

Indicator description	Number of people with sustainable access to clean water and/or sanitation through DFID support
Indicator Type	<p>Composite (combination of the sub-indicators) and cumulative (annual results are reported and summed over the entire reporting period, ensuring that each individual is counted within one year only).</p> <p>Some humanitarian projects report on a peak year basis to avoid double counting across different years. This adheres to the principle of ensuring that each person is counted only once.</p>
Rationale	Inadequate water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) accounts for nearly 1,000 child deaths per day and a total of 842,000 deaths ⁱ (all ages) per year in low and middle-income countries. Poor WASH is also a factor in under-nutrition and a number of neglected tropical diseases. Improved WASH can reduce this disease burden and can impact on poverty reduction, gender equity and education.
Technical definition	<p>All people counted under this indicator will have gained access to water or sanitation or both. Each person can be counted only once. This is the case even if the same individual benefits from multiple interventions in different years. Hygiene promotion should be integrated with water and sanitation programming.</p> <p>Humanitarian results must be included where we are planning to meet needs that are open-ended and/or where we are reinstating permanent services following a humanitarian event. It excludes provision to people anticipated to be displaced for a short duration (6 months as a guide).</p> <p>See the separate methodologies for water and sanitation (below) for guidance on definitions and calculating the number of people reached with each type of intervention. This methodology note outlines how to report on the composite indicator, combining the sub-indicators. How this is done will depend on available data, as set out in the 'data calculations' section below.</p> <p>To include results under this indicator, qualitative and/or quantitative information on sustainability will be required. A qualitative narrative on the approaches to sustainability taken within each project is required and quantitative information should be provided where possible (e.g. results of post-completion surveys/monitoring). See the separate methodologies for water and sanitation (below) for additional guidance/examples.</p> <p>We also separately monitor the number of people reached with each of water, sanitation and hygiene because it is useful contextual information on DFID's WASH programmes, and to ensure a continued high standard of transparency in our reporting to the UK public.</p>

ⁱ Preventing diarrhoea through better water, sanitation and hygiene: exposures and impacts in low- and middle-income countries, WHO 2014

Data calculations

Results are included from all relevant programmes including health, education, social development and livelihoods programmes. Refer to the 2 separate methodology notes on water and sanitation for further details on definitions of which facilities/interventions may be included.

Two issues arise in calculating the number of people with sustainable access to clean water and/or sanitation through DFID support. More than one programme may target the same geographical area and the same people may receive more than one type of intervention.

(1) If detailed information is available on individuals with access to WASH services, compile a list of communities (with populations) where WASH programmes (which may be overlapping) operate and categorise each person using the matrix below. For each category sum the population being served by each intervention or combination of interventions. Summing the total from each category then provides the total number of beneficiaries, ensuring that people receiving more than one intervention are counted once only.

Water or water and hygiene	Water and sanitation or water, sanitation and hygiene
Sanitation or sanitation and hygiene	

Example

A WASH programme provides 140,000 people with access to clean water and 90,000 with access to sanitation and hygiene promotion. These interventions are integrated and some of these people benefit from water, sanitation and hygiene.

In terms of the categories above, project data shows that we have the following numbers of people:

Water: 80,000

Sanitation and hygiene: 30,000

Water, sanitation and hygiene: 60,000

Those reached with water, sanitation and hygiene can be counted only once and so the total number of people reached with water and/or sanitation is the total of the 3 categories above, equal to 170,000.

(2) If detailed information is not available for analysis at individual level of services received, estimate the size of the population for which the programmes overlap and take only the highest figure from water or sanitation for the populations concerned.

