

<b>Indicator description</b>	<p><b>Number of countries supported by DFID in freer &amp; fairer elections</b></p> <p>The information from this indicator is also used to provide information for “Number of people who vote in elections supported by DFID” (for which there is no target).</p>
<b>Version</b>	<p>QUEST version 4.15 DATE 26/06/2014          QUEST version 4.13 DATE 12/07/2013          Quest version 4.12 DATE: 05/03/2013          Quest version 4.11 DATE: 14/02/2013</p>
<b>Changes since last version</b>	<p>The 26/06/2014 version reflects formatting and presentational changes recommended by Finance and Corporate Performance Division (FCPD).</p> <p>Changes in the 12/07/2013 version are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To clarify that results not from bilateral programming are being collected but presented in the main statistical tables</li> <li>• To clarify that the separate rounds/run-offs of particular elections should not be counted separately.</li> </ul> <p>Changes in 05/03/2013 version are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reflect decision of Executive Management Committee that in addition to bilateral programming, results from funds for specific programmes or programme elements by other bodies should be included</li> </ul> <p>Changes in 14/02/2013 version have been made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clarify the requirements for defining “freer and fairer”</li> <li>• What country offices should return</li> </ul>
<b>Type of Indicator</b>	<p>Cumulative (number of unique electoral events and unique visits to the polling booth)</p>
<b>Overview</b>	<p>This indicator refers to the total number of electoral events and the total number of people people who vote in elections related to national parliament, presidential, specific referendums or local elections in DFID partner countries.</p> <p>If the following two conditions are both met then country offices should report on this indicator.</p> <p>The first condition is that DFID supports an election in some form (e.g. supporting the updating of a voters registers, police training, observer training, funding observers, support to the election commission). The second condition is that the election is “freer and fairer as defined below.</p>
<b>Technical Definition summary</b>	<p>If the following two conditions are both met then country offices should report on this indicator.</p> <p>The first condition is that DFID supports an election in some form (e.g. supporting the updating of a voters registers, police training, observer training, funding observers, support to the election commission).</p> <p>There is no minimum level of spending required to meet the first condition since this does not necessarily relate to the impact of the intervention. . The support will most commonly be delivered as part of a DFID Country Office programme. However, where DFID has provided funds to another party specifically for a programme or programme element designed to support a freer and fairer</p>

	<p>election (according to the activities above) then those results should also be recorded (and the details of the arrangement reported).</p> <p>Where support is not delivered through a Country Office these results will not be reported in the main statistical tables but elsewhere in the DFID Annual Report.</p> <p>Country offices are required to document the nature of their support. See 'Country office role' for more detail.</p> <p>There are two ways to meet the second condition, which relates to DFID's commitment to "freer and fairer". The second condition is met if the election is assessed by credible (national or international) observer missions as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Credible,</li> <li>• Non-violent and</li> <li>• Reflecting the will of the people</li> </ul> <p>Alternatively, the second condition would also be met if credible observer missions specifically reported that the election was higher quality than the previous election of the same type (in terms of credibility, nonviolence and reflecting the will of the people).<sup>1</sup></p> <p>For operational purposes Country Offices are asked to report all DFID-supported elections together with (links to) their recommendations and evidence on whether the second criterion is met. See 'reporting roles role' for more detail.</p>
<b>Rationale</b>	This indicator gives a sense of scale of reach of DFID's electoral support.
<b>Data calculation and guidance</b>	<p>No. of people who vote in government elections in those countries where DFID is supporting electoral processes (by sex).</p> <p>Aggregation of all voters across all constituencies (or councils etc.).</p> <p>For non-trivial cases – with more than one election day over the SR period - the concept is unique visits to the polling booth.</p> <p>Complexity arises where there is more than one election event over the SR period. <b>The specific concept we are counting is unique electoral events and unique visits to the polling booth.</b> So, for example, the election turn-out for a 2012 election can be added to the turn-out a 2014 election, since these would be unique events.</p> <p>However if local and national elections are staged on the same date, such that citizens can vote in both with a single visit to the polling booth then turn-out for the local and national elections would not be added. Rather, the number of unique people visiting the polling station on the day would be reported.</p> <p>Note that in some cases an electoral event (such as a Presidential Election) may have multiple rounds or run-offs. In this case we report a single electoral event (the one with most voters) and do not count separately each round (even when they held on different days).</p>

<sup>1</sup> Note that election observers do not commonly comment on the direct comparison between a given election and the previous election of the same type.

