



Number of people supported to better adapt to the effects of climate change as a result of ICF

KPI I Methodology Note
November 2018

Acronyms	3
Rationale	4
Summary table	4
Technical Definition	5
Methodological Summary	5
Methodology	5
Worked Example	8
Data Management	10
Data Disaggregation	11
Annex 1: Comparability and synergies with other external indicators	13
Annex 2: Definitions of key methodological terms used across ICF KPIs	14

*Click on page numbers above to navigate direct to specific sections

About Climate Change Compass

The UK government has committed to provide at least £5.8 billion of International Climate Finance between 2016 and 2020 to help developing countries respond to the challenges and opportunities of climate change.

Visit www.gov.uk/guidance/international-climate-finance to learn more about UK International Climate Finance, its results and read case studies. Visit www.climatechangecompass.org to learn more about how Climate Change Compass is supporting the UK Government to monitor, evaluate, and learn from the UK International Climate Finance portfolio.

Acronyms

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AMP	Aid Management Programme
BAU	Business As Usual
CC	Climate Change
CCA	Climate Change Adaptation
CR	Climate Resilience
DFAT	Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade
DFID	Department for International Development
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GCF	Green Climate Fund
HMG	Her Majesty's Government
ICF	International Climate Finance
IPCC	Inter-Governmental Panel on Climate Change
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
PPCR	Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience
SCCF	Special Climate Change Fund

Number of people supported to better adapt to the effects of climate change as a result of ICF

Rationale

KPI 1 is an output indicator that measures the reach of UK International Climate Finance’s (ICF) climate change adaptation (CCA) programming. It counts the number of people who have been supported by ICF programmes to prepare and equip them to adapt to the effects of climate change (CC). This includes long-term changes in weather patterns (e.g. climate variability), as well as increasing frequency and severity of extreme weather events. This indicator does *not* measure the success, effectiveness, or impact of that support, which is assessed through other means.

Summary table

Table 1: KPI 1 summary table

Units	Absolute number of people
Disaggregation summary (click for more info)	Direct and indirect beneficiaries. Direct beneficiaries should further be disaggregated by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sex • Disability • Geography • Age
Headline data to be reported	Number of people supported to better adapt to the effects of climate change as a result of ICF: Total direct beneficiaries, also disaggregated by sex, disability, age, and geography; total indirect beneficiaries
Latest revision	November 2018. The main revisions to this Methodology Note are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adjusted KPI title to clarify KPI 1 is a reach indicator about climate change adaptation • Refined definitions of key terms and concepts to align with international standards of practice and UK commitments on climate adaptation • Included comparability and synergies with other external indicators in Annex 1
Timing issues	<p><i>When to report:</i> ICF programmes will be required to report ICF results once each year in March. Please bear in mind how much time is needed to collect data required to report ICF results and plan accordingly.</p> <p><i>Reporting lags:</i> The programme may have produced results estimates earlier in the year, for example during the programme’s Annual Review. It is acceptable to provide these results as long as they were produced in the 12 months preceding the March results commission.</p> <p>In some cases, data required for producing results estimates will be available after the results were achieved – if because of this, results estimates are only available more than a year away from when results are delivered, this should be noted in the results return.</p>
Links across the KPI portfolio	KPI 1 complements KPI 2 and KPI 3, which provide a population count for the ICF portfolio’s other aims, which are clean energy and deforestation respectively. Together, these three KPIs represent the population served by the ICF.

	KPI 1 counts people who have received climate change adaptation support, whereas KPI 4 counts those with improved resilience outcomes. KPI 4 is thus an important complement to KPI 1.
--	--

Technical Definition

Key concepts and technical terms used in this and other KPI Methodology Notes (MN) are defined in [Annex 2](#).

Methodological Summary

KPI 1 counts the number of direct and indirect beneficiaries in ICF CCA programmes. CCA programmes are invited to report the number of people that they support, according to the criteria and steps outlined in the methodology section. The main methodological steps consist of the following:

1. Does all or part of the programme count as 'climate change adaptation' according to the rationale and definitions presented in this Methodology Note?
2. Review the inclusion and exclusion criteria to determine if all or some of the population supported by the programme should or should not be counted towards KPI 1.
3. Obtain data from project/programme level M&E.
4. Categorise the adaptation beneficiary population by whether they are 'targeted' and their 'intensity of support' to identify who is a direct beneficiary, who is an indirect beneficiary, and who should be excluded from being counted towards KPI 1.
5. If necessary, convert household data into total number of people.
6. Calculate pro-rata share where HMG only funded part of a programme (attribution).
7. Disaggregate data and report numbers.

