



Extent of government institutional knowledge of climate change issues as a result of ICF

KPI 14 Methodology Note
November 2018

Acronyms	3
Rationale	4
Summary table	4
Technical Definition	5
Methodological Summary	5
Methodology	6
Worked Example	6
Data Management	10
Data Disaggregation	11
Annex 1: Criteria/questions	12
Annex 2: Optional scorecard template	14
Annex 3: Comparability and synergies with other external indicators	17
Annex 4: Definitions of key methodological terms used across 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
DFID	Department for International Development
GFDRR	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery
ICF	International Climate Finance
KPI	Key Performance Indicator
LDCF/SCCF	Least Developed Country Fund/Special Climate Change Fund
MN	Methodology Note
MoDP	Ministry of Devolution and Planning
N/A	Not Applicable
UK	United Kingdom
PPCR	Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience
TAMD	Tracking Adaptation and Measuring Development
UNFCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Extent of government institutional knowledge of climate change issues as a result of ICF

Rationale

This indicator is designed to capture the extent to which key government personnel have knowledge of, and are formally trained in key climate change issues relevant to their work. It can also be used to assess the performance of a capacity building programme, through assessment of those working in the target government system (e.g. ministry, sector, agency).

This indicator is meant to assess the extent of institutional knowledge targeted by one or more programmes. Programmes should be assessed at baseline, and during one or more follow-ups. Programmes are also expected to justify scores with evidence to demonstrate accuracy and attribution.

Summary table

Table 1: KPI 14 summary table

Units	Overall scores (0 to 20); Broken down into scores for individual questions: 0 to 4 for each of 5 questions
Disaggregation summary	N/A
Headline data to be reported	Extent of government institutional knowledge of climate change issues as a result of ICF. Total scores (0 to 20), broken down into scores for five individual questions (0 to 4 points each). Scoring summary: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Points assigned (0, 1, 2, 3 or 4) for each of the 5 questions • Baseline or previous score, current score, target for next year
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 more inclusive of full spectrum of CC programming and questions amended to better capture extent of government representatives' institutional knowledge • 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 keep 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 the baseline and the follow-up, do not estimate or repeat an earlier year's scores. Only report if you have conducted a formal update of KPI 14 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	<p>This indicator may be used as a KPI for institutional capacity, and is complemented by KPI 13: Extent of climate change integration in government planning as a result of ICF.</p> <p>KPI 14 is a cross-cutting indicator which spans ICF’s three thematic areas: (i) mitigation/low carbon development; (ii) adaptation/resilience; and, (iii) forestry.</p>

Technical Definition

Climate change

Climate change¹ is defined 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”.

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 gasses”. 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”.

Methodological Summary

This indicator takes the form of a scorecard (see [Annex I](#)) based on five thematic areas which capture the extent of knowledge and training on climate change mitigation and adaptation issues among key government personnel, namely:

1. General knowledge about climate change
2. Knowledge of CC issues which relate directly to government agency’s mandate
3. Knowledge of best practice(s) in policy/ programming to address the CC issues relating to agency’s mandate
4. Oversight of policy or implementation by individuals with in-depth knowledge of CC
5. Satisfactory number of people in target government agency trained in CC

The thematic areas are presented as general questions. Responses should be scored as 0 - 4 points each. The indicator questionnaire and scoring criteria 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

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.

Methodology

1. Fill in the scorecard

You should use the questionnaire in Annex 1 to complete this step. You may also use the optional Template Scorecard in [Annex 2](#).

Note that the questionnaire ([Annex 1](#)) – and criteria for scoring – are intentionally generic so that they can be applied across a wide variety of institutions and topics.

Please adhere to the following guidelines:

- Do not change the five questions listed in the Methodology and presented in Annex 1, beyond operationalising them within the context of your programme and government agency's own mandate. In other words, you may define and clarify what are the climate change issues which relate to your partner agency's mandate, or what is best practice in policy/programming strategies to address them.
- You should operationalise the scoring criteria to fit the scope of your programme and partner agency. For example, you may define quantitative thresholds for what constitutes "a little" or "a lot".
- You are expected to provide evidence to justify the current year's score for each question.
- Ensure that your assessment is focussed on institutional knowledge regarding 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 policy and practice, and not all energy security programming can justifiably be categorised as CC. In this sense, building the capacity of a Department of Energy overall is insufficient to report towards UK International Climate Finance (ICF). If the scope of your programme is broader than CC, your approach to scoring this indicator should focus specifically on CC components, not the overall programme.

2. Calculate overall score

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

Measurements towards the scorecard should be taken at programme baseline, with at least one follow-up measurement to track progress.

Worked Example

The two-step process is followed at the start of the programme and for each year of programme delivery.

