

## Departmental Strategic Objectives – Technical Annex (May 2010)

Departmental Strategic Objectives (DSOs) were established under the Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) 2007. There are 7 DSOs underpinned by a number of indicators, 32 in total.

### General notes on data quality:

- 1 **Data availability.** Despite efforts to secure up-to-date and reliable data for the DSO indicators, it is important to note that there are some limitations to the data available for reviewing progress.
  - Substantial lags in the data used for assessing progress against some indicators mean that the latest available information still predates the current assessment period and may, therefore, not reflect more recent events, for example, changes in global economic climate;
  - Where data are available, new figures may not be produced every year, so there may be gaps in time series or no change in the assessment compared with the previous period;
  - Where figures are produced every year, these may be based on data for an earlier period;
  - New data becoming available can lead to revisions on the data series for previous years, which means that some of the baselines set out at the start of the spending review period may change.
- 2 **Attribution.** DFID is not the only development organisation working with developing countries and internationally with the International Finance Institutions and others. Therefore, where progress is evident in achieving development outcomes at country level or internationally it is generally not possible to attribute this to DFID alone. Likewise where progress may have halted or reversed this could be the results of events and actions that are beyond the influence of DFID.
- 3 **External data sources.** A number of the indicators rely on data from external sources. In doing so, DFID relies on the quality assurance processes of the external organisations providing the data. However, for some indicators DFID also draws on its specialist teams to carry out quality reviews of the data. There are particular issues with some of the indicators that are based on the Paris Declaration surveys where there have been some methodological problems. These reflect changes in the weighting used to calculate 2006 and 2008 indicators which made targets for DFID more challenging; inconsistencies in data provided by donors and government where at times there was poor data capture and non-reflection of DFID funds that are channelled to government through other donors. The OECD-DAC is strengthening the methodology of the Paris Declaration survey due in 2011 to address these issues.
- 4 DFID is working at the country and international level to improve the availability, quality and use of data. This is underpinned by the Results Action Plan. Key priority actions have been identified that aim to ensure availability of better quality statistics and information, a stronger commitment to evidence-based policy making and robust systems for monitoring and evaluation. It also looks to strengthen the demand for evidence of results, by improving the systems which hold governments and donors to account.

Updated for 2009-10 reporting.

## DSO1: Promote good governance, economic growth, trade and access to basic services

DSO Indicator 1.1	Governance (improved state capability, accountability and responsiveness)	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Average CPIA Public Sector Management and Institutions	Aggregate Indicator Score on Voice and Accountability
Data provider	World Bank	World Bank Institute
Data set used	CPIA Average of Public Sector Management and Institutions (CPIA Cluster D)	Voice and Accountability Aggregate Indicator
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<a href="http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA">http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTABOUTUS/IDA</a>	<a href="http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/">http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/</a>
Baseline data value	3.1	-0.80
Reference period for baseline	2005	2005
Target data value	Improvement in average CPIA Cluster D	Improvement in Voice and Accountability score
Reference period for target	2010	2010

Milestone 2008/09		
Milestone 2009/10		
Additional Comments		

DSO Indicator 1.2	Improved support for economic growth	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Per capita GDP growth rates in Africa	Per capita GDP growth rates in Developing Asia
Data provider	IMF and UN	IMF and UN
Data set used	IMF World Economic Outlook and UN Population Figures: Real GDP Growth was obtained from the IMF and then population growth figures were subtracted from the Real GDP Growth to get real GDP per capita	IMF World Economic Outlook and UN Population Figures: Real GDP Growth was obtained from the IMF and then population growth figures were subtracted from the Real GDP Growth to get real GDP per capita
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<a href="#">IMF Publications Page</a>	<a href="#">IMF Publications Page</a>
Baseline data value	N/A	N/A
Reference period for baseline	2007	2007
Target data value	4%	7%
Reference period for target	2010	2010