Methodology

- 1. Does all or part of the programme count as 'climate change adaptation' according to the rationale and definitions presented in this Methodology Note?**

This KPI counts the total number of people supported by ICF to be better able to adapt to the effects of climate change, but does not measure whether this support was successful in reducing people's vulnerability to effects of CC. That should be assessed separately.

Programmes that can be justified as including some or all CCA activities in their business case¹, as per definitions and criteria presented in this Methodology Note (MN), are invited to report their total beneficiary numbers. The directions below explain who should be counted, and how. [See example](#).

- 2. Review the inclusion and exclusion criteria to determine if all or some of the population supported by the programme should or should not be counted towards KPI 1.**

This KPI is intended to count the reach of ICF CCA programmes. The population that should be counted are **Climate Change Adaptation Beneficiaries** (direct and indirect; see further explanation in step 4 below). Some or all of the programme budget should be ICF and its scope should meet the IPCC definition for adaptation. [See example](#).

¹ According to the April 2016 *Smart Guide: Climate and Environment*, "specific climate or environment objectives [should be included] in the strategic case – and capture planned benefits in the logframe. *This is essential* if some or all of the programme is to be counted as climate finance" (p. 2).

Inclusion criteria: Who should be counted?

Please report total numbers for all individuals supported to better adapt to the effects of climate change. Although there is much overlap between CCA and broader sustainable development aims, they are not entirely interchangeable. The programme scope should thus include components that meet the IPCC definition for adaptation. That is, the programme is expected to reduce people's vulnerability to the effects of CC by giving them resources, tools, or skills to better cope with changing weather patterns, including more unpredictable and extreme weather, as well as long-term, more incremental changes.

Exclusion criteria: Who should NOT be counted? Please exclude the following individuals from the numbers that you report.

- Do *not* count individuals who were supported by the same programme during previous reporting years, but are *not* beneficiaries in this reporting year.
- Do *not* count beneficiaries for parts of the programme which do not concern CCA. For example, if the programme includes both CCA and mitigation components, please exclude those who only benefit from mitigation measures. Some cases may be less clear, such as when CCA is being integrated into a broader development programme. A certain amount of professional judgement may be needed. One approach is to review programme components against the definition of adaptation, and to report only beneficiaries of those components.
- Do *not* count beneficiaries who are classified as both '*not targeted*' and '*low intensity*' (see further explanation in step 4 below).
- Do *not* count any individual more than once, even if several interventions support the same person in different ways. For example, if the person was trained in community-level climate disaster preparedness skills *and* climate-smart agriculture techniques, they may only be counted once. In addition, the total indirect beneficiary count should *exclude* anyone who has already been counted as a direct beneficiary (see further explanation in step 4 below).

3. Obtain data from project/programme level M&E.

Programme-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) data should be used to calculate the number of beneficiaries. [See example.](#)

4. Categorise the adaptation beneficiary population by whether they are 'targeted' and their 'intensity of support' to identify who is a direct beneficiary, who is an indirect beneficiary, and who should be excluded from being counted towards KPI 1.

To distinguish between a direct and an indirect beneficiary, consider two dimensions: *targeted* and *intensity of support*. [See example.](#)

Targeted: is defined as whether people (or households) can be identified by the programme as receiving direct support, can be counted individually, and are aware they are receiving support in some form. This implies a high degree of attribution to the programme. Please classify the beneficiaries according to this binary: *targeted* or *not targeted*.

Intensity of support: is defined as the level of support/effort provided per person. Please classify the beneficiaries into categories based on the examples below:

- **Examples of low intensity:** people falling within the administrative area of an institution such as a ministry or local authority receiving climate adaptation capacity building support, or people within a catchment area of a river basin subject to a water resources management plan.

- **Examples of medium intensity:** people receiving information services such as climate-modelled early flood warning or extreme weather forecast by text, or people within a catchment area with structural flood defences.
- **Examples of high intensity:** people benefitting from adaptive housing raised on plinths, project cash transfers, trainees (not “demonstration”) supported by agricultural extension services, or training of individuals in communities tasked to develop climate risk management plans.

These categories are not exclusive. A certain amount of judgement needs to be exercised.

In summary, *Direct Beneficiaries* are classified as both *targeted* and *high intensity*. Direct beneficiaries should be further disaggregated by sex, age, disability, and geography as per instructions in the *Data Disaggregation* section below.

