



Exploring the role of social learning in addressing climate uncertainties in district planning in Uganda

Marissa Van Epp, Margaret Barihaihi and Susannah Fisher

Country Report

December 2016

Climate change; Policy and planning

Keywords:

Climate change adaptation, climate change advocacy, social learning, public sector planning

About the authors

Marissa Van Epp is a consultant with IIED.

Margaret Barihaihi is the International Coordinator of the Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA).

Susannah Fisher is a Senior Researcher at IIED.

Corresponding author: msvanep@gmail.com

Produced by IIED's Climate Change Group

Working in collaboration with partner organisations and individuals in developing countries, the Climate Change Group has been leading the field on adaptation to climate change issues.

Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance

ACCRA is a consortium comprising of five international organisations: Oxfam Great Britain (Oxfam GB), the lead partner, the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) (research partner), Save the Children, CARE International and World Vision International (WVI).

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Cecily Kabagumya and Flavia Bykwaso for their invaluable contributions to the fieldwork informing this report.

Published by IIED, December 2016

Van Epp, M, Barihaihi, M and Fisher, S (2016). Exploring the role of social learning in addressing climate uncertainties in district planning in Uganda. IIED, London.

<http://pubs.iied.org/10173IIED>

ISBN: 978-1-78431-421-7

International Institute for Environment and Development
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055
email: info@iied.org
www.iied.org

 [@iied](https://twitter.com/iied)

 www.facebook.com/theIIED

Download more publications at www.iied.org/pubs

Significant uncertainties around future climate change challenge the implementation of policies and programmes. Process-driven approaches, such as social learning, may offer a more flexible approach to tackling the particular challenges of climate uncertainties such as uncertain evidence and long timeframes. This report explores how such processes have helped address climate uncertainties in Uganda through the work of the Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance.

Contents

Summary	2	6 Impact on management of climate uncertainty	17
1 Social learning and climate uncertainty	3	6.1 Uncertain evidence	18
1.1 The challenges of climate uncertainty	4	6.2 Multi-sectoral nature	18
1.2 Social learning approaches to planning for climate uncertainty	4	6.3 Long timeframes	19
2 Case study description	6	6.4 Differential impacts on marginalised groups	19
3 ACCRA's interventions and approach	8	7 Conclusion	20
4 Methodological and analytical framework	11	References	23
5 Social learning analysis	13	Annex 1	25
5.1 Engagement and participation	14	Annex 2	27
5.2 Capacity development	14	Related reading	29
5.3 Iterative reflection and action	15		
5.4 Challenging institutions	16		

Summary

Climate change presents several challenges to planning and implementation of policies and programmes. The main challenges from climate uncertainty are: the uncertain nature of evidence, the multi-sectoral nature of climate effects, long cause and effect timeframes, and differential impacts on marginalised groups. There is a concerted focus on improving climate science and the delivery of climate information services to address some of these issues. However, so far evidence is limited of uptake of climate information in policymaking and its sustained use through to adaptive management of implementation.

A number of approaches have sought to improve decision-making and use of relevant evidence for complex problems in different contexts. Social learning is one such approach, supporting knowledge sharing, joint learning and co-creation of evidence among stakeholders around a common issue. Through iterative learning, reflection and action cycles, it can catalyse behaviour change and social mobilisation beyond the level of the individual to create systemic change. The four key dimensions of social learning are engagement and participation, capacity building and understanding, iterative reflection, and challenging institutions. Although there is some evidence on how social learning could support ways to address climate uncertainties, no systematic attempt has been made to learn from all the different process-driven approaches to assess which works best. The increasing number of examples of practice present a good opportunity to carry out such an assessment.

This report explores how social learning has helped address climate uncertainties in district climate planning in Bundibugyo district, Uganda. The African Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA) has been working with Bundibugyo district to build capacity to mainstream climate change in development planning for over five years. ACCRA is a consortium of five partners established in 2009 that engages in research, capacity building, and advocacy, working in Mozambique, Uganda and Ethiopia. Across its work ACCRA has taken an approach that is implicitly one of social learning. In many cases, though the social learning-oriented approach and nature of the interventions made ACCRA's work a suitable case study, we recognise that ACCRA's interventions have not necessarily or explicitly aimed to address the challenges of climate uncertainty identified above but have done so implicitly with varying focus on the different dimensions.

The report shows that through work on mainstreaming climate change into planning ACCRA has successfully engaged a range of stakeholders across several levels in planning for climate change; built their capacities to learn from each other; and challenged district government to value climate change as a crosscutting issue requiring horizontal cooperation. Iterative learning was not a strong feature of ACCRA's interventions. Addressing the issue of uncertain evidence has not been a focus of ACCRA's work in Bundibugyo, so there is limited evidence of social learning's impact on this topic at the district level. That said, engagement in iterative learning (action and reflection cycles) of Harugale community members in the NAPA pilot created trust and built relationships that have the potential to help them cope with uncertain evidence. Through inclusive engagement and capacity development on climate change mainstreaming throughout its interventions, ACCRA has challenged institutions – specifically, district-level government – to shift towards treating climate change as a crosscutting issue. Engagement and capacity development of vulnerable communities have ensured their participation in developing planning tools at the district and national levels that take their needs into consideration. Furthermore, the engagement of women through gender analysis tools – in particular, in community consultations and activities such as the National Action Plan of Action (NAPA) pilot – may help sub-county and district stakeholders to address the differential impacts of climate uncertainty on different groups.

We argue that further action-orientated research is needed that focuses on building evidence and understanding on how process-oriented approaches to planning for adaptation can improve outcomes. This should integrate considerations of power, politics and decision-making into how processes are designed and tracked, aiming to maximise the likelihood that these can be negotiated to ensure resilient outcomes for marginalised groups. We consider active experimentation is essential to push forward understanding in this area. This would involve working with policymakers, practitioners, and businesses to develop and test process-oriented interventions that improve planning with respect to climate uncertainties, while at the same time fostering stakeholders' buy-in – across levels and sectors – to better understand how to encourage the move from planning to mobilisation and action.

Social learning and climate uncertainty

1

1.1 The challenges of climate uncertainty

Planning for climate change involves navigating several interconnected uncertainties (Wilby and Dessai, 2010). These include: 1) uncertainty about what future greenhouse gas emissions will be, 2) uncertainty within our various models for climate change and impacts, and 3) uncertainty around society's response to current and future impacts (Wilby and Dessai, 2010). These uncertainties present a number of specific challenges for planners and decision-makers.

For this research, we have focused on four key challenges:

- 1. Uncertain evidence:** The human elements of the uncertainties described above mean that even with improvements it is unlikely that climate modelling will allow us to accurately predict future climate and its impacts. These uncertainties may deter planners and decision-makers, but inaction also has potentially severe negative consequences.
- 2. Multi-sectoral nature of impacts:** Climate change impacts are cross-cutting. They affect not just the environment, but also health, infrastructure, migration, etc. These interrelated impacts – and coping with uncertainty around them – require a coordinated response across sectors.
- 3. Long and unpredictable timescales:** While changes in climate take place over long timescales, government planning and priority definition typically happen on shorter timescales, like five-year cycles (Fisher 2013; 2016). Decisions made now that have long-term impacts, however, may “lock-in” investment for adaptation solutions or development pathways that are no longer ideal once new climate information emerges.
- 4. Differentiated impacts on marginalised groups:** Different groups experience risk in different ways; the experience of marginalised groups may be impacted by lower levels of or access to resources and resilience to shocks (Moser 2008, Holmes and Jones 2010, Khan et al. 2014, Bradshaw and Linnekar 2014, Schalatek et al. 2012, UNFCCC 2010). Marginalised groups may be excluded from planning processes.

