Indicator description	**Number of people with sustainable access to clean drinking water sources 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.
Technical definition / Methodological summary	The bilateral results attributable to DFID will be those from direct investment in improved drinking water sources. The results are based on the 'number of water points built or rehabilitated' multiplied by the 'number of beneficiaries per water point'. An 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. This indicator <u>excludes</u> temporary facilities constructed as part of humanitarian interventions and other temporary means of water provision (e.g. bottles). Permanent facilities constructed under humanitarian programmes <u>should</u> 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 clean drinking 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. This may not always be clear-cut. In the case of providing access to safe drinking water in urban areas, for example, individuals reached with the intervention may already have had some access to clean water but this access is now improved (and is now

	available perhaps for longer periods of time, at a smaller distance or as a protected source). 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. 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. 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.
Rationale	Lack of water supply has negative impacts on poverty reduction, gender equity, child health, and education. Ensuring everyone has access to safe water supply is a high priority for the coalition government.
Country Office Role	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. 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.
Data source	Provision should be included in projects and programmes for the collection of data on improved access to water directly attributable to the intervention. 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. Data on household size, where needed, should be determined from recent national census data or from a nationally representative household survey. In the case of sector and budget support, output level data (i.e. the number of water points built/rehabilitated) 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 . Water 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. 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 (but should not be used as a primary source, output level data is preferred). Where we are funding through multilateral partners at a country level, they should be requested to collect WASH specific data to

	demonstrate results achieved.
Data included	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). Where specific support is provided to multilaterals at country level to support water, 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 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 clean water facilities but any potential areas of double counting should be considered. However if the number of people able to access water points increases over the life of the programme / project the larger number can be used when reporting results. Where countries are supporting clean water 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 WASH 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 all members of that community (e.g. a shared, protected spring) 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 water sources remain in use after a given period of time, i.e. it does not include a measure of the sustainability of the intervention. This data should be collected where possible for project monitoring purposes
Data calculations	Indicator = (c+r) x b where: c = number of water points constructed r = number of water points rehabilitated b = number of beneficiaries per water point A common example of b is where b = n x h n = average number of households served by each water point h = average number of people per household[1]. In many cases, multipliers 'b' for a variety of interventions will have been developed in each country. For example, the value of b will differ for different types of water point constructed and in different locations.
Worked example	DFID provides 10% of the cost of a programme that has constructed 4,000 improved water sources and rehabilitated 1,000 water sources. Data shows that each serves an average of 50 households of average size 6 people. Indicator = 0.1 x (4,000 + 1,000) x 50 x 6 = 150,000

[1] Figures for average household size will be available from the latest census or (nationally representative) household survey. The average household size may differ between urban and rural.

Most recent baseline	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.
Good Performance	Good performance will be if the project is on track to meet the target set out in the logframe.
Return format	Number of people with sustainable access to clean drinking water sources through DFID support
Data dis-aggregation	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. Where there are specific gender impacts or issues (for example, a project aiming to increase access for women and girls), data should be disaggregated by sex to the extent possible. Whilst this is not a requirement for DRF reporting, the MDG target indicator disaggregates data according to **rural/urban** 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.
Data availability	Provision should be included in projects and programmes for the collection of data on improved access to water 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	It is recognised that the quality of data available to estimate the number of unique

	people reached with access to clean drinking water as defined in this note will vary. Please indicate any concerns in this respect in the results template. 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 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.
Data issues	It is important to note that DFID's methodology is consistent with the approach used by national government and multilateral organisations but is different to the JMP methodology that measures the number of people using improved sources of water. The JMP methodology includes people who gain access through self-supply but does not include people who live near an improved source but are excluded from using it for social, economic or other reasons.