



Extent of climate change integration in government planning as a result of ICF

KPI 13 Methodology Note
November 2018

Acronyms	3
Extent of climate change integration in government planning as a result of ICF	4
Rationale	4
Summary table	4
Technical Definition	5
Methodological Summary	5
Methodology	6
Worked Example	7
Data Management	9
Data Disaggregation	10
Annex 1: Scorecard	11
Annex 2: Optional scorecard template	12
Annex 4: Comparability and synergies with other external indicators	17
Annex 5: Definitions of key methodological terms used across ICF KPI Methodology Notes	18

*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

BAU	Business As Usual
CC	Climate Change
HMG	Her Majesty's Government
ICF	International Climate Finance
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NAP	National Adaptation Plan
NAPA	National Adaptation Plan of Action
NDCs	National Determined Contributions
N/A	Not Applicable
PPCR	Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience
TAMD	Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Extent of climate change integration in government planning as a result of ICF

Rationale

This indicator is designed to capture the extent to which climate change has been integrated into government planning processes (national, sectoral or agency contexts). For those interventions designed to build the climate change capacity of government partners, it is essential that their plans and strategies satisfactorily address climate change (CC).

Summary table

Table 1: KPI 13 summary table

Units	Scores per question: i.e. 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4 Total score (sum) from individual questions: i.e. 0 to 20
Disaggregation summary	N/A
Headline data to be reported	Extent of climate change integration in government planning as a result of ICF. Total scores (0 to 20), broken down into scores for five individual questions (0 to 4 questions each). Scoring summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points assigned (0, 1, 2, 3 or 4) for each of five questions • Baseline or previous score, current score, target for next year • Separate scores may be reported when a programme is working with multiple agencies operating independently from one another
Latest revision	November 2018. The main revisions to this Methodology Note are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improved readability, clarity, usability and consistency • Text and scorecard are more inclusive of full spectrum of CC programming (adaptation bias removed) • Expanded score range for individual questions from 3 to 5
Timing issues	<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 the data required to report ICF results and plan accordingly. If there are two or more years between baseline and follow-up, do not estimate or repeat an earlier year's scores. Only report if you have conducted a formal update of KPI 13 scored during the previous year. <i>Reporting lags:</i> Your programme may have produced results estimates earlier in the year, for example during your 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. 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.

Links across the KPI portfolio	KPI 13 can be used to assess the performance of a capacity building programme by evaluating the target institution (e.g. ministry, sector, agency) throughout the programme lifecycle. This indicator may also be used as a KPI for government planning and institutional capacity, and is complemented by KPI 14: <i>Extent of government institutional knowledge of climate change issues as a result of ICF.</i>
---------------------------------------	---

Technical Definition

Climate change

Climate change is defined as by the UNFCCC as: “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”¹.

Within the context of this KPI, climate change refers to practices which relate to ‘mitigation’ and ‘adaptation’. Mitigation² is defined by the IPCC as: “anthropogenic interventions to reduce the sources or enhance the sinks of greenhouse gases”. Adaptation³ to CC is defined by the IPCC as: “adjustment in natural or human systems in response to actual or expected climatic stimuli or their effects, which moderates harm or exploits beneficial opportunities”.

You should substitute ‘climate change’ with the specific mitigation or adaptation aspect of CC which fits the mandate of the government institution you are working with. For example, a Ministry of Energy is responsible for different issues than say a Ministry of Agriculture. Please ensure that your KPI assessment is focussed on planning for CC, not the sector in general.

There is considerable overlap between CC and sustainable development, resulting in many ‘win-win’ opportunities. Climate change is nevertheless a specific body of practice, and not all energy security programming can justifiably be categorised as addressing CC. In this sense, building the capacity of a Department of Energy overall, and the formulation of general strategies/plans are insufficient to report towards UK International Climate Finance (ICF).

Conversely, if your work includes mainstreaming specific CC practices within an overall development plan, that is sufficient. Moreover, if the scope of your programme is broader than CC mainstreaming, your approach to scoring this indicator should focus specifically on CC components, not the overall programme.

Methodological Summary

This indicator takes the form of a scorecard (see [Annex I](#)) based on five themes. The themes relate to the treatment of CC in government agency planning documents, and the extent and maturity of activities and mechanisms to address CC mitigation and adaptation in the planning process. These themes are:

1. Climate change integration into planning
2. Institutional coordination of climate change integration
3. Priority planning to address climate change

¹ UN, 1992: United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Available at:

https://unfccc.int/files/essential_background/background_publications_htmlpdf/application/pdf/conveng.pdf

² 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.

