# **Proposed Prioritisation Approach**

Kit Nicholson Consulant

Inception Workshop for the Development of Climate Change Financing Framework & Climate Change Action Plan in Priority Ministries

July 11, 2013

Himawari Hotel, Phnom Penh



CAMBODIA CLIMATE CHANGE ALLIANCE

#### **Steps**

- 1. Long list (identification)
- 2. Rapid assessment to short list (including clustering)
- 3. Full assessment of short list to prepare Planning Matrix, with funding allocation



## **Reminder on Action Categories**

- Category 1: Dedicated climate change interventions (to deal with unaddressed CC issues);
- Category 2: Modifying existing interventions by adding adaptation proofing and mitigation actions;
- Category 3: Re-scaling of existing and planned interventions based on their climate change dimension



# **Prioritisation Evidence**

- Adaptation/mitigation primary scores
- 2 additional scores (co-benefits and feasibility)
- Phasing
- Scale
- For Cat 2 and 3, prioritisation refers to the proofing

#### element or re-scaling, not the existing expenditure

	Adaptation	Mitigation	Co-benefits	Feasibility	Aggregate	Phasing	Scale		
	Score	score	score	score	score	(s-m-l)	(1-4)		
Cat 1: New Actions									
Cat 2: Proofing									
Cat 3: Rescaling, replication									
						Ministry of Anviconment	uropean Union Bedercean Danida		

# **Adaptation Score**

	Adaptation	Mitigation	Co-benefits	Feasibility	Aggregate	Phasing	Scale	
	Score	score	score	score	score	(s-m-l)	(1-4)	
Cat 1: New Actions								
Cat 2: Proofing								
Cat 3: Rescaling, replication								

- Based on comparing the benefits if CC does take place to benefits if CC doesn't happen
- Rapid Assessment
  - 2 benefits with CC more than double benefits without ('high regret' actions)
  - 1 benefits with CC significant but small compared to benefits without ('low regret' actions)
  - 0 no/little difference in benefits with/without CC (no regret, provided the action is viable)
  - -1 intended adaptation benefits backfire (maladaptation)
  - -2 benefits with CC lower than without (climate risky)
- Full assessment involves estimation of benefits, where possible HANGE ALLIANCE

# **Mitigation Score**

	Adaptation	Mitigation	Co-benefits	Feasibility	Aggregate	Phasing	Scale
	Score	score	score	score	score	(s-m-l)	(1-4)
Cat 1: New Actions							
Cat 2: Proofing							
Cat 3: Rescaling, replication							

#### Rapid assessment

- 2 highly cost effective mitigation (no/little net cost)
- 1 moderately cost effective mitigation (expensive way to reduce emissions)
- 0 no/little mitigation
- -1 increases emissions
  More detailed assessment
  Estimate marginal
  abatement cost (\$/tCO2e)



# **Co-benefit and Feasibility Scores**

	Adaptation	Mitigation	Co-benefits	Feasibility	Aggregate	Phasing	Scale		
	Score	score	score	score	score	(s-m-l)	(1-4)		
Cat 1: New Actions									
Cat 2: Proofing	•						•		
Cat 3: Rescaling, replication									

- Co-benefits, scored 0-3, (adding scores from below)
  - Strong economic benefits? (0/1)
  - Strong social benefits (0/1) (ie concentration of benefits to vulnerable groups, like women, disabled, marginal ...)
  - Strong environmental benefits (0/1) (eg land/water degradation, biodiversity loss/gain)
- Feasibility, scored 0-3 (adding scores from below)
  - Strong political support? (0/1) (ie likelihood to proceed smoothly)
  - Good capacity to deliver? (0/1) (eg institutions and skills in place, plus operating resources)
  - Easy of implement (0/1) (eg complexity, coordination, legal needs)
- For full assessment, it may be useful to breakdown the components into more detail (eg using the Sustainable Development criteria)



# Timing, scale

	Adaptation	Mitigation	Co-benefits	Feasibility	Aggregate	Phasing	Scale		
	Score	score	score	score	score	(s-m-l)	(1-4)		
Cat 1: New Actions									
Cat 2: Proofing									
Cat 3: Rescaling, replication									

#### • Timing

- Short-mid-long term (no score)
- Any sequencing issues (Y/N just a reminder)

• Scale

- 1. Costs less than \$500,000
- 2. \$0.5-1m (eg studies, new policies, capacity building ...
- 3. \$1-5m (infrastructure, proofing, re-scaling with less than 100,000 beneficiaries in one location)
- 4. >\$5m (major infrastructure in many provinces more than 100,000 beneficiaries)



# **Example of Planning Matrix**

CCCS P Strat egy #	Minis try CCSP Strate gy #	Action	Catego ry of action	Respon sible depart ment(s)	Estimated budget					
					2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	Total
2		Climate proof design of canals in	2	Depart	20,00					
		the Northwest irrigation		ment of	0,000					
		programme*		Water	USD					
				Resourc						
				es						
4 and		Capacity Development	1	Depart	500,0					
5		programme on climate change		ment of	00					
		monitoring and analysis for		Meteor	USD					
		meteorology officials at national		ology &						
		and provincial levels**		Climate						
				Change						
				Focal						
				Point						
1		Increase budget for technical	3	Depart	1,000,					
		support for FWUCs***		ment of	000					
				Water	USD					
				Resourc						
				es						
		Etc.								

# **Filling in the Planning Matrix**

- Initial estimate of total expenditure for each shortlisted action (\$m)
- Add up initial estimates and compare with resource scenarios (from Ministry of Economic and Finance in CCFF)
- Reduce (or increase) spending to match resources available, using the prioritisation criteria to help decide which actions are reduced most
- Consider evidence on phasing (short-mid-long) and sequencing (ie start actions that are needed to prepare for others and don't start actions that need others) and allocate to each year

# **Political Finalisation**

- Consultation with stakeholders (agencies, NGOs, private sector, donors ...) on prioritisation and planning matrix
- Seek inputs from policy makers in ministry and obtain instructions on revisions
  - Prioritisation scores
  - Planning matrix



# **Guidelines to Groups**

- Fill in two forms provided: action list + Planning Matrix
- Action list requires
  - for all actions, do rough subjective classification of adaptation/mitigation, plus phasing and scale
  - for new actions, do co-benefits, feasibility, phasing
- Fill in blank planning matrix allocating 100 units of financial resource (aim to do one initial allocation and one revision)
- Reporting
  - Scores, phasing, scale
  - Matrix
  - Suggestions



#### **Action List**

	Adaptation	Mitigation	Co-benefits	Feasibility	Aggregate	Phasing	Scale			
	Score	score	score	score	score	(s-m-l)	(1-4)			
Cat 1: New Actions										
Cat 2: Proofing										
Cat 3: Rescaling, replication	Cat 3: Rescaling, replication									



## **Planning Matrix Form**



# **THANK YOU!**