Addressing these four types of uncertainties in planning requires an approach that is flexible, multi-sectoral, forward-looking, and inclusive.

1.2 Social learning approaches to planning for climate uncertainty

Social learning-oriented approaches to planning for adaptation may help to address some of the challenges of planning in the context of climate uncertainty, as discussed above. Taking the definition of the Climate Change and Social Learning (CCSL) initiative, social learning approaches are those that “... *help facilitate knowledge sharing, joint learning and co-creation experiences between particular stakeholders around a shared purpose, taking learning and behaviour change beyond the individual to networks and systems. Through a facilitated iterative process of working together, in interactive dialogue, exchange, learning, action and reflection and ongoing partnership, new shared ways of knowing emerge that lead to changes in practice*” (Van Epp and Garside 2015).

Based on this definition, the core of a social learning-oriented approach is collective, iterative learning, action and reflection around a common, complex problem. The objective of the process is, in our framing, to catalyse social change. Learning must spread from individuals involved in the process to wider networks in order to achieve this objective. In this respect, social learning goes beyond other participatory approaches.

Four dimensions common to such approaches have been identified in the CCSL initiative's Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) Framework (Van Epp and Garside 2015): engagement and participation, capacity development, iterative reflection and action, and challenging institutions. These dimensions are defined in the CCSL M&E Framework as follows:

- 1. Engagement:** Outreach to and involvement of individuals and groups as part of the problem definition and learning process. Engagement as part of good social learning targets women, youth and other marginalised groups.
- 2. Capacity development:** The development of an individual's or group's knowledge and skills. In social learning this is not limited to a uni-directional transfer between two parties (eg researcher to farmer) but instead is multi-directional and involves multiple parties (eg farmers to researchers, farmers to farmers, researcher to farmer, etc).

3. **Iterative reflection and action:** Collective or group learning that occurs continuously or cyclically in order to co-create knowledge.
4. **Challenging institutions:** Active questioning of institutional practices and values, potentially leading to institutional change. In social learning, “institutions” refers not only to the formal, bricks-and-mortar sense of the term (eg government bodies or research institutes), but also to the informal, and intangible sense (eg local community organisations or cultural practices).

These dimensions are interlinked. For instance, capacity development may be necessary for meaningful engagement and participation in iterative learning; engagement and iterative learning are necessary for challenging institutions. Through encouraging an inclusive, bottom-up process; improving the capacity of stakeholders to build a shared understanding of the issues and co-generate knowledge that feeds into solutions; building flexibility and emerging evidence into decision-making; and helping institutions to value and support this kind of approach, social learning offers the *potential* for addressing the challenges of planning in the context of climate uncertainty. In the case study that follows we explore the extent to which there is evidence to support this hypothesis.

Case study description



This case study focuses on the most recent work that the Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA) carried out in Bundibugyo District in Uganda. Bundibugyo was chosen in part because ACCRA's involvement there has been relatively long term; it was one of the first districts that ACCRA worked with, starting in 2010.

Bundibugyo is a mountainous district in Western Uganda, on the border with the Democratic Republic of Congo, and has a population of around 230,000 people (Jockus 2013). Rain-fed agriculture is the main source of income (ACCRA 2011). The district's geography makes it particularly prone to soil erosion and landslides. The poverty level is around 60%; in 2010 0.2 per cent of households had access to electricity, and 98 per cent of the population was dependent on firewood and charcoal (Isabirye 2016). This dependence has led to deforestation, increasing the potential for erosion and landslides. Infrastructure is also already poor (Isabirye 2016, Jockus 2013). Climate change has brought

increased flooding and unpredictable rain patterns, exacerbating the pre-existing issues. For the many villagers both farming and living on the steep mountain slopes throughout the district, the combination can mean famine and even death when crops fail and homes are washed away. An increase in temperatures has also been observed; coupled with flooding, this has led to an increase in pests and diseases (Isabirye 2016, Jockus 2013).

For this case study, two sub-counties within Bundibugyo District were targeted to better understand local planning processes for climate change: Harugale Sub-County and Bukonzo Sub-County.¹ ACCRA was directly engaged with Harugale through research and later a pilot of National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) activities, but was only indirectly engaged with Bukonzo through its engagement at district level. A more detailed description of ACCRA's interventions is given in the following section.

¹ The sub-county is one administrative level below the district. Below sub-county are two additional levels: parish and village.

ACCRA's interventions and approach

3

The African Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA) is a consortium of five partners established in 2009 that engages in research, capacity building, and advocacy, working in Mozambique, Uganda and Ethiopia.² ACCRA aims to transform governance systems in order for them to support climate adaptive capacity development for people living in poverty, and increase their gender responsiveness and accountability. ACCRA has worked with local governments in Uganda for over five years, supporting them to mainstream climate change in their development plans through contextual evidence-based planning.

Some aspects of ACCRA's initiatives have sought to improve Ugandan decision-makers' and technical planners' ability to address climate uncertainty. These efforts have taken several different forms over the past five years, all of which have contributed to the current situation: the new Uganda climate change policy reflects the voices of the most vulnerable, climate change adaptation indicators gathered from communities around the country are slated for approval by the national government and integration into national- and local-level monitoring tools. It is important to note that ACCRA's interventions sometimes – but not always – addressed challenges relevant to climate *uncertainties* specifically.

Across this work ACCRA has taken an approach that is implicitly one of social learning. It has made an effort across the four dimensions of social learning: to engage all relevant stakeholders; to develop their capacity to understand climate change and learn from each other; to encourage cyclical learning between them; to facilitate vertical and horizontal relationships; and to challenge the institutions responsible for making decisions about climate change that affect the most vulnerable.

The analysis that follows is not intended to be an evaluation of ACCRA's efforts. In many cases, though the social learning-oriented approach and nature of the interventions made ACCRA's work a suitable case study, we recognise that ACCRA's interventions have not necessarily or explicitly aimed to address the challenges of climate uncertainty identified above. The objective of the analysis is not to judge the success or failure of ACCRA, but rather to search for evidence that such an approach has helped – or not helped – stakeholders to manage different aspects of climate uncertainty specifically, rather than climate change adaptation and planning more generally, and to better understand how the approach does or does not contribute.

An overview of the activities, focusing on the case study district, is given in this section:

Local Adaptive Capacity Research (2010–2011):

ACCRA began with the development of a framework for assessing local adaptive capacity. It piloted the framework in Uganda and other ACCRA countries with the aim of investigating the ways in which development work was enhancing or undermining the adaptive capacity of vulnerable groups, including women. The pilot took place in three districts in Uganda: Bundibugyo, Gulu, and Kotido (Jones et al. 2011). Key findings included: that district development plans did not reflect local climate-related challenges; that coordination between national and district levels, and between districts, was inadequate; and that the Environment Department, tasked with addressing climate change, was poorly funded (Jones et al. 2011, ACCRA and GoU *nd*). Following the research, ACCRA sought to put some of the recommendations stemming from it into practice. By the end of 2011, ACCRA was working with local government to experiment with ways to mainstream climate change in local development planning.