Milestone 2008/09	4%	7%
Milestone 2009/10	4%	7%
Additional Comments		

<b>DSO Indicator 1.3</b>	<b>Increased participation in global trade by developing countries</b>
	Success measure:
Description	The change in value (expressed in U.S. dollars at current prices) of all import and exports of goods (excluding arms and oil) from least developed countries and low income countries as a proportion of world trade. *
Data provider	United Nations, World Bank, IMF
Data set used	Comtrade (UNSD-UNCTAD through WITS database access if available); or Direction of Trade Statistics (IMF); or UNCTAD Handbook of trade statistics available at: <a href="http://stats.unctad.org/Handbook/">http://stats.unctad.org/Handbook/</a>  The figure used for total share of world imports for LICs* and LDCs* is adjusted to deduct the value of fuels but not arms as specified in the target. This is because the trade data used largely excludes the value of arms and defence equipment. Hence DFID believes that not deducting arms/defence trade has an immaterial value in relation to the total value of trade and will, therefore, not have an impact on the overall proportions.
Link to external data source (if applicable)	
Baseline data value	0.645% (LDC); 11.79% (LICs)
Reference period for baseline	2006
Target data value	0.684% (LDC); 14.17% (LICs)
Reference period for target	2009

Milestone 2008/09	0.684% (LDC); 14.17% (LICs)
Milestone 2009/10	0.686% (LDC); 14.90% (LICs)
Additional Comments	* The classification of aid recipients countries by income groups is based on GNI per capita figures in 2004 according to the thresholds set out below. These are updated regularly by the World Bank but the 2004 income groups are used for reporting against the 2008-11 PSA. The threshold for <b>Low Income Countries (LIC)</b> is GNI per capita in 2004 of below \$825 and includes: <b>Least Developed Countries (LDC):</b> Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cape Verde, Central African Rep., Chad, Comoros, Congo, Dem. Rep., Djibouti, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Kiribati, Laos, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Niger, Rwanda, Samoa, Sao Tome & Principe, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sudan, Tanzania, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tuvalu, Uganda, Vanuatu, Yemen, Zambia; <b>Other Low Income countries:</b> Cameroon, Congo, Rep, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, India, Kenya, Korea, Dem.Rep. Kyrgyz Rep., Moldova, Mongolia, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Tajikistan, Uzbekistan, Vietnam, Zimbabwe.

<b>DSO Indicator 1.4</b>	<b>Delivery of the white paper commitments on public services</b>	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Primary completion rate in PSA countries	percentage of births attended by a skilled professional in PSA countries
Data provider	UNSD MDG monitoring database	UNSD MDG monitoring database
Data set used	Primary education completion rates	Percentage of births attended by skilled health personnel
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value	10 countries off track	6 countries off track
Reference period for baseline	2007	2007
Target data value	Half the number of off track countries	Half the number of off track countries
Reference period for target	2010	2010

Milestone 2008/09	9 off track	5 off track
Milestone 2009/10	7 off track	4 off track
Additional Comments	Direction of travel thresholds used for the PSA indicators are not applied to these measures.	Direction of travel thresholds used for the PSA indicators are not applied to these measures.

	Success measure	Success measure	Success measure
Description	percentage of most-at-risk populations reached with HIV prevention programmes	percentage of people with access to safe drinking water in PSA countries	percentage of people with access to basic sanitation in PSA countries
Data provider	UNAIDS	WHO/UNICEF/Joint Monitoring Programme	WHO/UNICEF
Data set used	UNGASS surveillance or other special surveys	UNSD	UNSD
Link to external data source (if applicable)		-	-
Baseline data value	tbc	13 countries off track	18 countries off track
Reference period for baseline	2007	2007	2007
Target data value	tbc	Half the number of off track countries	Half the number of off track countries
Reference period for target		2010	2010

Milestone 2008/09		11 off track	15 off track
Milestone 2009/10		9 off track	12 off track
Additional Comments	Direction of travel thresholds used for the PSA indicators are not applied to these measures.	Direction of travel thresholds used for the PSA indicators are not applied to these measures.	Direction of travel thresholds used for the PSA indicators are not applied to these measures.

