



**CLIMATE &
CLEAN AIR
COALITION**
TO REDUCE SHORT-LIVED
CLIMATE POLLUTANTS

DEMONSTRATING IMPACTS OF ACTIVITIES **Framework, process, and methodology**

*Developed by the Demonstrating Impacts
task team based on decision
from HLA&WG/DEC2015/02
reviewed and finalised in May 2017*

Contents

Contents	2
DEMONSTRATING IMPACTS FRAMEWORK (from WG/DEC2015/02)	3
CHAPEAU	3
OUTPUT AND OUTCOMES INDICATORS	4
IMPACT INDICATORS	5
ANNEX: PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY FOR THE USE OF STANDARD INDICATORS	6
GENERAL METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS.....	6
GENERAL REFERENCES	8
TIMELINES AND PROCESSES FOR REPORTING AND PRODUCTION OF THE CCAC ANNUAL REPORT.....	9
METHODOLOGY SHEETS.....	10
1.1.1. Training.....	10
1.2.1. Strengthened Institutions.....	13
1.2.2. Laws and regulations.....	16
1.2.3. Policies and plans	20
1.2.4. Changes in technologies and practices.	23
2.1.1. Political outreach.....	26
2.2.1. Media coverage.....	29
2.2.2. Commitments.....	32
2.2.3. Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).	35
3.1.1. Co-funding.....	38
3.2.1. Catalysed funding.....	41
4.1.1. Knowledge resources and tools.	44
4.2.1. Knowledge dissemination.	47
4.2.2. Utilisation of tools.....	50
Guidance note on metrics used by the SNAP toolkit for impact indicators.....	52
Template for methodology sheets.....	53

DEMONSTRATING IMPACTS FRAMEWORK (from WG/DEC2015/02)

CHAPEAU

Recognising the dual objective of demonstrating impacts, to: (i) assess and improve performance internally and inform planning of activities and allocation of funds; and (ii) report and demonstrate progress externally, to show accountability towards all partners and donors, and to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Climate and Clean Air Coalition (CCAC) as a vehicle for meaningful, rapid and scalable action to the public.

Recognising that the following set of 'standard indicators' is meant to be the common currency across the CCAC activities to measure and report on collective impact through the initiatives and broader Coalition's supported actions, in a way that supports narrative reporting. Indicators have been split up into output, outcome and impact indicators to capture direct results of activities as well as longer-term effects.

Recognising that the ability to report and collect data varies among the initiatives calling for a flexible system of measurement and reporting. In line with their respective theory of change, initiatives are expected to report on output and outcome indicators for activities for which they have received funding. They are also encouraged, when such information is available, to report on relevant outputs, outcomes and impacts beyond their direct activities, especially on those they helped catalysed. 'N/A' alongside an explanation is an acceptable response for indicators outside the scope of an initiative's work.

Recognising that there are actions undertaken by Partners outside of the CCAC without using the Trust Fund. Such actions are also captured through the Partners in Action exercise, showing how the overall landscape related to short-lived climate pollutants (SLCPs) is changing.

Recognising that attribution of results needs to be as clear and transparent as possible to ensure credibility. Output indicators capture results that are directly attributable to CCAC funded activities. Outcome indicators may capture results that are directly attributable to CCAC, but also changes sparked or influenced by but not solely attributable to CCAC. Results captured under impact indicators reflect the social, economic or environmental benefits which respond to identified needs under a long-term vision. Data for impact indicators will reflect progress to which CCAC has contributed through reported outputs and outcomes. A narrative puts data into context. Potential issues of double counting are addressed in the methodology sheets.

Recognising that indicators are revised as needed. Every year, when the progress reports are submitted, a feedback process is carried out to allow lead partners to inform of situations where there has been difficulties, or of a need for clarification or reformulation of methodologies and possibly of indicators.

The set of 'standard indicators' aligns with the goal and key strategies of the CCAC 5-Year Strategic Plan.

For transparency, each indicator is described in a methodology sheet, defining the purpose, the methodology, data aggregation and interpretation of each indicator. An effort will be made to build on and recognise existing methodologies as well as to link CCAC impacts to other relevant processes in order to highlight support and or complementarity. Where applicable, data collected may be supplemented by external data or analyses that illustrate global trends in key climate, health or other metrics to which CCAC contributes. While these data or analyses are not considered indicators for CCAC, they may help provide context for the work of the Coalition.

This framework can be shared with external actors for information or use, including with co-funders of the CCAC activities, as appropriate.

OUTPUT AND OUTCOMES INDICATORS¹

1. 'Catalyse ambitious action'

Output

1.1.1 Training. # of people and hours trained, specifying what, how, who, why, on what, and with what effect

Outcomes

- 1.2.1. Strengthened Institutions.** # of institutions or organizations with improved capacity to address SLCPs, including science capacity, specifying by whom, how, why, what, and with what effect
- 1.2.2. Laws and regulations.** # of SLCP relevant laws, regulations, by-laws, and standards developed, amended, adopted, or implemented, specifying what, where, when, why, and with what effect
- 1.2.3. Policies and plans.** # of SLCP relevant action plans, policies, strategies, programmes, and projects developed, modified, enacted, or implemented, specifying what, where, by whom, when, why, and with what effect
- 1.2.4. Changes in technologies and practices.** # of lower emitting/alternative technologies/practices adopted, specifying scope and scale of implementation when data is available, as well as details regarding what, by whom, where, why, and with what effect

2. 'Mobilise robust support'

Output

2.1.1. Political outreach. # of high level policy consultations and outreach events on SLCP relevant issues and # of participants, specifying what, whom, where, when, why, to what effect

Outcomes

- 2.2.1. Media coverage.** # of mentions of CCAC-supported or SLCP-relevant activities in the media, specifying the source, channel and details of the mention (who, what, where, when) and when relevant, associated social media engagement (# of retweets, replies, comments, likes, clicks, favorite, etc. in aggregate)
- 2.2.2. Commitments.** # of high level commitments covering SLCPs, or endorsing CCAC activities, and # of committing institutions, specifying what, whom, where, when, why, to what effect
- 2.2.3. Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA).** # of relevant MEA(s) with improved considerations of SLCP issues specifying what, when, why, to what effect

3. 'Leverage finance at scale'

Output

3.1.1. Co-funding. Amount (USD) of co-funding secured to support initiatives/other CCAC projects, outside the CCAC trust fund (i.e. for every dollar of support from the trust fund, CCAC work was supported by x dollars of outside funding), with details on what, by whom and to what effect

Outcome

3.2.1. Catalysed funding. Narrative describing transformative action on SLCP mitigation catalysed by CCAC, quantified where possible (secured amount in USD) specifying what, by whom, when, where and with what effect

4. 'Enhance science and knowledge'

Output

4.1.1. Knowledge resources and tools. Narrative of knowledge resources and tools on SLCPs, including what, on what, and to what expected effect

Outcomes

- 4.2.1. Knowledge dissemination.** Quantified representation of use of SLCP relevant knowledge resources (recommended proxies: # of references to the knowledge resources in policy documents; # of downloads from the CCAC website and/or partner websites), specifying where possible how, to whom and to what effect
- 4.2.2. Utilisation of tools.** Quantified representation of usage of SLCP relevant tools (size of user community OR # of references to the tool in policy documents) specifying utilisation of what, by whom and to what effect

¹ See methodological details for each indicator in Annex.

IMPACT INDICATORS

5-Y Strategic Plan	Impact indicators
<p>'Catalyse substantial SLCP emission reductions that will contribute to keeping global temperature rise below 2 degrees, improve air quality and achieve additional benefits'</p>	<p>Quantitative qualification, supplemented with qualitative narratives, of projected and achieved:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in emissions - for all relevant pollutants, present day and scenarios (through 2050) • Energy efficiency benefits - rate of improvement; energy input per output • Near term climate benefits – temperature and other climate benefits at a global, regional, and national scale • Health benefits – mortality, morbidity, DALYs • Agriculture and ecosystem benefits - agricultural productivity, food security

In addition to these standard indicators, discussions will be held with the SAP and other partners with relevant expertise to determine the best approach for using information about air pollution concentrations to capture air quality improvement.

ANNEX: PROCESS AND METHODOLOGY FOR THE USE OF STANDARD INDICATORS

GENERAL METHODOLOGY CONSIDERATIONS

Definitions

The following definitions of output, outcome and impact have been used:

- Output: Products and services produced or competencies and capacities established as the direct result of project activities.
- Outcome: The intended situation at the end of or soon after a project's lifespan in terms of gains in performance (as a result of changes in knowledge and behaviour).
- Impact: Social, economic or environmental improvements to a situation that respond to identified needs under a long-term vision. Only indicators related to long-term benefits, such as emission reductions, are categorised as impact indicators.

Methodological rigor

- Reporting should be done in accordance with the methodology presented in this and the following sections to ensure transparency and consistency across the reporting streams. Initiatives, Secretariat and all other reporting streams are responsible for the relevance, accuracy and methodological rigor of the information they report on.
- Standard indicators, associated methodologies and data collection questionnaires will be revised on a regular basis. In case of any methodological issue encountered while reporting, please inform the CCAC Secretariat.

Output and outcome indicators

- The methodology for each output and outcome indicator is presented in individual methodology sheets in the [following sections](#).
- The methodology sheets cover definitions, the relationships between indicators, and double counting (or attribution). They also outline the list of quantitative and qualitative data elements and disaggregation, providing further context for the indicators in relation to the 5 Year Strategic Plan, purpose and rationale, etc. An effort was made to build on and recognise existing methodologies while developing the Demonstrating Impacts framework.
- The methodology sheets are NOT templates to be filled in. Instead, they are guidance notes to support the completion of the reporting. The reporting tool for providing data according to the timeline and process presented in next section is available from this [link](#).

Impact indicators

- Each initiative is responsible for specifying the detailed methodology used for data they provide on impact indicators. Additionally, initiatives are invited to work with the SNAP initiative on impact indicators, especially on the characterisation of emission factors, changes in emissions and energy efficiency gains. Consultation with the SNAP initiative not only supports impact quantification by the initiatives, it also helps to improve the SNAP toolkit and ensure compatibility across methodologies used. [A guidance note on metrics for impact indicators used by the SNAP toolkit can be accessed here.](#)
- The Secretariat and SNAP initiative are responsible for monitoring progress across initiatives and identifying opportunities for benefit calculation exercises as part of an initiative's work and across CCAC-supported activities.

Data sources

- Data sources used for reporting against the standard indicators may include initiative documents, funding proposals, contracts and any other documents associated to the activity reported.

CCAC contribution

- The framework takes into consideration the collaborative nature of the Coalition. This framework has been designed to identify outputs, outcomes and impacts to which the Coalition's work has contributed rather than results that can be directly attributed to the Coalition.
- Initiatives are encouraged to report on any SLCP-relevant results, especially those they helped catalysed beyond their regular activities, including results of co- and catalysed funding. This will help the Coalition's tracking of overall progress on SLCPs worldwide.
- Contribution categories include: 1) funded or co-funded by CCAC (i.e. the progress reported has directly resulted from work directly funded or co-funded by the CCAC, e.g. a clean bus programme developed with funding from the CCAC in Mexico city); 2) CCAC partnership played a role (i.e. although the reported progress has not resulted from a direct and/or financial contribution by the CCAC, the CCAC has helped catalyse or support part of the work that has led to this progress, e.g. replication in 10 new cities by the World Bank of the clean bus programme CCAC helped develop in Mexico city); 3) no CCAC role (this category should mainly be used for Partners in Action for relevant progress for which there is no clear linkages to the CCAC, e.g. Country X adopted a new mitigation policy on coal mining). What falls under these different categories is left to the discretion of initiatives/other relevant reporting groups who have the best sense of the contribution made by their work.

Baselines and targets

- Baselines and targets can take a lot of time and resources to establish and require the willingness of partners and actors to communicate necessary information. However, these figures are critical for analysing progress. For each standard indicator, lead partners should work to establish a single or a small set of harmonized baseline(s) and target(s) across their initiative, components or activities as appropriate.
- When baselines and targets cannot be set for an initiative, sector-level baselines and targets at the regional or global scale can be provided instead specifying how initiatives intend to contribute to those.
- In line with the 5-year Strategic Plan, relevant timelines for targets include: 2020, 2030 and 2050.
- If not possible to establish a target, direction of change and expected rate of progression may be indicated. E.g. increase of media coverage by X% every year.
- Baselines and targets can be revised and added at any time through the reporting tool accessible [here](#).