Example: fully overlapping programmes or one programme

	<p>providing a range of WASH interventions</p> <p>DFID’s funding to the UNICEF Water and Health programme in Eritrea will provide access to sanitation for 90,000 people, access to water for 20,000 people and hygiene promotion for 100,000 people. The people provided with water and sanitation access will be in the same six regions of Eritrea, so we assume the results could largely or fully overlap. The larger figure of 90,000 people is used as a conservative estimate of people reached with access to water, sanitation or both (note that we do not count people who <u>only</u> receive hygiene promotion).</p> <p>Example: partly overlapping programmes</p> <p>Two programmes exist as follows within the same country:</p> <p>Water: 100,000 people Sanitation: 80,000 people</p> <p>These two programmes overlap geographically and it is not possible to determine how many people receive only water, only sanitation or both.</p> <p>If the programmes only partly overlap Geographically, the results could be scaled accordingly using the percentage overlap. For example, if only 25% of the sanitation results above are achieved in the same regions as the water results, the total result recorded should be 160,000 people calculated as follows:</p> <p>Highest result (water = 100,000) + non-overlapping sanitation result (60,000 = 75% of 80,000) = 160,000</p>
Data sources	<p>Provision should be included in projects and programmes for the collection of data on access to and use of water and sanitation. This will normally be the primary source of data. Where water and sanitation results are delivered through non-specific WASH programmes, for instance health, education, social development or livelihoods, projects will need to collect WASH data in addition to other project data.</p> <p>See the individual methodology notes on water and sanitation for more detail on data sources.</p>
Reporting roles	<p>DFID country offices/spending departments take primary responsibility for ensuring adequate baseline data is available and that programmes include suitable indicators and requirements for ongoing monitoring.</p> <p>Where direct budget support or sector support is being provided, country offices should determine the share of national results that can be attributed to DFID support (see <u>general guidance on attribution</u>).</p>
Baseline data	<p>For DFID reporting purposes, 2014-15 financial year baseline is used with achieved results being reported from 2015-16 onwards.</p>
Return format	
Data dis-aggregation	<p>Data disaggregation requirements are in line with DFID’s Data Disaggregation Action Plan. Data disaggregated by sex and disability</p>

	<p>must currently be reported where available and projects must work towards fully disaggregating by these variables and by age and by Geography over time. The Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability should be used in future data collection. For meaningful disaggregation, collection of this data should be on a sample basis of the users of WASH. Basing disaggregations on community profile data does not provide information on whether individuals are able to access and using WASH facilities. Community profile data may be reported in the interim until improved methods can be implemented, with details of methods used reported.</p>
Data availability	Bi-annually
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 assurance measures	<p>It is recognised that the quality of data available to estimate the number of people reached with water and sanitation who did not previously have access as defined in the methodology notes will vary. The quality of information on overlap between programmes will also vary. Please indicate any concerns in this respect in the results template and ensure that estimates are conservative where necessary by, for example, excluding one set of results in cases of overlap between programmes where data is not available on beneficiaries at an individual level (see data calculations section).</p> <p>There are four layers of quality assurance (QA) in place relating to the DFID calculations, not including any processes put in place by partners or implementers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Country offices assess data quality during annual reviews and project completion reviews. 2. Country offices comment on the quality of their data being reported to DFID HQ, and provide a link to the calculations spreadsheet. 3. Policy Division check results returns and calculations, and record any issues in a QA log. 4. Finance and Corporate Performance Division review the QA log to ensure resolution of issues.
Data quality	<p>Given the range of data sources used, the accuracy of the results data varies and is subject to the quality of the underlying data source. In many cases DFID uses data collected by others (e.g. partner country governments, international organisations) and has limited control over the quality of the data. There are challenges to collecting data in developing countries including constraints due to security risks. This can jeopardise the completeness and accuracy of the results estimates.</p> <p>Statistics advisers in DFID under take quality assurance of the results data and attempt to minimise the source of any errors although there is a risk that errors may still exist.</p>

