

Indicator description	Number of people with sustainable access to an improved sanitation facility through DFID support
Version	Quest version 2.16 DATE: 18/02/2012
Changes since last version	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarification of the types of shared sanitation facilities which may or may not be counted under the relevant indicators.</li> <li>• Additional numerical worked examples.</li> <li>• Clarification on preferred data sources, the counterfactual, avoiding double counting, sustainability and comparability with JMP indicators.</li> </ul> <p>Note: most of these changes are for clarification and should not greatly affect reporting.</p>
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.
Technical definition / Methodological summary	<p>This result is based upon the ‘number of sanitation facilities constructed’ multiplied by the ‘average number of beneficiaries per sanitation facility’</p> <p>The bilateral results attributable to DFID will be:</p> <p>(1) DFID-supported programmes that directly result in beneficiaries constructing their own facilities, for example Community-Led Total Sanitation (CLTS), Total Sanitation and Sanitation Marketing (TSSM) or other Community Approaches to Total Sanitation (CATS)<sup>i</sup>;</p> <p>(2) Those people who benefit from direct investment in sanitation facilities in the form of construction or rehabilitation of improved<sup>ii</sup> sanitation facilities.</p>

<sup>i</sup> Monitoring should be carried out to verify that improved facilities have in fact been constructed. Facilities constructed under (1) may not meet the JMP definition of ‘improved sanitation’ but should eliminate open defecation.

<sup>ii</sup> **Improved 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.

Facilities constructed under (1) may not meet the Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) definition of 'improved sanitation' but should eliminate open defecation. This is consistent with the sanitation ladder approach adopted under the JMP. Therefore, latrines constructed with DFID support do not need to comply with the JMP definition of an 'improved' latrine in order to be counted towards our results, provided that they contribute towards eliminating open defecation in communities.

The Country Office may choose to disaggregate results into facilities that meet the JMP definition of 'improved' and those that are 'unimproved' according to the JMP but eliminate open defecation. This will generate a more fine-grained picture of DFID's in-country contribution, but this will not affect the results to be reported centrally, which include both categories.

This indicator excludes temporary facilities constructed as part of humanitarian interventions. Permanent facilities constructed under humanitarian programmes may be included.

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 sanitation according to the definitions outlined in this methodology. This may not always be clear cut. 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.

Each individual should be counted only once, even if the same individual benefits from multiple interventions in different years.

	<p>This indicator refers to sustainability. Measuring sustainability is challenging and would require monitoring well beyond the timespan of the DFID Results Framework. It therefore is not possible to require that all interventions are verified as sustainable. However, sustainability should be considered within project design and monitoring.</p> <p>Note that unlike the Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP), this indicator measures access rather than use. In this sense, the indicators are generally aligned with other DFID Results Framework indicators which are pitched at output rather than outcome level. Measuring use and attributing the results to DFID would be challenging and potentially more subjective.</p>
Rationale	<p>Lack of sanitation has negative impacts on child health, nutritional outcomes and education.. Ensuring everyone has access to sanitation is a high priority for the coalition government.</p>
Country Office Role	<p>Country offices should report this on this indicator through the DFID Results Framework data collection system. In reporting on this indicator the country office will take primary responsibility for ensuring adequate baseline data is available and that programmes include suitable indicators and requirements for regular measurement.</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 the DRF teamsite). Use of figures on output level results (access to WASH services) is preferred.</p>
Data source	<p>Provision should be included in projects and programmes for the collection of data on improved access to sanitation directly attributable to the intervention. 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>Data on household size, where needed, should be determined from recent national census data or from a nationally representative household survey.</p> <p>In the case of sector and budget support, output level data (i.e. the number of sanitation facilities constructed) 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 . Sanitation coverage is a key indicator that we would expect to be included in partner countries national statistical record and which would provide the basic data required.</p> <p>The Joint Monitoring Programme of WHO/UNICEF (<a href="http://www.wssinfo.org/">http://www.wssinfo.org/</a>) 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 (but should not be used as a primary source, output level data is preferred).</p> <p>Where we are funding through multilateral partners at a country level, they should be requested to collect WASH specific data to demonstrate results achieved.</p>
Data included	<p>Results are to be recorded from all relevant bilateral programmes including health, education, social development and livelihoods programmes (although not humanitarian programmes unless the facilities constructed are permanent).</p> <p>Where specific support is provided to multilaterals at country level to support sanitation, programmes ("multi-bi"), it should be possible to attribute results to DFID but care will be needed to avoid double-counting with global programmes. If you have questions please contact the Statistics Adviser in the</p>

WASH Policy Team.

