

Key Objective/Outcome Indicator (KOI)	Definition/Description	Source/Method of Verification
% of beneficiaries reporting that humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable, and participatory manner	<p>1) This indicator is more a process than an outcome indicator; DG ECHO wants to ensure that sufficient attention is given to protection mainstreaming to ensure corrective measures are identified and implemented when required during the action.</p> <p>2) At reporting stage, mention also in the comment section the total number of beneficiaries interviewed.</p> <p>3) Disaggregate the figures (% and absolute numbers) by sex, age and disability.</p> <p>A guidance for the use and reporting on this KOI, and for the related source of verification, is available on the Helpdesk.</p>	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] This indicator will be monitored throughout project implementation (e.g. periodically or after distribution of assistance) as its aim is to identify corrective actions to be taken promptly to improve the quality of programming. DG ECHO has designed a survey tool / method of verification for this indicator, which consists of a questionnaire with a set of questions to be asked to beneficiaries, as well as a methodology to aggregate the data collected and ease the analysis and reporting.
Crude Mortality rate (number of deaths/10.000p/day)	Number of deaths divided by (population at risk x period of time)	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] Survey. Surveillance
Average Coping Strategies Index (CSI) score for the target population	CSI score is to be calculated according to WFP methodology (frequency x weight). The full (not the reduced) CSI should be the main outcome indicator for livelihoods projects and for multi-purpose assistance in combination with relevant sector-specific outcome indicators.	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] Household survey with representative sampling.
% of the target population with acceptable Food Consumption Score (FCS)	<p>FCS measures dietary diversity, energy and macro and micro value of the food consumed at household level.</p> <p>FCS score calculated according to WFP methodology and definition of thresholds.</p> <p>'Acceptable' is generally designated as a score of greater than 35.</p> <p>Should be the outcome indicator for all general Humanitarian Food Assistance projects.</p> <p>The target value should be greater than 80% but may be context specific.</p>	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] EFSA, PDM survey, FCS specific surveys on household level with representative sample.
Severe Acute Malnutrition Recovery rate	Proportion (%) of the total number of discharged [as cured + defaulters + death] across all treatment facilities, over the period of programme which are discharged as cured.	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] Records of treatment facilities
Coverage of the nutrition program	<p>Proportion (%) of the total number of under 5 SAM cases which are adequately admitted in the nutrition program.</p> <p>The coverage survey which provides this data should be referred to as an activity in the SF.</p>	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] Coverage survey such as SQUEAC, SLEAC, S3M.
% of 6-23 months old children in target population who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)	Minimum acceptable diet = Minimum meal frequency + minimum dietary diversity (taking breastmilk into consideration for breastfed children) as defined by WHO	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] KAP surveys, 24h recall assessment, PDM reports, DHS reports
% of target population with adequate WASH services and hygiene practices	<p>Average % of the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % of population considering that their basic WASH needs are met. - % of population with adequate hygiene practices (according to SPHERE standards on appropriate use and regular maintenance of facilities and on hand washing) <p>Provide data for each of these two indicators in the comments field.</p>	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] Focus group discussions, KAP survey, Household surveys with at least 5% statistically accurate representative sample.
Case fatality rate	<p>Proportion (%) of deaths due to given disease of total cases of given disease.</p> <p>Specify the disease(s) taken into account in the comments field.</p>	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] Line listing of disease (outbreak)
% of target population living in safe and dignified shelters in secure settlements	<p>Average of the following two indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % of population considering that their basic shelter needs are met in a timely manner. - % of population considering their settlement to be secure. <p>Provide data for each of these two indicators in comments field.</p>	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] Focus group discussions. Household surveys with at least 5% statistically accurate representative sample.

