Indicator description	**Number of people supported by DFID programmes to cope with the effects of climate change**
Type of Indicator	**Cumulative**
Technical definition/ summary	Identifying the target number of beneficiaries is now an essential step in the business planning process, and will be a key output/outcome indicator for any programme DFID supports.

Definitions

'Support' is defined as direct assistance from the programme in question, with the explicit intention of helping people deal with climate change impacts. It could include for example financial resources, assets, agricultural inputs, training, communications (e.g. early warning systems) or information (e.g. weather forecasting). Whilst almost any development intervention that has the outcome of reducing poverty and therefore vulnerability could be described as supporting people to cope with the effects of climate change, the definition here requires the effects of climate change to be explicitly recognised and targeted by the programme in question[1].

'People supported' should relate to populations or households[2] identified by the programme in question with a direct relationship to it.

'Effects of climate change' are defined here as the effects of both existing climate variability and the magnified impacts of future climate change. Normally resulting from the primary consequences of climate change of: changes to precipitation, temperature and sea level rise, these may be sudden onset or gradual, and can include floods, droughts, storms, landslides, salination, coastal inundation, heat or cold waves and biodiversity loss.

Application

This indicator relates to the UK International Climate Fund (ICF) impact statement from the theory of change for adaptation to climate change: *'Vulnerable people in poor countries are prepared and equipped to respond effectively to existing climate variability and the magnified impacts of climate change'.* This indicator seeks to measure the numbers of people who have received an input of support as a proxy for preparing and equipping them, but does not seek to measure the output of whether this support was successful in reducing the impacts of climate change events or effects on these people, or the outcome of increasing their resilience or reducing their vulnerability to climate change. For the ICF we will seek to capture this outcome of improved resilience to climate change through evaluation and other indicators where possible.

---

[1] At a minimum all programmes with a 'Departmental Strategic Objective' (DSO) on climate change and/or a primary or secondary component Input Sector Code on climate change should be included in this indicator, though others may also be eligible.

[2] If the data collected is by household then this figure should be converted into a number of people indicator – see data calculation section

It is desirable to distinguish between numbers of poor people and numbers of vulnerable people, as not all vulnerable people are poor, and it is not always the poorest that are vulnerable, but this methodology does not encompass this definition yet. Future methodological work is planned to provide a more robust and multi-dimensional definition, and to deepen our understanding of who is vulnerable to climate change. All interventions should be in developing (non-OECD) countries, therefore at least according to this broad categorisation the people supported will be located in poor countries. However this methodology does not define which countries or people are poor or specify that these people have to be targeted by the intervention in question, though if it is possible to disaggregate by level of poverty this should be done (see the labels under the 'further information' section below).

This indicator should only cover bilateral spend at this stage. Multilateral and other support (e.g. direct to NGOs), will be collected and calculated separately, to ensure the same individuals aren't double counted, e.g. if supported in different ways (or even the same way) by geographically overlapping programmes.

There are two dimensions of 'support':

1) *Targeted:* 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.

2) *Intensity*: defined as the level of support/effort provided per person, on a continuum but broad levels may be defined as:
   a. Low: e.g. people falling within an administrative area of an institution (e.g. Ministry or local authority) receiving capacity building support or people within a catchment area of a river basin subject to a water resources management plan.
   b. Medium :e.g. people receiving information services such as a flood warning or weather forecast by text, people within catchment area of structural flood defences, people living in a community where other members have been trained in emergency flood response.
   c. High: e.g. houses raised on plinths, cash transfers, agricultural extension services, training of individuals in communities to develop emergency plans

These dimensions are not completely exclusive, medium intensity support may be either targeted (e.g. early warning text messages) or not targeted (catchment area of a flood defence system). **However high intensity support should always be targeted, and low intensity support cannot normally be considered targeted. Low intensity support *should not be reported* for this indicator**

Categories

There are therefore **2 categories for reporting:**

A) **Direct:** Targeted & High intensity. Must fulfil both criteria e.g. people receiving social protection cash transfers, houses raised on plinths, agricultural extension services, training of individuals in communities to develop emergency plans and use early warning systems.