³ Ibid.

4. Screening for low-carbon efforts, and climate risks
5. Climate safeguarding system

These themes are expressed as general questions. Responses should be scored as: 0 - 4 points each. The indicator questionnaire and scoring criteria for each question are presented in the table in [Annex I](#).

The methodology follows a simple two-step process:

1. Fill in the scorecard
2. Calculate the overall score

Methodology

1. Fill in the scorecard

You should use the questionnaire in [Annex I](#) to complete this step. You may also use the optional Template Scorecard in [Annex 2](#).

Note that the questionnaire ([Annex I](#)) – and criteria for scoring – are intentionally generic, because integrating CC into government planning includes an exceptionally diverse body of work.

Please adhere to the following guidelines:

1. Substitute 'climate change' with the specific aspect of CC which fits the mandate of the government agency you are working with. See the definition section above for further details.
2. Do not change the five questions listed in the Methodology and presented in Annex I, beyond clarifying what is meant by 'climate change issues'.
3. You may tailor the scoring *criteria* for the five questions to fit to the scope of the programme, and the government agency's mandate or institutional processes. If you do this, please do ensure that the scoring criteria appropriately and clearly answers the five questions that are posed and that the same criteria are used subsequently in follow-up assessments. You may also set specific quantitative thresholds for each criteria. See Annex 3 for an example of a scorecard that has been tailored to fit a particular programme.

You are also expected to provide evidence which justifies the current year's score for each question.

The scorecard should be applied to the government unit that the programme is supporting. Ideally, any programme would report a single score for its capacity building efforts. However, HMG recognises that in some cases a programme may be working with multiple agencies which operate independently from one another (for example, provincial administrations for a country's coastal provinces, each having different baseline scores).

In such cases, it is permissible to report different scores for different institutional partnerships. However, doing so will require multiple parallel scoring processes. Where feasible, a single score for the entire programme is more likely to be more efficient.

2. Calculate the overall score

An overall score is calculated, based on the number of points assigned to each of the five questions.

The scorecard should be measured at baseline, with at least one follow-up measurement to track progress.

Worked Example

This example is based on a fictitious programme which aims to increase the institutional capacity of the government of Malawi to mainstream climate change.

This multi-year process is followed at the start of the programme, and for each year of programme delivery.

I. Fill in scorecard

Table 2: Worked Example scorecard

<p>Programme: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme (fictitious example) Type of climate change consideration: Adaptation and Mitigation Unit of planning (National/Sectoral/Institutional): National Data sources: Annual Review and Mid-Term Review (MTR) Review Target (Programme/System): System (National Planning) Stakeholders consulted: Ministry of economic planning and development, ministry of finance, department of climate change and meteorological services. Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is funded solely by HMG, and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. Date of reporting: February 2018</p>					
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Climate change integration into planning.</i> 1. Does the agency you are partnering with have a strategy/plan in place to address climate change?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No mention of climate change in planning documents, or treatment of climate change restricted to aspirational statements with no specificity.</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Some effort has been made to address climate change within planning documents, but material is simple, superficial and/or preliminary.</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate change and measures to address it are discussed in planning documents, together with broad strategies to tackle them. However, they are not comprehensive.</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate change and measures to address it are integrated into the strategic plan in a detailed and nuanced way, however some key gaps remain.</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate change issues and measures are addressed in a sophisticated and comprehensive way.</p>
Current year score			2		
Evidence	<p><i>Baseline score:</i> 0 <i>Previous year scores:</i> Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 2 <i>Target for next year:</i> 3 <i>Evidence for current year score:</i> National CC strategy launched. Climate-oriented sector action plans being developed in agriculture and urban development. Terms of References for climate-oriented water management have been developed. <i>Evidence for attribution:</i> Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. <i>Data source:</i> Annual Review and MTR</p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Institutional coordination of climate change integration.</i> 2. Does the agency have an authoritative body that has been budgeted and staffed to coordinate climate change</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No coordinating body.</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> There is a coordinating body, but it lacks resources or mandate to function effectively.</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> There is a coordinating body which meets regularly, and is able to perform some of its expected functions.</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> There is a coordinating body which has significant resources and authority, however there are still some impediments.</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> There is an authoritative body with strong mandate, authority, staffing, and financial resources.</p>