Cross-cutting disaggregation categories

The following disaggregation categories are used across indicators. They are in line with the CCAC Solution Center taxonomy.

- Implementer's name(s): partner(s) or actor(s) responsible for the reported result
- Type(s) of Implementer: 1) Academic & Research; 2) Government; 3) News & Media; 4) NGO; 5) Private Sector; 6) Inter-governmental (UN organizations included here)
- Funding request and activity reference(s): title of funding request and activity associated to the reported result, if any
- Sector/Theme/Initiative(s): 1) Diesel; 2) Oil & Gas; 3) Waste; 4) Bricks; 5) Cooling & Refrigerating; 6) Household Energy; 7) Agriculture; 8) National Planning; 9) Finance; 10) Assessments; 11) Health

- Pollutant(s): 1) black carbon and co-pollutants; 2) methane; 3) HFCs; 4) tropospheric ozone
- CCAC contribution: 1) funded or co-funded by CCAC; 2) CCAC partnership played a role; 3) no CCAC role
- Scope: 1) local; 2) national; 3) regional; 4) global
- Region(s): 1) Global; 2) Africa; 3) Asia & The Pacific; 4) Europe; 5) Latin America & The Caribbean; 6) North America
- Country(ies): please use official name of UN Member States as per www.un.org/en/member-states
- City(ies)
- Date (month and year)
- Budget (In USD)

Although recommended, the use of data disaggregation might not be possible or appropriate for reporting some results, especially those beyond CCAC direct activities and some disaggregation categories might be left empty.

Aggregation

- Information reported by initiatives and other reporting streams might be aggregated at different levels, over different reporting streams and periods, and may also be broken down in various ways using the recommended disaggregation categories detailed in the metadata sheets.
- In support to sound aggregation operations, all quantitative data provided under this framework should be put into context by a short narrative as specified in each methodology sheet.
- When aggregating data, the Secretariat, initiatives and other reporting streams will be careful not to double count and other methodological issues as specified in the methodology sheets associated to each indicator.

Customised indicators

- Initiatives willing to develop a customised indicator to report on specific additional information are encouraged to use the same methodology sheet format (cf. [template](#)).

GENERAL REFERENCES²

- Revised Coalition Framework (HLA-SEP2014-04A)
- 5 Year Strategic Plan (HLA/MAY2015/03A)
- Demonstrating impact Framework and Process (WG/DEC2015/02)
- Excel questionnaire for data collection
- Partners in Action guidelines - Revised based on DI framework
- CCAC Annual Reports
- CCAC IGPO Initiative Governance and Processes (WG-MAY2015-08A) and annexes (Assessment Criteria, Funding Proposal)
- Visibility guidelines

² Available from CCAC teamwork <https://ccac.teamwork.com/#/projects/248265/overview/summary>

TIMELINES AND PROCESSES FOR REPORTING AND PRODUCTION OF THE CCAC ANNUAL REPORT

Initiative reporting

- Each initiative is required to report once per year at the initiative level on the results of their activities and as possible on the results of activities they helped catalysed, by submitting their annual reporting, including the Demonstrating Impacts reporting, to the Secretariat by 31 July of each year³. Initiatives' annual reporting should cover the period from 1st July of the past year to 31st June of the current year.
- Initiatives' annual reporting are based on implementer's bi-annual reporting due on 15 January and 15 July⁴.
- Initiatives are also encouraged to undertake one cumulative reporting exercise, taking stock of their outputs, outcomes and impacts since the start of the initiative. This will support baselines establishment as well as monitoring and assessment of progress since the creation of the initiative.
- In addition, initiatives are encouraged to inform the CCAC Secretariat of their progress on a continuous basis.

Partners in Action

- Each partner is encouraged to provide an update to the CCAC of its SLCP action through the "Partners in Action" exercise each year at the date indicated by the Secretariat. Partners are invited to organise the information they provide along the relevant indicators of the DI framework as possible⁵.
- Partners are also encouraged to inform the CCAC of their progress on a continuous basis.

Secretariat reporting

- The Secretariat is required to report on activities of the CCAC beyond its initiatives, such as science, communications, outreach, CCAC meetings and work of other task teams as relevant, in the Annual report. Such reporting is also based on the DI framework where appropriate.

Production of the CCAC Annual Report

- Information received by the Secretariat from initiatives and other work streams as well as through the "Partners in Action" exercise is then processed and turned into the CCAC Annual Report made available to partners in draft by September and final report in November/December.
- This information can also be disseminated, when appropriate, through the CCAC website and through other communication materials.

As part of the Demonstrating Impact Framework and Process, the above is subject to revision at any time upon decision of the Working Group.

³ See detailed reporting modalities here: <https://ccac.teamwork.com/#/projects/248265/overview/summary>

⁴ New contracts issued from now on will reflect the DI framework.

⁵ See detailed guidance in the CCAC Partners in Action_ guidance: <https://ccac.teamwork.com/#files/3721543>
And detailed modalities here: <https://ccac.teamwork.com/#/projects/248265/overview/summary>

METHODOLOGY SHEETS

1.1.1. Training. # of person-hours of training on SLCP relevant issues, specifying what, how, who, why, on what, and with what effect	
Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator directly supports key strategy (1) catalyse ambitious action because it can contribute to strengthening capacity for SLCP mitigation, and increases the likelihood of sustainability of relevant interventions supported through the CCAC Trust Fund and in-kind contributions of partners. • Depending on the focus of the training, this indicator can also support key strategies: (2) mobilise robust support; (3) leverage finance at scale; or (4) enhance science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator allows quantification of training activities across CCAC initiatives/ components/ activity streams and is used to gain insight on the number of people who may have increased competencies regarding SLCP mitigation. • Training is an important element in the CCAC theory of change, because it can help raise awareness, generate knowledge and increase institutional ability to take SLCP mitigation action. Training may relate to development and implementation of policies, regulations and strategies, to practices and technologies that reduce SLCP mitigation, or also to development of and application for finance. <p><u>Relation to other indicators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • While training itself is an output, related outcomes of training can be captured under indicators related to strengthened Institutions, laws and regulations, policies and plans, technologies and practices, knowledge dissemination, and utilisation of tools (1.2.1.- 4. and 4.2.1. & 2.) • Training may also contribute to other standard or customized indicators as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Training is defined as a training event or learning activity for any number of participants, involving: (1) a setting for transferring knowledge and skills that enable participants to contribute to effective action to mitigate SLCPs; (2) formally designated instructors, lead persons or dedicated networks for peer-to-peer learning; and (3) a defined/documentated curriculum, learning objectives and outcomes. • Training can include sponsored seminars, workshops, conferences, on-the-job learning experiences, observational study tours, or distance learning through webinars and online training courses, as well as other events or settings of any duration that fulfil the three requirements above. • Coaching and meetings (such as consultations), that have educational value but do not have a defined curriculum or objectives, are not considered to be training. Events with multiple purposes, such as information sharing and decision making with high level representation, should be reported under 2.1.1 Political outreach. The same event cannot be reported under both 1.1.1 Training and 2.1.1 Political outreach. • The targeted audience of training activities can include any stakeholder who plays a role in SLCP mitigation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While this indicator is numerical, it should be complemented by a narrative report that answers the questions: what, how, who, why, on what, and with what (see required details in the section on Data requirements and disaggregation).
Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Number of people, number of hours, number of person-hours, number of person-days</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See paragraph on baseline and targets in "General methodology considerations" section. For person-hours of training: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The baseline can be established at zero at the start of the implementation of the initiative/ component/activity. The target can be established based on an estimate of the number of person hours of training necessary for success of the initiative/component/activity and/or its uptake and scaling up by relevant stakeholders at the relevant timescales (2020, 2030, 2050). Expl: In 2012 almost no farmer in the Province of Santiago de Chile implemented manure management practices. By 2020 one out of 50 farmers will have been trained to sustainable manure management practices and have received associated accreditation to train others.
Methodological approach	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only participants who have completed the entire training course are counted for this indicator. Representatives of the CCAC Secretariat and implementers should <u>not</u> be counted as participants. <p><u>Calculation</u></p> <p>Person-hours of training for <u>each single event</u> are calculated under this indicator following the equation:</p> $\text{Person-hours of training for event A} = (\text{number of participants who completed the training}) \times (\text{number of hours of the specific training event})$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Total person-hours of training delivered under an activity/work stream/component should be calculated as follows: $\text{Person-hours of training supported by CCAC for event A} + \text{Person-hours of training supported by CCAC for event B} + \dots$ 1 day of training = 8 hours of training Counting procedures should be consistent throughout the duration of the activity. <p><u>Double counting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Events reported under the indicator 2.1.1. Political outreach should not be reported under 1.1.1 Training. <p>Outcomes of training that relate to another indicator (e.g., institutional strengthening) should also be reported under the relevant indicator.</p>
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of people and hours should be disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Title and date of training ✓ Gender (woman, man) ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (see relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator should take the form of a short paragraph indicating for each training reported (1 sentence for each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Format (workshop, seminar, etc.) ✓ Objective (purpose, issues addressed, what constitutes completion - e.g. for a short course, only full attendance may be mandatory; for a longer course, there might be testing to ensure competencies are achieved). ✓ Direct outcome (decision, increased interest, commitment, etc.) and usefulness (e.g., feedback from participants indicating how they will apply information learned). ✓ Details on CCAC role when relevant • An electronic copy of the training participant lists, programmes and any other relevant documents associated to the training should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.
<p>Data sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See relevant paragraph in “General methodology considerations” section. For training, relevant documents may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Attendance sheets, training event agenda or curriculum with stated objective or expected competencies lists ✓ Survey (at the end of the training session) ✓ Follow up questionnaires (6 months - 1 year after training) to document impact of training ✓ Other activity records and documentation. ✓ Initiative/ component/ activity stream document, funding proposal, contracts associated to the activity.
<p>Anticipated limitations and comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator addresses only the completion of training related to SLCP mitigation. As such it does not provide any information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Whether training has led to action or changes in institutional or organisational capacity. ○ Effectiveness, quality, diversity or impact of the training and the depth of skills and knowledge conveyed and acquired. ○ This indicator also groups together the training of persons across many different functional roles that vary in terms of their power/influence, and could mask gender and other disparities. ○ Geographical and gender balance of training organizers. <p>In order to avoid the multiplication of training hours and participants without due consideration being given to usefulness, quality and relevance, or at the expense of other activities, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.</p>
<p>Relevant international efforts</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>References</p>	<p>See General references in associated section.</p>

1.2.1. Strengthened Institutions. # of institutions or organizations with improved capacity to address SLCPs, including science capacity, specifying by whom, how, why, what, and with what effect

Indicator name	Strengthened institutions
Indicator type	Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthening institutions' capacity for SLCP mitigation directly contributes to key strategy (1) on catalysing ambitious action. As per the Coalition's Framework, mobilising targeted support for those developing countries that require resources to increase their capacity is one of the core functions of the CCAC. In addition, developed countries also may need to improve capacity to respond to the SLCP challenge. Therefore, ensuring institutions/organisations are able to take ownership of, continue and scale up SLCP mitigation efforts initiated by the CCAC is a critical element of any CCAC activity. Depending on the focus of the institutional strengthening, this type of efforts can also support key strategies: (2) mobilise robust support; (3) leverage finance at scale; or (4) enhance science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator supports quantification and monitoring of the number of institutions/organisations with strengthened capacities to address the SLCP issue.. Addressing SLCPs requires institutions/organisations to be able to understand the issues at stake, develop and put in place adequate strategies and effectively implement ambitious SLCP mitigation measures. Supporting institutions to build, adjust and sustain their capacities to address SLCP is a central element of the CCAC theory of change and success in doing so is an indicator of our progress. <p><i>Relation to other indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened institutions /organisations can be an outcome of activities reported under other standard output and outcome indicators, including but not limited to training, co-funding, knowledge resources, etc. It is also a stepping stone toward changes in technologies and practices. The outcomes and impacts of strengthened institutions/organisations can be captured under other standard or customized indicators as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In this context, a strengthened institution/organisation is an institution/organisation with a new or improved ability to perform functions related to SLCP mitigation. This new or improved ability should be demonstrated through concrete regulatory, political, informational, scientific, technical, organisational, financial, or administrative changes (i.e. participation of a representative in a political outreach or training event does not constitute the strengthening of an institution). <u>Reporting of institutions /organisations strengthened should be done for each institution at the smallest, most relevant institutional /organisational level to which the strengthening applies.</u> Relevant institutions/organisations include governmental (such as municipalities, ministries, departments, or commissions), intergovernmental, non-governmental (NGOs, local civil society organisations, or trade unions), and private sector institutions/organisations. Indications of institutional strengthening can include, but are not limited to: new science; new expertise or tools; increased human resources; new relevant