WASH results achieved through DFID core funding to multilateral organisations will be considered separately, following an agreed approach across DFID. Only bilateral results (including 'bilateral through a multilateral') should be included in the DRF template.

It is important to avoid double counting of results. If the same people are beneficiaries in multiple years then the results for each year cannot be added together. It is unlikely that this will be the case with providing sanitation facilities but any potential areas of double counting should be considered. However if the number of people able to access sanitation facilities increases over the life of the programme / project the larger number can be used when reporting results.

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 counting. Calculations to avoid this can be complex. Please contact the statistics lead on Water and Sanitation (Watsan) for further advice.

Where facilities are provided within public buildings such as schools or clinics but are not freely accessible to a community, the number of people reached cannot be included in this access indicator as their access is considered partial, in contrast to household access. Data on these kinds of facilities should be collected for project monitoring but should not be included in the DRF template. However, facilities provided within a community which can be accessed freely by that community (e.g. within a market or other shared community area) may be included. Judgement may be required and the WASH team can provide advice if necessary.

Note that this calculation **does not** include a measure of whether the sanitation facilities remain in use after a given period of time, i.e.

	<p>it does not include a measure of the sustainability of the intervention. This data should be collected where possible for project monitoring purposes.</p>
Data calculations	<p>Indicator = <math>s \times b</math></p> <p>where:  s = number of sanitation facilities constructed (if this is not monitored it could be estimated using h (number of households reached by a sanitation campaign (programme data) x r (average ratio of latrines constructed as a result of the campaign (from a sample survey)), see worked example)  b = number of beneficiaries per sanitation facility. This is usually = average number of people per household</p>
Worked example	<p>Where the <u>number of sanitation facilities is monitored directly:</u></p> <p>DFID provides 20% of the cost of a programme that has constructed 5,000 sanitation facilities, with an average number of beneficiaries per sanitation facility of 10.</p> <p>Indicator = <math>0.2 \times 5,000 \times 10 = 10,000</math></p> <p>Or, where the <u>number of beneficiaries of sanitation promotion is monitored only:</u></p> <p>DFID reaches 50,000 households with a sanitation campaign. A survey shows that on average, one latrine is built per 10 households reached through the campaign, generally for private household use. The average household size is 6. DFID provided 50% of the funding.</p> <p>Indicator = <math>50,000 \times 0.1 \times 6 \times 0.5 = 15,000</math></p>
Most recent baseline	<p>Baselines vary by country and 'results achieved between baseline and milestone 1' should be reported in the DRF template in addition to results for 2011/12 onwards where applicable. For projects, baseline data should be collected at the start of the project.</p>
Good Performance	<p>Good performance will be if the project is on track to meet the targets set out in the</p>

	logframe.
Return format	Number of people with sustainable access to an improved sanitation facility through DFID support
Data dis-aggregation	<p>Women and girls are most severely affected by the lack of adequate WASH. At the household level it is expected that all family members would benefit from the provision of the facility and therefore it may not make sense to sex disaggregate.</p> <p>Where there are specific gender impacts or issues (for example, a project aiming to increase access to sanitation for women and girls), data should be disaggregated by sex to the extent possible.</p> <p>Whilst this is not a requirement for DRF reporting, the MDG target indicator disaggregates data according to <b>rural/urban</b> and so this data should be collected wherever possible for the purposes of monitoring. Data should also be disaggregated by age where possible for this purpose.</p>
Data availability	Provision should be included in projects and programmes for the collection of data on improved access to sanitation directly attributable to the intervention. 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.
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 unique people reached with access to sanitation will vary. Please indicate any concerns in this respect on the results template.</p> <p>The JMP of UNICEF/World Health Organisation collates and analyses data on use of water and sanitation facilities from a range of developing countries every 2 years. JMP uses national sources of data and a</p>

	<p>common indicator definition to estimate progress in the sector. This provides an independent assessment of country's own estimates of progress. Please note that this is a complementary, quality assurance measure which may not be directly comparable with DFID's indicators.</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> <p>Latrines constructed with DFID support do not need to comply with the JMP definition of an 'improved' latrine in order to be counted towards our results<sup>iii</sup>. Rather they should comply with country definitions of latrines that provide access to sanitation.</p>
Contact	Laura Westcott

---

<sup>iii</sup> **Improved 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.