planning and actions?					
Current year score		1			
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: 0 Previous year scores: Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 1 Target for next year: 2 Evidence for current year score: Limited staffing and budget for coordinating body. Some capacity in sector/line ministries to take forward CC action plans. Coordinating body not very effective at coordination of line ministries and local government on CC. Ministry of finance also taking the lead on climate finance mechanism. Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. Data source: Annual Review and MTR</p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p>Priority planning to address climate change.</p> <p>3. Have specific actions to address climate change priorities been identified and budgeted for in the agency's strategic plan?</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: No specific priorities to address climate change are identified.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Climate change priorities are identified, but are not 'actionable' because they are vague and /or have little or no funding.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Priorities to address climate change have been identified, but action plans are limited in scope, budget and/or implementation mechanisms.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Priorities to address climate change have been identified, and practical action plans are in place, however resource or other limitations inhibit comprehensive implementation.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Climate change priorities have been identified, and a comprehensive action plan with sufficient budget and implementation mechanisms are in place.</p>
Current year score		1			
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: 0 Previous year scores: Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 1 Target for next year: 2 Evidence for current year score: Vague climate change priorities. Currently lacking targets and funding. Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. Data source: Annual Review and MTR</p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p>Screening for low-carbon efforts, and climate risks.</p> <p>4. Are climate-relevant initiatives within the agency routinely screened for low-carbon development and/or climate risks?</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: No climate screening.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Limited climate screening.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Climate screening is patchy, <i>ad hoc</i>, or limited to only some relevant areas.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Significant climate screening.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Climate screening is routine in all relevant areas.</p>
Current year score			2		
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: 0 Previous year scores: Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 2 Target for next year: 3 Evidence for current year score: Only some climate-relevant initiatives within the agency screened for climate risks Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. Data source: Annual Review and MTR</p>				

Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
Climate safeguarding system. 5. Is there a formal climate safeguards system in place to ensure that the agency's interventions meet specific standards?	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No climate safeguards system that goes beyond climate screening.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate safeguards are in place, but they are weak, limited in scope, superficial and/or not applied.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Some climate safeguards are in place, but they are not comprehensive in scope and/or fully applied.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A strong formal climate safeguards mechanism is in place and generally applied, however their scope or enforcement can and should be improved.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A strong, comprehensive and formal climate safeguards system is in place and enforced.
Current year score			2		
Evidence	<i>Baseline score: 0</i> <i>Previous year scores: Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 2</i> <i>Target for next year: 3</i> <i>Evidence for current year score: Some climate safeguards system in place, but they are localized and do not span the entire country.</i> <i>Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives.</i> <i>Data source: Annual Review and MTR</i>				

2. Calculate overall score

Total baseline score: $0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 0/20$

Total score for Year 1: $1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 5/20$

Total score for Year 2: $2 + 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 8/20$

Total score for current year: $2 + 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 8/20$

Target score for next year: $3 + 2 + 2 + 3 + 3 = 13/20$

Data Management

Data Sources

There is some leeway in how individual programmes are scored. The recommended approach is for internal stakeholders to hold an assessment meeting to assign values, with documented evidence to justify scoring (and presented in a narrative report).

Ideally an external expert on the climate change issues in question would conduct fact-checking/duel diligence of the final score and accompanying narrative report. This approach manages the risk of stakeholders inflating their own scores. A second, related issue is that if programme stakeholders' knowledge of climate change itself is weak, they may be unable to distinguish sufficiently well between a basic versus a comprehensive plan.

Most Recent Baseline

The baseline should reflect status of institutional planning prior to ICF funding, along with anticipated projections of what would happen without the ICF (i.e. Business As Usual or BAU). This MN applies to programmes which conduct baselines from January 2019. Programmes which began prior to this should continue using the questionnaire from the previous iteration of this MN.

Data Issues/Risks and Challenges

It is recognised that some element of subjective judgment is required. Questions have been designed to be specific and transparent. Nevertheless, they are necessarily broad. While adjusting the exact scoring

criteria is allowable, doing so also increases inconsistency from programme to programme. In some cases, data may be based on implementing partners' own assessments, which may lead to stakeholders inflating their own results. Stakeholder assessments and supporting evidence should be provided to validate scorecards to help any such assessments of climate change planning capacity that take place in the future.

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 who is not directly involved in the reporting programme. Suitable persons vary by department; this could be an analyst or adviser dealing with: results, statistics, climate and environment or economics.