Indirect Beneficiaries are classified as either:

- *Targeted and medium intensity;* or
- *Not targeted and medium intensity.*

If any individual ‘counts’ as a direct beneficiary by any part of the programme, that person should be counted only one time, and as a direct beneficiary. If that person is also an indirect beneficiary under another component of the programme, do *not* count them again.

Those who are classified as *not targeted* and *low intensity* should *not* be counted towards KPI I at all.

Do *not* report detailed breakdowns for how many people were grouped into the *targeting* or *intensity of support* categories.

5. If necessary, convert household data into total number of people.

All individuals who benefit from ICF adaptation support should be counted, although numbers of *direct* and *indirect* beneficiaries should be reported separately.

Ideally, ICF-affiliated programmes collect detailed data about the individuals that they reach. However, it is recognised that that is not always feasible. If only household-level data has been collected, then the programme may estimate the total number of beneficiaries based on typical household size in the target area. If local data is not available, then national-level data on household size can be used to estimate total number of beneficiaries.

In some cases, a CCA programme may not interact directly with a population, for example: institutional strengthening in climate risk management or extreme weather forecasts broadcast on radios. These programmes may use population estimates for their target area, using whatever data source is recognised to be most accurate. [See example.](#)

6. Calculate pro-rata share where HMG only funded part of a programme (attribution)

If HMG is the sole investor in a project or programme, it should assume all responsibility for any results (where the results are assessed to be additional and where HMG has a causal role).

In many instances HMG may be acting alongside one or more other development partners or multilateral bodies that also provide funding or support for projects or programmes – and where each partner has played a role towards the results. In these cases, HMG should only claim responsibility for the portion of results that can be attributed to its support.

If HMG is only funding part of a project/programme, reporters should calculate results as a pro-rata attributable share based on the value of all public co-financing towards the project.

In instances where ICF programmes leverage (public or private) finance that helps to deliver programme results, please contact your central ICF teams on how to address attribution of results delivered. See methodology notes for KPI 11 and 12 for definitions (of public, private, and leveraged finance and co-finance).

If HMG is contributing to a fund

'First best' approach: use project/programme level attribution (as above)

In this approach, reporters calculate results attributable to the UK for each project/programme implemented by the fund using the project/programme level attribution approach, and then sum results across all projects/programmes in the fund to reach total UK attributable results.

This approach allows for recognition of other co-finance contributions at the project/programme level. However, this approach may be complicated or not always possible in practice as it relies on (i) full information about project/programme level inputs, (ii) additional work to calculate results at the project/programme level.

'Second best' approach: use fund-level attribution

Reporters apply fund-level attribution (i.e. at point of UK investment) for reporting results. I.e. results should be shared across all donors that contribute to a fund. All results are attributable to the relevant fund (e.g. CIFs, CP3, GAP) regardless of whether these funds blend with other sources of finance in implementing projects at levels below the point of UK investment. This approach assumes that any further finance towards the project is counted as leveraged. Where this is known to not be the case, a more conservative approach to attribution may be appropriate, please contact your central ICF teams on further guidance.

While this is the less preferred approach as it does not recognise additional contributions at the project/programme level, it may be more practical to implement where full data on project/programme level inputs is not available.

Note: The distinction between attribution at the project/programme level and at the fund level (or at point of UK investment) is only an issue where the UK is investing in funds where there are multiple investment levels.

[See example.](#)

7. Disaggregate data and report numbers.

Report on:

- # of direct beneficiaries, disaggregated by sex, age, disability, and geography.
- # of indirect beneficiaries.

[See Data Disaggregation Section below](#) for detailed instructions. [See example.](#)

Worked Example

The worked example consists of a programme aiming to improve climate-adaptive livelihoods for local farming communities experiencing increasingly severe and unpredictable weather (fictitious ICF programme with 15% co-funding from the national government).

1. Does all or part of programme count as 'climate change adaptation' according to the rationale and definitions presented in the Methodology Note?

The fictitious programme is designed to scale-up and integrate proven CCA approaches to agriculture and to diversify local livelihoods. The programme goal is: “Increased capacity of small-scale farmers to withstand climate related shocks and stresses”.

Adaptation activities related to this goal include integrating climate-smart agriculture approaches within overall agriculture extension services; improving quality and accessibility of weather forecasts/disaster early warning in the local language; promoting hardier farm animal breeds and species; and enabling non-farm livelihood and income opportunities.

The programme was affiliated with ICF during the business case approval stage.

