

Indicator description	Number of people supported to have choice and control over their own development and to hold decision-makers to account
Version	QUEST Version DATE: 20/06/2014
Version control	Updated 20/06/2014 to reflect presentational changes recommend by Finance and Corporate Performance Division (FCPD)
Type of Indicator	Peak year or cumulative depending on the intervention and measurement at country level
Overview	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.
Technical Definition summary	<p><u>How to count: methods for including programme results into the indicator</u></p> <p>The numbers reported should be attributable to DFID¹. See the general guidance note and example below for how to attribute results.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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. More detail is provided in the Data Calculation Section below.</p> <p><u>How to deal with overlapping programmes</u></p> <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Beneficiaries of program A • Beneficiaries of program B • Total number of individual beneficiaries = C <p>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. More detail is provided in the Data Calculation Section below. There is space in the template to record your assumptions</p> <p><u>The overlap between country programmes and BBC Media Action</u></p> <p>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.</p>

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.

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)
 - 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.
 - 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).
 - 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

Mechanisms for people to have more information and to hold decision makers to account are an important part of the broader theory of change that leads to more

	<p>effective and responsive institutions. This indicator has been chosen because it gives a broad sense of the scale of DFID programming in this important area.</p> <p><u>How to count: methods for including programme results into the indicator</u></p> <p>If a programme is solely funded by DFID, DFID should count all recipients of the programme.</p> <p>If the programme is joint funded (or DFID is supporting a government programme) the number of recipients is calculated as:</p> <p>Number of recipients/beneficiaries attributable to DFID = Total number of recipients/beneficiaries x (DFID expenditure / Total budget)</p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>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 so that it is not interpreted as 2.5 million a year for four years.</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><u>How to deal with overlapping programmes</u></p> <p>It is likely that country offices will contribute to this indicator through several different programs. 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. Possible approaches that you might consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>
--	---

	<p><i>contribution to the indicator would be $5,000 + 19,000 = 24,000$.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>
Data source	<p>There are different possible sources as follows. In the cases where multiple sources maybe available DFID programme data is the preferred source as it most easily attributed to DFID.:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • DFID programme data <p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Survey data <p>In some cases the result of a programme may be measured through survey data (for example in Ethiopia).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Population data <p>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)</p>
Reporting roles	DFID Country Offices select the most relevant data and calculations and submit these to the DFID HQ. The final numbers and calculations are then quality assured by the DFID HQ.
Worked example	See section Data Calculation and Guidance
Baseline data	Measured for the first time in 2011-12. There may be a baseline for a specific country based on the method chosen.
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 if possible, along with a record of workings. In addition, the following should be clearly highlighted: any deviations from the standard methodology described in this note; any specific concerns about the quality of the data; any major risks to achievement of the forecast; and an explanation for any major changes from results or forecasts provided previously.
Data dis-aggregation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By sex if possible (not mandatory) • 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	The majority (60%) of the results are achieved through one global programme where results are measured through representative sample surveys and are available annually. The largest country office programmes measures results through Management Information Systems
Time period / lag	Programmes will tend to map results from the project / annual review cycle to the DRF financial year reporting cycle. This minimises the respondent burden but can introduce a time lag off several months.

Quality assurance measures	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Country Offices assess the quality of the quantitative information and record this in their returns. 2. Regional teams and FCPD perform basic checks for completeness of information 3. Policy Division (GOSAC) perform further checks against previous returns and expectations, then record any issues in a QA log 4. FCPD review the QA log to ensure resolution of issues. <p>The responsibilities are documented in more detail in a checklist.</p>
Interpretation of results	<p>An increased number of people supported at output level would be considered positive progress. A result in excess of the public commitment of 40 million is considered a success.</p>
Summary of data quality	<p>This output level indicator is relevant measuring DFID's public commitment to support 40 million people to hold authorities to account. It gives a broad indication of the reach of DFID empowerment and accountability interventions. The majority (60%) of the results are achieved through one global programme where results are measured through representative sample surveys and expected to be reasonably accurate and timely. The largest country office programmes measures results through Management Information Systems for which the accuracy is less well understood. The indicator offers no external comparability in an area with very few agreed international standards.</p>
Additional comments	
Variations from the standard methodology	<p>DFID Nigeria and DFID Zambia report that they do not follow the standard methodology.</p>