<b>DSO Indicator 1.5</b>	<b>Increased access by women and girls to economic opportunities, public services and decision making</b>		
	Success Measure		
Description	Gender-related Development Index		
Data provider	UNDP		
Data set used	Gender-related Development Index (GDI)		
Link to external data source (if applicable)			
Baseline data value	See above		
Reference period for baseline	2007/8		
Target data value	By the end of the PSA period, 75% of PSA countries show an improvement in their GDI.		
Reference period for target	2011		

Milestone 2008/09	25% of PSA countries improve their GDI score against the baseline
Milestone 2009/10	50% of PSA countries improve their GDI score against the baseline
Additional Comments	Following review NAO suggested using Gender Empowerment Measure (GEM) as this includes aspects of empowering women and girls through decision making and would therefore be a more appropriate measure for this indicator. However, GEM data are not available for many PSA countries. The current measure, GDI, is based on the Human Development Index which does not provide an accurate measure of performance against the objective - a high GDI score could be due to the country having a high HDI not necessarily greater levels of gender equality. We are working on identifying an alternative and more robust measure for this indicator.

## DSO 2: Promote climate change mitigation and adaptation measures and ensure environmental sustainability

DSO Indicator 2.1	Policies and programmatic approaches developed for effective climate change mitigation and adaptation measures in developing countries, along with coherent international support for both	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Countries have integrated climate change into their plans and budgets. At least five countries are implementing programmes for low carbon development, and at least five countries are implementing strategies for climate resilient development, including with support through the Climate Investment Funds	An increase in multilateral financing, and leveraging of funds from private sector, for climate change mitigation and adaptation in developing countries
Data provider	World Bank, regional development banks, CIFs Admin Unit, UNFCCC, DFID reporting and countries' own plans	World Bank, Regional Development Banks, UNFCCC and DFID reporting.
Data set used	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Scaling-up Renewable Energy Programme (SREP) reporting on national investment plans</li> <li>2) Forest Investment Programme (FIP) reporting on national investment strategies</li> <li>3) Clean Technology Fund (CTF) reporting on national investment plans</li> <li>4) Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience (PPCR) reporting on national strategic programmes for climate resilience</li> <li>5) UNFCCC Communications</li> <li>6) DFID reporting on national low carbon and/or climate resilient plans</li> <li>7) Energy Sector Management Assistance Program (ESMAP) Low Carbon Growth Country Studies</li> <li>8) Regional Economics of Climate Change Studies</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Annual reporting on the CIFs</li> <li>2) CIF leveraging</li> <li>3) Annual reporting on the UNFCCC Special Funds (Global Environment Facility Trust Fund, Least Developed Countries Fund, Special Climate Change Fund)</li> <li>4) GEF leveraging</li> <li>5) DFID funding for the CIFs</li> <li>6) DFID funding for the GEF</li> </ol>
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<a href="http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/">http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/</a> <a href="http://unfccc.int/national_reports/items/1408.php">http://unfccc.int/national_reports/items/1408.php</a> <a href="http://www.esmap.org">www.esmap.org</a>	<a href="http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/">http://www.climateinvestmentfunds.org/cif/</a> <a href="http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/financial_flows.pdf">http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/publications/financial_flows.pdf</a> <a href="http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/summit/2008/doc/pdf/0708_07_en.pdf">http://www.mofa.go.jp/policy/economy/summit/2008/doc/pdf/0708_07_en.pdf</a>
Baseline data value	No countries have clean technology or low carbon or climate resilient plans for support under the CIFs. Developing countries have emerging strategies for transition towards clean energy development. Proposed baseline is IEA 2006 reference scenario (projected to 2030). No low income countries have climate adaptation policies and plans, including disaster risk reduction, integrated into planning and budgeting, and being effectively implemented. Performance on dealing with economic, social and physical shocks and stresses associated with climate variability poor.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CIFs established in 2008. No baseline data.</li> <li>2. CIFs established in 2008. No baseline data.</li> <li>3. As of July 2007 the GEF had allocated (since its inception) a total of just over \$3.3 billion to climate change projects from the GEF Trust Fund.</li> <li>4) Further co-financing in excess of \$14 billion has been leveraged for the above GEF projects, or \$4.2 per dollar of GEF grant.</li> <li>5. DFID committed £100 million to the CIFs in 2008-9 (jointly with DECC – no data for 2007 as CIFs established in 2008).</li> <li>6. The UK has committed £433m to the GEF to date and is the fourth largest donor to the facility.</li> </ol>
Reference period for baseline		
Target data value	<p>At least five developing countries are implementing programmes for transition towards low carbon development, including with support from SREP and the Forest Investment Programme.</p> <p>At least five low income countries have effective climate adaptation policies and plans integrated into planning and budgeting, and being effectively implemented, including with support from the Pilot Programme for Climate Resilience.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CIFs spend £200 million in 2009/10.</li> <li>2. CIF funding reaches \$3 billion plus \$27 billion in co-financing</li> <li>3. GEF spends US\$2.55 billion on Climate Change projects up to November 2009 and since the start of the GEF Trust Fund (all four replenishment periods).</li> <li>4. GEF leverages approximately US\$ 6.05 billion in co-financing.</li> <li>5. DFID commits £200 million to the CIFs, and £800 million in total to the ETF by 2010/11 (jointly with DECC).</li> <li>6. DFID commits £210 million to the GEF for GEF 5 (an increase of almost 54% on GEF 4).</li> </ol>
Reference period for target		

