Indicator description	**Number of people supported to have raised incomes and better jobs[i] or livelihoods[ii]**
Type of Indicator	Cumulative (annual results reported and summed over the entire reporting period (in this case the SR period to date) where double counting can be avoided. Otherwise a peak year indicator should be used.
Rationale	DFID's overarching priority in economic development is to promote growth that creates more and better productive jobs and livelihoods to help people lift themselves out of poverty. Enhanced employment opportunities and skills is also a means to address the underlying drivers of instability and can support longer term security and stability. While there are numerous challenges associated with measuring the impact of jobs focused intervention, it's important that DFID is able to monitor and communicate the achievements of these important programmes.
Technical definition	People benefitting from existing interventions satisfying the following criteria can count towards this indicator: - Programme is focused on job rich activities with an objective to either increase beneficiaries' income from economic activity or get beneficiaries into more productive and/or better quality employment, and can provide a clear rationale of why and how the Programme is doing this. AND -The relevant jobs/income related effects on beneficiaries are monitored at least twice within the lifetime of the programme (e.g. within the logframe or regular surveys) within the existing monitoring; and there is a clear line of sight between the programme activities and the aim of increasing beneficiaries' income or getting beneficiaries into more productive and/or better quality jobs (e.g. within clearly described within the programme theory of change). To demonstrate this criteria is met projects will therefore need to have a measurement methodology in place to be included. When submitting a return spending departments should provide a brief statement of assurance, including evidence, that both conditions are met. Evidence for the first criterion can be gauged by programme level reports e.g. business cases, annual reviews, independent evaluations, etc. Evidence for the second criterion should be within programme theory of change, logframes or other relevant monitoring frameworks.

[i] Better jobs could mean an increase in productivity or better quality jobs.

[ii] A livelihood refers to capabilities, material and social resources and activities required for a means of living. For the purposes of this commission only those activities which lead to production should be in scope, meaning those people who are recipients of cash transfers such as some social protection programmes would not be included as described under exclusions.

	Existing programmes and data only – this aims to collect information from existing programmes using data that is already collected/available as part of existing monitoring framework. It shouldn't involve new data generation although some work may be required to transform the existing information into a beneficiary number (see below on unit of measurement). **Definitions of jobs/income** The exact definition of jobs/incomes is not stipulated for inclusion for this indicator as this will legitimately vary across countries, sectors and over time. In addition, the most suitable job/income indicator for programme monitoring will need to be programme-specific to maximise its value for monitoring. Following good monitoring practices, we expect indicators to be aligned with programme objectives. In addition, each programme should aim to have a clear methodology note, outlining how the indicator used to satisfy condition two is measured and highlighting any quality issues. The methods should ideally be quality assured by your local statistics adviser or results lead. **Unit of measurement** Note that this indicator is on the number of people not jobs. So if your programme indicator used to satisfy condition two is measured at the jobs level, then you'll need to convert this to a people number either using alternative programme level monitoring information or a suitable robust conversion method. As a minimum where programmes are not solely DFID funded, total programme results with regard to the number of people supported should be adjusted for the percentage of funding DFID provided. **Examples of the type of interventions** An indicative, but not exhaustive list, of jobs-focused interventions that could be included when there is also relevant jobs/income monitoring information • Agriculture programmes aimed at increasing productivity of agribusinesses or individual farmers. • Infrastructure programmes designed and located in strategic locations to maximise productivity of surrounding communities and areas. • Skills programmes that address the specific skills shortages, e.g. not in areas where there's a skills surplus already as evidence by un/underemployment of people with those skills. • Business development programmes that increase the size or number of businesses, any investments in businesses that aim to lead to higher incomes/employment.