Indicator description	Number of people with sustainable access to clean drinking water sources through DFID support
Indicator type	<p>Cumulative – annual results are reported and summed over the entire reporting period, assuming that each individual is counted within one year only (i.e. only once).</p> <p>Some humanitarian projects report on a peak year basis to avoid double counting across different years. This adheres to the principle of ensuring that each person is counted only once.</p>
Rationale	Lack of water supply has negative impacts on poverty reduction, gender equity, child health, and education. Ensuring everyone has access to a clean water supply is a high priority for the UK government.
Technical definition	<p>The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation has proposed new drinking water and sanitation 'ladders' for the sustainable development goals (SDGs). These include two main levels of service for water:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safely managed water • Basic water <p>Safely managed water is defined as a basic water source which is located on premises and available when needed; free of faecal and priority chemical contamination and/or regulated by a competent authority.</p> <p>Basic water is defined as a basic drinking water source with a total collection time of no more than 30 minutes for a roundtrip including queuing, and meeting the previous MDG definition of improvedⁱⁱ.</p> <p>For measurement under this indicator, we will use the basic water definition, supplemented by measures of use and sustainability in line with the indicator description and to provide assurance on the quality and sustainability of interventions. We will also separately monitor the number of people with access to safely managed water through DFID support, to capture progression in service levels, through a complementary indicator. 'Safely managed water' is the proposed service level for SDG indicator 6.1.</p> <p>All programmes reporting results under this indicator must have assurance of the number of users of the relevant water facilities to provide evidence of the success and quality of the intervention and to avoid large assumptions on numbers of people reached. This may be provided by sources such as national or regional surveys (if this aligns</p>

ⁱⁱAn improved drinking-water source is defined as one that, by nature of its construction or through active intervention, is protected from outside contamination, in particular from contamination with faecal matter.

Improved facilities include piped water into dwelling; piped water to yard/plot; public tap or standpipe; tubewell or borehole; protected dug well; protected spring; and rainwater.

well with programme areas), administrative data or programme-specific baseline and endline surveys. **Results forecast should include only the number of people expected to use facilities. If not all people reached are expected to use facilities, then an adjustment should be made utilising evidence as outlined above. It is anticipated that this adjustment will be required in most cases.** Existing studies on success rates of the relevant intervention may be used to estimate the size of the adjustment. Teams can consult with the WASH Policy team if required.

To include results under this indicator, programmes will have to demonstrate that relevant aspects of sustainability have been addressed in programme design and implementation. For example:

- Has the programme addressed **functional sustainability**, i.e. how services will remain operational including aspects such as appropriate design and operation and maintenance?
- How will the programme ensure that national/local government/communities have the necessary **capacity** to maintain sustainable services?
- Has the programme addressed **environmental sustainability** including assessing impacts on water resources and considering climate change?

Evidence (qualitative and/or quantitative) on sustainability must be provided for all projects for which results are reported under this indicator. This should be updated throughout the project.

Examples of evidence provided on sustainability

DFID DRC provided evidence of community based approaches to sustainability including assessments of continued use after 1, 2 and 3 years and approaches to address slippages.

DFID Nigeria provided evidence of institutional approaches to sustainability, including creation of departments with M&E systems and budget to ensure continued investment in sustainability.

DFID Tanzania provided details of how sustainability is imbedded within programme design including trial of a payment-by-results approach to incentivise maintenance of water points

DFID Ethiopia provided information on a complementary project focussed on ensuring sustainability through support to government programming including development of a Sustainability Check Framework monitoring tool.

	<p>A survey-based assessment of post-completion sustainability and use across the WASH portfolio will be carried out centrally and programmes are strongly encouraged to undertake measurement of sustainability following interventions. The WASH Policy team can provide support on approaches to this.</p> <p>Humanitarian results must be included where we are planning to meet needs that are open-ended and/or where we are reinstating permanent facilities following a humanitarian event. Permanent facilities constructed under humanitarian programmes <u>should</u> be included. This indicator <u>excludes</u> temporary provision (e.g. water bottles, short term tanker provision) to people anticipated to be displaced for a short duration (6 months as a guide).</p> <p>Where facilities are provided within public buildings or areas (e.g. schools), they can only be counted if they are freely accessible at all times (e.g. not only during the day). Separate indicators, sitting under education and health, are proposed to capture extra-household services as defined by the JMP. These will not count towards this indicator unless the facilities are freely accessible at all times.</p> <p>Rehabilitated facilities can be counted if they have been fully non-functioning for over a year. The principle is whether the intervention has provided basic access to water that an individual did not have before rehabilitation. Rehabilitation of DFID-funded facilities found to be non-functioning cannot be counted.</p> <p>Each individual should be counted only once, even if the same individual benefits from multiple interventions in different years.</p> <p>The preferred data source for this indicator is programme data on direct beneficiaries and this should capture only individuals who have gained access to basic water sources as defined within this methodology which they did not previously have. If alternative data sources are used, care must also be taken to establish the counterfactual – i.e. the number or proportion of people who already had access to clean drinking water sources according to the definitions outlined in this methodology. Individuals reached with the intervention will already have had access to a water source of some kind and the judgement is whether the level of access has changed from not meeting the basic water definition to now meeting the definition after the intervention. Please make conservative estimates in this respect and contact the WASH policy team if clarification is required.</p>
Data calculations and guidance	<p>Results included from all relevant programmes including health, education, social development and livelihoods programmes.</p> <p>Where countries are supporting clean water provision through multiple funding mechanisms e.g. non- Government programmes, sector budget</p>