Climate Change Mainstreaming with Bundibugyo Local Government (2011–2012):

ACCRA carried out capacity gap analyses at district level in relation to mainstreaming climate change and disaster risk management. Some of the key findings for Bundibugyo included: lack of performance indicators (and thus accountability) for climate change; lack of district awareness on climate change and ownership of national policies and priorities; insufficient funding for DRR and climate change adaptation; a lack of coordination across sectors; and capacity and knowledge gaps (ACCRA 2011). These analyses informed ACCRA's work supporting different sectors to mainstream climate change in their planning.

At national level, based on power and stakeholder analyses, ACCRA co-opted relevant ministries into its national steering committee, including the Ministry of Water and Environment (MoWE), Climate Change Department (CCD), Uganda National Meteorological Authority (UNMA), and Office of the Prime Minister (OPM), among others. Collaborating with the MoWE and OPM, ACCRA provided “technical and financial support to the process of integrating climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction actions into [the] Bundibugyo District Development Plan (2011–2015)” (Isabirye 2016). The process was informed by available climate information, compiled and presented by the UNMA. Through the process, ACCRA challenged government institutions by bringing representatives

² Consortium members include Oxfam GB, the Overseas Development Institute, Care International, Save the Children and World Vision International. Source: Jones 2014.

of key ministries together with community members in Bundibugyo to discuss climate change risks and challenges.³ It also funded a training workshop facilitated by key ministries in which district planning unit representatives from all 11 sectors agreed on the key issues for each sector and identified actions to reduce vulnerability (ACCRA and GoU, *nd*). These activities informed the mainstreaming of climate change into sector-based and overarching government planning, at national and district levels.

One result of this work was that Bundibugyo District won a 20% budget bonus from the national government in 2011 by scoring highly on environment mainstreaming in the Ministry of Local Government (MoLG)'s annual performance assessment for local governments, which is based on a set of minimum standards. The money earned was plugged back into the natural resources sector. Based on this process ACCRA realised that local governments would be more willing to take up climate change mainstreaming if provided with the right incentives and knowledge – a national climate change policy, guidelines for mainstreaming climate change in district development plans, and minimum standards for mainstreaming in the Local Government Assessment Tool (LGAT), to name a few examples.

National Adaptation Plan of Action Pilot (2012–2013): The MoWE received money from DANIDA through the Royal Danish Embassy to pilot the National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) (Jockus 2016). Though originally Bundibugyo was not one of the 13 districts selected for the NAPA pilot, ACCRA lobbied the MoWE to have it included. A tripartite MoU was signed between Bundibugyo District, MoWE and ACCRA to support the pilot; ACCRA's role supporting capacity development activities constituted the 20% co-funding condition. With ACCRA's support, the district developed a proposal for the funding based on improving its existing development plan; the activities in the proposal were selected based on the issues that had been identified by the sub-counties and mainstreamed during ACCRA's previous engagement with Bundibugyo.

At the district level, a NAPA Steering Committee led by the Chief Administrative Officer (CAO) led on planning, procurement and technical support. A sub-county level NAPA Implementation Committee took charge of implementation and monitoring. The MoWE provided general coordination and management, and remained involved through monitoring and learning activities, visiting the districts involved (Jockus 2013). At the end

of the pilot, the results were documented and a national learning event took place to present the findings to all other districts and ministries, as well as international organisations and donors.

Tracking Adaptation and Monitoring Development (2014–2015): Using lessons from the NAPA pilot, ACCRA continued to pursue the development of climate change mainstreaming and performance measurement indicators for the LGAT. In August 2014, following a presentation by representatives from the Tracking Adaptation and Monitoring Development (TAMD) project supported by IIED in Mozambique, the Ugandan government officially invited IIED to launch TAMD in Uganda (Kajumba et al. *nd*). Five districts were chosen for the TAMD project, two of which had piloted the NAPA activities. ACCRA funded four of the districts, including Bundibugyo, while CARE funded one.⁴

In its four districts, ACCRA carried out a climate change vulnerability analysis (CCVA), theory of change exercises with community members, and an institutional scorecard exercise with district officials.⁵ The purpose of the theory of change exercises was to collect indicators from community members. The exercises were carried out by trainers who had themselves been trained in Bulambuli, one of the four districts; some were at district level, others were at national level.

After it was revealed that USAID was conducting a parallel exercise in 19 other districts, ACCRA asked the MoWE to coordinate a merger of the indicator collection and validation processes between the two projects. A workshop was held to bring the two projects together to share methods and indicators. For validation, several meetings were convened to allow the ministries to narrow down the list of indicators that would become national minimum standards.

At the same time, the government received funding from the French embassy to develop a performance measurement framework (PMF) for the national Climate Change Policy; so, by coincidence the TAMD indicators influenced this framework as well as the LGAT and Output Budget Tool (OBT). At the time of writing, the minimum standard indicators for each sector were being presented to the Permanent Secretary Forum and the cabinet for approval. Once approved, all ministries will have to integrate the indicators into their sector plans, and local governments will have to follow suit. The Ministry of Finance also issued a budget call in September 2016 notifying the other ministries that climate change mainstreaming was to become mandatory.

³ Bundibugyo Case Study. Ministries represented included the National Meteorological Authority, Disaster Risk Reduction group in the Office of the Prime Minister, National Agricultural Research Organization, and Climate Change and Water Departments of the Ministry of Water and Environment.

⁴ Further research on the TAMD process can be found in the Climate Change and Social Learning (CCSL) Initiative's ACCRA case study, which is focused on this intervention as an example of a social learning approach to climate change adaptation.

⁵ The CCVA in Bundibugyo was carried out in 2013, prior to the TAMD work, as part of the capacity development support ACCRA provided during the NAPA pilot.

Methodological and analytical framework

4

To understand social learning-oriented processes in Bundibugyo and their impact on managing climate uncertainties, a qualitative analysis was carried out based on fieldwork and a desk review of relevant documentation. The latter included reports regarding ACCRA's activities in the district and more broadly in Uganda. Semi-structured interviews and informal discussions with ACCRA were used to establish an outline of the activities and processes implemented. A total of 20 key informant interviews and three focus group discussions were conducted to gather evidence on the results of those activities and processes. Interviewees included national government officials in Kampala, district-level officials in Bundibugyo, and local government officials and community members in Harugale and Bukonzo sub-counties.

The analytical framework for data collection and analysis is based on the differing challenges of climate uncertainties (uncertain evidence, multi-sectoral impacts, long timeframes, and uncertain impacts on marginalised groups) and an adaptation of the key dimensions of social learning (engagement, capacity development, iterative learning and challenging institutions) identified in Section 1. The adapted dimensions for social learning can be found in Annex 2. Indicators were developed for the processes and outcomes in each dimension of social learning that we hypothesised would help planners and decision-makers address each challenge of climate uncertainty. These indicators are shown below in Figure 1; this matrix was used to support the interview schedule and code interview transcripts.