	<p>equipment or other goods or services; relevant change in vision, mission, priorities or mandate reflected in official documents; increased funding allocation; enhanced coordination with other relevant stakeholders; new or improved networks, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthened institutions /organisations can be the outcome of activities including, but not limited to: training, co-funding, knowledge resources, etc. While this indicator is numerical, it should be complemented by a narrative report that responds to the questions: whom, how, why, what, and with what effect (see required details in section on Data requirements and disaggregation).
Measurement unit(s)	<i>Number of institutions or organisations with improved capacity</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See relevant paragraph in the “General methodology considerations” section. For strengthened institutions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline can be established at zero (institution/organisation strengthened) at the start of the implementation of the initiative/component/activity stream. Target can be established based on an estimate of the number of institutions to be engaged for success of the initiative/component/activity and/or its uptake and scaling up by relevant stakeholders at the relevant timescale (2020, 2030 or 2050). <p>Expl: in 2012, none of the developing country partner focal points had an explicit reference to SLCP and associated tasks listed in their contract’s terms of reference. By 2020 all SNAP countries will have at least one staff with SLCPs relevant missions listed in their Terms of Reference.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is important to note that demonstrating improvement in institutional capacity requires an initial and a post-intervention assessment of the targeted capacities. In your narrative reporting, where possible, please reference these institution-specific baselines and targets. Definition of such baselines and targets and associated assessments can take the form of simple exercises in accordance with allocated budgets and agreed timelines.
Methodological approach	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If the same institution is strengthened over different reporting periods, it can be reported as such under each of these periods, specifying the new concrete changes that are achieved each year. Reporting should be done for each institution at the smallest, most relevant institutional level to which the strengthening applies. <p><u>Double counting</u></p> <p>Institutional strengthening can result in achievements that are relevant to other indicators, such as a new policy or law, or the dissemination of a tool. In such cases, the strengthening of the institution should be reported under 1.2.1 Strengthened institutions, and the associated achievement under the other relevant indicator.</p> <p>When aggregating data over different years and/or different reporting streams, be careful not to count the same institution more than once.</p>
Data elements and disaggregation	<p># of institutions strengthened disaggregated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Name of the smallest, most relevant institutional level to which the changes constituting the institutional strengthening apply ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (see relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ New vs continued (newly targeted institution, institution with which work has already been engaged in previous years) • Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator should indicate for each institution reported (1 sentence for each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Reason (why was the institutions strengthened, why was it needed) ✓ Objective (what were the changes targeted) ✓ Means (tools or methodology used) ✓ Effect (the extent to which capacity has been built) ✓ Institution specific baselines and targets (initial & post-intervention assessment of the targeted capacities) ✓ Details on CCAC role when relevant • Links to relevant documents and/or relevant institution’s webpages should be attached to the reporting.
Data sources	<p>See relevant paragraph in “General methodology considerations” section. For institutions strengthened, relevant documents can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow up assessment to document impact of intervention (6 months - 1 year after the end of capacity building activities), other activity records and documentation. • Initiative/ component/ activity stream document, funding proposal, contracts associated to the activity.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator only provides an indication of the number of institutions with improved capacity to which the CCAC contributed, and beyond as possible. It does not provide any information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the quality, usefulness or relevance of capacity improvement. ○ whether appropriate consideration has been given to geographical and gender balance, as well as other prioritization criteria among and across institutions strengthened. ○ whether appropriate initial and subsequent capacity assessments have been conducted and the quality of the enumerator’s subjective judgment in detecting the capacity needs and changes. ○ Whether the same methodology is used to conduct these assessments across organisation and time periods. ○ It should also be noted that by focusing on number of institutions/ organisation only, this indicator might direct efforts toward targeting a maximum number of institutions at the expense of the quality and sustainability of interventions. However, the same institution can be counted over different years if it keeps increasing its capacity. In addition, appropriate consideration will be given to the description of effects of intervention and reason for targeting the strengthened institutions into the narrative reporting.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

1.2.2. Laws and regulations. # of SLCP relevant laws, regulations, by-laws, and standards developed, amended, adopted, or implemented, specifying what, where, when, why, and with what effect

Indicator name	Laws and regulations
Indicator type	Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laws and regulations directly contribute to key strategy (1) Catalyse ambitious action. As per the Coalition’s Framework, enhancing existing and developing new national actions to reduce SLCPs is one of the core functions of the CCAC. Effective implementation of such actions across the various economic sectors requires the backing of legal instruments that can be used for enforcement or to provide incentives. The development, adoption and implementation of laws, regulations, by-laws, standards and other legally binding policy instruments are therefore transformative milestones toward large scale, sustainable SLCP mitigation and are a targeted outcome of many CCAC activities. This type of efforts can also support other key strategies, by helping to: (2) mobilize robust support; (3) leverage finance at scale; or (4) enhance Science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator allows the quantification of the number of legally binding policy instruments that are related, at least in part, to SLCP mitigation. Improving legal frameworks for SLCP mitigation in CCAC partner countries and beyond helps create the enabling environment to ensure efforts and investments in SLCPs mitigation have legal ground for effective implementation at large scale and in a sustainable manner. Improvements to legal frameworks are often the outcomes of policies and plans (see indicator 1.2.3.) and can also be a leverage for other important policy level decisions and actions. Therefore, influencing legal instruments is an important element of the CCAC theory of change and an indicator of CCAC success. This indicator is used to provide insights on CCAC efforts (and beyond as possible) in influencing the development, adoption and implementation of legal instruments supporting SLCP mitigation countries. The ability to develop, pass and implement legislation is an indication of jurisdictions’ engagement in SLCP mitigation. This indicator can also help monitor the evolution of the global SLCP legislative landscape. <p><u>Relation to other indicators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Laws and regulations can be an outcome of activities whose outputs and outcomes are also reported under other standard or customized indicators (e.g., training, political outreach, knowledge production, etc.) Outcomes of laws and regulations may contribute to other standard or customized outcome indicators such as changes in technology and practices, as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator focuses on legally binding policy instruments that relate, at least in part, to the reduction of SLCP emissions and/or to their environmental and socio-economic benefits.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A legally binding policy instrument refers to a system of rules, procedures and/or principles that are prescribed and enforced by a governing authority to require or prevent specific actions or provide incentives that lead to changes in actions or preferences. They include, but are not limited to: laws, regulations, standards, by-laws, codes, etc. • They can relate to different types of jurisdictions such as a ministry, state, municipality, or group of states (with the exception of Multilateral Environmental Agreements, which should be reported under indicator 2.2.3.) • “Development”: a first draft of the instrument has been officially presented for instance through public review, debate or consultation. • “Adoption”: the instrument has been officially codified or enacted by the relevant decision making authority. • “Implementation”: a strategy and/or operational plan exists; financial and human resources have been allocated; and outputs detailed in the strategy or operational plan are observable. • While this indicator is numerical it should be complemented by a narrative report responding to the questions: what, where, when, why, and with what effect (see required details in section on Data elements and disaggregation).
<p>Measurement unit(s)</p>	<p><i>Number of legally binding policy instruments developed, adopted/amended or implemented</i></p>
<p>Baseline and target</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section. • For laws and regulations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Baseline can be the number of relevant existing legally binding instruments in the targeted sector at the start of the initiative/component/activity. E.g. In 2012, only one out of every five countries in Asia have adopted Euro VI standards for heavy duty vehicles ○ Target, can be established based on an estimate of level of efforts required over the regulatory environment to enable success of the initiative/component/activity and/or its uptake and scaling up by relevant stakeholders at the relevant timescales (2020, 2030 or 2050). E.g. The initiative aim at supporting the adoption of Euro VI standards for heavy duty vehicles by all countries in Asia by 2020.
<p>Methodological approach</p>	<p><u>Double counting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each legal instrument that applies to the same jurisdiction can be counted once as “developed”, once as “adopted/amended” and once as “implemented” throughout different reporting periods. • If a legal instrument has gone through multiple stages (e.g. development and adoption) during the same reporting period, it should be counted only once, with the most advanced stage reported. The narrative report should provide further information about the evolution of the legal instrument. •

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal instruments reported under indicator 2.2.3. Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) should not be reported under this indicator. • Measures reported under indicators 1.2.3. Policies and plans and 2.2.2. Commitments are not eligible for reporting under this indicator (please refer to the respective definitions). • Outcomes of laws and regulations that relate to another indicator (e.g. changes in technologies and practices) should be reported under the relevant indicator. <p>In aggregating results across different years or reporting streams one should be careful not to double count one same legally-binding instrument.</p>
<p>Data elements and disaggregation</p>	<p># of legal instruments, disaggregated by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Official title and reference of legal instrument ✓ Cross-cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph in the "General methodology considerations" section) ✓ Type (law, regulation, by-law, standard) ✓ Stage (developed; adopted/amended; implemented) <p>Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator should indicate for each instrument reported (1 sentence for each):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What is the instrument/modification about and why was it needed? ✓ What are the expected benefits and how do they contribute to SLCP mitigation (and where and when)? If benefits are already accruing, brief description on how the legal instrument have led to this. Details on CCAC role if any ✓ If the instrument has gone through different stages in the reporting period, this can be indicated in the narrative. An electronic copy of/links to the laws and regulations, or their drafts, relevant official reports, summary of consultations and any other relevant associated documents and web links should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.
<p>Data sources</p>	<p>For general specifications, please refer to the relevant paragraph in the "General methodology considerations" section)</p> <p>For this indicator, possible data sources include: See relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section. Relevant data sources for laws and regulations may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Legal instrument documents, or their drafts, relevant official reports, summary of consultations, etc. • Initiative document, funding proposal, contracts associated to the activity.
<p>Anticipated limitations and comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator only provides an indication of the number of legally binding instruments and as such it does not provide any information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the legal instrument usefulness and quality and whether it is well-designed or effective and if a proper background analysis has been conducted.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ whether issues of potential gender, geographical or other social discriminations the instrument might create or increase have been addressed. ○ on quality, transparency and fairness of the process through which the instrument was developed, adopted or implemented. ○ potential side effects of the instrument on other environmental, economic or social issues. ○ the quality of implementation, level of enforcement, and its effects. ● It should also be noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development, adoption and implementation of legally binding instruments depends on the actions of multiple groups and may be subject to many limitations and processes. Progress may be achieved in the long term and intermediate signs of achievements may be limited. ○ Role of the CCAC might be difficult to accurately determine.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

1.2.3. Policies and plans. # of SLCP relevant action plans, policies, strategies, programmes, and projects developed, modified, enacted, or implemented, specifying what, where, by whom, when, why, and with what effect.