	<p>support and general budget support there are significant risks of double counting. Please contact the WASH team for further advice if needed.</p> <p>The numbers of people provided with access may be calculated in a number of ways depending on the nature of each programme. For example, the number of users per water point provided may be estimated or if a whole community is reached but some already had access as defined above, then the numbers reached may be calculated as the total population of the community minus the number already having access.</p> <p>The two key principles are that each person should be counted only once and only if they have gained access to basic water, as defined above, which they did not previously have.</p>
Data sources	<p>Provision should be included in projects and programmes for the collection of data on access to basic water and use. This will normally be the primary source of data. Where water results are delivered through non-specific WASH programmes, for instance health, education, social development or livelihoods, projects will need to collect WASH data in addition to other project data.</p> <p>In the case of sector and budget support, programme data is the preferred starting point before attributing DFID's share of results. If this is not available, national statistical data should be used but in this case, funding in the sector from other sources should be considered in addition to the government budget when calculating DFID's share of total expenditure.</p> <p>The Joint Monitoring Programme of WHO/UNICEF (http://www.wssinfo.org/) publishes a report every 2 years using data on use of improved water supply and basic sanitation from surveys and censuses. The resulting international database of coverage provides a useful reference to assess the validity of country data and to assess use. National or regional surveys (if this aligns well with programme areas), administrative data or programme-specific baseline and endline surveys can also provide evidence on access and use. The approach to monitoring taken by each programme will depend on data availability and the Geographical scope of the interventions.</p> <p>Where we are funding through partners at a country level, they should be requested to collect the necessary WASH specific data to demonstrate results achieved.</p>
Reporting roles	<p>DFID country offices/spending departments take primary responsibility for ensuring adequate baseline data is available and that programmes include suitable indicators and requirements for ongoing monitoring.</p> <p>Where direct budget support or sector support is being provided, country offices should determine the share of national results that can be attributed to DFID support (see general guidance on attribution).</p>
Worked	A programme provides water points within communities. These meet the

example	<p>JMP basic definition.</p> <p>Within a particular community (population 2,000), enough water points are provided to serve the whole community, allowing collection of water within 30 minutes and in accordance with the technologies provided. However, 5% of these communities have their own water points on plot used only by those households. A baseline and endline survey also shows that only 80% of the community use an improved source of water after the intervention. The number of people who can be reported for this indicator is:</p> $(2,000 \times 0.8) - (2,000 \times 0.05) = 1,500$ <p>[1,600 – 100 = 1,500]</p> <p>(the number of people using basic water sources after the intervention minus the number using basic sources before)</p>
Baseline	<p>For DFID reporting purposes, 2014-15 financial year baseline is used with achieved results being reported from 2015-16 onwards.</p>
Data dis-aggregation	<p>Data disaggregation requirements are in line with DFID’s Data Disaggregation Action Plan. Data disaggregated by sex and disability must currently be reported where available and projects must work towards fully disaggregating by these variables and by age and by Geography over time. The Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability should be used in future data collection. For meaningful disaggregation, collection of this data should be on a sample basis of the users of WASH. Basing disaggregations on community profile data does not provide information on whether individuals are able to access and using WASH facilities. Community profile data may be reported in the interim until improved methods can be implemented, with details of methods used reported.</p>
Time period/lag	<p>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.</p>
Quality assurance measures	<p>It is recognised that the quality of data available to estimate the number of people reached with access to clean drinking water as defined in this note will vary and that DFID will have to consult with programme partners to assess the quality of data provided. Please indicate any concerns in this respect in the results template.</p> <p>There are four layers of quality assurance (QA) in place relating to the DFID calculations, not including any processes put in place by partners or implementers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Country offices assess data quality during annual reviews and project completion reviews. 2. Country offices comment on the quality of their data being reported to DFID HQ, and provide a link to the calculations spreadsheet. 3. Policy Division check results returns and calculations, and record any issues in a QA log.

