

Indicator description	<b>Number of women and girls with improved access to security and/or improved access to justice services through DFID support</b>
VERSION	Amended 6 March 2013
CHANGES SINCE LAST VERSION	Key revisions include minor amendments to the language of the indicator itself and to the definitions of 'security' and 'justice.' These revisions will allow for greater inclusion of security and justice programmes and interventions which promote personal safety and challenge violence against women and girls (VAWG).
Type of Indicator	Peak year
Technical Definition / Methodological summary	<p>This indicator provides an aggregate of the additional numbers of women and girls accessing DFID supported security and justice programmes over the four year reporting period.</p> <p><b><u>Number</u></b></p> <p>The reporting unit is the number of unique beneficiaries. In all cases country offices should take care to avoid double counting.</p> <p>Targets and results should only be cumulative (adding beneficiaries from each year to get a grand total) if country offices can demonstrate that beneficiaries are different individuals from year to year (i.e., the programme targets non-overlapping geographical areas in different years). Otherwise, targets will be peak-year, and results will also be peak year (the single year with the greatest number of beneficiaries).</p> <p><b><u>Women and Girls</u></b></p> <p>The term covers all female beneficiaries regardless of age. In practice certain methodologies, e.g. perception surveys or government data sources, may offer data on a subset of girls over the age of consent or of women up to a certain age (15-60); in these cases only the data for the subset should be recorded. Note that it may be possible to collect data indirectly on girls younger than the age of consent, such as through interviews asking parents whether their younger children accompanied them to a shelter or through administrative records of specific kinds of justice programmes, such as child custody hearings.</p> <p>To avoid double-counting, male beneficiaries should not be included in the DRF results, even if women and girls might indirectly benefit from programming they have received.</p> <p><b><u>Improved</u></b></p> <p>To promote consistency in reporting and to avoid double counting of participants, the term 'improve' is taken either to mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to offer new or substantially improved access to security and/or justice services or</li> <li>• to add beneficiaries to existing programmes which aim to improve access to security and/or to justice services.</li> </ul> <p>Countries should report only the <b>number of people</b> accessing a new or substantially improved programme/services or the <b>additional number</b> of people with access to existing security and justice programmes/services.</p> <p>In either case, for the purposes of the DRF, <b>it is assumed that these programmes are of acceptable quality</b> as to constitute an improvement to its participants, i.e. that the Business</p>

Case provides evidence that the benefits of the programme outweigh its disbenefits and that participants are legitimately counted as beneficiaries.

The point here is that the indicator measures **numbers of people** benefitting from new or fundamentally improved services, and not light-touch improvement in the quality of existing services. Country offices are encouraged to include separate measures of the quality of services provided in their logframes and programme assessments, but the qualitative element is not directly addressed in this indicator.

### **Access**

Access is measured by a number of proxy indicators, as set out in the methodology section below.

### **Security and Justice**

Security' and 'justice' are not terms with universally accepted definitions.

**Security** can be considered from a number of angles including personal security, individual safety, security of assets etc. Security might involve accessing a service (e.g. gender responsive police unit) or it might involve a broader range of interventions to address the causes of women and girls' insecurity (e.g. cultural drivers of insecurity, empowerment etc).

**Justice** similarly can be considered from a number of angles including the provision of punishment, arbitration, restitution, retribution, rehabilitation and/or reconciliation. As such, it is possible that a broad range of DFID programmes may contribute to this target.

**Relevant programmes** which aim to improve women and girls' access to security and access to justice services may include, but are not limited to, programmes designed to:

- improve formal (both civil and criminal) or informal systems of justice – may include work with paralegals and other providers of legal and dispute resolution services.
- provide support to all parts of the criminal justice system including police, prosecutors, courts and prisons – may include increased recruitment of (female) police officers, building capacities for gender-responsive policing and the establishment of gender based violence units within the police.
- support for alternative dispute resolution.
- prevent, manage or resolve conflict and/or crime.
- prevent and respond to violence against women and girls - may include harmful traditional practices such as Female Genital Cutting.
- improve individual and community safety – may include a variety of projects such as the provision of street lighting.
- empower women to claim and enforce their rights - may include land rights, inheritance and dowry-related issues.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• tackle the cultural drivers which prevent women and girls from accessing security and accessing justice services.</li> </ul> <p>Given the breadth of security and justice programming, in-country advisors should contact CHASE (Anne-Kristin Treiber) to discuss the inclusion of their programmes' results in this indicator.</p> <p><b><u>Through DFID Support</u></b></p> <p>Data will be provided by DFID country office advisers working on programmes which aim to improve women and girls' access to security and access to justice services. This indicator is attributable to DFID, so includes only those women and girls who have benefitted from DFID bilateral programming. Where programmes are funded by more than one donor or through multilaterals funded by country offices, country offices will provide a % calculation of proportionate DFID share.</p>
Rationale	This indicator provides data about one area of DFID governance programming, in a field of priority to DFID Ministers.
Country office role	<p>Provision of numbers every six months, following request from Finance and Corporate Performance Division (FCPD).</p> <p>Country office advisers will also check any summary note produced by FCPD to ensure country by country data are accurate.</p>
Data source	Wide variety of sources, depending on country context. Likely to include project monitoring data from implementing agencies, which may include international organisations, NGOs and managing agents, and/or national or local administrative data about target populations (from police, courts, prisons, victim support units, schools and hospitals, government agencies and community-based justice providers). It may be possible that questions on awareness of particular services can be added to existing national surveys, such as the Demographic Health Surveys or other welfare surveys. The data may take a variety of forms including perception surveys, focus groups and other forms of impact measurement.
Reporting Organisation	As above, through DFID advisers.
Data included	As per title of indicator.
Formula / Data calculation	<p><b><u>Methodology Selection</u></b></p> <p>This note sets out four methodologies for calculating the number of beneficiaries of DFID programmes/ interventions which aim to improve access to security and improve access to justice services for women and girls.</p> <p>Country offices should <b>follow methodology 1</b> (see below) for all programmes/ interventions where the data allows and there are no other major barriers to accessing security and justice programming (see <i>Note</i> below).</p> <p>It is recognised, however, that it may not be possible to follow this methodology in every case. In such instances, country offices should consider using the other methodologies outlined below. These methodologies should be selected based on (i) the available data, (ii) the assumptions outlined in the <b>notes</b> section of each methodology and (iii) the scope of the programme.</p> <p>Countries should <b>indicate clearly which methodology they are using</b> in the comments section of the reporting template. Advisers are invited to approach the CHASE policy lead, Anne-Kristin Treiber (<a href="mailto:ak-treiber@dfid.gov.uk">ak-treiber@dfid.gov.uk</a>) or statistics advisor Alex Jones (<a href="#">alex-</a></p>

[jones@dfid.gov.uk](mailto:jones@dfid.gov.uk)) for advice on which methodology is most appropriate given the circumstances of the programme.

### **Methodology 1: Access by Proxy of Awareness of Interventions/ Services**

This method gathers representative data on the awareness of provision of interventions/ services within programme areas. Instruments include project monitoring data, awareness / perception surveys, existing surveys run by national statistics offices and administrative data.

#### **Example indicator:**

% of the target population of women and girls of all ages who are aware they can access free paralegal services in their local municipal courthouse (numerator as number aware, denominator as target population)

***Note.** This is a proxy indicator that assumes the main barrier to accessing justice is a lack of awareness amongst the target population of women and girls. It may not be appropriate where other barriers to accessing justice, such as distance to a service centre, lack of appeal to target population of women and girls, or prevailing cultural norms, exist.*

### **Option 2: Access by Potential Uptake**

#### **Example indicators:**

Estimated % of annual survivors of violence against women and girls who have pursued justice through [DFID sponsored] formal or informal means, multiplied by the total population of women and girls of all ages in each of the geographical regions benefiting from the programme)

Estimated % of women involved in land disputes who used a [DFID sponsored] formal mechanism to assert land rights (multiplied by the total population of women and girls of all ages in each of the geographical regions benefiting from the programme)

***Note.** Not all women and girls will suffer an incident that could be addressed through security and justice services in any given year. This methodology takes use as the 'tip of the iceberg' and projects the total number of beneficiaries that would have used the service had they needed to. This methodology requires some confidence in data around the projected prevalence of incidents involving women and girls that could be addressed through security and justice services in target areas, over and above the numbers of women and girls who actually used the justice service. It may not be appropriate in circumstances where the capacity of programmes could not realistically serve the numbers of beneficiaries claimed.*

### **Methodology 3: Access by Geographical area / Catchment area / Population**

**Option 3a:** Total population of women and girls of all ages living within a reasonable distance (the patrol area of a police station, catchment area of a courthouse, or, as the default recommendation, a radius of one day's travel) around each of the facilities from which the programmes are delivered.