Indicator name	Policies and plans
Indicator type	Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and plans directly contribute to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan (1) catalyse ambitious action which states that CCAC will provide support to Partners and key stakeholders to develop, enhance and implement national policies and action plans to reduce SLCPs. Moreover, as per the Coalition’s Framework, enhancing existing and developing new national actions to reduce SLCPs is one of the core functions of the CCAC. Influencing the action plans, policies, strategies, programmes, projects and other non-binding policy instruments are key milestones of any policy process and are critical components of CCAC activities. • This type of efforts can also support other key strategies by helping to: (2) mobilize robust support; (3) leverage finance at scale; or (4) enhance Science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator supports the quantification of the number of <u>non-binding policy instruments</u> targeted at supporting SLCP mitigation. • Effective SLCP emission reductions at scale and across sectors may include institutions developing non-binding policy instruments defining overall visions, goals, directions and proposing a course of action to achieve those. Non-binding policy instruments are essential in ensuring institutional engagement, commitment and ownership. Although they need to comply with laws and regulations in place, in some cases, such non-binding policy instruments can lead to the creation of new legal instruments. Mainstreaming SLCPs in these official documents guiding decisions of organisations/institutions is therefore an important element of the CCAC theory of change and an indicator of CCAC success. • This indicator is used to provide insights on CCAC efforts (and beyond as possible) in influencing non-binding policy instruments supporting SLCP mitigation in partner countries, organisations, etc. This indicator also provides information on engagement of partners and other stakeholders in SLCP mitigation and can help monitor the evolution of the global SLCP policy landscape. <p><u>Relation to other indicators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policies and plans can be an outcome of CCAC activities whose other outputs and outcomes are reported under other indicators (e.g. training, political outreach, knowledge production, laws and regulations, etc.) • Outcomes of policies and plans may contribute to other standard or customized outcome indicators such as 1.2.4. Changes in technology and practices, or 1.2.2. law and regulations, as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator focuses on <u>non-binding policy instruments</u> that are relevant, at least in part, to SLCP issues, and which have been developed, modified, enacted, or implemented. • A non-binding policy instrument refers to a coherent set of decisions associated with a vision, objective and/or direction, as well as a proposed course of action to achieve these. Examples include, but are not limited to: action plans, policies, strategies, programmes, and projects. • Non-binding policy instruments can fall under the responsibility of different types of organisations (ministry, company, international organisation, NGO, etc.) and have different scopes of application (international, national, local, etc.). • “Development”: a draft of the non-binding policy instrument has been officially presented, for instance, through formal stakeholder consultation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Enacted” or “modified”: the instrument (or its modification) has been officially approved by the relevant decision making authority. • “Implementation”: an operational plan exists; financial and human resources have been allocated; and outputs detailed in the operational plan are observable. • While this indicator is numerical it should be complemented by a narrative report for each legal instrument that responds to the questions: what, where, by whom, when, why, and with what effect (see required details in section on Data elements and disaggregation).
<p>Measurement unit(s)</p>	<p><i>Number of non-legally binding policy instruments developed, modified, enacted or implemented</i></p>
<p>Baseline and target</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section. <p>For policies and plans:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Baseline can be the number of relevant existing non-legally binding instruments in the targeted sector at the start of the initiative/component/activity. ○ Target, can be established based on an estimate of level of efforts required over the policy environment to enable success of the initiative/component/activity and/or its uptake and scaling up by relevant stakeholders at the relevant timescales (2020, 2030 or 2050). <p>Expl: In 2012 none of the CCAC developing country partners had black carbon issues covered under their climate change national strategy or action plan. By 2020 all SNAP countries will have integrated black carbon issues into their national climate change strategy or action plan and by 2025 they will all have started implementation of new black carbon reducing measures as a result of these revised strategies or action plans.</p>
<p>Methodological approach</p>	<p><u><i>Double counting</i></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each instrument applying to the same geographical or institutional area can be counted once as “developed”, once as “enacted/modified” and once as “implemented” across multiple reporting periods. • If a legal instrument has gone through the different stages (e.g. developed and enacted) during the same reporting period, it should be counted only once, with the most advanced stage reported. The narrative report should provide further information about the evolution of the legal instrument. • Legally binding instruments should be reported on under the indicator 1.2.2. Laws and regulations Or measures reported under indicators 2.2.2. Commitments and 2.2.3. Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA) should not be reported under this indicator (please refer to the respective definitions). • A policy or plan may produce results that relate to other indicators. When the case, please report these results under the relevant indicators (e.g. changes in technologies and practices, knowledge dissemination, or laws and regulations). • When aggregating results across different years or reporting streams, one should be careful not to double counting one same policy or plan (e.g. which would have been reported by two different initiatives).
<p>Data elements and disaggregation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of non-binding policy instruments should be disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Official title of instrument and name of responsible institution ✓ Type (action plan; policy; strategy; programme; project) ✓ Stage (developed; enacted/modified; implemented)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section) • Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator should indicate for each instrument reported (1 sentence each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What is the instrument/modification about and why was it needed? ✓ What are the expected benefits and how will they contribute to SLCP mitigation (and where and when)? ✓ Details on CCAC contribution if any. ✓ If the instrument has gone through different stages in the reporting period, this can be indicated in the narrative. • An electronic copy of/links to the policies and plans, or their drafts, as well as relevant official reports, summary of consultations and any other relevant associated documents and web links should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.
<p>Data sources</p>	<p>See relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section.</p> <p>Possible data sources for policies and plans include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Official policy documents or their drafts, relevant official reports, summary of consultations, etc. • Initiative document, funding proposal, contracts and other CCAC documents associated to the activity which led to this outcome.
<p>Anticipated limitations and comments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator only provides an indication of the number of non-binding policy instruments as such it does not provide any information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Significance, usefulness and quality of the instrument and its impacts and whether it is/will be well-designed or effective and if a proper background analysis has been conducted. ○ whether potential gender, geographical or other social discriminations the instrument might create or increase have been addressed. ○ on quality, transparency and fairness of process through which the instrument was developed, enacted or implemented. ○ potential side effects of the instrument on other environmental, economic or social issues. • It should also be noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Non-binding policy instruments depends on the actions of multiple groups and may be subject to many limitations and processes. Their implementation may also depend on the passing of laws. Progress may be achieved in the long term and intermediate signs of achievements may be limited. ○ Influence of CCAC might be difficult to accurately determine. • In order to avoid the multiplication of non-binding policy instruments for SLCP mitigation without due consideration being given to quality and relevance or at the expense of other activities, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.
<p>Relevant international efforts</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>References</p>	<p>See General references in associated section.</p>

1.2.4. Changes in technologies and practices. # of lower emitting/alternative technologies/practices adopted, specifying scope and scale of implementation when data is available, as well as details regarding what, by whom, where, why, and with what effect

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in technologies and practices
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in technologies and practices are a direct outcome of key strategy (1) catalyse ambitious action. One of the ultimate goals of the 5 Year strategic plan is to catalyse SLCP reductions at scale. One means necessary to achieve this is the widespread adoption of SLCP emission controls and lower-emitting technologies and practices. Changes in technologies and practices may also be an important outcome of other key strategies, including: (2) mobilize robust support, (3) leverage finance at scale and (4) enhance science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This quantitative indicator tracks the adoption of lower emitting or alternative technologies/practices deployed, including with support of the initiatives and beyond as possible. Deployment of these technologies/practices directly resulting in emissions reduced or avoided, is one of the ultimate goals of the CCAC. This indicator allows for identification of trends in the implementation of technologies/practices as well as, when possible, an assessment of the scope and scale of that implementation. It can also help identification of gaps and needs, and support enhanced coordination and collaboration on support for changes in technologies and practices across the CCAC initiatives and beyond. <p><u>Relation to other indicators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in technologies and practices may be the result of activities, which outputs and outcomes are captured under other standard indicators, such as (4.2.1.) Knowledge dissemination, (1.2.2.) laws and regulations, (1.2.3.) policies and plans and (3.2.1.) Catalysed funding. Outcomes and impacts of changes in technologies and practices may also contribute to other standard or customized indicators as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Changes in technologies and practices” refers to the adoption, deployment, and implementation of new technologies or practices, or to the modification or increase in the use of technologies or practices associated with production processes. These concrete, on-the-ground changes directly result in reductions in SLCP emissions or increased avoided emissions. This indicator focuses on technologies or practices that have direct connection to SLCPs. Eligible technologies and practices can include, but are not limited to: mechanical, physical, chemical, biological technologies and management and cultural practices. Changes can relate to any timeframe and geographical scope. This is a numerical indicator under which information for each technology/practice implemented should be provided (see required details in section on data elements and disaggregation).
Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Number of new or improved technologies/practices implemented</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section. Baseline and target for this indicator can consist of a brief description of:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>For baseline</i>: the current level of deployment of technology/practice. Can be zero for new projects. ○ <i>For target</i>: the number of technology units/applications of practices needed to reach the objective of the initiative/component/activity stream at the relevant timescales (2020, 2030, 2050). ○ EXPL (diesel initiative): baseline: in 2015 ~ one-third of new heavy-duty diesel vehicles are subject to world-class emission standards with diesel particle filters target: low sulfur diesel (50 ppm) is phased in globally by 2025 and ultra-low sulfur diesel (10 ppm) representing the majority of global diesel supply by 2030.
<p>Methodological approach</p>	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Only <u>implemented changes in technologies/practices that result directly in SLCP emissions reductions</u> are eligible for reporting on under this indicator. ● <u>Changes related to financing or project processes (e.g. modification in a bank's grant attribution criteria) should not be reported under this indicator but under indicator 1.2.3. Policies and plans.</u> ● Reporting under this indicator is linked to reporting on associated emission reductions or energy efficiency gains under the impact indicators. Linking these two results intends to support assessment of the scope of the technology and practices changes reported. ●
<p>Data elements and disaggregation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● # of technologies/practices changes and associated projected or achieved emission reductions disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Name of technology/practice applied ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section). ● Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator should indicate for each change in technology and practice change reported (1 sentence for each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What are the changes about and why were they needed? ✓ Scope and scale of the change. Measurement units could include but are not limited to: geographical coverage of the implemented technology/practice, or if available, total market and/or total emission reduction potential, percentage of population impacted.) Initiatives may reference information from existing assessment documents if applicable. ✓ How the intervention came about (e.g., implementation of policy, demonstration project) ✓ Name of institution responsible of implementation ✓ Name of technology/practice provider if any ✓ CCAC role if any ● An electronic copy of/link to any written document(s) associated to the intervention should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.
<p>Data sources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ See relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section. ● For this indicator, possible data sources include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Initiative document, funding proposal, contracts associated to the activity.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Written document(s) and other material(s) associated to the technology or practice change.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator addresses only changes in policies or practices deployed by the initiatives and beyond as possible. It does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ allow insight on the quality of the implementation or likelihood of success. ○ address whether the intervention was implemented in transparent and impartial manner. ○ capture gender and geographical balance among users and institutions involved or the engagement of all relevant stakeholder in the implementation of the technology/practice. ○ enable an estimate of the impact of the intervention. • When presenting data collected under this indicator, one should be careful of preventing comparison between changes of very different nature, including across different initiatives.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

2.1.1. Political outreach. # of high level policy consultations and outreach events on SLCP relevant issues and # of participants specifying what, whom, where, when, why, to what effect

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political outreach
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Output
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Political outreach directly contributes to key strategy (2) mobilize robust support. As per the Coalition’s Framework, raising awareness of SLCPs and their impacts, promoting best practices or available technologies as well as opportunities for greater international coordination and showcasing successful efforts to address SLCPs are part of the core CCAC functions. Political outreach is an important means to perform such functions, to engage strategic stakeholders and advocate for scaled up action on SLCPs. Depending on the focus of the political outreach, this type of efforts can also support key strategies: (1) catalyse ambitious action; (3) leverage finance at scale; or (4) enhance Science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator supports the quantification of CCAC activities, and beyond as possible, involving outreach on SLCPs to high level representatives of governments, organisations, private sector or the civil society. Political will is key to action. Increasing direct involvement of high level decision makers can increase the chances of measures being taken and effectively and successfully implemented across all relevant sectors. Therefore, reaching out to and obtaining personal engagement from decision makers at the highest level is an important element of the CCAC theory of change. This indicator is used to provide insights on CCAC efforts (and beyond as possible) to mobilize leadership and develop and maintain a dynamic, productive high level dialogue on SLCP issues. <p><i>Relation to other indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> While political outreach is an output, outcomes of CCAC political outreach efforts can be captured under indicators (2.2.1.) Media coverage, (2.2.2.) Commitments, (2.2.3.) Multilateral Environmental Agreements, (4.2.1.) Knowledge dissemination, (1.2.4.) changes in technologies and practices. Political outreach outcomes and impacts may also contribute to other standard or customized indicators as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High-level policy consultations or outreach events are defined as activities that consist of a formal interaction/event with defined participants and objectives (provision of advice, awareness raising, information sharing or decision making), and that involve <u>people who have the authority to engage their institutions.</u> These events can take the form of a <u>high-level sponsored/side event, decision making meeting, policy consultation, presentation, policy briefing, press conference, etc.</u> Event objectives can vary <u>from information sharing to decision making</u>, and can take place in any location, be closed or open to the public, and last for any amount of time. This indicator focuses only on political outreach activities where SLCPs are an explicit part of the topics and issues addressed during the interaction/event. While this indicator is numerical, it should be complemented by a narrative report for each event that responds to the questions: what, whom, where, when, why and to what effect (see required details in section on Data requirements and disaggregation).

Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Number of high level events and number of participants</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See relevant paragraph in “General methodology considerations” section. • For political outreach: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Baseline can be established at zero at the date of the launch of the relevant initiative/component/activity. ○ Target, can be established based on an estimate of the level of political outreach necessary for success of the initiative/component/activity and/or its uptake and scaling up by relevant stakeholders at the relevant timescale (2020, 2030 or 2050). <p>Expl: In 2012, no high level SLCP dedicated event had been held at the COP. By 2020 a high level representative of each UN country will have participated in at least one SLCP dedicated event or bilateral on the margins of a COP.</p>
Methodological approach	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A single political outreach event composed of multiple high-level segments or sessions <u>should</u> be counted as one single event. • Events where the only high-level participant(s) are CCAC Secretariat staff should not be reported under this indicator. • Events must have <u>already occurred</u> to be counted under this indicator. <p><u>Double counting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events already reported under indicator 1.1.1. Training should not be counted under this indicator. • Political outreach can result in achievements pertaining to other indicators (e.g. a commitment). When the case, the political outreach event should be reported under this indicator and the associated achievements should be reported under the other relevant indicators (e.g. 2.2.1. Commitment). • When aggregating results over different reporting streams, one should be careful of not counting twice one same event.
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of high-level policy consultations and outreach events disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Title, date and place of event ✓ Type of event: 1) decision making/policy consultation meeting; 2) communication/media event. • Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator should indicate for each event reported (1 sentence for each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Reason for event (objective and context) ✓ Results (decision, increased interest, commitment, etc.) • An electronic copy of/link to the political outreach events participant lists, agendas and any other relevant associated documents (communiqué, press release, etc.) should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.
Data sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See relevant paragraph in “General methodology considerations” section. <p>Relevant data sources might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participant lists, agendas and any other relevant associated documents (communiqués, statements, declarations, press release, etc.)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiative documents, funding proposals, contracts associated to the activity.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator only provides an indication of the number of political outreach events in which the CCAC has been involved, and beyond as possible. As such it does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provide any information on the usefulness, effectiveness, or quality of the events or of their impacts ○ Give any insight on the diversity, geographical and gender balance of high level representatives reached out to • This indicator focused exclusively on number of events. In order to avoid the multiplication of political outreach events without due consideration being given to usefulness, quality and relevance or at the expense of other activities, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

2.2.1. Media coverage. # of mentions of CCAC-supported or SLCP-relevant activities in the media, specifying the source, channel and details of the mention (who, what, where, when) and when relevant, associated social media engagement (# of retweets, replies, comments, likes, clicks, favorites, etc. in aggregate)

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media Coverage
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media Coverage directly supports key strategy (2) Mobilize Robust Support. As per the Coalition’s Framework, raising awareness of SLCPs and their impacts is one of the core CCAC functions. Media coverage through engagement with influential local, national and international media is an important tool for advocating for enhanced action to reduce SLCPs with the CCAC targeted audience and effectively amplifying domestic and international attention to CCAC successes and partners’ actions. Acceptance of policies generally correlates positively with the availability of information and awareness of environmental problems. Media coverage contributes to public awareness and knowledge that is an important part of the success of measures and policies to address SLCPs. • This type of efforts can also support key strategies: (1) catalyse ambitious action; (3) leverage finance at scale; or (4) enhance Science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator supports quantification of media and social media coverage of CCAC activities and as possible of other SLCP relevant activities. • Media and social media coverage are essential elements of any awareness raising effort. They are one of the main means of reaching out to the general public and can also increase attention of decision-makers to specific issues. As such, ensuring that CCAC activities and SLCP issues are understood and covered by an increasing number and a wide range of media is critical to the sustainability and scaling up of our action. • This indicator is used to provide insights on the evolution of media coverage of CCAC activities and more generally of SLCP issues. It can also support an assessment of the range of media covering SLCPs and their associated audience. This can inform further development of the CCAC communication strategy. <p><u>Relation to other indicators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Media coverage can be an outcome of activities whose outputs and outcomes are reported under other indicators (e.g., training, political outreach, etc.) In the medium to long term, Media coverage can influence policies and laws and support changes in technology and practices.) As such it can contribute to other standard outcome indicators as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “Media coverage of CCAC-supported or SLCP-relevant activities” is defined as the mention of any CCAC-supported activity or SLCP-relevant issue in the news or specialized media, including print media (e.g. newspapers, magazines), broadcast media (e.g. radio and television), and the internet (e.g. online newspapers, news blogs) at the international, national or local level. • “Social media engagement” is defined as the measure of how much and how often social media users interact with content on Twitter, Facebook, Google+, Pinterest, LinkedIn, YouTube, etc. Social media engagement actions to be aggregated under this indicator can include: retweets, replies, comments, likes, clicks, favourites, etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While the indicator is numerical, it should be complemented by a short narrative (see required details in section on Data requirements and disaggregation).
Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i># of mentions of in the media, and # of retweets, replies, comments, likes, clicks, favorites, etc. (in aggregate)</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For media coverage: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline can be established at zero at the start of the implementation of the initiative/ component/ activity stream. Target can be established based on an estimate of the level of media coverage necessary to the success of the initiative/component/activity, and/or its uptake and scaling up by relevant stakeholders at the relevant timescale (2020,2030 or 2050). As an alternative, it can also be set relatively to previous year performance (e.g. target: superior to [number of mention in the media during previous year]) <p>Expl: In 2010 SLCPs had not been mentioned in any major press publication. By 2020 SLCPs will have been in the headlines of at least one major press publication in every CCAC country.</p>
Methodological approach	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public <u>communication materials</u>, such as press releases, communiqués, declarations, brochures or flyers, including those <u>produced by CCAC</u>, its partners or implementers, <u>cannot</u> be accounted for under this indicator. This indicator focuses on social media engagement (number of shares, likes, comments, clicks, etc.) and not on impressions (the number of times a post has appeared in user feeds/timelines). Comprehensive reporting under this indicator might be difficult and initiatives are primarily required to report on key media coverage they have helped make happen or that directly relates to their activities. <p><u>Double counting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Each media piece in which there is one or more mention(s) of a CCAC-supported activity or SLCP-relevant issue should be counted once To avoid double counting of the same media piece, it is important that the <u>source and link be provided</u>. Science articles <u>should not</u> be reported under this indicator but under indicator 4.1.1. Knowledge resources. Nevertheless, media coverage of scientific findings associated to a knowledge resource reported under indicator 4.1.1. should be counted under this indicator. Media coverage of an activity reported under one of the output indicators (e.g., political outreach) should be reported under this indicator.
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of mentions of CCAC-supported or SLCP-relevant activities in the media, and when relevant, associated social media engagement should be disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Source ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph in General methodology considerations section) A short narrative and link to each media coverage and/or an electronic copy should be attached.

Data sources	The CCAC Secretariat supports tracking of press coverage of CCAC activities and SLCP issues and undertakes annual media analysis.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator addresses only the number of new media mentions and social media actions on CCAC activities and beyond as possible. It does not enable to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ fully capture the coverage of SLCP issues in the media and as such may not enable identification of some associated trends. ○ reflect the scope of information dissemination nor does it provide information on the accuracy, quality, usefulness and impact of the coverage, and thus does not necessarily correlates with a change in awareness and support to CCAC or SLCP mitigation. ○ provide any information on gender and other characteristics of journalists, reporters and other media professionals. ○ address disparities or issues in terms of normative rules, limit to the freedom of expression, or influence of the editorial lines of the media. • Opinion and views expressed on CCAC, its activities and more generally any SLCP related matters in the media or on social media do not necessarily align with those of the CCAC and shall not be considered as such, not shall CCAC be held accountable for accuracy of content of media coverage.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

2.2.2. Commitments. # of high level commitments covering SLCPs, or endorsing CCAC activities, and # of committing institutions, specifying what, whom, where, when, why, to what effect

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commitments contribute to key strategy (2) Mobilize robust support of the 5 Year Strategic Plan which aims among others at increasing political support for SLCP reductions. Official expressions of support to or pledges toward SLCPs mitigation are important outcomes of CCAC activities. They can help recognize opportunities and benefits of action, and facilitate inclusion or elevation of SLCPs as institutional priorities. • This type of efforts can also support other key strategies by helping to: (1) Catalyse ambitious action; (3) leverage finance at scale; or (4) enhance Science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator allows quantification of the number of official expressions of support or pledges related to SLCPs mitigation or to a CCAC activity and of the associated number of committing institutions.. • An official expression of support or pledge by a stakeholder is representative of an increase in engagement toward SLCP mitigation. They are important in ensuring continuity and scaling up of political support and can help mobilisation of further resources or further implementation of actions. It can also indicate the start of a policy process aimed at improving the legal and/or institutional environment for SLCP mitigation. As such, they are indications of success of CCAC activities. • This indicator is used to provide insights on CCAC efforts (and beyond as possible) in generating political support and engagement in countries, organisations and identify associated gaps. It can also, more specifically, help to measure effectiveness of CCAC outreach efforts, and, more generally, provide information on the status of SLCP in political agendas. • Commitments can be an outcome of activities whose outputs and outcomes are reported under other indicators (e.g. 2.1.1. Political outreach, 4.1.1. Knowledge production, etc.) • Outcomes of Commitments may contribute to other standard or customized outcome indicators such as 1.2.4. Changes in technology and practices, 1.2.2. laws and regulations, as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator focuses on commitments, i.e. non-legally binding official expressions of support or pledges relevant to SLCPs. It also looks at the number of institutions making these expressions of support or pledges. An “official expression of support or pledge” is defined as an official account of facts, views, intentions, and/or plans that further engage a stakeholder in SLCP mitigation, communicated through a formal written or oral announcement. They include, but are not limited to: official commitments, declarations, statements, as well as international decisions, recommendations or resolutions (such as the 2015 WHO resolution on air pollution). • Commitments are not legally binding. They can fall under the responsibility of different organisations (ministry, company, international organisation, NGO, etc.) and apply to different scopes (international, national, local, etc.). • A committing institution is defined as an institution that officially supports the reporting commitment (e.g. signatories to an international resolution).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While this indicator is numerical, it should be complemented by a narrative report for each legal instrument, responding to the questions: what, whom, where, when, why, to what effect (see required details in section on Data elements and disaggregation).
Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Number of official expressions of support or pledges and number of committing institutions</i>
Baseline and target	<p>See relevant paragraph in the General methodology considerations section</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For commitments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Baseline can be established at zero at the start of the initiative/component/activity. Target, can be established based on an estimate of the level and scale of commitment needed for success of the initiative/component/activity and/or its uptake and scaling up by relevant stakeholders at the relevant timescales (2020, 2030 or 2050). <p>Expl: In 2017 only 3 countries target black carbon in their NDCs. In 2020 all CCAC partners will have revised their NDCs commitments to integrated black carbon.</p>
Methodological approach	<p><i>Scope</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only official expressions of support or pledges that have been <u>issued during the current reporting period</u> and that are new in nature (not previously announced) can be reported under this indicator. Official expressions of support or pledges linked to results reported under other indicators for the same reporting period, such as 1.2.3. Policies and plans, 1.2.2. Laws and regulations (e.g. government committing to work to develop a law), 1.2.4. Changes in technologies and practices, 2.2.3. Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEA), 3.1.1. Co-funding, and 3.2.1. Catalysed funding, <u>CANNOT</u> be reported on under this indicator. <p><i>Double counting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official expressions of support or pledges relating to the same facts, views, intentions, or plans, announced on different occasions, should only be counted once. Multiple announcements of the same commitment may be described in the narrative.
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of official expressions of support or pledges and # of committing institutions disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Title of the commitment(s), dates and place ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph in "General methodology considerations" section) ✓ Objective of event Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator should indicate for each commitment reported (1 sentence for each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What is the official expression of interest or pledge about and why was it needed? ✓ Where and when was it issued? ✓ What are its expected benefits? ✓ Details on CCAC role if any <u>An electronic copy of/link to the commitments, or other materials documenting them, as well as relevant official reports, summary of consultations and any other relevant associated documents and web links should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.</u>