Figure 1. Social Learning and Climate Uncertainty Matrix

	Uncertain evidence	Multi-sectoral / interconnected	Long timeframes	Likelihood of differentiated impacts especially on marginalised groups
Engagement/ participation of diverse stakeholders	New evidence co-generated is more robust to uncertainty as takes into account range of types of evidence (triangulation) with different uncertainties, assumptions and knowledge bases. As climate projections converge – models improved, hindcasting tests prove validity of models etc. – decisions can be taken to use outputs from ensembles. These can be based on the trust and relationships developed that support dealing with this type of evidence and decision.	Stakeholders perspectives go beyond traditional sectors and new connections are made or strengthened.	Different timeframes used by stakeholders can help broaden priorities and assess longer term implications. Better understanding of the linkages between short term and longer term decisions.	Including insights from marginalised groups in a meaningful and robust way makes decisions more attentive to power relations and institutional barriers, as well as differentiated impacts.
Capacity building and shared understanding	Decisions can be made on basis of evidence when available/sufficient so allows build up of information, reflection on uncertainties and identifying necessary information for decisions (such as using the ensembles outlined above).	Better understanding of multi-sectorality and co-generation processes build understanding of complex issues.	Increased understanding can increase motivation to look at longer term effects. Co-generating evidence can build a more complex picture across time.	Other stakeholders understand these differentiated impacts and are motivated to address them.
Iterative reflection and action (non-linearity)	May help challenge norms on the need for specific forms of data or help validate evidence from wider range of sources with differing assumptions of validity, certainty etc.	As unintended consequences across sectors are noted or deemed to be important they can be added in.	Enable decision to be taken when most appropriate for evidence available and planning.	As differentiated outcomes and unintended effects become apparent for different groups they can be incorporated into planning.
Challenging institutions	Challenging institutional silos and norms within sectors.	Challenging institutional silos and norms within sectors, such as short-term planning timeframes, could help address aspects of uncertainty.	Challenging institutional practices could encourage stakeholders to listen to and take into account of the differentiated impacts on marginalised groups and livelihoods, including recognising the particular needs and priorities of women.	

Social learning analysis

5

5.1 Engagement and participation

Overview

Through various ACCRA initiatives a wide range of stakeholders has been engaged in addressing climate change and climate uncertainty, including communities and in particular women in those communities. Representatives of different ministries and sectors were brought together, as were members of different levels of government, and government together with communities. Though these kinds of interactions were already occurring to some extent through standard government procedures, they were augmented by ACCRA's interventions. Furthermore, ACCRA's approach has brought other actors in this space together, including other NGOs and donors.

Identification of disadvantaged groups and tailored engagement:

At district level, planning builds on the priorities sent from all of the sub-counties, which are built on the priorities sent from all parishes, which in turn are decided based on consultations with community members in each village. This bottom-up planning is generally perceived to take the needs of women and people with disabilities into account. While this planning process appears to be standard, ACCRA's interventions contributed to ensuring that such bottom-up processes outlined on paper are being implemented in real life.

In Bukonzo, engagement processes in sub-county level planning did not appear to be different from in Harugale. There was no specific evidence of tailored engagement for different stakeholder groups, but equally no evidence either of inequality in engagement practices. Further work is needed to understand the engagement processes and outcomes in Bukonzo.

In terms of specific ACCRA interventions, in Harugale, both women and men were targeted by the NAPA project. The NAPA committee, for instance, was comprised of at least half women and included disabled people (one woman and one man). The composition of such groups is regulated by village bylaws – also not the result of ACCRA's work. Though members were selected through a top-down process, others were allowed to join based on interest. Equal numbers of women and men were selected to participate in the training of trainers (TOTs) for NAPA activities. Both women and men participated in all four NAPA activities in the training and through the Farmer Field Schools (FFS).

Furthermore, ACCRA's approach has enabled synergies of various kinds, including technical relationships, co-funding relationships and networking, coordination and learning at various levels. These relationships and the spread of learning have helped to actively and passively scale up ACCRA's initiatives.

5.2 Capacity development

Overview

Tailored capacity development activities on climate change, uncertainty and mainstreaming were conducted with all major stakeholder groups and at multiple levels. The common language and understanding that this capacity development has contributed to has enhanced stakeholders' ability to learn from each other regarding climate change adaptation.

Capacity development needs for knowledge co-creation identified:

Within district-level government it is generally understood that climate change is a “cross-cutting” issue. This comes in part from the top: national government has named it a cross-cutting issue in the National Climate Change Policy (2015), 2015–2020 five-year development plan, and Vision for 2040. This conceptualisation of climate change stems from many influences – including international forums like the COP – and cannot be attributed solely to ACCRA's interventions. That said, ACCRA's contribution to ensuring robust policies through the provision of evidence is well recognised by the government.

In contrast, there is limited knowledge co-creation between departments in Bundibugyo District: in some cases they plan together, but in others they are not able to because of the division of some aspects of climate change into two different departments. In the case of water, for example, the Department of Water handles only water infrastructure, while the Department of Environment handles environmental water issues. When there is funding or a mandate from national government for cross-departmental working groups, such groups foster knowledge sharing and joint planning. For example, a disaster risk reduction (DRR) working group was put in place, but has since become inactive due to lack of funding and prioritisation.

Many of ACCRA's interventions have focused on capacity development for district-level government (centred on climate change awareness, gender analysis, climate mainstreaming and risk assessment), aimed at bringing different departments together to plan together for climate change. None of the interviewees in this study appeared to remember this work specifically, but that is not to say that it has not had any impact. Some of these efforts happened early on in ACCRA's

engagement with Bundibugyo, so there are two possible explanations: 1) beneficiaries of this capacity development have been transferred to other districts, and/or 2) the efforts were successful to the point that the cross-cutting nature of climate change issues seems obvious to current officials.

ACCRA has carried out several capacity assessments. A capacity gap analysis informed early mainstreaming efforts, including a climate vulnerability and capacity analysis (CVCA) and gender analysis. More recently, during indicator collection, trainers led district officials through an institutional capacity self-assessment using a scorecard developed jointly with TAMD, which was used to shape ACCRA's capacity development agenda. The latter assessment is an example of bottom-up identification of capacity development needs.

There are examples of capacity development for knowledge co-creation at and between other levels as well. In the case of NAPA activities in Harugale, community members learned from other community members through the farmer field schools. During earlier mainstreaming and later indicator validation workshops, members of different sectors and levels were brought together to learn from each other and recognise the value of such processes.

Though not discussed in depth during the fieldwork informing this study, ACCRA has taken steps towards merging traditional knowledge with scientific knowledge on climate. Improving access to and capacity for understanding forecasts from the National Meteorological Authority has been part of ACCRA's efforts. Knowledge co-creation has not yet been a focus specifically, but fundraising is underway for a future project with this objective.

Capacity development is tailored to suit different stakeholder groups: The NAPA pilot in Harugale involved capacity development activities supporting the technical skills and knowledge community members needed to carry out the NAPA activities. These activities included a visit to Kabale, another mountainous district with similar climate change issues and hands-on experience to learn specific techniques from Kabale community members who were successfully practising them. This mode of capacity development was appropriate and worked well. Upon the trainers' return, farmer field schools were set up to share the techniques with more community members; this method of spreading capacity development to a wider group also appears to have been an effective method.

Community members and local officials in Bukonzo have not benefitted from capacity development activities supported by ACCRA. Though there have been interventions by other NGOs, like the Red Cross, limited information on these projects was available.