2. Review the inclusion and exclusion criteria to determine if all or some of population supported by the programme should or should not be counted towards KPI I.

Programme meets all inclusion criteria:

- The programme is expected to reduce people’s vulnerability to effects of CC.
- Programme has explained in their business case why it constitutes an adaptation programme, and is affiliated with ICF.

Exclusion criteria:

- Programme excludes the following individuals from the numbers to report:
- Does not count individuals who were supported by the same programme during previous reporting years, but are not beneficiaries during this reporting year.
- Does not count beneficiaries for programme components that do not relate to adaptation.
- Does not count beneficiaries who are classified as both ‘not targeted’ and ‘low intensity’.
- Does not count any individual more than once.

3. Obtain data for project/programme level M&E.

All data is collected through the project’s M&E system.

4. Categorise the adaptation beneficiary population by whether they are 'targeted' and their 'intensity of support' to identify who is a direct beneficiary, who is an indirect beneficiary, and who should be excluded from being counted towards KPI I.

To report towards KPI I, the programme team categorises beneficiaries according to the ‘targeted’ and ‘intensity’ criteria. Populations supported directly by the project (through agriculture, animal husbandry, and/or small business development) are categorised as *high intensity*. Those who are only supported by the activities related to general private sector strengthening and weather forecasts in the area are classified as *medium intensity*. The *low intensity* category is applied to those who *only* benefitted from living in locations where village development committees prepared a “Local Adaptation Plan for Action.”

5. Convert household data into total number of people.

As only household-level data has been collected, the programme estimates the total number of beneficiaries based on typical household size in the target area.

6. Calculate pro-rata share where HMG only funded part of a programme (attribution)

This programme has 15% co-funding from the national government. Therefore, only 85% of the improvement can be attributed to ICF. Thus, the (disaggregated) number of people supported by the

programme who are better able to adapt to the effects of climate change is multiplied by .85. This is the figure that is reported to HMG as the number of people supported by the ICF programme who are better able to adapt to the effects of climate change.

7. Disaggregate data and report numbers.

The project team then disaggregates direct beneficiary data by sex, disability, age, and geography. Finally, it reports the total number of *direct beneficiaries* (disaggregated) and total number *indirect beneficiaries* to HMG.

Data Management

Data sources

Ideally, the programme will have the necessary data from project-level M&E data sources (e.g. population surveys, project reporting). For example, programmes should not assume that their population is 50% female. HMG expects programmes to collect and analyse robust data on target populations whenever possible.

While numbers should not simply be based on models or estimates, in certain cases it may be necessary. If household-level data has been collected, individuals can be estimated using the method described in Step 5 above. National-level data may be used for this if there is not robust local-level data available on household size.

If it is not feasible for the programme to collect population data on the beneficiary population (for example, due to violent conflict, migrant/mobile populations, or simply if the programme does not interface directly with a population), you may use best available data source to make estimates. If available data is not reliable, please reconsider reporting towards this indicator.

Quality assurance

All results estimates should be quality assured before they are submitted during the annual ICF results return, ideally at each stage data is received or manipulated. For example, if data is provided by partners, this data should be interrogated by the ICF programme team for accuracy, or at the very least data should be sense checked for plausibility. When converting any provided data into KPI results data, quality assurance should be undertaken by someone suitable and not directly involved in the reporting programme. Suitable persons vary by department; this could be an analyst, a results/stats/climate and environment adviser/economist.

Central ICF analysts will quality assure results that are submitted and this may lead to follow up requests during this stage.

To avoid inherent reporting biases, it is strongly recommended that, where possible, data collection is undertaken by a third party that is not directly involved with implementing the project. Where not possible, consider using independent evaluations or alternative means to periodically check the validity of results claims.

Any concerns about data quality or other concerns should be raised with your departmental ICF analysts and recorded in documentation related to your results return.

Data Disaggregation

HMG is strongly committed to the principle that “every person counts and should be counted.” It has endorsed the *United Nations Global Partnership for Development Data*, and is now operationalising this commitment. HMG has prioritised four disaggregation axes, which are required for all programmes going forward. While HMG encourages all programmes to disaggregate data by these four axes to the extent that it is feasible, this requirement is not retroactive to programmes with logframes finalised prior to publication of the July 2018 DFID Inclusive Data Charter Action Plan. Disaggregation should *only* apply to direct beneficiaries.