B) **Indirect:** which covers:
   i)   Targeted & Medium intensity: e.g. people receiving weather information and text message early warnings.
   ii)   Not targeted & Medium intensity: e.g. people within the coverage of an early warning system, or catchment area of a large infrastructure project (e.g. flood defences), or living in a discrete community in which others have been trained in emergency response

Programmes are **only** required to distinguish direct and indirect support (and not the sub-categories of 'indirect' above – e.g. whether targeted or not)

A third category does not need to be reported at all:

C) **Not Reported:** Indirect and Low intensity: e.g. people benefiting from falling within an administrative area of an institution receiving capacity building support, or catchment area of a Water Resources Management plan or strategy (these numbers can be captured through the programme's own monitoring, and for the ICF the interventions under the 'institutional development' scorecard KPIs).

If you are unsure how to break down the number of people your programme supports into these categories please contact the adaptation and water resource management team leads as listed at the end of this document.

Gender:
Reporting by gender has been marked as mandatory. If you are unable to disaggregate by gender please see the additional guidance in the data disaggregation section below.

A single programme may include interventions which are direct and indirect (e.g. a programme which has activities including social protection and early warning systems). A single *intervention* may also include people supported directly and people supported indirectly, e.g. individuals trained to develop community emergency plans and use early warning

systems would be supported directly, whereas people living in the same community and benefiting from those plans would be supported indirectly

Further information
2 further optional labels can then be applied within the above categories:
1. The first label is simply: <u>Does this programme fit under any of the sectors prioritised in the ICF adaptation thematic paper?</u> That is:

(a) access to social protection (if the programme is defined as an 'adaptation' intervention) including micro-finance and broader social protection/insurance mechanisms;
(b) support to water shed and water basin management (both the construction of small-scale infrastructure at household or community level and large-scale support for watershed and water basin management activities;
(c) support with urban resilience including resilient infrastructure;
(d) support to any community and/or national level disaster risk reduction activities;
(e) support for resilient agriculture programmes;
(f) support for eco-systems development and coastal zone management programmes; and
(g) support for health programmes which are primarily tackling climate change risks.

2. The second label considers the proportion that are poor: <u>What proportion of the beneficiaries are poor?</u>

Numbers of poor people could be determined by numbers below a country specific poverty line rather than the international $1.25/day definition. For programmes which have indirect beneficiaries, proportions of poor could be estimated from social vulnerability analyses commissioned as part of the programme preparation or any prior Climate Change Strategic Programme Reviews.

Methodological points to note:
1. Numbers of people supported through multilateral multi-sector adaptation programmes where UK is major funder will also be included in this indicator. We will be working with the multilateral partners to ensure this headline indicator can be gathered in future.

2. With multi-sectoral support there is scope for double-counting of results, we will therefore ensure that targeted interventions are tagged against one or another sector.

3. Finally, both household and individual data can be collected as part of this exercise. Data on household size should be determined from the most recent national census data or from a nationally representative household survey. If data is collected at the household level, the country office will need to multiply the number of households by the average household size.

Rationale	This is a new area of programming. Although we are not envisaging all programmes to be able to gather all of the disaggregated levels of data, what is collected will strengthen the story on our adaptation portfolio and strengthen our evidence base. This indicator links clearly to policy priorities around climate adaptation as articulated by the International Climate Fund Board. With limited international consensus on measuring successful adaptation, HMG's development of these and other indicators will be leading the way in the international community.
Data calculation and guidance	The indicator is expressed in absolute numbers, so not relevant. However, the data will be aggregated by CED using the numbers provided against sector interventions summed across to arrive at a total figure. It is possible that some of the disaggregated levels of data are provided as percentages. These will then be converted as appropriate into absolute numbers.
	Where HMG are only funding part of the project, benefits (number of people) should be calculated as a pro-rata share of funding. For example, if we are funding 10% of a project with 100 beneficiaries, we should claim that 10 of these beneficiaries are attributable to DFID.
	It is possible for a single programme to reach both direct (targeted and high intensity) and indirect (targeted or not targeted and medium intensity) beneficiaries in which case these should be reported separately.
Data sources	The indicator will be measured through the monitoring and, to some extent, evaluation of DFID bilateral climate adaptation programmes and multilateral programmes, particularly those financed by the UK's International Climate Fund (ICF).
	In some cases (e.g. on-going programmes in Bangladesh) the data will be generated through project-specific surveys. Where DFID programmes are operated through government (e.g. the Ethiopia PSNP), the data will come from separate commissions. Similarly, data on proportions of poor will be undertaken through individual surveys at project level and then attributed to the programme. Perhaps at a later stage, household level surveys will begin to gather this data more readily.
	The aggregation for this indicator will be undertaken by Climate and Environment Department (CED) across all projects/programmes.
Reporting roles	DFID Country Offices select the most relevant data and calculations and submit these to CED.
Vaseline data	By nature of the indicator the baseline for the programme in question will normally be zero for number of people supported *by DFID*. The possible exception being where the programme is an extension of an existing DFID programme that preceded the current Comprehensive Spending Review, in which case a baseline of 2011/12 should be used. *[For the aggregated total for DFID overall the baseline will be zero at the start of the Comprehensive Spending Review period]*.
Return format	Absolute numbers of beneficiaries only, disaggregated by direct/indirect and gender. Please see Data dis-aggregation section below.

