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Ian Noble gave an overview of the most significant comments offered by our reviewers thus far. These included:

1. an agreement that we should not reinvent the wheel when creating an index
2. more clarity is needed in describing why one indicator was chosen over another; however, few offered suggestions of better indicators or directly critized current indicators
3. several reviewers advocated inclusion of energy as a sector
4. scalability must either be addressed or included
5. we must be clearer about our audience and why how our model should be used
6. are we correctly combining indicators (should they be additive or multiplicative)
7. readiness must be better defined
8. “adaptive capacity” might be better placed into a third axis; it has a different meaning than exposure and sensitivity indicators

Bob Edwards expressed support for keeping Adaptive Capacity within the Vulnerability axis as long as it focuses on the actual physical capacity of a population to adapt.

Marc Miles explained three issues the team must address drafting the next iteration of the model and accompanying explanations:

1) explain the variables and issues that we have considered but are not directly using in the model; if we overlook an issue that is significant to a particular reader, he/she might disregard the paper from the start

2) must clearly define Readiness

3) Our Readiness signal will mean something different to different audiences. A low Readiness might signal a need for governments/institutions to get involved whereas the private sector might shy away

Juan Jose Daboub noted that both the GEF and White House have asked who our audience and have expressed enthusiasm for private sector metrics. Private sector metrics can show where they can fill in the gaps. Both groups stated they can’t move as quickly on such metrics because of politics.

Bob Edwards noted that our goal is to provide a tool to help prioritize investments. Ian suggested that our focus should shift more toward providing information that supports others’ prioritizations, given that the subject of “allocations” is intensely political.

JJDaboub emphasized that we should not shy away from our private sector focus but not be seen as having a too-narrow focus. We want a company to prepare for adaptation as well as invest in areas that provide adaptive capacity – philanthropic of business-oriented. BEdwards noted that these goals would require different metrics. MMiles suggested that we target one goal (investment) first, and do that well. Then, others (those with philanthropic goals) will follow.

**INDEX**

JJDaboub suggested during the remainder of the discussion on GaIn™ that the team focus on a few main topics:

**Audience**

INoble suggested three different situations in which the private sector would use our index:

1. a company that might have an exposure within a country and foresee a need to build resilience
2. a company that is concerned about making an investment (general) in a country; a low country score might dissuade entry into that market
3. a company is seeking a business opportunity/investment specifically in climate adaptation – sea walls, water systems, agricultural products, etc..

BEdwards mentioned Transparency International’s Corruption Perception Index as a model for communicating results and use of an index. They develop insightful and provocative thought pieces that accompany their database. Though perhaps not as analytically rigorous, TI’s product is more visible than Kaufmann’s Governance Indicators.

BEdwards further suggested visualizing what types of articles and provocative though pieces we want to produce, to help clarify specific interests.

**Scale**

INoble brought up the team’s ongoing discussion to eventually have a 3-tiered product.

1. Readiness/Matrix
2. Expanded list of indicators/information for users to mix-and-match according to their interests
3. Country-specific information regional and local conditions; similar to World Bank mapping

JJDaboub mentioned that New Zealand company Climsystems is working with CH2M Hill on providing local information on adaptation. We could even work with Google Maps to help us provide deeper geographic information.

**Proprietary Aspects of GaIn™**

BEdwards asked whether GaIn™ possessed something fundamentally proprietary and unique beyond good analytics and communication. A data stream that we owned would be a critical component our success. The Adaptometer component could be this missing piece or do we nneed to fund data collection on a particular element?

INoble said that awareness is currently a non-occupied area and that we could bring novel information into the Readiness matrix.

**Energy/Infrastructure**

BEdwards stated that we should not add a component that we will get “stuck on.” Be sure not to focus on energy potential but risks to infrastructure. Further, resist an indicator that is just another reflection of GDP. Percent of power generation within 5 meters of sea level, was a hypothetical indicator that would work under this definition -- Japan was brought up as an example. MMiles emphasized that Japan wasn’t an event in the “normal range” and that we are measuring this normal range.

MMiles offered another example of how to construct an energy indicator, 1) measure the importance of energy to GDP and 2) examine the distribution grid of energy delivery infrastructure.

INoble noted that there are chronic energy problems in places like Uganda. There is not enough annual water supplies, this can be measured.

The team was tasked with researching what indicators are out there and to at least discuss the topic at the May 2 and 3 meetings.

JJDaboub emphasized that transport is very important because food is wasted when roads are unusable. MMiles noted that World Economic Forum has a good physical infrastructure indicator.

