Indicator description	**Number of people supported to have choice and control over their own development and to hold decision-makers to account**
Type of Indicator	Peak Year
Pillar	Governance
Technical Definition / Methodological summary	**<u>Summary</u>** This indicator is a headcount measure of the reach of DFID-supported empowerment and accountability, in terms of the number of unique beneficiaries. It is not a measure of whether beneficiaries have been empowered since empowerment is a complex and broad concept. **<u>How to count: methods for including programme results into the indicator</u>** The numbers reported should be attributable to DFID[1]. See the general guidance note for how to attribute results. The key concept being measured is the number of **unique beneficiaries** of DFID programmes in this area over the Spending Review period. The nature of the programme itself will determine how to get at the number of unique beneficiaries, as the following scenarios illustrate. This is a measure of the number of unique beneficiaries of DFID empowerment and accountability programmes. It is not a measure of whether the individuals are empowered, since this is a complex concept. The different designs of DFID programmes mean that various calculation methods will have to be used to capture to the key concept of unique beneficiaries. In the scenario where the programme provides on-going support or mentoring over a number of years, 'peak year' figures will be used (rather than cumulative). If the figure for the baseline year consists of DFID beneficiaries then this need not be subtracted; otherwise the baseline figure will be subtracted. *For example, if DFID is supporting 10 million people though the coverage of citizen's scorecards for 4 years, and that these are essentially the same people we should count 10 million people, not 40 million. You should be clear about this in your presentation*

---

[1] We recognise that numbers may be low initially (particularly in relation to new technologies) due to the use of innovative approaches but that these numbers will increase in subsequent years.

so that it is not interpreted as 2.5 million a year for four years.

If a programme provides a one off intervention, such as the opportunity for constituents to meet their elected representative, then there are different beneficiaries in each year of the programme. The figures for each year will therefore be accumulated.

For example, if DFID is supporting 5,000 extra individuals to meet their elected representatives in each of 4 years, it is reasonable to claim 4 x 5,000 = 20,000 unique beneficiaries.

How to deal with overlapping programmes

It is likely that country offices will contribute to this indicator through several different programs. Countries should provide in the comments section the disaggregated information showing the number of people supported through each project/program as well as the overall contribution to this indicator. e.g.

- Beneficiaries of program A
- Beneficiaries of program B
- Total number of individual beneficiaries = C

Note that C does not necessarily = A + B, if some individuals are beneficiaries of both programmes. If this is the case, you will need to estimate the overlap in the way that is most appropriate to your country context and based on your professional expertise. There is space in the template to record your assumptions

Possible approaches that you might consider are:
- Taking account of geographic coverage: if programmes are in different regions it may be appropriate to assume zero overlap.
- Reporting the single biggest programme as your contribution, where these are likely to overlap heavily, or where it is difficult to assess the overlap.
- Taking a probabilistic approach. In your situation is it reasonable to assume that benefiting from Programme 1 does not affect your chance of benefit from Programme 2? In that case you can calculate the chance that the same individual benefits from both just by luck.

For example, in a community of 100,000 there are 5,000 who benefit from Prog1 and 20,000 from Prog2. Being in one programme does not affect your chance of benefiting from the other.

*In this case everyone in Prog2 has a (5/100) chance of already being in Prog1 – in other words 0.05 * 20,000 = 1,000 will not be 'new' unique beneficiaries. So the contribution to the indicator would be 5,000 + 19,000 = 24,000.*

*It doesn't matter which order you do the calculation. (20/100) of Prog1 participants will already be part of Prog2, so there are 0.2 * 5,000 = 1,000 who are not 'new', just as above*

The overlap between country programmes and BBC Media Action

The Policy Division in the central part of DFID fund a programme through BBC Media which support people in a number of countries by enhancing the availability of information. Some of these countries may also benefit from programmes funded by the DFID country office.

It is important to eliminate the risk of double counting, and this handled centrally after the data have been collected. We subtract from the BBC Media Action contribution the contribution of the local DFID office in each country that benefits from BBC Media Action and DFID country programmes.

What to count: definition of 'supported to have choice and control'

Programmes which may contribute to the indicator are:
- Support to Parliament (e.g. number of additional people visiting their MP)
- Support to councils/traditional leaders (e.g. no. of additional people meeting with their local councillor or traditional leader)
- Participatory surveys (e.g. number of people engaging in the survey)
- Strengthen community monitoring capacity (e.g. number of people who participate in government or community monitoring)
- Community planning (e.g. number of individuals engaged in community planning)
- Budget analysis and tracking (e.g. number of individuals using budget analysis for advocacy)
- Programmes which enhance the availability of information which can empower individuals and enable them to have more choice and to hold decision makers to account (e.g. information about the decisions taken by government representatives, or about mechanisms that citizens can use to hold

	government to account). (Beneficiaries should be those expected to access the new information).
	
	Programmes to exclude:
	• Cash transfers
	• Programmes with headcount beneficiaries under another Operational Plan (OP) indicator (unless such beneficiaries also benefit from a separate programme on E&A then you can count them)
	  o Example 1. If you have a programme to enhance school management committees, then the members of these committees, or people informed by the committees, would count as beneficiaries. However children who gain access to school as a result of the committees, would not count.
	  o Example 2: If a programme supports health committees then beneficiaries include those participating in the committees and those informed by the committees through media etc. Those informed, who go on to use health services, should not be counted (again).
	  o Example 3: If a programme supports elections in some way, and the people supported to should be included under the elections indicator and not double counted here.
	
	E&A beneficiaries of broader sectoral programmes may be included against this indicator but it is important that only the beneficiaries supported on E&A are included. Staff should not include the broader set of beneficiaries in the sectoral programme.
	
	An example could be that 3 million people receive improved health services and that (of those 3 million), 50,000 people provide feedback on those services through citizen's score cards. The count against this indicator should be 50,000.

Rationale	This indicator is a headcount measure of the reach of DFID-supported empowerment and accountability. It is not a measure of whether beneficiaries have been empowered since empowerment is a complex and broad concept.
Country office role	Country Office based staff to provide data on request to FCPD.
Data source	There are different possible sources:

	• DFID programme data Much data are likely to be available directly through the program. For example in Zambia the programme directly counts the numbers of extra people meeting with their MP. • Survey data In some cases the result of a programme may be measured through survey data (for example in Ethiopia). • Population data In some cases, an intervention may affect the full population or full adult population in a particular geographical area. In these cases, population data should be taken from the most reliable source (population wide sources include (a) the last population census (b) interim census population projection estimates, usually conducted by the national statistics office (c) electoral roll data)
Data included	
Formula / Data calculations	If a programme is solely funded by DFID, DFID should count all recipients of the programme. If the programme is joint funded (or DFID is supporting a government programme) the number of recipients is calculated as: Number of recipients/beneficiaries attributable to DFID = Total number of recipients/beneficiaries x (DFID expenditure / Total budget)
Worked example	See Methodological Summary
Most recent baseline	
Good Performance	**Target number of people supported to have choice and control over their own development and to hold decision-makers to account achieved (40 million)**
Return format	**Number of people supported to have choice and control over their own development and to hold decision-makers to account per year, disaggregated by sex wherever possible.**
Data dis-aggregation	• By sex if possible • **IMPORTANT**: To enable corporate reporting on the different types of initiatives disaggregate by programme type and have a clear description of the programme the related indicator and the tool (e.g. questionnaire, interviews, media) used to generate

	the data
Data availability	
Time period/ lag	
Quality assurance measures	
Data issues	
Additional comments	