Uncertainties: Though some effort was made to integrate climate information into Bundibugyo's District Development Plan, it does not appear that uncertainties in evidence for or models of future climate change specifically are discussed in depth at district or sub-county level. This is in part because there is no funding for long-term planning (and limited funding for short-term planning). Funding processes are also quite rigid, with limited flexibility for dealing with new evidence. Lastly, there is limited information on future climate change being communicated from the national level to the district and below to begin with.

5.3 Iterative reflection and action

Overview

Encouraging cyclical learning and reflection among government was not a major element of ACCRA's interventions. Activities bringing multiple stakeholder groups together were learning opportunities, but as ACCRA's approach is explicitly one of working within existing systems to improve them, the interventions did not focus on putting in place new systems that would ensure that the learning continues after/without ACCRA's support. Standard government planning procedures do involve iterative learning to some extent, but government hierarchy and rigidity continue to present obstacles to the flexibility and third-loop learning needed to address climate uncertainty. At local level, the NAPA activities encouraged cyclical learning and reflection, but it appears to have ceased with the end of the project.

Cyclical learning and reflection processes inform decisions: At district level, the planning process for five-year development plans is in some sense a learning and reflection process, though the emphasis does not appear to be on learning or reflection. In some cases, according to one key informant, the district planner may essentially recycle the previous five-year plan. That said, the meetings in which priorities are approved often involve leadership from district, sub-county and even parish levels sitting together, so there is certainly opportunity for collective learning.

Government at sub-county level also has established procedures for consulting community members to gather their priorities for the five-year development plans. This bottom-up planning (initiated at village level, then parish level, then sub-county level, and eventually district level) that occurs every five years is in some ways cyclical learning, but reflection and "learning" are more implicit than explicit parts, and it is a long

learning cycle with relatively few intervals for adjustment. Budgets are planned annually, but must fit within the five-year plan.

In Harugale, during the NAPA pilot the farmer field schools got together periodically to share successes and failures and discuss solutions. The NAPA project was only one year (thus not many learning cycles), but in Harugale the work was extended to two and a half years using the budget bonus that Bundibugyo received.

Systems for implementing new ideas are in place:

These are not really present at district level, due to the planning and budgeting cycles described above. In Harugale, within NAPA, the quarterly meetings of the farmer field schools and the NAPA committee provided an opportunity to implement new ideas. Beyond this, however, as in Bukonzo, there is no evidence of flexibility of government funding to support new ideas. Within the structure of ACCRA, however, there is ample evidence that the flexibility needed to implement new ideas is available.

Second and third loop learning: At district level this appears to only happen to a limited extent; we did not ask explicitly about it but no efforts to do this were mentioned. At sub-county level, decision-making processes do not appear to leave room for this kind of questioning. This level of learning was, however, happening within ACCRA, and influenced their strategy and involvement.

5.4 Challenging institutions

Overview

Through engagement and capacity development ACCRA worked to challenge government at national and district levels. Champions were identified, especially at national level, and an evolving change strategy was developed based on existing norms and processes. At national level, some long-term changes – due in part to the government's own desire to implement these changes – are visible. At district level, fewer changes are visible and attribution to ACCRA's social learning-oriented approach is more difficult. This is due in part to districts' positioning in the top-down government hierarchy, as well as to the transient nature of government staff in a given district – officials who were engaged by ACCRA's initial interventions had been transferred or could not remember the activities.

Champions identified: There was limited evidence of this at district level, but some at sub-county level. In Harugale, the selection of trainers for the NAPA

activities was effectively a top-down method of selecting champions; there is also no evidence, though, that this did not work, as members of the community appeared to treat the opportunity for leadership as a privilege. Membership in the NAPA committee was also open to those who were interested and at least a few committee members present in the focus group discussion reported self-selecting into the group because they thought it was important. This group appears to be keeping the effort – or at least the spirit of it – alive long after the activity ended. At the very least, they are ready to take up the flag again if further funding is obtained. In Bukonzo, there was no evidence that identification of champions was a part of the Red Cross activities.

Throughout its engagement, ACCRA has strived to identify champions at national level. By encouraging specific ministries and individuals to take ownership of specific processes – like the validation of adoption of the climate change adaptation indicators – ACCRA has created more sustainable processes that are continuing under their own steam.

Change strategy developed including mapping of norms and processes: ACCRA's engagement with district-level government (eg for the institutional capacity self-assessment with TAMD) demonstrates that a change strategy was in place, which took into consideration existing norms and processes that impede Uganda's progress on climate change. The change strategy evolved based on action-reflection cycles, and as new information was acquired. ACCRA did not work in Bukonzo, and there was not an opportunity to speak to representatives of other NGOs about change strategies that the organisation may have developed for its interventions there.

Institutions challenged: ACCRA's activities, including the institutional capacity self-assessment, have challenged district government to think about climate change in a more holistic way. Though it appears that planning for climate change at sub-county level – which largely focuses on immediate, practical needs – happens in a cross-cutting way, further work is needed to understand how planning processes have changed over time and why. In terms of ACCRA's interventions, some sub-county officials may have attended the theory of change workshops conducted with community members, but it is not apparent that this had a lasting impact on sub-county level government's ability or proclivity to engage in *social learning* more so than usual (again, bottom-up planning processes are already in place). Across levels, government hierarchy means that sub-county government would find it difficult to challenge district level, and the same for district-level government challenging national level.

Impact on management of climate uncertainty

6

6.1 Uncertain evidence

Overview

This element of climate uncertainty has not been a focus of ACCRA's interventions in Bundibugyo. There is little scientific evidence on long-term (and even short-term) climate trends available to district-level planners (and below) to begin with. That said, the NAPA pilot supported trust building through the engagement of Harugale community members in iterative learning processes, which should help them to deal with uncertain evidence in the future.

Through the NAPA pilot in Harugale, trust and relationships that support dealing with uncertainty (and uncertain evidence) were built to some extent through the farmer field schools and NAPA Implementation Committee. Committee members specifically referred to the friendships they had formed across the parish, sub-county and even district borders as a positive outcome of the pilot activities. Trust was also formed between Bundibugyo and Harugale officials and ACCRA, resulting in officials' receptiveness to climate information sent by ACCRA (specifically by Tracy Kajumba). Some sub-county officials in Bukonzo also said they trusted that (and other) climate information when they received it. However, many community members and sub-county officials indicated they are more likely to rely on traditional knowledge.

Though ACCRA has worked on flexible and forward-looking decision making (FFDM), the piloting of an FFDM game took place in Kotido district and not in Bundibugyo district. This kind of intervention explicitly supports reflection-to-action cycles that deal with uncertain evidence, allowing for incremental improvement based on evolving/changing evidence and for room to fail. In contrast, disasters in Bundibugyo are primarily addressed in a reactive manner. For instance, the district Water Officer noted that he only has plans for disasters that happen frequently, like floods; for droughts, which are less frequent, there is no plan. Again, funding is a crucial barrier. The DRR Committee at district level is also not functional due to lack of budget.

There is no indication that more robust evidence on future climate change – where robust means it takes a range of perspectives on current and future scenarios into account – is being generated at either district or sub-county level. This was not a focus of the ACCRA or Red Cross interventions. Community members and farmers, who rely primarily on indigenous knowledge in agriculture, do not have any direct engagement with the NMA or other sources of scientific climate information.