Central ICF analysts will quality assure results that are submitted and this may lead to requests for follow up 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 this is 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

N/A

Annex I: Scorecard

Table 3: KPI 13 Questionnaire and Generic Scoring Criteria

Questions	No, not at all (0)	A Little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A Lot (3)	YES, fully (4)
<p><i>Climate change integration into planning.</i></p> <p>1. Does the agency you are partnering with have a strategy/plan in place to address climate change?</p>	No mention of climate change in planning documents; or treatment of climate change restricted to aspirational statements with no specificity.	Some effort has been made to address climate change within planning documents, but material is simple, superficial and/or preliminary.	Climate change and measures to address it are discussed in planning documents together with broad strategies to address them. However, they are not comprehensive.	Climate change and measures to address it are integrated into the strategic plan in a detailed & nuanced way, however some key gaps remain.	Climate change issues and measures are addressed in a sophisticated and comprehensive way.
<p><i>Institutional coordination of climate change integration.</i></p> <p>2. Does the agency have an authoritative body that has been budgeted and staffed to coordinate climate change planning and actions?</p>	No coordinating body.	There is a coordinating body, but it lacks resources or mandate to function effectively.	There is a coordinating body which meets regularly and can perform some of its expected functions.	There is a coordinating body which has significant resources and authority, however there are still some impediments.	There is an authoritative body with strong mandate, authority, staffing, and financial resources.
<p><i>Priority planning to address climate change.</i></p> <p>3. Have specific actions to address climate change priorities been identified and budgeted for in the agency's strategic plan?</p>	No specific priorities to address climate change are identified.	Climate change priorities are identified, but are not 'actionable' because they are vague and /or have little or no funding.	Priorities to address climate change have been identified, but action plans are limited in scope, budget and/or implementation mechanisms.	Priorities to address climate change have been identified, and practical action plans are in place, however resource or other limitations inhibit comprehensive implementation.	Climate change priorities have been identified, and a comprehensive action plan with sufficient budget and implementation mechanisms are in place.
<p><i>Screening for low-carbon efforts, and climate risks.</i></p> <p>4. Are climate-relevant initiatives within the agency routinely screened for low-carbon development and/or climate risks?</p>	No climate screening.	Limited climate screening.	Climate screening is patchy, <i>ad hoc</i> , or limited to only some relevant areas.	Significant climate screening.	Climate screening is routine in all relevant areas.
<p><i>Climate safeguarding system.</i></p> <p>5. Is there a formal climate safeguards system in place to ensure that the agency's interventions meet specific standards?</p>	No climate safeguards system in place, that goes beyond climate screening.	Climate safeguards are in place, but they are weak, limited in scope, superficial and/or not applied.	Some climate safeguards are in place, but they are not comprehensive in scope and/or fully applied.	A strong formal climate safeguards mechanism is in place and generally applied, however their scope or enforcement can and should be improved.	A strong, comprehensive formal climate safeguards system is in place and enforced.
Total Score:					

Annex 2: Optional scorecard template

Table 4: Optional Scorecard Template

Programme: Type of climate change consideration: Unit of planning (National/Sectoral/Institutional): Logframe: Data sources: Target (Programme/System): Stakeholders consulted: Evidence for attribution: Date of reporting:					
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<i>Climate change integration into planning.</i> 1. Does the agency you are partnering with have a strategy/plan in place to address climate change?	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No mention of climate change in planning documents, or treatment of climate change restricted to aspirational statements with no specificity.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Some effort has been made to address climate change within planning documents, but material is simple, superficial and/or preliminary.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate change and measures to address it are discussed in planning documents, together with broad strategies to address them. However, they are not comprehensive.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate change and measures to address it are integrated into the strategic plan in a detailed and nuanced way, however some key gaps remain.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate change issues and measures are addressed in a sophisticated and comprehensive way.
Current year score					
Evidence	<i>Baseline score:</i> <i>Previous year scores:</i> <i>Target for next year:</i> <i>Evidence for current year score:</i> <i>Evidence for attribution:</i> <i>Data source:</i>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<i>Institutional coordination of climate change integration.</i> 2. Does the agency have an authoritative body that has been budgeted and staffed to coordinate climate change planning and actions?	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No coordinating body.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> There is a coordinating body, but it lacks resources or mandate to function effectively.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> There is a coordinating body which meets regularly, and is able to perform some of its expected functions.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> There is a coordinating body which has significant resources and authority, however there are still some impediments.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> There is an authoritative body with strong mandate, authority, staffing, and financial resources.
Current year score					
Evidence	<i>Baseline score:</i> <i>Previous year scores:</i> <i>Target for next year:</i> <i>Evidence for current year score:</i> <i>Evidence for attribution:</i> <i>Data source:</i>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<i>Priority planning to address climate change.</i> 3. Have specific actions to address climate change priorities been identified and	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No specific priorities to address climate change are identified.	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate change priorities are identified, but are not 'actionable' because they are	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Priorities to address climate change have been identified, but action plans are limited in scope,	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Priorities to address climate change have been identified, and practical action plans are in place, however	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Climate change priorities have been identified, and a comprehensive action plan with