We recognise that in some cases, programmes do *not* directly interact with a population. Examples include an adaptation programme which focuses on climate-resilience institutional strengthening or a climate-modelled early warning system. HMG recognises that it may not be feasible for such programmes to collect or have access to nuanced population data.

Whenever possible, such programmes should assess the impact of their interventions through surveys which disaggregate population data in this way. When this is not feasible, however, these programmes are permitted to utilise available population data or opt out altogether.

Sex

Programmes should disaggregate by males/females. Disaggregation should be based on *actual data*, not models or estimates. Report:

- # male direct beneficiaries
- # female direct beneficiaries
- Disaggregated data by sex is not feasible to collect

Disability

Programmes should incorporate the Washington Group “short set” of six disability questions to their population surveys². These questions and further guidance for them can be found at: <http://www.washingtongroup-disability.com/washington-group-question-sets/short-set-of-disability-questions/>. While all HMG programmes are expected to apply and track all six questions in beneficiary surveys, at the KPI level HMG expects reporting towards two categories: *disabled* and *not disabled*. Anyone who answers “a lot of difficulty” or “cannot do it all” to one or more of the six questions should be counted as *disabled*. Report:

- # *disabled* direct beneficiaries
- # *not disabled* direct beneficiaries
- Disaggregated data by disability is not feasible to collect
- Programme is not required to report disaggregated data because logframe was finalised prior to July 2018

Geography

At the KPI level, all programmes should report on whether beneficiaries are urban or rural. Report:

- # of urban direct beneficiaries
- # of rural direct beneficiaries
- Disaggregated data by geography is not feasible to collect
- Programme is not required to report disaggregated data because logframe finalised prior to July 2018

² The Washington Group was established under the United Nations Statistical Commission in 2001 to address the need for cross-nationally comparable population-based measures on disability. It is composed of representatives of National Statistical Offices around the world.

While the concepts of “urban” and “rural” are easily understood, in an era of migration and burgeoning peri-urban populations, the distinctions may blur in many cases. Moreover, there are substantial differences between how various countries approach this question, and there is no internationally-agreed upon definition. For statistical purposes, HMG (and the United Nations) allows each country to define urban and rural individually. You should follow the definitions set for your country by its National Statistics Office (or equivalent agency).

Age

Whilst all programmes are expected to collect and analyse detailed data on the age of beneficiaries (see *DFID Guidance on Disaggregating Programme Data by Age*), at the KPI level ICF-affiliated programmes should report numbers consolidated into four categories: children, youth, adults, and elders. Report:

- # of child direct beneficiaries (age 0-14)
- # of youth direct beneficiaries (age 15-24)
- # of adult direct beneficiaries (age 25-64)
- # of elder direct beneficiaries (age 65+)
- Disaggregated data by age is not feasible to collect
- Programme is not required to report disaggregated data because logframe finalised prior to July 2018

Note: As of the August 2018 writing of this Disaggregation Guideline, HMG is prioritising these four data disaggregation axes. However, it is committed to ultimately disaggregating data to the full suite of eight axes (i.e., income, age, sex, race, ethnicity, migratory status, disability, and geography) as advocated by the United Nations. As such, disaggregation guidance may be expanded in the coming years, probably beginning with income.

Annex I: Comparability and synergies with other external indicators

KPI I directly relates to Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) 13 (“take urgent action to combat climate change and its impacts”), and particularly target 13.1 (“strengthen resilience and adaptive capacity to climate-related hazards and natural disasters in all countries”).

Counting the number of programme beneficiaries is a routine measure for international development programmes. Indeed, it would be surprising if others did not use some form of this measure. However, there may be important differences in how various donors define the parameters of the counted population.

A sample of indicators used by other agencies is listed below:

- **Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience (PPCR)** - Number of people supported by PPCR to cope with CC/CR (core indicator);
- **Global Environment Facility (GEF)** - Number of direct beneficiaries;
- **Adaptation Fund** - Number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect);
- **Green Climate Fund (GCF)** - Number of direct and indirect beneficiaries; number of beneficiaries relative to total population;
- **Least Developed Countries Fund / Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF)** - Number of direct beneficiaries;
- **Australian Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade (DFAT)** - Total number of beneficiaries (direct and indirect), disaggregated by sex, age, disabilities, rural/urban, and indigenous peoples.

This snapshot confirms that KPI I indicators are standard and consistent with those required by other donors. It does have more detail insofar as it specifies “supported to better adapt,” however the above list of sample indicators largely applies to adaptation-specific funds which do not need that clause.

