

# How to capture improvements in people's resilience to climate change

## Frequently Asked Questions following updates to ICF KPI 4 methodology

### Summary of KPI 4 methodology

KPI 4 measures the number of people with improved climate resilience due to UK International Climate Finance (ICF) support. Specifically:

- It measures number of people with a change in climate resilience at outcome level;
- It focuses on changes in climate resilience that have been positively influenced by the programme/project in question;
- It is not a measure of absolute resilience.

Climate change may be a global problem, but climate resilience is fundamentally local. What constitutes 'climate resilience' is profoundly shaped by context, and so climate-resilient development pathways are diverse. When it comes to M&E, climate resilience is also notoriously tricky to measure. There are no specific units to count and compare – at least, not in the same way that you can count income, or school completion.

On top of that, because it is also a new body of practice, interventions are often experimental. This all adds up to an exceptionally complex set of measurement challenges that all the climate portfolios are struggling with. KPI 4 represents an innovative approach: rather than measuring climate resilience per se, it instead counts the number of people with improved resilience – and then presents a step-by-step methodology on how to do that. The associated methodology note is written for a professional audience and assumes a certain level of experience in M&E and statistics.

Although KPI 4 guidance does need technical expertise to follow, it should not be daunting. It begins by confirming that the programme in question is indeed climate resilience, and then frames that within a particular lens: a climate resilience model such as DFID's '[3As Framework](#).' One then tags key parts of a logframe to the model, and then identifies indicators which can be drawn from – or integrated into – a programme's M&E plan. From there, one collects and compares data.

While climate resilience is defined in terms of

a flexible framework, it is up to programmes to operationalise it within the context of your location and programme. Only then can the number of people with improved climate resilience be measured. Programmes can do so by following these steps:

1. Confirm that your programme qualifies as climate resilience.
2. Consider the exclusion criteria which may inhibit your programme from reporting towards KPI 4.
3. Familiarise yourself with the 3A model (or another recognised climate resilience model) which will be applied to the climate resilience programme.
4. Align your programme's activities with the 3As (or alternative) Resilience Model.
5. Identify quantitative outcome indicator(s) for at least two of the 3A components (or construct a climate resilience index which includes a balance for measurements referring to at least two dimensions of resilience).
6. Assign performance targets/thresholds for each quantitative indicator.
7. Design a survey and collect data.
8. Calculate number of people with improved climate resilience.
9. Subtract the baseline (counterfactual/additionality).
10. Calculate percentage attributable to ICF (if there is co-financing).
11. Disaggregate data and report number of people with improved climate resilience to HMG.

Details of what these methodological steps entail can be found in the KPI 4 methodology note on <http://climatechangecompass.org/>. A summary of these steps is also available in the webinar slides on this website.

## Frequently Asked Questions

**In a lot of contexts we work in, it doesn't make sense to work on climate resilience only but to take a more holistic approach to managing risk and building resilience more broadly. In most cases, this will include building resilience to climate effects but also taking into considering conflict, fragility, etc. Can the KPI4 methodology allow for this?**

Yes. In many cases, climate resilience is something that has been mainstreamed in development programming. You may have a broad DRR or agriculture programme with some components very clearly related to climate resilience, but some others are not and those workstreams can be omitted from the climate resilience calculations. The methodology note, as part of the 4th step “Align your programme’s activities with the 3As (or alternative) Resilience Model” acknowledges that it is likely that at least one of the programme activities does not relate to climate risk management or fit with any of the 3 As. In scenarios like this, any activities and associated outputs that do not fit any component of the chosen climate resilience model need to be excluded. KPI 4 focuses only on those components of your programme which advance climate resilience.

**We work on funding national government resilience (e.g. sign-up of governments to sovereign risk insurance mechanisms). These abstractly benefit the resilience of everyone in the country, but I assume we can't count the whole population as beneficiaries. How do we deal with improvements of national systems?**

Other KPIs exist for these aspects. Please refer to the methodology notes for KPI 13 (Extent of climate change integration in government planning as a result of ICF) and KPI 14 (Extent of government institutional knowledge of climate change issues as a result of ICF). Even though these KPIs are no longer centrally managed by HMG and used for ICF portfolio level reporting, they are well suited to capture improvements of institutional capacities and national systems. All KPI methodology notes can be found on <http://climatechangecompass.org/>

**How does KPI 4 relate to KPI 1 on number of people supported to cope with effects of climate change? What is the rationale for measuring KPI 4 instead of KPI 1?**

KPI 4 is an important complement to KPI 1. These two KPIs do not sit at the same level in the result chain/pathway because they do not capture the same type of change. KPI 1 is an output indicator that measures the reach of UK ICF’s climate change adaptation programming. It counts the number of people (beneficiaries reached) who have been supported by ICF programmes to prepare and equip them to adapt to the effects of climate change.