% of target facilities (PHU, schools, markets) with basic WASH services functioning	<p>Use one or calculate average of the following indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - % of (present) users considering basic WASH services to be functional in the target facilities. - % of facilities implementing an adequate environmental health and hygiene management plan. Users: refers to the direct beneficiaries of the service, such as patients (health centres) or students (schools); not to the staff (i.e., medical, teachers) who bear (most of) the responsibilities for maintaining WASH services. <p>Functional: in terms of quality, quantity, and access.</p> <p>An 'adequate plan' includes practical and efficient measures to mitigate the major environmental and hygiene risks to which patients and staff of the facilities are exposed to and/or represent a risk to the communities they service.</p> <p>This indicator is only relevant if WASH is in support of other sectors (i.e., health; nutrition) rather than stand-alone.</p>	[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified] Perception survey with at least 5% statistically accurate representative sample of population; Facility surveys of all targeted facilities.
% reduction in the number of affected people (experienced, expected or modelled)	<p>In comments box:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) define "affected people" (injured, evacuated, relocated, with houses damaged/ destroyed, deprived of livelihood, crops, etc.) 2) Provide absolute numbers. <p>State if the reduction is experienced, expected, or modelled.</p>	<p>[Adjust as specify as necessary and justified] Administrative records.</p> <p>Modelling report.</p> <p>Survey of affected people/people at risk</p>
Average monthly number of CW/IED related accidents/incidents reported in area of operation	<p>CW = Conventional Weapons (i.e., mine/ERW (Explosive Remnants of War)/SALW (Small Arms & Light Weapons).</p> <p>IED = Improvised Explosive Devices.</p> <p>As baseline use (an estimate of) the number of accidents/incidents over several months before the project start.</p> <p>Provide explanation of major fluctuations of monthly figures (if any) in comments field.</p>	<p>[Adjust as specify as necessary and justified] Secondary data from military, police, UN and NGOs.</p> <p>Key informant interview at medical facilities in area.</p>
% targeted girls and boys who are retained in education at the end of the action	<p>This indicator measures the percentage of children targeted for EiE support who remain in some form of education at the end of the action. Targeted girls and boys are specific to the project (as stated by the partner in the single form). Targeted girls and boys usually include any child who has been supported by the project (including children who were already enrolled at the start of the action and children newly enrolled during the action). Retained means that a child is still enrolled in some form of education (NFE or FE) at the end of the action. Actions that end during school holidays should consider the last academic term as the end point. Targeted students who complete the final grade of secondary school can be counted as still in education. In contexts of active mobility, available data on new arrivals and numbers of children who have left the project area should be provided. Disaggregation of data by sex, NFE type or level of education (primary, lower secondary, upper secondary) and disability to be provided.</p>	<p>[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified]</p> <p>e.g., school registers, household surveys, sample- based enrolment verification surveys (telephone or in person), school monitoring visit report. Enrolment data should be verified to ensure that enrolment data is indicative of actual participation. Where verification is not feasible at school level, alternative methods (e.g., surveys) should be identified. Disaggregation of data by disability type should use the Washington Group 6 Short Set of Questions (or for actions with specialised responses to disabilities use the complete Child Functioning Questionnaire) or equivalent.</p>
% targeted children who transition (1) into formal from NFE, or (2) into the next level of NFE, or (3) into the next academic year of formal education	<p>This indicator measures the percentage of children who transition or advance in their education levels during the action. The partner should state clearly which one or combination of the three options will be reported against. Targeted girls and boys are specific to the project (as stated by the partner in the single form). Transition means the targeted child was registered in one grade (or NFE course) and is then enrolled in the next level (or into FE) at the end of the action. <i>Disaggregation of data by sex, NFE type or level of education (primary, lower secondary, upper secondary) and disability to be provided.</i></p>	<p>[Adjust/specify as necessary and justified]</p> <p>e.g., school registers, household surveys, sample- based enrolment verification surveys (telephone or in person), school monitoring visit report. Enrolment data should be verified to ensure that enrolment data is indicative of actual participation. Where verification is not feasible at school level, alternative methods (e.g., surveys) should be identified. Disaggregation of data by disability type should use the Washington Group 6 Short Set of Questions (or for actions with specialised responses to disabilities use the complete Child Functioning Questionnaire) or equivalent.</p>