Annex 2: Definitions of key methodological terms used across ICF KPIs

As different HMG departments may use the same terminology to refer to different concepts, this section sets out definitions for key terms used across Methodology Notes for ICF KPIs. The terms used in these notes refer to the concepts as defined below, rather than to alternative, department-specific usages of these terms.

Additionality: Impacts or results are additional if they are beyond the results that would have occurred in the absence of the ICF-supported intervention. That is, results are additional if they go beyond what would have been expected under a BAU counterfactual.

Attribution: Attribution refers to allocating responsibility for impacts or results among all actors that have played a causal role in programmes that deliver additional results. Results are commonly attributed to causal actors based on their financial contributions to programmes (though there may be cases where greater nuance is needed, as with KPI 11 and KPI 12).

Causality: Causality refers to the assessment that one or more actors bear responsibility for additional results or impacts, because of funding provided through the ICF or actions taken under an ICF programme. Multiple development partners may be assessed to have played a causal role in delivering results.

Climate change^{3 4}: A change of climate which is attributed directly or indirectly to human activity that alters the composition of the global atmosphere, and which is in addition to natural *climate variability* observed over comparable time periods.

*Climate change adaptation*⁵: The process of adjustment to actual or expected climate and its effects. In human systems, adaptation seeks to moderate or avoid harm or exploit beneficial opportunities. In some natural systems, human intervention may facilitate adjustment to expected climate and its effects.

*Coping capacity*⁶: The ability of people, organizations, and systems, using available skills, resources, and opportunities, to address, manage, and overcome adverse conditions.

Counterfactual: The situation one might expect to have prevailed at the point in time in which a programme is providing results, under different conditions. Commonly, this is used to refer to a 'business as usual' (BAU) counterfactual case that would have been observed if the ICF-supported intervention had not taken place.

Effects of climate change: Effects of both observed climate variability and expected impacts of future climate change on lives, livelihoods, health, ecosystems, economies, societies, cultures, services, and infrastructure.

³ United Nations. (1992). United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, pp. 7.

⁴ UNFCCC Glossary, Article I, Page 120 (https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/syr/AR5_SYR_FINAL_Glossary.pdf)

⁵ IPCC, 2014: Annex II: Glossary [Mach, K.J., S. Planton and C. von Stechow (eds.)]. In: Climate Change 2014: Synthesis Report. Contribution of Working Groups I, II and III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [Core Writing Team, R.K. Pachauri and L.A. Meyer (eds.)]. IPCC, Geneva, Switzerland, pp. 117-130.

⁶ Ibid.

*Mitigation (of climate change)*⁷: A human intervention to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases.

*Resilience*⁸: The ability of a system and its component parts to anticipate, absorb, accommodate, or recover from the effects of a hazardous event in a timely and efficient manner, including through ensuring the preservation, restoration, or improvement of its essential basic structures and functions.

Support: Assistance from an ICF programme, with the explicit intention of helping people adapt to observed or predicted climate change impacts. Support could include: agricultural inputs, assets, capacity-building, communications (e.g. climate risk and early warning systems), financial resources, information (e.g. climate forecasting), institutional strengthening, or policy formulation. This definition requires that the ICF programme explicitly recognise and target people to adapt to the effects of climate change.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.



Photo credits

Photos used in this KPI guidance note series were sourced from two websites, Climate Visuals and Unsplash (except the photo for KPI 14 which belongs to IMC Worldwide). They are available for use under a Creative Commons license, which enables organisations provided that photographers are credited. Photographers for this KPI guidance note series are credited below.

KPI 1, Kenya. Georgina Smith / CIAT

KPI 2, Bhutan. [Asian Development Bank](#).

KPI 4, Indonesia. [Sigit Deni Sasmito/CIFOR](#).

KPI 5, Afghanistan. [Asian Development Bank](#).

KPI 6 [Roshni Sidapara](#).

KPI 7, Sri Lanka. [Sansoni / World Bank. Photo ID: DSA0020SLA World Bank](#).

KPI 9, [Abbie Trayler-Smith / Panos Pictures / Department for International Development](#).

KPI 11, Sri Lanka. Dominic Sansoni / World Bank. Photo ID: DSA0233SLA World Bank

KPI 12, [Samuel Zeller](#). Solar panels.

KPI 13, Bangladesh. Sajid Chowdhury / [Big Blue Communications](#). 2013

KPI 14, [Rawpixel](#)

KPI 15, [Ryan Searle](#).

KPI 16 [Alessandro Bianchi](#)