Data sources	<p>See general specifications in relevant paragraph of the "General methodology considerations" section. Data source for this indicator may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Copy of the commitments, or other materials documenting them. • Initiative document, funding proposal, contracts associated to the activity which led to this outcome.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator only provides an indication of the number of official expressions of support or pledges, which are relevant, at least in part, to SLCP issues or CCAC activities. As such it does not provide any information on their usefulness, significance, effectiveness, or quality and these of their impacts. • It should also be noted that influence of CCAC on these official expressions of support or pledges might be difficult to accurately determine. • In order to avoid the multiplication of official expressions of support or pledges without due consideration being given to their relevance and quality or at the expense of other efforts, appropriate consideration will be given to trends as well as narrative reporting and documentation submitted.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

2.2.3. Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs). # of relevant MEAs with improved considerations of SLCP issues, specifying what, when, why, to what effect

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs) contribute to key strategy (2) Mobilize robust support of the 5 Year Strategic Plan aimed, among others, at increasing political support for SLCP reductions. In addition, as per the Coalition’s Framework, encouraging existing and new regional actions and promoting opportunities for greater international coordination is one of the core functions of the CCAC. As such, influencing MEAs toward integration of considerations relative to SLCP mitigation, as appropriate, is an important part of the CCAC work. Such efforts can also play an important role in support of other key strategies by helping to: (1) catalyse ambitious action; (3) leverage finance at scale; or (4) enhance science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator allows quantification of MEAs with improved considerations of SLCP issues. MEAs are key policy instruments for elevating the international importance of an environmental issue and to trigger additional political momentum and commitment. In addition, they can constitute the basis for development of mitigation measures by participating countries and facilitate domestic legislative and policy development. Therefore, further integration of SLCP considerations MEAs is an important element of the CCAC theory of change and an indicator of CCAC success. This indicator is used to provide insights on SLCP integration into the international environmental agenda and progresses made in recognition of the importance of SLCP issues at this level. Monitoring of these trends can help identify successes and gaps, and prioritize efforts, including those related to political outreach. <p><i>Relation to other indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased integration of SLCP into MEAs can be an outcome of CCAC activities whose outputs and/or outcomes are also reported under other indicators (e.g. organization of workshops dedicated to SLCPs under a MEA can lead to training, media coverage, as well as better integration of SLCP under a MEA). Outcomes of this indicator may contribute to other standard or customized outcome indicators such as changes in technology and practices, as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator focuses on the number of MEAs with improved integration of SLCP mitigation considerations. A MEA refers to a <u>legally binding instrument between two or more nation states (including at the regional level) that deals with some aspect of the environment</u>. MEAs can include, but are not limited to: conventions, treaties, agreements, charters, final acts, pacts, accords, covenants, protocols, and constitutions (for an international organisation). MEAs generally go through various stages: negotiation, adoption, ratification, and implementation.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> While this indicator is numerical it should be complemented by a narrative report for each MEA that responds to the questions: what, when, why, to what effect (see required details in section on Data elements and disaggregation).
Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Number of MEAs with improved considerations of SLCP issues</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For general specifications, see relevant paragraph in the "General methodology considerations" section. For this indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Target, can be established based on an estimate of the number of existing MEA which would need to be improved for full recognition at the international level of the issue addressed under the initiative/component/activity at the relevant timescale (2020, 2030 or 2050). Expl: In 2010, no MEA related to air pollution integrated black carbon consideration. By 2020 all MEA covering air pollution issues will have integrated their black carbon aspects.
Methodological approach	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Non-binding international decisions, recommendations or resolutions (such as the 2015 WHO resolution on air pollution) reported under indicator 2.2.2. Commitments should not be reported under this indicator. <p><u>Double counting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Report any new and SLCP-relevant modifications to an MEA that are made during the current reporting period. MEAs should <u>not</u> be reported under indicators 1.2.2. Laws and regulations, 1.2.3. Policies and plans and 2.2.2. Commitments (see respective definitions). A MEA with improved integration of SLCPs can result in achievements that are relevant to other indicators (e.g. new SLCP national policies). When the case, the modification of the MEA should be reported under this indicator and the associated achievements under the relevant indicator (e.g. 1.2.2. Policies and plans)
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of MEAs should be disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Official title of MEA ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph in the "General methodology considerations" section.) Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator should indicate for each MEA reported (1 sentence for each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ What are the MEA and improved/new SLCP considerations about and why were they needed? ✓ What are the expected benefits and how do they contribute to SLCP mitigation (and where and when, next stages)? ✓ Details on CCAC role if any An electronic copy of/link to the MEAs, or their drafts, as well as relevant official reports, summary of negotiations and any other relevant associated documents and web links should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.
Data sources	<p>For general specification, see relevant paragraph in the "General methodology considerations" section. For this indicator possible data sources include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> MEAs, or their drafts, as well as relevant official reports, summary of negotiations, etc.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initiative document, funding proposal, contracts associated to the activity.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator only provides an indication of the number of MEAs with improved integration of SLCP considerations and as such it does not provide any information on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ the MEAs usefulness, significance, effectiveness, or quality and these of their impacts. ○ whether issues of potential gender, geographical or other social discriminations the MEA might create or increase have been addressed. ○ on quality, transparency and fairness of process through which the MEA was developed, adopted or implemented. ○ potential side effects of the MEA on other environmental, economic or social issues. • It should also be noted that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Creation or amendment of MEAs are long and complex processes. Progress may be achieved in the long term and intermediate signs of achievements may be limited. ○ Role of CCAC might be difficult to accurately determine.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

3.1.1. Co-funding. *Amount (USD) of co-funding secured to support initiatives/other CCAC projects, outside the CCAC trust fund (i.e. for every dollar of support from the trust fund, CCAC work was supported by x dollars of outside funding), with details on what, by whom and to what effect*

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-funding
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-funding contributes directly to key strategy (3) Leverage finance at scale. Mobilizing sufficient resources is critical to the successful implementation and scaling up of CCAC action. To this effect, co-funding from external sources for initiatives is encouraged, either through in-kind or monetary contributions. It can contribute to active participation of partners and actors in the CCAC and engagement of key stakeholders in tackling SLCPs, it can also increase the impact of CCAC actions. • Co-funding can also directly support the other key strategies when provided to fund activities that help (1) catalyse ambitious action, (2) mobilize robust support, or (4) enhance science and knowledge.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator captures the amount of secured resources engaged by partners and actors, in activities falling under the scope of the initiatives and other CCAC work streams, beyond these of the CCAC Trust Fund (i.e. for every dollar of support from the trust fund, CCAC work was supported by x dollars of outside funding). It helps to assess to what extent activities funded by CCAC Trust fund are also supported through other funding streams from partners and actors and how such support is evolving. • Monitoring the level of co-funding can help assess the success and relevance of CCAC actions by providing insights into the evolution of interest and uptake of these as well as the total amount of resources dedicated by partners and actors to such activities. It also provides insights into the evolution of partners and actors engagement in the CCAC and more generally SLCP mitigation. <p><i>Relation to other indicators</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-funding outcomes and impacts may be captured under other standard or customized indicators as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In accordance with the guidance on externally funded implementers as per the CCAC Initiatives Governance and Process document (WG/MAY2015/08A), co-funding is defined as any monetary or in-kind contribution made by a CCAC partner or actor - <u>not allocated through the CCAC Trust Fund</u> - to activities that are directly a part of, or within the scope of, a CCAC-approved initiative/component/activity stream. • Co-funding can include any secured monetary or in-kind contribution necessary for the execution of an activity, work stream, or initiative. In-kind contributions are all non-cash contributions to initiative/component/activity stream objectives. These contributions can be made in the form of goods, services and facilities; staff time; provision of or access to equipment, special materials and other commodities. The methodology to estimate the monetary value of in-kind contributions is left to the discretion of Lead Partners, but should be specified in the report. • Monetary contributions can consist of financial contributions of any amount. • While this indicator is numerical, it should be complemented by a narrative report that responds to the questions: what (in kind, monetary), by whom (source) and on what (co-funded activity description) (see required details in section on Data requirements and disaggregation).

Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>USD and ratio (fund delivered through trust fund/amount of co-funding)</i>
Baseline and expected/indicative target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For general specification, please see relevant paragraph in the General methodology considerations section. For co-funding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Baseline, can be established at zero at the start of the initiative/component/activity stream. ✓ Target, can be any amount which is estimated to represent an appropriate level of support (in addition to Trust Fund resources) for the objectives of the initiative/activity to be fully met at the relevant timeline (2020, 2030, 2050). <p>Expl: In 2012 the Bricks initiative had no co-funding. By 2020 the Bricks initiative will have reached a 50% co-funding rate from least 5 funding different funding sources.</p>
Methodological approach	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Co-funding includes any resources beyond CCAC trust fund resources that are secured for an initiative. <p><u>Calculation</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition to the amount of co-funding (USD), the associated co-funding ratio should be calculated when appropriate: $\text{Initiative/activity co-funding ratio} = (\text{USD of co-funding} / \text{USD from CCAC trust fund going to the activity/Initiative})$ <p><u>Double counting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding for activities reported on under indicator 3.2.1. Catalysed funding do not qualify as co-funding (see respective definitions). • Co-funding can result in achievements which are relevant to other indicators (e.g. co-funding to a training event). When the case, the co-funding should be reported under this indicator and the associated achievement under the relevant indicator (e.g. 1.1.1. Training)
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USD amount and associated co-funding ratio should be disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Type (monetary, in-kind) • Narrative reports should take the form of a short paragraph (1-2 sentences) providing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Description of activities co-funded and expected results ✓ Indication of what such co-funding enables (e.g. expand geographical or technological scope of action supported by CCAC Trust Fund) <p>An electronic copy of/links to any relevant written document(s) associated to the reported co-funding and associated activities should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.</p>
Data sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For general specifications, see relevant paragraph in the “General methodology considerations” section. Data sources for this indicator may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Initiative document, funding proposal, documents from co-funding source, any other reference document.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator only captures co-funding notified by partners and actors and as such might not fully reflect the level of co-funding.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In addition, it should be noted that CCAC visibility on co-funding streams and associated activities can be limited and is left to the discretion of co-funding partners and actors as is responsibility for these activities. • This indicator does not provide any information on relevance, effectiveness, quality or success of activities funded, nor does it provide information on their connections to the environmental impacts and benefits pursued by the CCAC. • Nor does it provide information on geographical balance and equity or more generally on fairness of financial support allocation. • This indicator is only focused on level of co-funding. In order to be successful, the CCAC also needs to see its own funds increase. To avoid diversion from the CCAC Trust Fund, in addition to the volume of co-funding and ratio of co-funding to Trust Fund resources, appropriate consideration will also be given to the evolution of the funding volume going to the CCAC Trust Fund. • Main issues regarding precision, reliability, attribution and double counting are addressed in sections on Methodological Approach, Data Elements and Disaggregation. If you come across additional issues, please inform the CCAC Secretariat. • Standard indicators and associated methodology are to be revised on a regular basis. Partners are encouraged to inform the CCAC Secretariat of any difficulty encountered while reporting against the indicator.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

3.2.1. Catalysed funding. *Narrative describing transformative action on SLCP mitigation catalysed by CCAC, quantified where possible (secured amount in USD), specifying what, by whom, when, where and with what effect*