**PILOT PROJECTS**

**Pilot Projects**

Bedwards suggested that the Institute focus on projects that will lead to insights into the GaIn™ model, not just a “few water projects.” Further, he questioned whether we would ever have enough projects that could substantively conribute to learning for the Index. JJDaboub concured that given our limited resources, we should make selective choices and that we can eventually make a link between projects and moving the needle on GaIn™, showing that the index is not static.

**Call with Meister**

BEdwards queried what the “universe” or scope of Meister’s work plan entails. Peter Meister said they will focus on developing countries and “quick wins,” projects that do not take too long. Also, the projects would be scalable. Some other criteria discussed was how synergistic projects would be with GaIn™ as well as with the donor community.

Meister stated that they currently have a database of over 1,000 adaptation projects and that they have narrowed to about 120 based on our initial considerations. He indicated they would begin approaching institutions such as World Resources Institute, IFC, UNDP, to either help fund or implement projects.

JJDaboub asked whether, instead of funding 5-10 projects, we focus on only 2-3 and spend remaining funds on collecting data. Meister indicated that they would be flexible to adjust to changing demands and that wie should have a sense soon on whethe that will be the case.

**Discussion After Meister**

BEdwards strongly suggested that pilot projects have some relationships to the Index and further, that wie not fund projects that are just like everyone else’s. For instance, there are hundreds of water projects in Africa, we don’t just want to add to those. Unsure about how to tie the Index to something unique, unless projects are used to show how a country moves up or down. We need to undertake a “demand and supply” assessment of projects. Don’t be one of 100 pitching the same project to Rockefeller.

JJDaboub stated that projects will be important to help build our story, BEdwards agreed. JJDaboub also mentioned that , though we can’t direct Meister on what projects we need now, Meister can help early on with fundraising.

Jessica Siegel suggested that we conduct a correlation analysis between projects that have been undertaken already and the Index, to show its usefullness. This will give us more time as the Index matures.

The discussion ended with JJDaboub suggesting Ian and Peter spend some more time discussing how to align the Index and the Institute’s goals with pilot projects.

**May 2 & 3**

JJD stated that goals of the even include:

1. developing relationships with the council of scientists
2. introducing those who have worked on GaIn™
3. an actual consultation
4. meeting funding prospects/suspects (mingling of potential donors)

BEdwards expressed concern about Tim discussing our fundraising strategy with potential donors as well as Meister speaking as a consultant.

BEdwards also emphasized that somehow, we need to state something visionary up front; exciting, aggressive to tee all this up. A 15 or 20 minutes discussion that will set the stage of vision early during the meeting, then people are able to process what it means.

“We have developed an index that will change the world, with that we will develop pilot projects on the ground that will change lives, this will be so great, that our outreach program will not only reach presidents and leaders, but captains of industry. This will spawn papers, discussion, action. A VEN diagram of 3 concepts.”

INoble concurred, suggesting that JJDaboub set the scene in the morning, a brief SOTU - Since the last time we met, things have change, adaptation has grown more prominent, we have had massive events that have reinforced the need.

**Consultation Process**

BSans outlined the consultation:

1. Our initial reviews by a handful of close advisors, David Wheeler, Moss, Clark
2. For May meeting, we will send a revised model with changes
   1. On May 3 we will have our broader consultation. JJDaboub stated that he would like to have a roadmap for how to conduct the consultation laid out as clearly as possible.
   2. BEdwards noted that we don’t need to be peer reviewed, but need something that is 90% right, not 99%. At some point we will have to ignore feedback. JJDaboub clarified that during the consultation process, it will not only be with scientists, but with economists, civil society, government.
3. Open consultation process after May 2 and 3 event

**Telling the Story**

BEdwards inquired what story we would tell to high level officials. MMiles suggested that this requires a dynamic, not a static story. This will necessitate gathering long term data over time. Show that if you change x or y or z, this is how the country improves, moves backward.

**Lisa Horrocks**

JJDaboub stated that Lisa Horrocks could work with us in the capacity of a consultant, by helping:

1. Validate and explore
2. Help us structure the responses
3. Help us on communications front; AEA has been involved (50 hours work, etc..)

BEdwards mentioned that Bill Clark is critical and Horrocks is good to have close. Everyone else can contribute.

**Role Out**

BEdwards reiterated that we don’t want others stealing our ideas early on and that one way to overcome this could include ensuring that the GaIn™ screenshot is included as much as possible. INoble and BEdwards suggested having a “Phase II” in place concurrently each time we release a current product.