budgeted for in the agency's strategic plan?		vague and /or have little or no funding.	budget and/or implementation mechanisms.	resource or other limitations inhibit comprehensive implementation.	sufficient budget and implementation mechanisms are in place.
Current year score					
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: Previous year scores: Target for next year: Evidence for current year score: Evidence for attribution: Data source:</p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p>Screening for low-carbon efforts, and climate risks.</p> <p>4. Are climate-relevant initiatives within the agency routinely screened for low-carbon development and/or climate risks?</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: No climate screening.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Limited climate screening.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Climate screening is patchy, <i>ad hoc</i>, or limited to only some relevant areas.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Significant climate screening.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Climate screening is routine in all relevant areas</p>
Current year score					
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: Previous year scores: Target for next year: Evidence for current year score: Evidence for attribution: Data source:</p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p>Climate safeguarding system.</p> <p>5. Is there a formal climate safeguards system in place to ensure that the agency's interventions meet specific standards?</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: No climate safeguards system in place that goes beyond climate screening.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Climate safeguards are in place, but they are weak, limited in scope, superficial and/or not applied.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Some climate safeguards are in place, but they are not comprehensive in scope and/or fully applied.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: A strong formal climate safeguards mechanism is in place and generally applied, however their scope or enforcement can and should be improved.</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: A strong, comprehensive formal climate safeguards system is in place and enforced.</p>
Current year score					
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: Previous year scores: Target for next year: Evidence for current year score: Evidence for attribution: Data source:</p>				

I. Fill in scorecard

Table 5: Worked Example scorecard

<p>Programme: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme (fictitious example) Type of climate change consideration: Adaptation and Mitigation Unit of planning (National/Sectoral/Institutional): National Data sources: Annual Review and MTR Review Target (Programme/System): System (National Planning) Stakeholders consulted: Ministry of economic planning and development, ministry of finance, department of climate change and meteorological services Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. Date of reporting: March 2018</p>					
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Climate change integration into planning.</i> 1. Does the agency you are partnering with have a strategy/plan in place to address climate change?</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> No strategy in place.</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> National climate change strategy in place.</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> 33% of national climate change strategy implemented.</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> 66% of national climate change strategy implemented.</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> 100% of national climate change strategy implemented.</p>
Current year score			2		
Evidence	<p><i>Baseline score:</i> 0 <i>Previous year scores:</i> Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 2 <i>Target for next year:</i> 3 <i>Evidence for current year score:</i> National CC strategy launched. Climate-oriented sector action plans being developed in Agriculture and Urban Development. ToRs for climate-resilient Water Management have been developed. <i>Evidence for attribution:</i> Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. <i>Data source:</i> Annual Review and MTR</p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Institutional coordination of climate change integration.</i> 2. Does the agency have an authoritative body that has been budgeted and staffed to coordinate climate change planning and actions?</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> No coordinating body in Malawi.</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Coordinating body in Malawi, but with limited mandate.</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> There is a coordinating body in Malawi which meets regularly and is able to perform some of its expected functions.</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> There is a coordinating body in Malawi which has significant resources and authority, however there are still some impediments.</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> There is an authoritative body in Malawi with strong mandate, authority, staffing, and financial resources.</p>
Current year score		1			
Evidence	<p><i>Baseline score:</i> 0 <i>Previous year scores:</i> Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 1 <i>Target for next year:</i> 2 <i>Evidence for current year score:</i> Limited staffing and budget for coordinating body. Some capacity in sector/line ministries to take forward CC action plans. Coordinating body not very effective. Ministry of finance taking the lead on climate finance mechanism, but so far limited concrete steps. <i>Evidence for attribution:</i> Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. <i>Data source:</i> Annual Review and MTR</p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Priority planning to address climate change.</i> 3. Have specific actions to address</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> No specific priorities to address climate</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Climate change priorities are</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Priorities to address climate change have</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Priorities to address climate change</p>	<p><i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Climate change priorities have been</p>