<b>Data source</b>	<p>When measuring the number of people who voted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Where electoral management body (EMB) reports are cited as viable, by credible observer missions, cite the turnout data provided by the EMB</li> </ul> <p>Otherwise, DFID will rely on next best source. Suggested sources are below, but we recognise that this can vary according to context:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- If electoral management body (EMB) reports are cited as non-viable, by credible observer missions, use turnout estimates provided by the credible observer missions themselves;</li> <li>- If necessary and where available, draw from indicative data that may be available from processes such as exit polling and parallel vote tabulation;</li> <li>- In a worst case scenario, provide estimates from the UK mission</li> </ul> <p>It is possible that data on the total number of voters will be available within days of the election, but verified, sex disaggregated data may take longer.</p>
<b>Reporting roles</b>	<p>Data will be provided by DFID country office Governance Advisers (likely from election commissions/bodies). The country office Results lead may therefore need to liaise with the Governance Advisor.</p> <p>The country office should report results for elections where at least the first condition (DFID support) is met.</p> <p>In any event, QUEST links to the evidence and recommendation on the question of ‘freer and fairer’ should be provided in the ‘Provide workings’ field.</p> <p>This additional information can be most easily recorded in the template provided at the <a href="#">DRF Teamsite</a>.</p> <p>The policy lead in Governance Open Societies and Anti-Corruption Department (GOSAC) will peer review the evidence and recommendation on “freer and fairer”.</p> <p>Quality assurance roles will be as detailed below</p>
<b>Worked examples</b>	<p>In country A general and local elections are held on the same day. Each of 3m voter receives two ballot papers at the polling station. The result we are counting is the 3m people supported on the day, not the 6m votes cast.</p> <p>In country B there is a general election in 2012 (turnout 2m) and again in 2014 (turnout 3m). DFID support both. The result we report is 5m unique trips to the polling station that we have supported (although some of these trips might have been made by the same person on different occasions).</p>
<b>Baseline data</b>	<p>N/A – 2011-12 is first calculation.</p>
<b>Return format</b>	<p><b>Number. of people who vote in elections supported by DFID</b> for each relevant year, disaggregated by sex where possible</p>
<b>Data dis-aggregation</b>	<p>Sex disaggregated results should be reported where these are available but are not mandatory</p>
<b>Data availability</b>	<p>After each election, numbers of those who voted are typically available from partner country National Election Commissions. To note, National Assembly elections are normally held every few years, typically every 4 or 5 years, according to a country’s constitution. Local elections or referenda may be held at different times.</p>
<b>Time period/lag</b>	<p>Varies depending on the source/ used (see “data source”). Note that often official data may not be available, depending on context. It has so far been</p>

	possible to report the elections for each financial year in the corresponding DFID Annual Report.
<b>Quality assurance measures</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <b>Country Offices</b> assess the quality of the <b>quantitative</b> information (turnout) and record this in their returns. They also assess the <b>‘freer and fairer’</b> criterion and record the supporting evidence for this in an agreed pro forma.</li> <li>2. <b>Policy Division</b> (GOSAC) assure the pro forma (to ensure sufficient evidence is provided) and assure that expected results appear in the reporting template, then record any issues in a QA log</li> <li>3. FCPD review the QA log to ensure resolution of issues.</li> </ol> <p>The responsibilities are documented in more detail in a <a href="#">checklist</a>.</p>
<b>Interpretation of results</b>	Different countries hold different elections in different years. An increase or decrease in annual reporting figures is no reflection on DFID performance.
<b>Data quality</b>	These indicators are considered to be of <b>relevance</b> for measuring our public commitment to support freer and fairer elections in 13 countries. They are used for broad communication purposes rather than policy design. The number of people who vote in DFID-supported elections is considered to be very <b>accurate</b> and there are no concerns in terms of <b>cost, confidentiality</b> or <b>timeliness</b> .
<b>Additional comments</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This indicator is not – and cannot be - fully attributable to DFID but gives a sense of impact of one area of governance support activity undertaken by DFID.</li> <li>• Note that annual figures will vary according to how many DFID partner countries are holding elections in any given year.</li> <li>• Given variability of data availability by country, reportees should state whether data are from official partner government figures or a DFID estimate.</li> <li>• Country offices must ensure that no duplication of voters is made, i.e. that where we have supported one person to make one trip a polling station, they are not counted twice because they receive two ballot papers</li> </ul>
Variations from the standard methodology	There were no reported variations from the standard methodology from the 11 countries reporting against this indicator by 2013-14.