	4. Finance and Corporate Performance Division review the QA log to ensure resolution of issues.
Data quality	<p>Given the range of data sources used, the accuracy of the results data varies and is subject to the quality of the underlying data source. In many cases DFID uses data collected by others (eg partner country governments, international organisations) and has limited control over the quality of the data. There are challenges to collecting data in developing countries including constraints due to security risks. This can jeopardise the completeness and accuracy of the results estimates.</p> <p>Statistics advisers in DFID under take quality assurance of the results data and attempt to minimise the source of any errors although there is a risk that errors may still exist.</p>
Data issues	National programmes frequently count the number of facilities constructed. It is important to verify using other means that such facilities are brought into use for their intended purpose.

Indicator description	Number of people with sustainable access to sanitation through DFID support
Type of indicator	Cumulative – annual results are reported and summed over the entire reporting period, assuming that each individual is counted within one year only (i.e. only once) . Some humanitarian projects report on a peak year basis to avoid double counting across different years. This adheres to the principle of ensuring that each person is counted only once.
Rationale	Lack of sanitation has negative impacts on child health, nutritional outcomes and education. Ensuring everyone has access to clean sanitation is a high priority for the UK government.
Technical definition	The WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation has proposed new drinking water and sanitation ‘ladders’ for the sustainable development goals (SDGs). These include the following service levels for sanitation : <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safely managed sanitation • Basic sanitation • Shared sanitation • Unimproved sanitation • Open defecation <p>Safely managed sanitation is defined as a basic sanitation facility which is not shared with other households and where excreta is safely disposed in situ or transported to a designated place for safe disposal or treatment, where appropriate (disposal applies particularly to urban sanitation).</p> <p>Basic sanitation is defined as a sanitation facility not shared with other households and meeting the previous MDG definition of improvedⁱⁱⁱ.</p> <p>Shared sanitation is defined as an otherwise improved sanitation facility shared with other households.</p> <p>Unimproved sanitation is defined as an unimproved^{iv} sanitation facility, shared or unshared.</p> <p>Open defecation is defined as defecation in bushes, fields, water bodies or other open spaces.</p> <p>For measurement under this indicator, we will include safely</p>

ⁱⁱⁱ Improved sanitation facilities include flush/pour flush toilets or latrines connected to a sewer, septic tank, or pit, ventilated improved pit latrines, pit latrines with a slab or platform of any material which covers the pit entirely, except for the drop hole and composting toilets/latrines.

^{iv} Unimproved sanitation facilities include flush/pour flush not going to sewer/septic/pit, pit latrines without a slab, hanging and bucket latrine

managed sanitation, basic sanitation and elimination of open defecation where an entire community is certified as open defecation free (ODF). Only those people who did not have one of these minimum levels of access previously should be counted under this indicator (not the whole community where certified as ODF). However, we will also separately monitor the progression in service levels through a complementary indicator. 'Safely managed sanitation' is the proposed service level for SDG indicator 6.2.

Facilities constructed to eliminate open defecation need not meet the Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) definition of basic sanitation (e.g. they may be shared) but should comply with country definitions of latrines that provide access to sanitation. They should eliminate open defecation and should not allow excreta to be expelled in to the immediate environment.

Rehabilitated facilities can be counted if they have been fully non-functioning for over a year. The principle is whether the intervention has provided basic access to sanitation that an individual did not have before rehabilitation, or provided access to sanitation contributing to a community becoming ODF after rehabilitation. Rehabilitation of DFID-funded facilities found to be non-functioning cannot be counted.