climate change priorities been identified and budgeted for in the agency's strategic plan?	change are identified in Malawi.	identified in Malawi, but are not 'actionable' because they are vague and /or have little or no funding.	been identified in Malawi, but action plans are limited in scope, budget, and/or implementation mechanisms.	identified in Malawi, and practical action plans are in place, however resource or other limitations inhibit comprehensive implementation.	identified in Malawi, and a comprehensive action plan with sufficient budget and implementation mechanisms are in place.
Current year score		1			
Evidence	<p><i>Baseline score: 0</i> <i>Previous year scores: Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 1</i> <i>Target for next year: 2</i> <i>Evidence for current year score: Vague climate change priorities. Currently lacking targets and funding.</i> <i>Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is the only programme funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives.</i> <i>Data source: Annual Review and MTR</i></p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
Screening for low-carbon efforts, and climate risks. 4. Are climate-relevant initiatives within the agency routinely screened for low-carbon development and/or climate risks?	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> No screening in Malawi.	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Limited screening in Malawi.	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Screening is patchy, <i>ad hoc</i> , or limited to only some relevant areas.	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Significant screening in Malawi.	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Screening is routine in all relevant areas in Malawi.
Current year score			2		
Evidence	<p><i>Baseline score: 0</i> <i>Previous year scores: Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 2</i> <i>Target for next year: 3</i> <i>Evidence for current year score: Climate-relevant initiatives within the agency sometimes screened for climate risks.</i> <i>Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is solely funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives.</i> <i>Data source: Annual Review and MTR</i></p>				
Question	No, not at all (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
Climate safeguarding system. 5. Is there a formal climate safeguards system in place to ensure that the agency's interventions meet specific standards?	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> No climate safeguards system that goes beyond screening in Malawi.	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Climate safeguards are in place in Malawi, but they are weak, limited in scope, superficial, and/or not applied.	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> Some climate safeguards are in place in Malawi, but they are not comprehensive in scope and/or fully applied.	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> A strong formal climate safeguards mechanism is in place in Malawi and generally applied, however their scope or enforcement can and should be improved.	<i>Tailored scoring criteria:</i> A strong, comprehensive, and formal climate safeguards system is in place and enforced in Malawi.
Current year score			2		
Evidence	<p><i>Baseline score: 0</i> <i>Previous year scores: Year 1 = 1, Year 2 = 2</i> <i>Target for next year: 3</i> <i>Evidence for current year score: Some climate safeguards in place, but they do not span the entire country.</i> <i>Evidence for attribution: Malawi Climate Change Institutional Strengthening Programme is the only programme funded by HMG and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives.</i> <i>Data source: Annual Review and MTR</i></p>				

2. Calculate overall score

Total baseline score: $0 + 0 + 0 + 0 + 0 = 0/20$

Total score for Year 1: $1 + 1 + 1 + 1 + 1 = 5/20$

Total score for Year 2: $2 + 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 8/20$

Total score for current year: $2 + 1 + 1 + 2 + 2 = 8/20$

Target score for next year: $3 + 2 + 2 + 3 + 3 = 13/20$

Annex 4: Comparability and synergies with other external indicators

Institutional strengthening is a focus for all the major climate funds. Building the capacity of government agencies to effectively address climate change – including by mainstreaming it into planning and crafting targeted public policies – is a major priority. It is, however, difficult to measure.

KPI 13's indicator and approach is consistent with those of other donors; indeed, given the overlap, one challenge may be parallel processes that are assessing much the same thing. For example, the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR) has a very similar indicator (“degree of integration of climate change in national including sector planning”); and while this KPI is derived from the Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD) Framework⁴ (“representation of strategies that address climate change in relevant planning documents and processes”) it is not identical to it. Inter-agency coordination may be important to avoid duplicative processes.

⁴ Brooks, N., Anderson, S., Burton, I., Fisher, S., Rai, N. and Tellam, I. 2013. An operational framework for Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development (TAMD). IIED Climate Change Working Paper No. 5. (available at <http://pubs.iied.org/10038IIED.html>).

Annex 5: Definitions of key methodological terms used across ICF KPI Methodology Notes

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.

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.

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.

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.

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).

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](#)