Milestone 2008/09	5 countries developing climate resilient plans and budgets and 5 countries developing clean technology plans for support through the CIFs.	CIFs launched, with £800 million from the UK's Environmental Transformation Fund International Window. EU position on future financing agreed.
Milestone 2009/10	Countries receiving financial support to implement plans: at least 5 countries for climate resilient plans and at least 5 countries for low carbon development plans	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. CIFs spend £200 million in 2009/10.</li> <li>2. CIF funding reaches \$3 billion plus \$27 billion in co-financing</li> <li>3. GEF spends US\$2.55 billion on Climate Change projects up to November 2009 and since the start of the GEF Trust Fund (all four replenishment periods).</li> <li>4. GEF leverages approximately US\$ 6.05 billion in co-financing.</li> <li>5. DFID commits £200 million to the CIFs, and £800 million in total to the ETF by 2010/11 (jointly with DECC).</li> <li>6. DFID commits £210 million to the GEF for GEF 5 (an increase of almost 54% on GEF 4)</li> </ol>
Additional Comments	<p>CIFs funding is available to all ODA-eligible countries (<a href="http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/32/40/43540882.pdf">http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/32/40/43540882.pdf</a> - currently 152 countries) with an active multilateral development bank programme (i.e. where an MDB has a lending programme and/or ongoing policy dialogue with the country). This means that over 100 countries are eligible.</p> <p>The ESMAP Low Carbon Growth Country Studies covered Brazil, China, India, Indonesia, Mexico, and South Africa.</p> <p>The Regional Economics of Climate Change studies cover Brazil, Mexico, Central America, South America, Caribbean, South East Asia, China, South Korea, North East Asia, South Asia, Pacific Island states, Poland and East</p>	<p>MDB climate spend is self-reported by the MDBs, and is not audited. There is an inherent difficulty in separating climate change spend from development spend which all donors are currently addressing. It is therefore difficult to be certain that the figures reported by the MDBs on their spend are exact and they are reported as estimates rather than audited figures.</p> <p>CIFs leverage is calculated from various sources of data. The data source for the value of the CTF investment is the national plans that are published on the internet; these provide projected ('notional') leverage ratios. <u>The MDBs' Project Appraisal Documents provide 'planned' leverage information. Implementation status reports will provide annual updates on the CIFs portfolio, providing a blend of planned and actual leverage figures.</u> From the Autumn Performance Report 2010, a further data source will be the annual audited accounts for the CIFs. These will provide actual expenditure under the CIFs and 'planned' leverage figures for other institutions and the private sector. The value of the total investment is also taken from the national investment plans and in future will also be taken from the audited accounts.</p>