Data dis-aggregation	<u>Data to be disaggregated and reported in the ICF results template:</u> - Number of direct or indirect beneficiaries - Gender: • Reporting by gender has been marked as mandatory. If you are unable to report by gender please explain why in the metadata columns of the results template. • We would expect gender disaggregation to be possible for all programmes in the direct category. Where possible gender disaggregation should also be given for the indirect category. • We acknowledge that gender disaggregation will not be possible if household level data are used. If local gender disaggregation data is not available but you have target population data that allows you to give an estimated number then please report this. If an estimate is used then please state this clearly in the metadata column. • It is not intended to present gender disaggregated figures by country/programme but as an aggregated total across programmes for the DRF indicator. <u>Data to be disaggregated as part of workings and Quest number provided:</u> Disaggregation of the following variables will not be collected as part of the ICF results template. Please include disaggregated data in your working documents and record the Quest number for these documents in the ICF results template. - Thematic sector of programme - Proportion of beneficiaries who are poor
Data availability	It should be possible for country offices (and eventually multilateral partners) to report on beneficiary numbers at least annually (to inform Annual Reviews). CED will collate this information annually. Robust data from programmes already in implementation may be difficult to gather as baselines are unlikely to have been developed in all cases. Therefore we expect the routine M&E of these programmes to be able to generate this information.
Time period/ lag	This will have to be worked through with country offices and multilateral partners, but a 6-9 month lag may be necessary.
Quality assurance measures	It is recommended that, where possible, data collection and quality assurance is undertaken by a third party that is not directly involved with implementing the project. Country offices will need to estimate country-level aggregation, where separate programmes may support the same people in different ways. Country offices will be in the best position to do this analysis on geographic overlap. If reporting officers have any concerns about the quality of data, then

	please note this in the DRF results template.
Interpretation of results	An increase in this indicator will show that an increasing number of people are being supported to cope with the effects of climate change. These figures however do not give an indication of whether this support was successful in reducing the impacts of climate change events or effects on these people, or the outcome of increasing their resilience or reducing their vulnerability to climate change.
Data quality	This output level indicator is relevant to measuring DFID's public commitment to help millions of people to protect their lives and livelihoods from the effects of climate change. This indicator measures how many people are benefitting and who those people are. A majority of the results achieved for this indicator are through one global programme. The implementers of this programme work with around 300 different projects, each of which is required to return results against this indicator based on information gathered as part of their routine project monitoring. The quality of inputs from across these projects is not fully understood. The largest of the other country office programmes which contribute to the results achieved also measure results through routine project monitoring. We have been told by programme managers that results are reasonably accurate. This indicator by itself gives very little information as to the quality or nature of the support given; this can be obtained from complementary project information. The nature of the support provided can and does vary widely, for example from raising a house on a plinth to providing training to react to an early warning system alarm. There are no concerns in regards to cost and confidentiality.
Additional comments	CED also plans to undertake more methodological work on definitions of vulnerability and will aim to do an evaluation on the impact of the ICF programmes on resilience. At some future date, these indicators can be used in conjunction with the indicator above to strengthen its impact focus.

The number of people supported to cope with climate change indicator is new and attempts to measure a new area in development of common international interest. We have shared this methodology with a number of international partners including the MDBs and other donors and a number of these partners have chosen to replicate this methodology in their own reporting. |
| Variations from the standard methodology | NA |