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catalysed funding
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catalysed funding directly contributes to key strategy (3) leverage finance at scale. The CCAC has been established as a catalytic effort aimed at bringing together many diverse, experienced, and influential stakeholders to leverage high-level engagement and political will across and beyond membership to catalyze rapid and large scale action. It is not a funding mechanism <i>per se</i>. and its success will largely depend on its ability to generate and capture SLCP mitigation action in developed and developing countries beyond its scope of direct intervention. To this effect, catalysing transformative action and mobilizing associated funding beyond the CCAC Trust Fund and through collaboration with state and non-state partners, engagement with national and multi-lateral development banks and bilateral development agencies, and work with the private sector are priorities in achieving the objectives of the 5-year Strategic Plan. • Catalysed funding can also directly support the other key strategies when targeted at activities that help (1) catalyse ambitious action, (2) mobilize robust support, or (4) enhance science and knowledge.
Purpose, rationale and interpretation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator is primarily narrative and is intended to help provide a comprehensive picture of SLCP mitigation action catalysed through seed funding or other types of support from the CCAC. • As the CCAC has been designed to be a catalytic effort aimed at generating rapid, large scale and sustainable SLCP mitigation, transformative action and associated financial resources mobilized through its support and going beyond the scope and scale of its intervention are important indicators of its success. • This indicator is used to track progress in catalysing the resources needed to bring about the transformational change encouraged by the CCAC. It supports recognition of action and resources invested in SLCP mitigation and provides a means to further assess the evolution of the global landscape of efforts. <p><u>Relation to other indicators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catalysed funding can be an outcome of some activities whose other outputs and outcomes are reported under other standard indicators. • Activities from catalysed funding are not directly attributable to the CCAC, however, recognizing that visibility on these might be limited, lead partners are encouraged to, where possible and with support from the Secretariat, seek to track their outcomes and impacts and report these under other standard or customized indicators as appropriate with the necessary attribution specifications (see notes on double counting and attribution under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Catalysed funding is defined as any <u>secured</u> financial flow outside of the CCAC Trust Fund that supports transformative actions toward SLCP mitigation. These transformative actions should be <u>relevant to</u>, but not part of, CCAC activities, outputs or outcomes. Catalysed funding should not be confused with co-funding, which supports CCAC activities (<u>see definition under 3.1.1.</u>)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sources of catalysed funding can include partners, actors and other public (e.g. development bank grants) or private (e.g. corporate investments) sources. • Catalysed funding and associated actions can be of any scope and scale and take many forms, such as a GEF project (e.g. Mexico SLCP GEF project) or a new funding mechanism hosted by a multilateral or national bank (e.g. the World Bank Pilot Auction Facility for Methane and Climate Change Mitigation). • Catalysed transformative action and associated funding can be an outcome of/linked to various CCAC activities, such as: support to the development of new market and business plans, promotion of the bankability of projects catalysed by initiatives, connection of banks with project proponents, or support to project preparation; and can also include awareness raising, advocacy or policy support (e.g. for the creation of feed-in-tariffs), and other informational, technical or scientific support. • This is a narrative indicator under which information for each catalysed transformative action should be provided (see required details in section on Data requirements and disaggregation). • While this indicator is narrative, the amount of catalysed funding should be quantified when possible.
Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Narrative and amount in USD (when possible)</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For general specifications, see relevant paragraph in the “General methodology considerations” section. Baseline and target for this narrative indicator can be qualitative with a quantitative indication of the level of catalysed funding required where possible. They can consist of a brief description, of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For baseline: the current level of action in the sector ○ For target: the necessary level of transformative action to be catalysed in order to achieve the pursued benefits at the relevant timescale (2020, 2030, 2050) under the CCAC initiative/ component/activity stream. <p>EXPL: Baseline: No international funding mechanism focused on methane emission reductions projects.</p> <p>X million USD deposited into a functional international funding mechanism focused on methane emission reduction projects.</p>
Methodological approach	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no minimum amount, scale or geographical scope for catalysed funding and associated transformative action reported under this indicator. • The definition of “linked to a CCAC activity” is at the discretion of the initiative Lead Partners, who have the best sense of what outside actions were, at least in part, catalysed by the work of their initiative. • Only catalysed funding secured during the current reporting period can be reported. • Although the outcomes and impacts of catalysed funding and associated transformative action are not directly attributable to the CCAC, and recognizing that visibility on these might be limited, lead partners are encouraged to track the outcomes and impacts of catalysed funding and associated transformative action, and report these under other indicators as appropriate with the necessary attribution specifications and with support from the Secretariat.

	<p><i>Double counting</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Any amount or activity associated with amounts already reported under the indicator 3.1.1. Co-funding should NOT be counted under this indicator.
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Qualitative description of the transformative action(s) catalysed and associated funding (in USD) disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Title of the transformative activity ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph of the "General methodology considerations" section) <p>Narrative section should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ the transformative action (including title, approach, timescale) ✓ associated rationale and expected benefits ✓ how the CCAC support has helped catalysed associated funding <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An electronic copy of/links to relevant and available documents associated to the catalysed funding and associated activities should be attached to the reporting/sent to the Secretariat.
Data sources	<p>See general specifications in relevant paragraph of the "General methodology considerations" section.</p> <p>The Secretariat also supports the initiatives in tracking outputs and outcomes of funding and transformative actions catalysed by the initiatives, as needed and appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Possible data sources for this indicator include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Documents associated to the catalysed funding and transformative actions. ✓ Initiative/ component/ activity stream document, funding proposal, contracts associated to the activity that helped catalysed funding.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It should be noted that CCAC visibility on catalysed transformative action and associated funding can be limited and is left to the discretion of the funding entities on which all associated responsibility also relies. • This indicator only captures transformative action and associated catalysed funding on which CCAC has information and might not fully reflect the level of funding and action catalysed by the CCAC. • This indicator does not provide any information on relevance, effectiveness, quality or success of catalysed transformative actions and funding. Nor does it provide information on geographical balance and equity or more generally on fairness and other prioritization criteria associated to these.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

4.1.1. Knowledge resources and tools. <i>Narrative of knowledge resources and tools on SLCPs, including what, on what, and to what expected effect</i>	
Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge resources and tools
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Output
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge resources and tools contribute directly to key strategy (4) enhance science and knowledge. The CCAC is intended to be an authoritative voice on the current state of SLCP knowledge. As per its framework, improving understanding of and reviewing scientific progress on SLCPs, their impacts, and the benefits of mitigation is one of the core function of the CCAC. Although existing SLCP science and knowledge are already providing a strong impetus for action, gaps remain including the need to better understand the multiple benefits of action, and country-, region-, sector-, or measure-specific data and analysis are required to support the adoption and scaling up of mitigation measures and to demonstrate their impacts. • Knowledge resources and tools can also play an important role in support of other key strategies by helping to: (1) catalyse ambitious action, (2) mobilize robust support, and (3) leverage finance at scale.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This narrative indicator helps to track the knowledge and science resources and tools produced by the SAP, the initiatives, supported by the CCAC, and beyond as possible. • Knowledge and tools production is a critical component of the CCAC theory of change. Although the CCAC is an action oriented effort, sound environmental science, as well as social, economic, policy and technical analysis need to underpin any of our action as key pre-requisites for credibility and success. • This indicator supports identification of trends in the production of knowledge resources and tools in terms of topical or geographical coverage and type of resources produced (e.g., scientific articles, technical studies, policy briefs, web tools, etc.) It can also help identification of gaps and needs, and support enhanced coordination and collaboration on knowledge production across the CCAC initiatives and beyond. <p><i><u>Relation to other indicators</u></i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Direct outcomes of knowledge resources produced can be captured under standards indicators (4.2.1.) Knowledge dissemination, (4.2.2.) Utilisation of tools, (1.2.2.) laws and regulations, (1.2.3.) policies and plans, (1.2.4.) Changes in technologies and practices, (2.2.1.) Media coverage, and (3.2.1.) Catalysed funding. Knowledge resources production outcomes and impacts may also contribute to other standard or customized indicators as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the context of this indicator: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <u>A knowledge resource</u> is defined as the theoretical or practical study of a defined subject or situation conducted using a specific methodology, and resulting in the production of <u>new</u> data or structured information relevant to SLCP mitigation. It can relate to any scientific or technical field, and apply to any timeframe and geographical scope. ○ <u>A tool</u> is defined as a technical aid that provides information on SLCP science, mitigation, or other related topics. It can relate to any timeframe and geographical scope. A tool can be computer-based, web-based, phone-based (e.g., ask an expert hotline) or be a piece of technical equipment (e.g., a black carbon monitor).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The knowledge resource or tool can have multiple formats, including, but not limited to: a <u>final</u> book, report, article, film, brief, computer- or web-based tool or package, or the modification of such tools or packages for better integration of SLCP-related issues. • Examples of such products include: peer-reviewed or grey literature publications; scoping studies; project reports; impact assessments; scenario studies; case studies; pre-feasibility and feasibility studies; economic, social, and technical studies; cost-benefit analyses; marketing studies; background studies; policy briefs and computer- or web-based tools or packages (e.g. SNAP toolkit, integration of an SLCP emissions calculator module into an existing emissions calculator tool, etc.). • This is a narrative indicator under which information for each knowledge resource should be provided (see required details in section on Data requirements and disaggregation).
<p>Measurement unit(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>N/A (narrative)</i>
<p>Baseline and target</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For general specifications, please refer to the relevant paragraph in the General methodology considerations section. Baseline and target for this knowledge resource and tool indicator are qualitative and consist of a brief description, of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>For baseline:</i> the current state of knowledge and existing tools. ○ <i>For target:</i> the knowledge resources and tools needed to reach the objective of the initiative/component/activity stream at the relevant timescales (2020, 2030, 2050). ○ EXPL: baseline: 2 studies of market opportunities for clean cookstoves enterprises in Mexico in 2010 but only covering solar stoves; target: all LAC region and alternative technology to traditional cookstoves covered by 2020.
<p>Methodological approach</p>	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Only knowledge resources and tools in finalized form can be reported under this indicator (no draft documents or beta version tools). • If a toolkit includes multiple unique tools, report by individual tool, if possible. • If not publicly accessible or published, only resources or tools to which at least the CCAC Secretariat has access can be reported under this indicator. <p><u>Double counting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Press articles, communication brochures and other communication materials are <u>not</u> eligible for reporting under this indicator (see relevance of press articles to indicator 2.2.1. Media coverage). • Any knowledge resource associated to a document reported under indicators 1.2.1. Laws and regulations, 1.2.2. Policies and plans, 2.2.2. Commitments, or 2.2.3. Multilateral Environmental Agreements <u>cannot</u> be reported under this indicator. • The production of a knowledge resource or tool will likely result in achievements that are relevant to other indicators (e.g. dissemination of the new knowledge resource). When the case, the knowledge resource or tool should be reported under this indicator and the associated achievement under the relevant indicators (such as 4.2.1. Knowledge dissemination, 4.2.2. Utilisation of tools, 1.2.4. Changes in technologies and practices, etc.)
<p>Data elements and disaggregation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reporting under this indicator should take the form of a short paragraph (2-3 sentences and citation) for each knowledge resource reported, specifying:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The issue covered (including sector and geographical scope) ✓ The rationale for the knowledge/tool production and the expected effect(s) (relevance and usefulness). ✓ Expected benefits. • Qualitative data reported on under this indicator should be disaggregated by (see data sheet): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Full reference of the resource ✓ Type of resource: 1) science and research; 2) technical document; 3) guidelines; 4) tool; 5) webinar & training material; 6) SAP briefing and update ; 7) database ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph in the General methodology considerations section) <p>An electronic copy of/ links to the written document(s) associated to the knowledge resource or tool should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.</p>
Data sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For general specifications, please refer to the relevant paragraph in the General methodology considerations section. Possible data sources for this indicator include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Initiative document, funding proposal, contracts associated to the activity. ✓ Written document(s) and other material(s) associated to the knowledge resource.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator addresses only the production of knowledge and tools related to SLCP mitigation. It does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ allow insight on its quality and credibility, including methodological rigor, or accuracy, relevance, comprehensiveness and usefulness of content. ○ address whether the knowledge/tool was produced in a transparent and impartial manner or the independency of its authors. ○ capture gender and geographical balance among authors and institutions involved or the engagement of all relevant stakeholder in its production. ○ enable an estimate of its impact and/or dissemination and whether the new knowledge/tool reached the right audience and translated into action.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