KPI 4 as an outcome indicator counts those with improved resilience and is thus meant to capture the effectiveness/performance of climate related activities.

**If the degree of improvement in resilience is not being measured, how can you compare effectiveness of different programmes or assess VfM?**

Global-level portfolio headline indicators serve a critical and important purpose, but are not usually the best vehicles for capturing nuances. For concepts which are not easily quantified – for example, climate resilience, youth empowerment, or democratization – KPIs are easily criticised for being clumsy. This is not entirely fair, but it is important to recognise the limitations of KPIs alongside their strengths and purposes.

KPI 4 is not designed to compare the effectiveness of different programmes per se, nor can it because there is no uniform, standard ‘resilience’ indicator that can be counted in the same way that you can count, say, infant mortality rates. To compare the effectiveness or VfM of various programmes, you will need a more comprehensive analytic approach. KPI 4 would only be one piece in that puzzle.

**The methodology note defines ‘improved resilience’ in terms of meeting targets in at least two out of the 3As for it to count as improved climate resilience. Are results that have been achieved only for one of the 3As ignored?**

First and foremost, anything needs to be defined before it can be measured and resilience is no exception. Definitions and approaches to what constitutes resilience (see Technical Definition in the KPI 4 methodology note) vary considerably, though some common elements include a focus on stability of systems, and that resilience rests on several separate pillars. In other words, resilience rests on a multifaceted foundation, and not having that falls short of international standards of what resilience is.

The other issue is practical: bad habits have sprung up in some quarters to do small, one-off projects – usually but not exclusively infrastructure upgrades – and then claiming broad-based climate resilience achievements. This just isn’t appropriate, and so upping the ante has been really necessary.

Programmes that only address one component of resilience or one of the 3As can indeed contribute to adaptation and other wide development objectives, but they cannot claim to achieve climate resilience single-handedly unless nested within a more coherent and comprehensive strategy. For better accountability and learning, such programmes should only report on indicators that capture what they specifically contribute to. For these programmes, KPI 1 might be a better fit.

**Assuming that the revised methodology can only be applied to new programmes in the design phase, can it be retrofitted at all into existing, presently running programmes?**

This methodology can be applied to ongoing programmes if they already use indicators that capture effectiveness and fit with at least two of the 3As or resilience dimensions/components of an alternative resilience model (or have access to existent datasets that tick the right boxes). Moreover, the updated methodology is largely consistent with the one that has been piloted by DFID BRACED programme and others the past few years. While there are some important changes – including greatly reducing the number of alternative and optional steps – if you are already set up to use the earlier KPI 4 methodology, only a few minor adjustments should be necessary.

**This method seems to assume that any changes observed will be due to the programme. But many of the indicators could change for a multitude of reasons (e.g. “% increase in income of households who convert to prawn aquaculture” could change due to economic growth or recession). How do you account for other factors that can drive changes?**

This question addresses M&E matters of attribution, and is not specific to measuring KPI 4 – for climate resilience – per se. In general, the lower in the results chain an indicator lies, the more confidently it can be attributed to the programme in question. However, indicators like “number of people trained” which are fully attributable to a programme do not say much about effectiveness. The more ‘interesting’ high-level indicators, by contrast, may be sensitive to external factors like currency exchange rate fluctuations or locusts.

KPI 4 does not solve these complex attribution questions. The instructions do direct you to identify indicators and targets which would reflect the programme’s scope and interventions. As explained above, this is not an absolute measure of climate resilience – KPI 4 instead frames them within your local context and the reach of your programme. At the individual programme level, however, KPI 4 is best interpreted within an overall reflective assessment.

**Where can I find more about KPI 4?**

The KPI 4 methodology note can be found on <http://climatechangecompass.org/>. In the first half of 2020, the Compass team will also provide technical assistance to two ICF programmes to support the design of monitoring plans and demonstrate how KPI 4 could be implemented. We are looking for programmes that:

- Have ICF-eligible activities
- Aim to improve climate resilience and interact with people
- Are in an early stage i.e. monitoring plans are not finalised/still flexible

**If you think your programme could benefit from this technical assistance, please contact Cecillie Andersen at [c-andersen@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:c-andersen@dfid.gov.uk)**