Results can be included from DFID-supported programmes that **directly result in beneficiaries constructing their own facilities in addition to people who benefit from direct investment in construction or rehabilitation of sanitation facilities.**

All programmes reporting results under this indicator must have assurance of the use of the relevant sanitation facilities to provide evidence of the success and quality of the intervention. This may be provided by sources such as national or regional surveys (if this aligns well with programme areas), administrative data (e.g. on communities certified as open defecation free which would provide sufficient evidence of use) or programme-specific baseline and endline surveys. **Results forecast should include only the number of people expected to use facilities. If not all people reached are expected to use facilities, then an adjustment should be made utilising evidence as outlined above. It is anticipated that this adjustment will be required in most cases.** Existing studies on the relevant intervention may be used to estimate the size of the adjustment. Teams can consult with the WASH Policy team if required.

To include results under this indicator, programmes will have to demonstrate that relevant aspects of sustainability have been addressed in programme design and implementation. For example:

- Has the programme addressed **functional sustainability**, i.e. how services will remain operational including aspects such as appropriate design and operation and maintenance?

- How will the programme ensure that national/local government/communities have the necessary **capacity** to maintain sustainable services?
- Has the programme addressed **environmental sustainability** including assessing impacts on water resources and considering climate change?

Evidence (qualitative and/or quantitative) on sustainability must be provided for all projects for which results are reported under this indicator. This should be updated throughout the project.

Examples of evidence provided on sustainability

DFID DRC provided evidence of community based approaches to sustainability including assessments of continued use after 1, 2 and 3 years and approaches to address slippages.

DFID Nigeria provided evidence of institutional approaches to sustainability, including creation of departments with M&E systems and budget to ensure continued investment in sustainability.

DFID Ethiopia provided information on a complementary project focussed on ensuring sustainability through support to government programming including development of a Sustainability Check Framework monitoring tool.

DFID Zambia provided information on a project extension focussing on handing data collection over to government and creation of a government WASH management information system.

An assessment of post-completion sustainability and use across the WASH portfolio will be carried out centrally and programmes are strongly encouraged to undertake measurement of sustainability following interventions. The WASH Policy team can provide support on approaches to this.

Humanitarian results **must** be included where we are planning to meet needs that are open –ended and/or where we are reinstating permanent services following a humanitarian event. Permanent facilities constructed under humanitarian programmes should be included. This indicator excludes temporary provision (e.g. temporary toilet facilities) to people anticipated to be displaced for a short duration (6 months as a guide).

Where facilities are provided within public buildings or areas (e.g. schools), they can only be counted if they are freely accessible at all times (e.g. not only during the day). Separate indicators, sitting under education and health, are proposed to capture extra-household services as defined by the JMP. These will not count towards this indicator unless

	<p>the facilities are freely accessible at all times.</p> <p>Each individual should be counted only once, even if the same individual benefits from multiple interventions in different years.</p> <p>The preferred data source for this indicator is programme data on direct beneficiaries and this should capture only individuals who have gained access to sanitation as defined within this methodology which they did not previously have. If alternative data sources are used, care must also be taken to establish the counterfactual – i.e. the number or proportion of people who already had access to sanitation according to the definitions outlined in this methodology. The judgement is whether the level of access has improved from not meeting the definitions within the methodology notes to now meeting the definitions after the intervention. Please make conservative estimates in this respect and contact the WASH policy team if clarification is required.</p>
Data sources	<p>Provision should be included in projects and programmes for the collection of data on access to sanitation and use. This will normally be the primary source of data. Where sanitation results are delivered through non-specific WASH programmes, for instance health, education, social development or livelihoods, projects will need to collect WASH data in addition to other project data.</p> <p>In the case of sector and budget support, programme data is the preferred starting point before attributing DFID's share of results. If this is not available, national statistical data should be used but in this case, funding in the sector from other sources should be considered in addition to the government budget when calculating DFID's share of total expenditure.</p> <p>The Joint Monitoring Programme of WHO/UNICEF (http://www.wssinfo.org/) publishes a report every 2 years using data on use of improved water supply and basic sanitation from surveys and censuses. The resulting international database of coverage provides a useful reference to assess the validity of country data and to assess use. National or regional surveys (if this aligns well with programme areas), administrative data or programme-specific baseline and endline surveys can also provide evidence on access and use. The approach to monitoring taken by each programme will depend on data availability and the Geographical scope of the interventions.</p> <p>Where we are funding through multilateral partners at a country level, they should be requested to collect the necessary WASH specific data to demonstrate results achieved.</p>
Data calculations and guidance	<p>Results included from all relevant programmes including health, education, social development and livelihoods programmes.</p> <p>Where countries are supporting sanitation provision through multiple funding mechanisms e.g. non-Government programmes, sector budget support and general budget support there are significant risks of double</p>

