

Appendix B: Checklist for Project Proposal Evaluation

1) Make rights and justice the focus of adaptation	
Encourage	Avoid
Does the project explicitly focus on how rights and entitlements are secured (or violated) in everyday lived realities, based on experiential knowledge?	Projects that focus predominantly on preparing for catastrophic events at the expense of the slow catastrophes of insecure rights and lived entitlements.
Does the project focus on the resilience of rights, such as how the investments in the project can help support right claims and secure access to resources and social and physical infrastructure in the face of climate events and climate change?	Approaches that uncritically focus on the physical resilience infrastructure or economic losses as a main goal of interventions
Does the project explicitly examine losses and risks for whom and to which rights, and which outcomes for vulnerable groups we seek to avoid?	Approaches that extend 'techno-centric resilience planning and interventions' that privilege the high-value physical assets of the richer rather than smaller or intangible losses of the poorer groups
Does the project explicitly prioritise the interests of the worst off over the better off, making rights claims the primary goal in order to address the underlying reasons for lived entitlements falling short of achieving formal rights?	Approaches that do not recognise social, cultural or political differences nor historical and current injustices

<p>Does the project recognise and study vulnerability issues and taboos that are often silenced in public discourse forming part of discrimination, such as disability, mental illness, LGBTQ+ rights, illicit practices and domestic violence?</p>	<p>Approaches that inadvertently focus on majority and elite/expert groups or fail to recognise the unique and interconnected vulnerability situations of different people within a community.</p>
<p>Does the project take the often invisible issues and groups (like disabled people etc mentioned above) as an explicit entry point to shift decision-making processes, for example assigning active roles in leading dialogues? Does the project consider the locally embedded sources of resilience and adaptation knowledges of these groups?</p>	<p>Approaches that situate groups as vulnerable and incapable recipients of adaptation performed by external experts, imposing externally defined problem understandings and solutions.</p>
<p>Does the project convene a diverse set of stakeholders and interest groups to revision governance?</p>	<p>Approaches that push responsibility for risk management to vulnerable individuals and groups</p>
<p>Does the project strengthen procedural justice in adaptation (i.e. process and people), including in reallocating capital towards poverty-alleviating public goods?</p>	<p>Approaches steered by external capital interests that lock the target community into risky, poverty-enhancing, ecologically degrading / socially exploitative forms of development</p>
<p>2) Acknowledge Power Relations</p>	
<p>Encourage</p>	<p>Avoid</p>
<p>Does the project implementation agency acknowledge and reflect on its own power, including the ways it asserts authority and legitimacy in determining adaptation strategies?</p>	<p>Projects where the implementation agency is 'power-blind', refusing to acknowledge how its own capacities and resources shape project design, implementation and outcomes.</p>

<p>Does the project recognise power relationships, inequalities and socio-political relations within and across the populations / communities that it seeks to engage including hidden sources of power?</p>	<p>Projects that represent communities as singular units rather than complex social entities</p>
<p>Does the project analyse its projected interventions within the broader socio-economic dynamics and political contexts that structure livelihoods, opportunities and exclusions?</p>	<p>Projects that do not reflexively consider how adaptation actions may create new hierarchies within and across target populations</p>
<p>Is the project reflexive about its use of brokers and other agents to mediate relationships with local communities and/or populations?</p>	<p>Projects that do not explicitly consider how adaptation interventions may shift costs and benefits between local groups, creating opportunities for some at the potential expense of others</p>
<p>Does the project consider how climate change may add domestic responsibilities, such as reduced water availability is increasing domestic water management responsibilities for women or youth and effect on education and health?</p>	<p>Approaches that inadequately address structural inequalities and inequitable relations and how these are affected by climate change and climate interventions.</p>
<p>Does the project consider how climate change may add domestic responsibilities, such as reduced water availability is increasing domestic water management responsibilities for women or youth and effect on education and health?</p>	<p>Approaches that inadequately address structural inequalities and inequitable relations and how these are affected by climate change and climate interventions.</p>

3) Embrace Knowledge Pluralism

Encourage	Avoid
Does the project provide an explicit route towards knowledge co-production with local knowledge holders?	Approaches that seek to catalogue or compendium local knowledge without empowering its holders within project design and implementation.
Does the project emphasise partnership and relationship building, not simply consultation of stakeholders?	Approaches that designate local/indigenous knowledge as 'supplementary' information that merely helps refine or legitimise scientific approaches.
Does the project have a clearly articulated process that establishes how inclusivity and legitimacy of knowledge co-production will be achieved?	Approaches that have predefined most activities and outputs.
Does the project provide an arena for interrogating and negotiating diverse interests, values and experiences? Does it convene diverse stakeholders on an on-going basis as part of the process, with recognition that the stakeholders never participate on an equal basis (power asymmetries)	Approaches that crowd out everyday innovation and strategies, or consider local adaptation strategies/knowledges as barriers to externally defined resilience building.
Does the project acknowledge the plurality of knowledge including the validity of knowledge that exists outside a Western/Scientific lens?	Projects that do not offer a route for engage knowledge outside of scientific or expert knowledge

4) Foster Bottom-Up Coalitions to Strengthen Local Sources of Adaptation	
Encourage	Avoid
Does the project explicitly build an enabling institutional and political infrastructure for community/grassroots agency?	Interventions that impose externally defined problem/risk understandings and solutions that privilege outside actors and expertise
Does the project commit resources to partnership and relationship building, rather than consultation?	Bureaucratic requirements and donor rules that make self-determination increasingly challenging in adaptation programming
Does the project explicitly address how social inequalities within communities (gender, age, religion, ethnicity, class) shape opportunities and constraints to active and ongoing roles within planning and implementation?	Projects that ignore the presence of inequities within and across target populations and communities
Does the project identify and build capacity within existing community organisations rather than creating parallel, competitive ones?	Interventions that crowd out everyday innovation and local strategies or that see local knowledge and networks as barriers to adaptation
5) Recognise Risks, Tradeoffs and Unexpected Outcomes	
Encourage	Avoid
Projects that show evidence of clear reflection on what the risks are generated and upon whom they fall.	Projects that anticipate only win-win outcomes

Projects that prioritise the empowerment of vulnerable groups to express their understandings of tradeoffs and risks within adaptation.	Projects that do not consider who the risks of unexpected outcomes will fall on.
Projects that put in place a framework for adaptive management to re-evaluate goals and outcomes after changes are brought about	Projects overfocused upon a narrow range of outcomes
Projects that put forward a strategy for identifying and acknowledging unplanned outcomes	Projects that do not recognise the potential for unintended outcomes within their design
6. Transform the Funding Environment	
Encourage	Avoid
Longer-term funding to allow time for outcomes and impacts to be realistically reached and trust and relationships to be built.	Short-term projects that prioritise outputs and focus on efficiency and value for money of delivery rather than effectiveness and equity
Commitment to monitoring, evaluation and learning, where the learning takes place within project lifespans and there is capacity to apply adaptive management	Rigid monitoring and evaluation systems that do not provide scope for learning, or encourage flexibility where necessary
Programmatic and portfolio approaches that provide opportunities for transferring learning from project to project, and/or expanding learning beyond individual projects	“Pilot” projects, when these are merely designed to demonstrate success but lack clear mechanisms for learning from the experiences of marginalised groups
Novel management configurations, for example outsourcing lead of monitoring, evaluation and learning roles (particularly relevant for programmes and portfolios)	Projects that do not reflect on how their governance, management or M&E may reinforce narrow problem definitions and inhibit learning