***Note.** This option is to be used if the geographical unit is so large that it is infeasible to assume that women living a great distance away will travel to use the services.*

**Option 3b:** Total population of women and girls of all ages in each of the geographical regions (sub-provincial, provincial, regional, or national) benefiting from the programme.

***Note.** This option is to be used if the programme has wide geographic coverage and all*

	<p>women within a geographic unit can reasonably be expected to be able to reach the delivery centre.</p> <p><b>Note for both.</b> Options 3a and 3b assume that the programme can genuinely provide access to large portions of the population. They should not be used if data for Options 1 or 2 are readily available, or if the limited capacity of programmes means it is unrealistic to claim these numbers of beneficiaries.</p> <p>This is a proxy indicator that assumes the main barrier to accessing justice is the absence of a service centre amongst the target population of women and girls. It may not be appropriate where other barriers to accessing justice, such as distance to a service centre, lack of appeal to target population of women and girls, or prevailing cultural norms, exist.</p> <p><b><u>Methodology 4: Access as Use</u></b></p> <p>Actual number of women and girls of all ages who have used formal or informal justice systems during the year.</p> <p><b>Note.</b> This calculation provides a minimum figure based on the fact that all women and girls who used formal or informal justice systems had access to the systems. It makes no attempt to estimate the number of women that would have used the system had they needed to. It should be used when no data is available for Options 1-3, or when, due to capacity constraints, a programme cannot realistically claim to serve the number of beneficiaries calculated in Options 1-3.</p>
Worked examples	<p><b><u>Methodology 1</u></b></p> <p>A nationally representative survey of women in Jamaica indicated that 43% were aware that they could discuss domestic violence in confidence with a female police officer at their local police station while retaining the final say as to whether to bring charges. This change in reporting domestic violence is the direct result of a DFID supported programme. The result is 43% of the number of women and girls in areas in which the DFID programme is active.</p> <p><b><u>Methodology 2</u></b></p> <p>It is estimated that 1 in 3 women in between ages 15 and 40 in Kenya are forced into sexual intercourse at least once. A survey of the provinces in which DFID is working indicates that 16% of women who were forced into having sexual intercourse sought help either through the police or traditional systems. The result is 16% of 1/3 of the women between ages 15 and 40 in the provinces in which DFID is working.</p> <p><b><u>Methodology 3</u></b></p> <p>Ethiopia plans to roll out its security and justice programme to five zones These zones have a combined population of 3.5 million women and girls of all ages, and everyone will be able to benefit from the improvement in the security and justice services.</p> <p><b><u>Methodology 4</u></b></p> <p>The Malawi DHS reported that 11.1% of women aged 15-49 who experienced physical or sexual violence in 2010 sought help from either the police or traditional systems. To convert this % to a number, it was multiplied by the population projection for the number of women aged 15-49 in 2010 from the national census.</p> <p><b><i>The above list is illustrative only. Please contact Anne-Kristin Treiber (CHASE) for further advice on the inclusion of specific programmes in your country office/ teams contribution to the We Will targets.</i></b></p>
Most recent baseline	N/A – 2011 is first calculation.

Good Performance	Increase shows improvement. Indicator shows whether or not there are more or better quality services for those who may have been excluded in the past, or need them most.
Return format	Number of women and girls with improved access to security and justice services through DFID support per year, disaggregated by sex wherever possible.
Data disaggregation	By sex. Further disaggregation will vary depending on the source used but may also include by region or by age.
Data availability	Data availability will vary depending on the source used. This indicator assumes disaggregation of data that may not always be available.
Time period/ lag	Varies depending on the sources used. At least annually.
Quality assurance measures	Varies depending on the sources and methodologies used.
Data issues	Where interventions/ services are focussed on women and girls it should be relatively simple to collect data. Disaggregating gendered data from interventions/ services provided generically to populations is harder and will need careful thought given inherent biases in how many of these services are currently provided and social barriers to access. The Security and Justice Team in CHASE can provide support on this point.
Additional comments	It is legitimate to include babies and toddlers in the head count, even though their access will be via a guardian.