	<p>counting. Please contact the WASH team for further advice.</p> <p>The numbers of people provided with access may be calculated in a number of ways depending on the nature of each programme. For example, if a whole community is reached but some already had access to sanitation as defined above, then the numbers reached may be calculated as the total population of the community minus the number already having access.</p> <p>The two key principles are that each person should be counted only once and only if they have gained access to the defined services which they did not previously have.</p>
Reporting roles	<p>DFID country offices/spending departments take primary responsibility for ensuring adequate baseline data is available and that programmes include suitable indicators and requirements for ongoing monitoring.</p> <p>Where direct budget support or sector support is being provided, spending departments should determine the share of national results that can be attributed to DFID support (see general guidance on attribution).</p>
Worked example	<p>A programme works to help communities become open defecation free.</p> <p>50 communities with a total population of 150,000 are targeted by the programme. 28 of these communities with a total population of 70,000 were certified as ODF through the national monitoring process. Project baseline data shows that 10% of people within these communities had access to improved sanitation before the intervention.</p> <p>The number of people within targeted communities cannot be reported against this indicator as these communities were not certified as ODF and evidence shows that the facilities constructed are not being used. For certified ODF communities, we know that the facilities are being used.</p> <p>The number of people reported for this indicator should be:</p> $70,000 \times 0.9 = 63,000$ <p>(The number of people living in communities certified as ODF who did not have access to improved sanitation before the intervention).</p>
Baseline	<p>For DFID reporting purposes, 2014-15 financial year baseline is used with achieved results being reported from 2015-16 onwards.</p>
Data disaggregation	<p>Data disaggregation requirements are in line with DFID's Data Disaggregation Action Plan. Data disaggregated by sex and disability must currently be reported where available and projects must work towards fully disaggregating by these variables and by age and by Geography over time. The Washington Group Short Set of Questions on Disability should be used in future data collection. For meaningful disaggregation, collection of this data should be on a sample basis of the users of WASH. Basing disaggregations on community profile data</p>

	<p>does not provide information on whether individuals are able to access and using WASH facilities. Community profile data may be reported in the interim until improved methods can be implemented, with details of methods used reported.</p>
Data availability	<p>Provision should be included in projects and programmes for the collection of data on access and use of sanitation. This will normally be the primary source of data. In cases such as general budget support where project level data may not be available, other sources may be used provided that DFID's attribution can be calculated. This may include national management information systems.</p>
Time period/lag	<p>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.</p>
Quality assurance measures	<p>It is recognised that the quality of data available to estimate the number of people reached with access to sanitation will vary and that DFID will have to consult with programme partners to assess the quality of data provided. Please indicate any concerns in this respect on the results template.</p> <p>There are four layers of quality assurance (QA) in place relating to the DFID calculations, not including any processes put in place by partners or implementers.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Country offices assess data quality during annual reviews and project completion reviews. 2. Country offices comment on the quality of their data being reported to DFID HQ, and provide a link to the calculations spreadsheet. 3. Policy Division check results returns and calculations, and record any issues in a QA log. 4. Finance and Corporate Performance Division review the QA log to ensure resolution of issues.
Data quality	<p>Given the range of data sources used, the accuracy of the results data varies and is subject to the quality of the underlying data source. In many cases DFID uses data collected by others (eg partner country governments, international organisations) and has limited control over the quality of the data. There are challenges to collecting data in developing countries including constraints due to security risks. This can jeopardise the completeness and accuracy of the results estimates.</p> <p>Statistics advisers in DFID under take quality assurance of the results data and attempt to minimise the source of any errors although there is a risk that errors may still exist.</p>
Data issues	<p>National programmes frequently count the number of facilities constructed. It is important to verify using other means that such facilities are brought into use for their intended purpose.</p>