6.2 Multi-sectoral nature

Overview

ACCRA's approach has targeted this element of climate uncertainty through engagement of multiple sectors/ministries and capacity development on mainstreaming, especially at district level. At national level, climate change is described in key documents as a cross-cutting issue (a relatively recent shift most likely due to many external influences). ACCRA's efforts have supported the translation of this understanding on paper to an understanding based on experience, by piloting and supporting cross-sectoral planning at multiple levels, as well as facilitating the development of vertical relationships between levels.

Stakeholder perspectives and understanding that cross-sector boundaries supporting more holistic solutions are evident at multiple levels. At national-level, climate change is seen as a cross-cutting issue – it is formally enshrined as such in the National Development Plan (NDP II).⁶

It is anticipated that the new LGAT and OBT for 2017–2018 will also recognise the cross-cutting nature of climate change by including climate change indicators for multiple sectors. At district level, ACCRA's interventions, through inclusive engagement and capacity development on mainstreaming, have played a more significant role in the shift from thinking of climate change solely as an environmental issue to one affecting all sectors. Planning at this level now involves people from multiple sectors.

At sub-county level, thinking shifted in a similar way, in part due to the various interventions by organisations (including ACCRA) that treat it as a cross-sectoral issue. Trickle-down from the top may have also played a role in the shift. The NAPA pilot, for instance, demonstrated to Harugale community members that the impacts of and adaptations to climate change cross sectoral boundaries. The pilot also gave them an opportunity to participate in decision-making about adaptation, to some degree. Thus, sectors and stakeholders that were not previously included in climate change decision-making now contribute to and benefit from the process.

That said, in terms of operationalisation, some institutional silos remain. For instance, the Water and Works Department, under the Ministry of Works and Engineering, is excluded from climate change discussions because it oversees water consumption rather than the protection of water resources, which is

⁶In NDP I there is no mention of climate change. Instead it is assumed that it is covered under "environment".

the domain of the Natural Resources Department, under the Ministry of Water and Environment. Furthermore, sectors do not share a budget to address cross-sectoral issues; even when they plan together they implement separately.

In sum, ACCRA's social learning-oriented approach has supported a better understanding of multi-sectorality, as well as the complexity of impacts and appropriate solutions to address them, at all levels. One example from Harugale came from the Sub-County Chief, who said, "ACCRA and the Renzworu Management Committee's interventions have changed the way I plan – they have taught me to think about climate change as a cross-cutting issue. I also now encourage community members to think about climate change as they go about their daily activities."

6.3 Long timeframes

Summary

Climate change timescales longer than five years are not yet being addressed in Bundibugyo. Government planning at all levels currently happens on a five-year cycle, and performance measurement is based on outputs. That said, the government intends to implement outcome monitoring, which may shift the timescales for planning to longer ones. The role of social learning in this shift is unclear. Overall, institutional challenging on this topic is difficult due to entrenched planning cycles.

Consideration of different timeframes used by stakeholders – especially long timeframes – does not appear to be happening at district or sub-county levels. This is primarily due to five-year development planning cycles and lack of funding. At national level, the Vision for 2040 informs the five-year plans. In the near future, the OBT (based on outputs) will be supplanted by the Project Budget Tool (PBT) (based on outcomes), a shift that will presumably require districts to plan for longer timescales. While the shift itself cannot be wholly attributed to ACCRA's interventions, ACCRA has supported the national government in creating outcome-oriented indicators for the first time and understanding their importance and relevance for different monitoring tools.

Engagement with climate scientists who work on longer timescales has not been part of ACCRA's efforts in Harugale, nor of any intervention in Bukonzo. Though the FFDM game pilot ACCRA conducted does challenge the short-term nature of government thinking and encourage the integration of long and unpredictable

timeframes into reflect–act cycles and decision-making, the pilot was limited to one district and did not take place in Bundibugyo.

6.4 Differential impacts on marginalised groups

Summary

Engagement and capacity development have been crucial to helping stakeholders to understand the differential impacts of climate change on marginalised groups.

At sub-county level, it appears that women are included in a meaningful and robust way in knowledge creation and decision-making. Though there are far fewer women in formal leadership positions, they are involved in the community consultations that inform the development plans. At district and sub-county levels, the standard bottom-up structure for planning involves a lot of face-to-face communication with community members (including youth) who are impacted by climate change and ensures that community concerns, needs and ideas are incorporated into sub-county and district level plans (where funding is available). That said, it is unclear whether planning *cycles* allow unintended effects on marginalised groups to be incorporated as they become apparent.

Outside of standard planning processes, women are also meaningfully included in projects like the NAPA pilot and TAMD indicator development, and in community groups like the BBG. In the NAPA committee women were active and vocal; the ToTs and farmer field schools for NAPA activities also included women. It is unclear whether ACCRA influenced these arrangements or whether it was a requirement of the NAPA pilot. Disabled people were included in the BBG.⁷ In some cases the inclusion of women and disabled people is mandated by sub-county bylaws.

In Harugale, men and women alike in the NAPA committee could name examples of differentiated impacts of climate change for both genders. Men interviewed at district level also appeared to understand that women would be impacted differently. Some of this is undoubtedly attributable to the decade-long national-level focus on gender as a cross-cutting issue.⁸ Because of this, challenging institutions to listen to and take account of women may not be a priority. Limited information was available on the inclusion of other marginalised groups (eg ethnic minorities).

⁷ The group includes one disabled man and one disabled woman.

⁸ Uganda has a Ministry of Gender, which leads on this issue.

Conclusion



This case study investigated the level and impact of social learning in decision-making processes addressing climate change and uncertainty at district and sub-county levels in Bundibugyo district in Uganda. A qualitative analysis was conducted through fieldwork and a desk review of documentation of relevant processes. The analytical framework, which draws on key elements of social learning and climate uncertainty, supported an assessment of the contribution of actions in four dimensions of social learning-oriented processes to stakeholders' ability to address four challenges of planning in the context of climate uncertainty.

Section 5 presented evidence that, using a social learning-oriented approach in a challenging context, ACCRA successfully engaged a range of stakeholders

across several levels in planning for climate change, built their capacities to learn from each other, and challenged district government to value climate change as a cross-cutting issue requiring horizontal cooperation. Iterative learning was not a strong feature of ACCRA's interventions.

While ACCRA often takes a social learning-oriented approach, addressing climate uncertainty specifically (rather than climate change adaptation more generally) has not been a focus of the consortium's efforts in Bundibugyo district. The results (summarised in Table 2 below), however, still provide some clues as to how activities in the different dimensions of social learning may increase planners' and decision-makers' ability to address specific challenges of climate uncertainty.