	• Value chain/working conditions/trade facilitation or regional integration programmes with explicit jobs/income component • Market development programmes that are not covered elsewhere. • Any of the above specifically targeting vulnerable groups or regions, e.g. women, youths, disabled people, deprived areas, etc. • Business environment reform or industrial policy programmes, especially those working on Special Economic Zones that can directly attribute employment/income effects. General Investment Climate programmes are unlikely to be targeting employment/incomes nor able to effectively attribute. Exclusions • Social protection programmes such as cash for work are excluded as these types programmes are not expected to have an economic transformation aim, even if direct employment and/or increased income is achieved temporarily. • Macro level growth or economic stability programmes. While these programmes are vital to support a country on the path towards inclusive economic transformation, it is extremely difficult to attribute a beneficiary number from such programmes. Please get in touch with the job policy lead if clarification is required. **Usage** This indicator will provide an indication of the reach of DFID's portfolio on jobs focused programmes, and be useful for internal and external communications. This is **not designed to measure job creation** nor be a proxy for such an indicator, rather it is looking to establish the attributable number of **people** supported by jobs focused programmes. There are a variety of jobs measurement challenges that makes it difficult to aggregate for a jobs number at DFID level. This collection for jobs data does not give a recommended method, it looks to aggregate figures where methods used fit the criteria stated.
Data sources	Provision should be included in programmes for data collection on programme beneficiaries, and for monitoring the job or income related indicators at programme level.
Reporting roles	Country offices/spending departments are primarily responsible for ensuring adequate baseline data is available and that programmes include suitable indicators and requirements for ongoing monitoring.

Data calculations and guidance	Any programme aiming to increase employment and/or income, where the benefits will persist beyond the provision of aid should qualify under criterion one. The number of people reached may be calculated using different methods depending on the nature of the programme, and the exact indicator used in the existing framework. If the relevant quality/productivity of jobs indicators, including pay, working conditions, sustainability, etc are used in the monitoring framework, then the underlying data for these indicators can be used to convert to a corresponding beneficiary number. The key principles are: 1) the two criteria listed above must be satisfied in order for beneficiaries of the interventions to be included. There are no other stipulations on the exact programme activities, except for the exclusion criteria above. 2) the job/income indicator for programme monitoring is part of the existing monitoring framework, and is aligned with the programme objective. Existing monitoring information should be used for the basis for estimating this indicator and should not require new data generation; and we are not expecting any additional indicators for programme monitoring if it's not programme relevant. 3) each person should be counted only once even if they have benefitted from multiple interventions over the reporting period. 4) the number of beneficiaries are those that are attributable to DFID, calculated based on a suitable robust attribution method appropriate for the programme. As a minimum results should be adjusted to report numbers to reflect the percentage of programme funding that was provided by DFID. 5) this is a people measurement not a jobs measurement, so any number provided should be a people number. 6) Results should only be for direct beneficiaries of the programme. Indirect beneficiaries are those benefitting through multiplier effects.
Baseline	For DFID reporting purposes, 2015-16 financial year baseline is used with achieved results being reported onwards.
Data dis-aggregation	The monitoring of beneficiaries should be disaggregated by sex and disability.
Data availability	Projects and programmes are expected to collect the relevant information for programme monitoring, including the beneficiaries number.
Time period/lag	Data collection and analysis is likely to take a minimum of six to twelve months. Results achieved in previous years should be reported against that year as data becomes available.
Quality	Country offices/spending departments are responsible for assessing

assurance measures	data quality during at least annual and project completion reviews. Any comments relating to the data quality should be noted in the relevant methodology note where available, and reported to headquarters via the collection template. The GRD jobs lead and the EcDev Cabinet statistics adviser will review and quality assure information submitted to ensure that both criteria are met.
Data issues	There is potential for double counting of beneficiaries given different types of programmes could provide support to the same people over the reporting period. In contexts where the same people are reached with more than one programme over the reporting period, they should only be counted once. It will likely be more straightforward to just count the programme with the highest number of beneficiaries in the reporting period, unless programme data enable more accurate monitoring of unique people from different programmes. This means when completing returns if two projects are likely to be counting the same beneficiaries only one should be included. Depending on exactly what is being monitored, coverage might be difficult to determine, especially for beneficiaries who are not direct participant of the programme