1. Fill in scorecard

Table 2: Worked Example scorecard

<p>Programme: XYZ Programme (fictitious) Type of climate change consideration: Climate risk management Agency: Ministry of Devolution and Planning (MoDP) Data sources: Progress reports, pre- and post-training scores, stakeholder reflection workshop, external due diligence review Stakeholders consulted: MoDP, partners Evidence for attribution: XYZ Programme is funded solely by HMG, and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives.</p>
--

Date of reporting: February 2018					
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>General knowledge about climate change.</i></p> <p>1. How knowledgeable about climate change are those in the training target population?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Moderate knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive knowledge</p>
Current year score		1			
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: 0. Current score and evidence to justify it: 2. MoDP personnel are aware of CC in general, but lack nuance and clarity on local implications. Target for next year: 2 Evidence for attribution: Programme has built awareness within the MoDP during the previous year on what is climate change, fundamentals of climate science, and projected impacts on the country. The programme is funded solely by HMG, and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. Data source: Progress reports, pre- and post-training scores, stakeholder reflection workshop, external due diligence review</p>				
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Knowledge of CC issues which relate directly to government agency's mandate.</i></p> <p>2. Are those who work in the targeted government agency knowledgeable about the CC issues which directly relate to their work?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Moderate knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive knowledge</p>
Current year score			2		
Evidence	Baseline score: 0				

	<p>Current score and evidence to justify it: 2. DFID programme has sponsored a series of training courses during past year to introduce the fundamentals of climate risk management planning for MoDP personnel. Target for next year: 3 Evidence for attribution: Training pre- and post-tests demonstrate that increase in awareness is due to DFID-sponsored climate change courses. The programme is funded solely by HMG, and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. Data source: Progress reports, pre- and post-training scores, stakeholder feedback workshop, external due diligence review.</p>				
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p>Knowledge of best practice(s) in policy/ programming which addresses the CC issues relating to agency's mandate.</p> <p>3. Are those who work in the target government agency knowledgeable about best practice(s) in policy / programming on the CC issues which relate to their work?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Moderate knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive knowledge</p>
Current year score		1			
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: 0 Current score and evidence to justify it: 1. Some MoDP personnel are knowledgeable about best practices in policy / programming relating to climate risk management, due to DFID training courses. Target for next year: 3 Evidence for attribution: The programme is funded solely by HMG, and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives. Data source: Progress reports, stakeholder feedback workshop.</p>				
Questions Criteria	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	YES, fully (4)
<i>Oversight of policy or implementation by individuals with</i>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> No or insignificant</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> A little oversight by</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> Some oversight by</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> A lot of oversight by</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> Comprehensive oversight by</p>

<i>in-depth knowledge of CC.</i>	oversight by knowledgeable personnel	knowledgeable personnel	knowledgeable personnel	knowledgeable personnel	knowledgeable personnel
4. Is public policy and/or implementation of relevant programmes being overseen by individuals with in-depth knowledge of key CC issues?					
Current year score		1			
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: 0</p> <p>Current score and evidence to justify it: 2. The DFID programme sponsored three key senior MoDP officials to attend an intensive summer training institute on CC and climate risk management at a university in the UK.</p> <p>Target for next year: 2</p> <p>Evidence for attribution: Pre- and post- training test scores. The programme is funded solely by HMG, and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives.</p> <p>Data source: Progress reports, pre- and post-training scores, stakeholder reflection workshop.</p>				
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<i>Satisfactory number of people in target government agency trained in CC.</i>	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Not at all satisfactory	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Mostly unsatisfactory	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Somewhat satisfactory	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Mostly satisfactory	<i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Fully satisfactory
5. Is the number of people in the target government agency who have been trained in CC satisfactory?					
Current year score			2		
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: 1</p> <p>Current score and evidence to justify it: 2. Extensive series of training sessions have greatly increased knowledge of climate change and risk management. 50% of staff in the MoDP structure tasked with the implementation of climate risk management actions have been trained.</p> <p>Target for next year: 4</p>				

	<p>Evidence for attribution: Training reports, pre- and post-training scores. The programme is funded solely by HMG, and no other donors are currently funding similar initiatives.</p> <p>Data source: Progress reports, pre- and post-training scores, stakeholder reflection workshop, external due diligence review.</p>
--	--

2. Calculate overall score

Total current year score: 1+2+1+1+2=7

Total score at baseline: 1

Total improvement: 6

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). An external expert on the climate change issues in question would conduct fact-checking/due 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 sufficiently distinguish between a basic versus 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. 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 evaluations 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 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