4.2.1. Knowledge dissemination. *Quantified representation of use of SLCP relevant knowledge resources (recommended proxies: # of references to the knowledge resources in policy documents; # of downloads from the CCAC website and/or partner websites), specifying where possible how, to whom and to what effect*

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge dissemination
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge dissemination contributes directly to key strategies (4) enhance science and knowledge. If national actor and private entities are to be motivated to take mitigation action, they must fully understand the scientific underpinnings and policy options, both of which depend fully on widespread dissemination of facts regarding SLCPs and the real opportunities and benefits of taking ambitious action. The CCAC is well position to provide this critical information and encourage partners to actively disperse available knowledge resources along multiple dissemination pathways. The lack of more widespread understanding of the scientific progress on SLCPs, their impacts, and the benefits of mitigation will inhibit further and ambitious action. The work may also focus on ensuring the inclusion of traditional and non-traditional audiences as recipients of relevant knowledge. • Knowledge dissemination also play an important role in support of other key strategies by helping to: (1) Catalyse ambitious action, (2) Mobilise robust support, (3) leverage finance at scale and.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This narrative and quantitative indicator tracks the use of SLCP relevant knowledge resources, especially those produced by the CCAC in terms of knowledge dissemination interventions (KDIs) by which knowledge and science resources are made available and being used. KDIs are critical to the CCAC theory of change, and therefore additional effort must be taken to understand qualitatively and quantitatively, where possible, the ways in which KDIs have spurred mitigation action, for example the extent to which decision makers have enhanced ability and motivation to make informed choices among policy alternatives. • This indicator allows for improving the understanding of how the CCAC can improve topical and geographical coverage of disseminated materials. It also helps identify what additional audiences may need to be served. It can also help identification of gaps and needs, and support enhanced coordination and collaboration on the most effective KDIs needed to catalyse action. <p><u>Relation to other indicators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • knowledge dissemination can be an outcome of CCAC activities whose other outputs and outcomes are also reported under other indicators (e.g. training, political outreach, knowledge production, etc.) • Direct outcomes of knowledge dissemination can be captured under laws and regulations (1.2.2.), policies and plans (1.2.3.), Political outreach (2.1.1), Changes in technologies and practices, (1.2.4.) Media coverage (2.2.1), Commitments (2.2.2) and Catalysed funding (3.2.1.).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In the context of this indicator, knowledge dissemination is defined as any means by which a knowledge resource is made available to its relevant audience. • This indicator focuses on dissemination of CCAC and other SLCP-related materials, including dissemination by CCAC (through Knowledge Dissemination Interventions - KDI).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a quantitative and qualitative indicator under which information for each knowledge dissemination intervention should be provided (see required details in section on Data requirements and disaggregation).
Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Quantified representation of dissemination, may vary by type of knowledge resources. Recommended proxies include: # of references to the knowledge resource in policy documents; # of downloads from the CCAC website and/or partner websites.</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See general specifications in the relevant paragraph of the "General methodology considerations" section. Baseline and target for this knowledge dissemination indicator are both quantitative and qualitative and consist of a brief description or numerical value: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>For baseline:</i> zero or the current state of knowledge. <i>For target:</i> the knowledge dissemination required to reach the objective of the initiative/component/activity stream at the relevant timescales (2020, 2030, 2050). EXPL: baseline: release of a new study on the health co-benefits of SLCP reductions from brick kilns; target: all CCAC partners with active brick kiln industry have referenced this new report document in one relevant policy document by 2020.
Methodological approach	<p><u>Scope</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only use of knowledge resources in finalized form are eligible for reporting under this indicator (no drafts). <p><u>Double counting</u> # of references to one knowledge resource in policy documents or # of downloads from the CCAC website and/or partner websites may increase over time and additional numbers can be provided for each new reporting period (using the same resource name to enable aggregation over the relevant periods of time).</p>
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quantified representation of dissemination (recommended proxies include: # of references to the knowledge resource in policy documents OR # of downloads from the CCAC website and/or partner websites; # of share on social media) reported on under this indicator is linked to reporting under indicator 4.1.1. on knowledge resources and tools. Narrative under this indicator should indicate for dissemination of each knowledge resource reported on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The means of dissemination and the methodology for measure ✓ the rationale for the knowledge dissemination and the expected effect(s) (relevance and usefulness). ✓ the full reference of the knowledge resource ✓ Information related to optional disaggregation categories if not provided as such. An electronic copy of/link to the written document(s) associated to the knowledge resource, and of any document relevant to the KDI should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.
Data sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The CCAC Secretariat is in charge of measuring # of downloads from the CCAC website. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ For general specifications on data sources, please refer to the relevant paragraph in the "General methodology considerations" section.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This indicator addresses only the knowledge dissemination interventions and potential consequences attributable to those interventions, specifically SLCP mitigation. It does not:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ address whether the knowledge resource was produced in a transparent and impartial manner or the independency of its authors. ○ fully account for all impacts of disseminated products. ○ Quality, usefulness, etc. of dissemination ● There may be some challenges in qualitatively attributing actions to receipt of knowledge resources via identified knowledge dissemination interventions.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

4.2.2. Utilisation of tools. *Quantified representation of usage of SLCP relevant tools (size of user community OR # of references to the tool in policy documents), specifying utilisation of what, by whom and to what effect*

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation of tools
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Outcome
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Utilisation of tools contributes directly to key strategy (4) enhance science and knowledge. As per its framework, improving understanding of and reviewing scientific progress on SLCPs, their impacts, and the benefits of mitigation is one of the core function of the CCAC. Technical and policy tools are one important means CCAC and initiatives use to promote the understanding and application of SLCP science and knowledge. Utilisation of tools can also play an important role in support of other key strategies by helping to: (1) catalyse ambitious action, (2) mobilize robust support, and (3) leverage finance at scale.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This quantitative indicator helps track the use of tools supported or developed by the initiatives, or supported by CCAC, and beyond as possible. Application of tools by policy makers and other key actors demonstrates the impact of those tools in promoting increased understanding and application of SLCP science and knowledge. This indicator allows for identification of trends in the utilisation of tools as well as a qualitative assessment of the impact of those tools. It can also help identification of gaps and needs, and support enhanced coordination and collaboration on support for and development of tools across the CCAC initiatives and beyond. <p><u>Relation to other indicators</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Direct outcomes of tool utilisation may be captured under other standards indicators including (4.2.1.) Knowledge dissemination, (1.2.2.) laws and regulations, (1.2.3.) policies and plans, (1.2.4.) Changes in technologies and practices, (2.2.1.) Media coverage, and (3.2.1.) Catalysed funding. Tool utilisation outcomes and impacts may also contribute to other standard or customized indicators as appropriate (see notes on double counting under methodological approach section).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the context of this indicator, the utilisation of a tool is defined as any use made of a tool by the relevant audience that is in line with the tool objectives. This is a quantitative indicator under which information for each tool should be provided (see required details in section on data elements and disaggregation).
Measurement unit(s)	<i>Quantitative representation of tool use, may vary by type of tool. Recommended proxies for measurement include: (size of user community OR # of references to the tool in policy documents)</i>
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> For general specifications please refer to the relevant paragraph in the “General methodology considerations” section. Baseline and target for this indicator are quantitative and consist of a brief description, of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>For baseline:</i> the current level of tool usage, if known. Can be zero for new tools. <i>For target:</i> the level of tool usage needed to reach the objective of the initiative/component/activity stream at the relevant timescales (2020, 2030, 2050). EXPL: baseline: SNAP toolkit applied in 4 countries in 2015. Target: Toolkit used in 6 additional countries by 2020.
Methodological approach	<u>Scope</u>

	The number of users of a tool OR the number of references to the tool in policy documents may increase over time. Updated numbers can be provided for each new reporting period (using the same resource name to enable aggregation over the relevant periods of time).
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantified representation of tool use (size of user community OR # of references to the tool in policy documents) reported on under this indicator is linked to reporting under indicator 4.1.1. on knowledge resources and tools and is disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Name of tool applied (similar to this reported on under 4.1.1.) ✓ Cross cutting disaggregation categories (cf. relevant paragraph in the "General methodology considerations" section). • Narrative reports complementing the quantitative indicator indicate for each instrument reported (1 sentence each): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ How has the tool been applied? ✓ What methodology was used to determine the number of tool uses? ✓ Information related to optional disaggregation categories if not provided as such • An electronic copy of/links to any written document(s) associated to the tool use should be attached to the reporting/sent to the secretariat.
Data sources	For general specifications on data sources, please refer to the relevant paragraph in the " General methodology considerations " section.
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This indicator addresses only the use of tools developed or supported by the initiatives and beyond as possible. It does not: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ allow insight on its quality and credibility, including methodological rigor, or accuracy, relevance, comprehensiveness and usefulness of content. ○ address whether the tool was produced in a transparent and impartial manner or the independency of its authors. ○ capture gender and geographical balance among users and institutions involved or the engagement of all relevant stakeholder in its production. ○ enable an estimate of its impact and/or dissemination and whether the tool reached the right audience and translated into action. • Main issues regarding precision, attribution and double counting are addressed in sections on Methodological Approach Data requirements and disaggregation. If you come across additional issues, please inform the CCAC Secretariat. • Standard indicators and associated methodology are to be revised on a regular basis. Partners are encouraged to inform the CCAC Secretariat of any difficulty encountered while reporting against the indicator.
Relevant international efforts	N/A
References	See General references in associated section.

Guidance note on metrics used by the SNAP toolkit for impact indicators

The guidance note can be accessed [here](#).

Template for methodology sheets

Indicator name	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Short name that constitute a summary of the indicator and is easy to reference
Indicator type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Is the indicator an outcome, output or impact indicator⁶ ?
Relation to key strategy of the 5 Year Strategic Plan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statement of how the indicator relates to the different key strategies of the 5 Year Strategic Plan, as well as any other goal monitored by the indicator. ▪ Highlights of trends in aspects of which the indicator is intended to measure.
Purpose and rationale	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Statement of what the indicator is for, why it is needed to help assess success, and how the indicator values should be interpreted (what does a rise or decrease means).
Definition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Clear, brief description of the indicator and of any parameter required for its assessment.
Measurement unit(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Specific unit of measurement used.
Baseline and target	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Baseline and target associated to the indicator if any, including associated timelines.
Methodological approach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description of the type and quality of data to be collected and of the choice of methods for data processing (collection, aggregation and analysis), including the underlying definitions and concepts, the measurement methods, the geographical coverage, temporal unit (frequency of measurement) and temporal coverage, where appropriate.
Data elements and disaggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Description of the basic data that are required to build the indicator, in accordance with the methodological approach described above; ▪ List significant subdivisions in the data that will be divided for the normal presentation of data (e.g., by training or technology type, participant function, etc.) if any; measurement types and scales are also indicated;
Data sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Anon-exhaustive list of sources where the data required for the indicator is or will be available
Anticipated limitations and comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Showing the main sources of uncertainties in the methodology – suggest possible means to reduce these uncertainties where possible ▪ Attribution issues ▪ Known data gaps and suggested strategies for filling these gaps are highlighted ▪ Other issues or comments relating to the indicator
Relevant international efforts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ International processes, data sources, indicator sets that involve similar measurements
References	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A non-exhaustive list of useful references, some of which might be essential to a full understanding of the methodological approach suggested.

⁶ **Output:** Products and services produced or competencies and capacities established directly as a result of project activities.

Outcome: Intended situation at the end of or soon after the project’s lifespan in terms of gains in performance (as a result of changes in knowledge and behaviour).

Impact: Improvement of a situation in terms of the social, economic or environmental benefits which respond to identified needs under a long-term vision. Only indicators related to long term benefits such as emission reductions will be categorised as impact indicators.