Table 2. Summary of results

DIMENSION OF CLIMATE UNCERTAINTY	IS THIS DIMENSION BEING ADDRESSED? AT WHAT LEVELS?	WHAT ASPECTS OF SOCIAL LEARNING ARE PRESENT AND SUPPORTING THIS, IF ANY?
Uncertain evidence	Hardly – all levels	Addressing the issue of uncertain evidence has not been a focus of ACCRA's work in Bundibugyo, so there is limited evidence of social learning's impact on this topic at district level. That said, engagement in iterative learning (action-and-reflection cycles) of Harugale community members in the NAPA pilot created trust and built relationships that have the potential to help them to cope with uncertain evidence.
Multi-sectoral nature	Yes – all levels	Through inclusive engagement and capacity development on climate change mainstreaming throughout their interventions, ACCRA has challenged institutions (specifically government at district level) to shift towards treating climate change as a cross-cutting issue.
Long and unpredictable timeframes	Partially – national level Hardly – district & sub-county levels	This has not been a focus of ACCRA's efforts in Bundibugyo, so there is limited evidence on the impact of social learning on addressing this challenge. ACCRA has, however, influenced national policies and monitoring tools are beginning to address the long timeframes of climate change through outcome monitoring, but this has not yet trickled down to district level.
Differentiated impacts on marginalised groups	Yes – all levels	Engagement and capacity development of vulnerable communities has ensured their participation in the development of planning tools at district and national level that take their needs into consideration. Furthermore, the engagement of women through gender analysis tools in particular in community consultations and activities like the NAPA pilot has potentially helped sub-county and district stakeholders to address the different impacts of climate uncertainty on different groups.

As climate data and science were not a focus of ACCRA's interventions, there is little evidence for the impact of their approach on changes in stakeholders' abilities to plan in the face of uncertain evidence, or for long and unpredictable timeframes. There is, however, strong evidence of the benefits of the approach for building decision-makers' understanding of the multi-sectoral nature of climate change (if not explicitly climate uncertainty) and their ability to plan for adaptation together across sectors. There is also some evidence that ACCRA's approach has helped to increase

different stakeholders' understanding of the impacts for marginalised groups, such as poor communities in isolated, mountainous districts like Bundibugyo, and for women in those communities.

This country report is part of a set of case studies IIED have undertaken looking at these issues. We argue that to address the gaps identified in this paper and build knowledge about how a process-orientated approach to adaptation could be made most effective in different contexts, further action-orientated research is needed.

References

- ACCRA. 2011. Capacity Gap Analysis Study of Bundibugyo District. February 2011.
- ACCRA, Feed the Future, and Government of Uganda. 2016. Workshop Report: The Stakeholders' Meeting to Review the Standard National Climate Change Indicators' Reference Sheets. From a workshop in Mukono, Uganda, on August 2nd, 2016.
- ACCRA and Government of Uganda. 2013. Bundibugyo District Local Government: Climate Change Vulnerability and Capacity Assessment. Training Report from a training session conducted February 6th and 7th, 2013.
- ACCRA and Government of Uganda. *nd* A Local Government's Experience in Integrating Climate Change Adaptation into Development Planning: Bundibugyo Case Study.
- ACCRA and Uganda Ministry of Water and Environment. 2015. Influencing National Level Policy Frameworks for Climate Change Planning and Budgeting Processes in Uganda: Using a Bottom-Up Approach.
- Bradshaw, S. and Linnekar, B. 2014. Gender and Environmental Change in the Developing World. IIED Working Paper. IIED, UK.
- Fisher, S. 2013. Low-carbon resilient development in the least developed countries. IIED Issue Paper. IIED, UK.
- Fisher, S. and Karani, I. 2015. Strengthening frameworks to monitor and evaluate climate adaptation in Uganda. IIED Climate Change Briefing, April 2015.
- Fisher, S., Fikreyesus, D., Kallore, M., Asafew, L., Rwirihira, J., Islam, N. 2016. Storylines of synergy in low carbon resilient development: finance, ownership and shifting co-benefits in Rai, N., and Fisher, S. (Eds), 2016, *Low-Carbon Resilient Development Planning in the Least Developed Countries*, Routledge, London.
- Government of Uganda. Bundibugyo District Local Government: Approved Five-Year District Development Plan 2010/11-2014/15.
- Holmes, R., and Jones, J. *nd* *Social Protection in the Developing World: Beyond Mothers and Safety Nets*. Zed Books, London.
- Isabirye, P. 2016. Ugandan Experience: Mainstreaming Climate Change Adaptation and Disaster Reduction. PowerPoint presentation given at the TAMD multi-country meeting in Meru, Kenya on November 13th, 2016.
- Jockus, M. 2013. The NAPA Pilot Project in Bundibugyo District: A case study of soil and water control and tree-planting project in the mountainous ecosystem – Harugale Sub-County. PowerPoint presentation given on September 4th, 2013.
- Jones, L., Ayorekire, F. Barihaihi, M., Kagoro, A. and Ruta, D. 2011. Preparing for the future in Uganda: Understanding the influence of development interventions on adaptive capacity at the local level. Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance (ACCRA) Uganda Synthesis Report. Available at: http://community.accraconsortium.org/.5a35bbfb/Uganda_Synthesis_Report.pdf
- Jones, L., Ludi, E., Carabine, E., and Grist, N. 2014. Planning for an uncertain future: promoting adaptation to climate change through flexible and forward-looking Decision-Making. ODI March 2014.
- Kajumba, T. and Karani, I. 2015. Influencing the development and integration of national standard climate change indicators into the monitoring and reporting frame works in Uganda. ACCRA Briefing Paper, November 2015.
- Kajumba, T. et al. ND. Tracking Adaptation, Measuring Development in Uganda: District Climate Change Adaptation Monitoring & Evaluation Indicators.
- Khan, F., Rehman, A., and Ahmed, A. 2014. Applying TAMD in Pakistan: rainwater harvesting, resilience and gender. IIED Country Report.
- Moser, C., and Satterthwaite, D. 2008. Towards pro-poor adaptation to climate change in the urban centres of low- and middle-income countries. IIED Discussion Paper. IIED, London.
- ODI. 2014. Planning for the future and adapting to climate change in Uganda: Lessons from ACCRA. ODI March 2014.

Schalatek, et al. 2012. 'The Green Climate Fund', Liane Schalatek, Heinrich Böll Stiftung and Smita Nakhooda and Neil Bird. London: Overseas Development Institute.

UNFCCC. 2010. Report of the Conference of the Parties on its sixteenth session, held in Cancun from 29 November to 10 December 2010: Part Two: Action taken by the Conference of the Parties at its sixteenth session (<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2010/cop16/eng/07a01.pdf>).

Van Epp, M. and Garside, B. 2014. Monitoring and Evaluating Social Learning: A Framework for Cross-Initiative Application. CCAFS Working Paper no. 98. CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change, Agriculture and Food Security (CAAFS). Copenhagen, Denmark.

Wilby, R.L., and Dessai, S. 2010. Robust adaptation to climate change. *Weather* 65:180–185.