N/A

Annex I: Criteria/questions

Table 3: KPI 14 Criteria/Questions table

Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>General knowledge about climate change.</i></p> <p>1. How knowledgeable about climate change are those in the training target population?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Moderate knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive knowledge</p>
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Knowledge of CC issues which relate directly to government agency's mandate.</i></p> <p>2. Are those who work in the targeted government agency knowledgeable about the CC issues which directly relate to their work?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Moderate knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive knowledge</p>
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Knowledge of best practice(s) in policy/programming which addresses the CC issues relating to agency's mandate.</i></p> <p>3. Are those who work in the target government agency knowledgeable about best practice(s) in</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Moderate knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive knowledge</p>

policy / programming on the CC issues which relate to their work?					
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Oversight of policy or implementation by individuals with in-depth knowledge of CC.</i></p> <p>4. Is public policy and/or implementation of relevant programmes being overseen by individuals with in-depth knowledge of key CC issues?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Some oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Satisfactory number of people in target government agency trained in CC.</i></p> <p>5. Is the number of people in the target government agency who have been trained in CC satisfactory?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Not at all satisfactory</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Mostly unsatisfactory</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Somewhat satisfactory</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Mostly satisfactory</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Fully satisfactory</p>

Annex 2: Optional scorecard template

Table 4: KPI 14 Scorecard Template

<p>Programme: Type of climate change consideration: Agency: Data sources: Stakeholders consulted: Evidence for attribution: Date of reporting:</p>					
Questions Criteria	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	YES, fully (4)
<p><i>General knowledge about climate change.</i></p> <p>1. How knowledgeable about climate change are those in the training target population?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Moderate knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive knowledge</p>
Current year score					
Evidence	<p><i>Baseline score:</i> <i>Current score and evidence to justify it:</i> <i>Target for next year:</i> <i>Evidence for attribution:</i> <i>Data source:</i></p>				
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Knowledge of CC issues which relate directly to government agency's mandate.</i></p> <p>2. Are those who work in the targeted government agency knowledgeable about the CC issues which directly relate to their work?</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A little knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Moderate knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> A lot of knowledge</p>	<p><i>Generic scoring criteria:</i> Comprehensive knowledge</p>

Current year score					
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: Current score and evidence to justify it: Target for next year: Evidence for attribution: Data source:</p>				
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p>Knowledge of best practice(s) in policy/ programming which addresses the CC issues relating to agency's mandate.</p> <p>3. Are those who work in the target government agency knowledgeable about best practice(s) in policy / programming on the CC issues which relate to their work?</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: No or insignificant knowledge</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: A little knowledge</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Moderate knowledge</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: A lot of knowledge</p>	<p>Generic scoring criteria: Comprehensive knowledge</p>
Current year score					
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: Current score and evidence to justify it: Target for next year: Evidence for attribution: Data source:</p>				
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p>Oversight of policy or implementation by individuals with in-depth knowledge of CC.</p> <p>4. Is public policy and/or</p>	<p>Criteria: No or insignificant oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>	<p>Criteria: A little oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>	<p>Criteria: Some oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>	<p>Criteria: A lot of oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>	<p>Criteria: Comprehensive oversight by knowledgeable personnel</p>

implementation of relevant programmes being overseen by individuals with in-depth knowledge of key CC issues?					
Current year score					
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: Current score and evidence to justify it: Target for next year: Evidence for attribution: Data source:</p>				
Question	No (0)	A little (1)	Somewhat (2)	A lot (3)	Yes, fully (4)
<p><i>Satisfactory number of people in target government agency trained in CC.</i></p> <p>5. Is the number of people in the target government agency who have been trained in CC satisfactory?</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> Not at all satisfactory</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> Mostly unsatisfactory</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> Somewhat satisfactory</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> Mostly satisfactory</p>	<p><i>Criteria:</i> Fully satisfactory</p>
Current year score					
Evidence	<p>Baseline score: Current score and evidence to justify it: Target for next year: Evidence for attribution: Data source:</p>				

Annex 3: Comparability and synergies with other external indicators

Other international climate funds include measures of institutional capacity and effectiveness, but typically (though not exclusively) they emphasize higher-order aims than simply extent of institutional knowledge.

For example:

- Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR): Number of countries with institutional capacity developed in the conduct of recovery assessments; development and institutionalization of good practice recovery planning; and implementation of standards in government systems;
- Pilot Program for Climate Resilience (PPCR): Evidence of strengthened government capacity and coordination mechanism to mainstream climate resilience (core indicator); Evidence showing that climate information, products/services are used in decision making in climate sensitive sectors (optional indicator);
- Least Developed Country Fund/Special Climate Change Fund (LDCF/SCCF): Capacities of regional, national and sub-national institutions to identify, prioritize, implement, monitor and evaluate adaptation strategies and measures;
- Green Climate Fund (GCF): Use of climate information products/services in decision-making in climate-sensitive sectors.

Annex 4: Definitions of key methodological terms used across Methodology Notes

As different Her Majesty's Government (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](#)