*-3.1: Role of MCCICC expanded and coordination functions of the MCCICC operating effectively. 14. *Output*-3.2: GoN formulates and implements climate change strategy. 15. *Output*-3.3: Climate change fund flow mechanism operating at national level with appropriate financial safeguards in place. 16. *Output*-3.4: Number of Public Private Partnerships (PPP) delivering effective climate change adaptation.	8. *Output-1.2:* 46,000 vulnerable men and 69,000 vulnerable women trained on different aspects of CC adaptation. 92,000 (80% of trained people) able to apply training to improved livelihoods). 80% satisfaction level with training. (Baseline: 7.5% out of 2037 surveyed HH have received training on climate change before NCCSP). 9. *Output-1.3*: 60% satisfaction rate - 256,000 people. (Baseline: 0) 10. *Output*-2.1: 69 VDCs, 1 Municipality, 14 DDCs and 4 regional hubs with functional climate change coordination committees to ensure CCA is integrated into mainstream local planning, delivery and monitoring. *(Baseline: 0).* 11. *Output*-2.2: 14 districts with CCA integrated into mainstream planning, delivery and monitoring systems. (*Baseline: 0*). 12. *Output*-2.3: 14 Districts with LAF meeting satisfactory Fiduciary safeguards. (*Baseline: 0*). 13. *Output*-3.1: MCCICC operating effectively in the coordination of CC programming and learning. (Baseline: MCCICC formed in 2010, secretariat met twice in 2012, coordinated LDC CC work.) 14. *Output*-3,2: CC strategy being implemented effectively. (*Baseline: 0*). 15. *Output*-3: Fund flow mechanism operating effectively. (*Baseline: 0*). 16. *Output*-3: PPP delivering 3 effective CC Adaptation projects. (*Baseline: 0*).

CIF Indicators

Five Core Indicators

1. Degree of integration of climate change into sector planning.
2. Evidence of strengthened government capacity and coordination mechanism to mainstream climate resilience.
3. Quality and extent to which climate responsive instruments/investment models are developed and tested.
4. Extent to which vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public sector services use improved PPCR supported tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate variability and climate change.
5. Number of people supported by the CCP to cope with the effects of climate change

Question Designate for each of the Five Code Indicators

Core Indicator #1: Degree of integration of climate change into sector planning

1.1 Is there an approved climate change plan for the sector?
1.2 Have climate resilience strategies been embedded in the central government's/sector's principal planning documents?
1.3 Has responsibility been assigned to institutions or persons to integrate climate resilience planning?
1.4 Have specific measures, e.g. investments and programs, to address climate resilience been identified and prioritized?
1.5 Do all planning processes routinely screen for climate risks?

Core Indicator #2: Evidence of strengthened government capacity and coordination mechanism to mainstream climate resilience

2.1 Are information, studies and assessments addressing climate change, variability and resilience available?
2.2 Is the necessary climate change expertise available?
2.3 Do national/sector incentives and legislative policies expressly address climate change and resilience?
2.4 Does the government/sector participate in a cross-sectoral coordination mechanism for climate change activities?

Core Indicator #3: Quality and extent to which climate responsive instruments/investment models are developed and tested

3.1 Has the instruments/investment models been developed and tested?
3.2 Has the instruments/investment models been implemented to the scale proposed?
3.3 Has the instruments/investment models appropriately incorporated the needs of both females and males into its design and implementation?
3.2 Has the instruments/investment models incorporated the needs of vulnerable population into its design and implementation?

Core Indicator #4: Extent to which vulnerable households, communities, businesses and public sector services use improved PPCR supported tools, instruments, strategies, and activities to respond to climate variability and climate change.

4.1 Number of Households using PPCR supported tools, instruments, and strategies
4.2 Number of Communities using PPCR supported tools, instruments, and strategies
4.3 Number of Businesses using PPCR supported tools, instruments, and strategies
4.4 Number of Public Sector Service Entities using PPCR supported tools, instruments, and strategies

Core Indicator #5: Number of people supported by the CCP to cope with the effects of climate change

5.1 Total number of people supported by the CCP to cope with the effects of climate change
5.2 Number of people below poverty line supported by the CCP to cope with the effects of climate
5.3 Number of females supported by the CCP to cope with the effects of climate change

::