



TIER 2 INDICATOR TECHNICAL NOTE

NUMBER OF PEOPLE FOR WHOM AUSTRALIA'S INVESTMENTS HAVE IMPROVED ADAPTATION TO CLIMATE CHANGE AND RESILIENCE TO DISASTERS.

Last updated: February 2024

DEFINITION

This indicator tracks the number of people directly supported by Australia's development assistance to better adapt to the impacts of climate change and disasters. For example, an investment which builds a climate-resilient school infrastructure directly supports children to continue attending school following climate or other disasters.

A nature-based solution investment that educates and supports a community to design, plant and protect a mangrove forest coastal buffer directly supports those people to adapt to the impacts of climate and disaster resilience.

We note that not all investments that proactively support climate action (those that mark the climate theme marker) can report against this indicator, for example, it may not be possible to identify the number of people from institutional support and it will be difficult for others, particularly in the short term, as monitoring and evaluation systems are updated to collect different data.

- **Number of people:** The number of women, men, girls, boys, people of diverse genders, people where sex is unknown, and people with disabilities provided with direct support to improve climate adaptation or disaster resilience. Where possible, DFAT and implementing partners should avoid double-counting in their data collecting and reporting.
- **Improved adaptation to climate change:** Adaptation is the ability to adjust to climate change to minimise potential impacts, take advantage of opportunities or to cope with the consequences of climate change. It could include adaptive capacity, anticipatory capacity, and absorptive capacity. Where available, sources of evidence of improved adaptation need to reflect impact, not just reach of an investment (see below for further detail).
- **Disasters:** Multi-hazard, including weather and geographical hazards.
- **Resilience:** The capacity of a system, community or society to tolerate shocks or disturbance, and to recover and rebuild a better 'new normal'. Resilience has economic, social and ecological dimensions. It requires diversity and the ability to adapt when external conditions change, and to respond to new opportunities.
- **Double counting:** It may be difficult to avoid double counting as individuals may receive multiple kinds of support. For example, a community may participate in training for disaster resilience as well as receive support for climate-resilient infrastructure.
- Every effort should be made to avoid double counting including within individual agencies and particularly where we provide assistance through multilateral or other partners.

Where accurate data is not available, double counting may be reduced by identifying which service has reached the most people. This can be used as a proxy for the total people reached. This figure must reflect the proportion of results attributable to DFAT, taking into account the proportion of the



partner/program's funds provided by DFAT. Where a program or partner is funded solely by DFAT, the total number of people reached should be included.

SCOPE

INCLUDES:

- Australian-supported investments that lead to improved adaptation to climate change and resilience to disasters for individuals. This includes investments that provide training, capacity building, improved climate-resilient infrastructure, nature-based solutions, multi-hazard disaster preparedness and disaster risk reduction, and climate-disaster related social protection. Evidence of improved adaptation to climate and disaster resilience is needed.
- Investments that have direct, and identifiable beneficiaries (see note below).
- This indicator lends itself to a case study of up to 100 words to reflect key outcomes in the reporting period.

EXCLUDES:

- Humanitarian disaster relief (which is reported under the Emergency Assistance indicator).
- Smallholder farmers benefiting from improved climate-resilient agriculture (which is reported in the food security indicator)
- Investments where there is no clear evidence of improved adaptation to climate change or resilience to disasters. For example, the number of people who attend climate-training is not sufficient evidence of 'improved adaptation'. Further evidence through surveys and follow-up discussions of how that training may influence behaviour is needed.

***Note:** There are investments that could indirectly improve people's adaptation to climate change and resilience to disasters through, for example, policy advice or governance reforms. Where it is not possible or relevant to report direct number of people, these investments can be reported in the other tier 2 indicator on climate investments.

CALCULATION METHOD

Where an investment is funded by other parties in addition to DFAT – such as partner governments, other donors, multilateral organisations or other Australian Government departments and agencies – the result should reflect a pro-rata share of DFAT's funding relative to the total funding. This should be based on Australia's share of the total investment value in the reporting year. The following key factors and example should be considered when calculating Australia's pro rata contribution to results:

- a. The total value of the investment (this represents the total of all donor/contributor amounts) for the reporting year – for example, AUD10,000,000.
- b. Australia's percentage share of the total value of the investment for the reporting year (calculated in the same currency) – for example, Australia provided AUD2,000,000 in the reporting year. $AUD2,000,000/AUD10,000,000 \times 100 = 20\%$.
- c. Total number of people supported (by all donors) in the reporting year – 2,500.
- d. Australia's pro rata share of the total number of people supported for the reporting year – $20\% \times 2,500 = 500$.



It may be appropriate to estimate the number of people if, for example, Australian investment has targeted the resilience of a whole community, and there is evidence of that broad reach. In that case, the total number of people in a community may be recorded. However, it is not appropriate to estimate benefits if the investment has only targeted a small number of people within a community and there is no evidence of broader community benefit. For example, training local government officials does not necessarily improve resilience of all the people in the local government area.

DATA SOURCE/S

Progress reports from investment implementing partners which show evidence of results. Evidence can also come from mid-term reviews or independent evaluations. Ideally, multiple sources of evidence would be used to triangulate data.

DISAGGREGATION

Where applicable, Investment Managers should report disaggregated data. Ideally this would be layered disaggregation including gender, age and disability (i.e. number of women/girls, men/boys, people of diverse genders, people where sex is unknown, people with disabilities disaggregated by gender).

WORKED EXAMPLE

- **Example 1: Climate Resilient by Nature** (\$14.5 million) is supporting 20,000 people from 85 Indo-Pacific communities to build their resilience to climate change through the use of nature-based solutions. In Cambodia, WWF is supporting 10 communities to enhance the long-term protection and management of climate-critical ecosystems and species that provide ecological, cultural, and economic value. In the 12 months to January 2023, implementing partners report that 930 people (400 women) were directly involved in newly established or enhanced livelihood activities. As Australia is the sole donor, Australia's share of the results is **930 people (400 women)**.
- **Example 2:** An investment with **UNDP in Fiji** sought to build a climate-resilient road to the local primary school. The road allowed children and teachers to safely attend schools during extreme weather events. The road supported access to education for 76 children, with wider benefits to teachers and parents who could return to work. In total, 216 people benefitted from climate-resilient infrastructure. Australian assistance accounted for 38 per cent of the funding, so Australia's pro rata share of the results is calculated as follows: **$0.38 \times 216 = 82$ people**.