Annex 1

Interview list

#	DATE	TITLE	LEVEL
1	31 Aug 2016	ACCRA International Coordinator, Oxfam	Programme
2	1 Sep 2016	Senior Economist, Office of the Prime Minister	National
3	2 Sep 2016	Climate Change Officer, Climate Change Department – Ministry of Water and Environment	National
4	2 Sep 2016	Head, Climate Change Department – Ministry of Water and Environment	National
5	2 Sep 2016	Local Government Inspector, Ministry of Local Government	National
6	3 Sep 2016	District Environment Officer, Bundibugyo District	District
7	3 Sep 2016	District Natural Resources Officer, Bundibugyo District	District
8*	4 Sep 2016	Bompomboli Boundary Group Leader and Officers, Bulambuli Sub-County	Local
9	5 Sep 2016	LC3 Chairman, Bulambuli Sub-county	Local
10	5 Sep 2016	Community Development Officer, Bulambuli Sub-County	Local
11	5 Sep 2016	National Agricultural Advisory Services Officer, Bulambuli Sub-County	Local
12	5 Sep 2016	Sub-county Chief (standing in for the Parish Chief), Bulambuli Sub-County	Local
13*	5 Sep 2016	NAPA Committee members, Bulambuli Sub-County	Local
14	6 Sep 2016	District Principal Assistant Secretary, Bundibugyo District	District
15	6 Sep 2016	Planner, Bundibugyo District	District
16	6 Sep 2016	Water Officer, Bundibugyo District	District
17	6 Sep 2016	Health Officer, Bundibugyo District	District
18	6 Sep 2016	Forest Ranger, Bundibugyo District	District
19	6 Sep 2016	Community Development Officer, Bundibugyo District	District
20	7 Sep 2016	LC3 Chariman, Bukonzo Sub-County	District
21	7 Sep 2016	Sub-county chief, Bukonzo Sub-County Parish chief, Bukonzo Sub-County Parish chief, Bukonzo Sub-County	Local
22*	8 Sep 2016	Bukonzo Sub-County	Local
23**	3–9 Sep 2016 (informal discussions throughout)	Independent Consultant; trainer during the TAMD indicator work with communities Climate Change Officer, CCD MoWE; trainer during the TAMD indicator work with communities	Programme
24	29 Sep 2016	Oxfam – ACCRA International Coordinator	Programme
25**	11–12 Oct 2016	Oxfam – ACCRA International Coordinator	Programme

* Focus group discussion; **Informal discussions

Annex 2

CCSL Social Learning Indicators Adapted for Climate Uncertainty

	PROCESS	LEARNING (COGNITIVE, NORMS, RELATIONAL)	VALUES AND PRACTICE
Engagement and participation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All key stakeholder groups affected by climate change – including women, youth and other disadvantaged groups – are identified and targeted Groups/individuals identified are engaged through appropriately tailored means Two parts: All target groups/ individuals are actively participating in the process Facilitator role identified as trusted and effective by all parties including these groups 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Cognitive] Knowledge of the problem enhanced by interactions [Relational] <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Engagement has led to better relations between target groups/individuals Trust created Engagement has led to awareness and valuing of other stakeholders [Normative] Two parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Different knowledge types from different stakeholders successfully integrated in to the group reflective process Engagement has led towards a change in collective understanding of the problem and solutions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> [Value] Engagement leads to increased commitment on the part of target groups/individuals in reaching the goal of the project [Practice] Three parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New social networks established New ideas and solutions discussed Empowerment of most vulnerable beneficiaries (communities) including women and children More informed stakeholders [Practice] Two parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Information given leads to different groups working together better Reflecting on evidence leads to changes in practice and in some case co-generated evidence that reflect a better understanding of the problem and solutions
Capacity development	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity development needs for effective knowledge co-creation are determined collectively in a bottom-up manner Capacity development processes are tailored to suit different groups (eg governments, farmers, scientists) – ensuring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1) information is shared in accessible ways with each group – fostering knowledge generation 2) the format of capacity building suits the participants and allows sufficient time to reflect and debate new understanding emerging from capacity development processes Uncertainties are discussed and reflected upon 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Similar level of understanding of the problem by all stakeholders [Relational] Increased understanding between different participant groups of different needs and perspectives [Normative] Increase in collective understanding/ challenging of relevant methods and evidence for particular stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reflecting on evidence leads to changes in practice and in some case co-generated evidence that reflect a better understanding of the problem and solutions

	PROCESS	LEARNING (COGNITIVE, NORMS, RELATIONAL)	VALUES AND PRACTICE
Iterative reflection and action	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cyclical learning and reflection processes are available for the group • Decision-making for further action is driven by group reflection cycles • Systems are in place to foster and implement new ideas when they arise, or when new evidence is available • Decision-making involves regular reflection on and re-evaluation of impact pathways • Questioning of values, norms, evidence and governance underlying problem is valued and happening regularly 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Cognitive] Two parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – New knowledge is co-created as part of the reflect and act cycles – Decisions incorporate the findings from group reflection • [Relational] Evidence as learning/evaluation takes place that people understand the reason to change relations and behaviours between people and groups • [Normative] Two parts: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Participants understand the need for alternatives and room to fail – Reviewing and evaluating is seen as important by stakeholders and decision-makers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Value] Wider stakeholder groups understand the reasons to change their relations and behaviours • [Practice] Wider stakeholder groups relate to each other differently • [Value] The need for alternatives and room to fail is evident in other projects/programmes • [Practice] Alternatives and room to fail are built in to other projects/programmes
Challenging institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key individuals/institutions who will support/champion change are identified • A change strategy is developed, including mapping of existing norms and endogenous processes. • Existing norms and endogenous processes are mapped • Key institutions are challenged to make changes that facilitate social learning and reflect-and-act cycles, including within decision-making processes 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Cognitive] SL participants understand the particular opportunities and barriers • [Relational] Key institutions and actors involved in the SL share a common understanding of the problem and approach to solving (social learning) such as changes in decision-making structures • [Normative] Institutions understand that a shift in values or practice is needed to foster social learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Value/Practice] Reduced number and severity of barriers; increased number and potential impact of opportunities • [Value] Challenges lead to changes in institutional openness towards SL-orientated approaches (evidenced in eg attitudes, conflicts) • [Practice] Challenges lead to changes in institutional support for SL-oriented approaches (evidenced in eg policy/roles, and resources made available for implementation)

Related reading

Brooks, N and Fisher, S (2014) Tracking Adaptation Measuring Development: a step by step guide. IIED Toolkit, London. IIED, London. <http://pubs.iied.org/10100IIED/>

Fisher, S., Garside, B., Van Epp, M., Dodman, D., D'Errico, S., Anderson, S., and Carlile, L., 2016, Planning and implementing climate change responses in the context of uncertainty: exploring the importance of social learning and the processes of decision-making, IIED Working Paper, London. <http://pubs.iied.org/10172IIED/>

Fisher, S and Garside, B (2016) Climate change responses in the context of uncertainty, IIED Backgrounder, London. <http://pubs.iied.org/17397IIED/>

Van Epp, M and Garside, B (2016) Solving 'wicked' problems: can social learning catalyse adaptive responses to climate change? IIED Working Paper: <http://pubs.iied.org/17390IIED/>

Significant uncertainties around future climate change challenge the implementation of policies and programmes. Process-driven approaches, such as social learning, may offer a more flexible approach to tackling the particular challenges of climate uncertainties such as uncertain evidence and long timeframes. This report explores how such processes have helped address climate uncertainties in Uganda through the work of the Africa Climate Change Resilience Alliance.

IIED is a policy and action research organisation. We promote sustainable development to improve livelihoods and protect the environments on which these livelihoods are built. We specialise in linking local priorities to global challenges. IIED is based in London and works in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and the Pacific, with some of the world's most vulnerable people. We work with them to strengthen their voice in the decision-making arenas that affect them – from village councils to international conventions.



International Institute for Environment and Development
80-86 Gray's Inn Road, London WC1X 8NH, UK
Tel: +44 (0)20 3463 7399
Fax: +44 (0)20 3514 9055
email: info@iied.org
www.iied.org



This research was funded by UK aid from the UK Government, however the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the views of the UK Government.



Knowledge
Products