<b>DSO Indicator 2.2</b>	<b>Environmental sustainability integrated into programmes</b>
	Success measure
Description	Strengthened support to developing countries to achieve MDG 7 (environmental sustainability), including impacts of climate change reflected in country programmes, (baseline) and promote principles of environmental sustainability, in relation to our work economic growth, livelihoods and resilience to climate change.
Data provider	DFID reporting, World Bank, UNDP, UNEP, UNPEI, Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
Data set used	DFID country programme assessments, UNDP2006 report - Making Progress on Environmental Sustainability
Link to external data source (if applicable)	
Baseline data value	<p>Of 158 countries reviewed, 85 (54 percent) have set at least one country-specific environmental target for achieving MDG 7. Each of the 85 countries with tailored targets has developed an average of three country specific targets, although not all of these are quantifiable or time-bound, and thus may not be verifiable. While all countries report on at least one global environmental indicator, MDG 7 reporting overall is weak. Only eight of the 158 countries report on all global indicators. Indicators related to water and forests have the highest rates of reporting, 138 countries and 133 countries, respectively. Well over half of the countries use the indicators on protected areas for biodiversity (124 countries), access to sanitation (116 countries) and carbon dioxide and ozone-depleting substance emissions (98 countries). However, only 72 countries report on energy use, 48 countries use the solid fuels indicator and only 47 countries provide data on slums.</p> <p>Environmental issues are not highly integrated into the MDG country reports outside of MDG 7 specifically. When environmental issues are discussed in the context of the other goals, the causal link between poverty and the environment is not well articulated nor is a response system developed. Reporting on MDG 7 progress appears to be hampered by either an actual or a perceived lack of data. The extent of tailoring and monitoring MDG 7 differs significantly by region and is often linked to varying national priorities and needs. More countries in Africa and the Arab States, which face significant water scarcity, have tailored Target 10 (water and sanitation) compared to Target 9 (environmental sustainability), whereas all the other regions have more countries tailoring Target 9. For Target 11 (slums), Africa has significantly more countries that tailored this target compared to other regions.</p>
Reference period for baseline	Oct-06
Target data value	
Reference period for target	
Milestone 2008/09	Review of DFID Environmental Assessment Screening: Review of UNEP/UNDP Poverty and Environment Initiative: UNEP Pow and Budget: PMs IIR to reflect IEG
Milestone 2009/10	
Additional Comments	Further to the recommendations of the National Audit Office report, we will be reviewing our monitoring and reporting process on environmental sustainability to ensure clear and measurable methodologies are in place. For example, future data sets could include: World Bank statistics on the number of countries reporting on national adjusted savings; the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organisation's Global Forest Resources assessment, measuring forest cover; and DFID's own portfolio description review work, which now allows a detailed analysis of spend in this sector.

### DSO 3: Respond effectively to conflict and humanitarian crises and support peace in order to reduce poverty

DSO Indicator 3.1	Improved capacity of the international system to prevent conflict, respond early to crises and build peace	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Increase in UNDP programmes to strengthen national and local capacities to prevent and recover from conflict.	More effective international support for conflict-affected countries during the immediate post-conflict early recovery phase.
Data provider	UN	HMG, UN, World Bank..
Data set used	UNDP Strategic Plan Reports, UNDP Country Programme Documents, DFID Project Completion Report for support to UNDP's Bureau for Crisis Prevention and Recovery.	HMG reporting, International Conference and meeting reports, UN Secretary-General Report on Stabilisation and Early Recovery, UNDP Crisis Prevention and Recovery reports, MDTF reporting, WB reporting.
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value	<p>UNDP Strategic Plan reporting on Goal 3, Outcome 3: 13 programmes in 2008 aimed at strengthening national capacities, with participation of women, to prevent, mitigate and cope with impact of violent conflict (<a href="http://www.undp.org/execution/word/dp09-11_Annexes.doc">http://www.undp.org/execution/word/dp09-11_Annexes.doc</a>)</p> <p>50 percent of countries deemed at risk of conflict are receiving support from UNDP on conflict prevention strategies and processes, including conflict analysis.</p>	Gaps in international support for early peacebuilding and recovery as identified by the report "Recovering from War" (1 July 2008) by New York University's Centre on International Cooperation ( <a href="http://www.cic.nyu.edu/peacebuilding/docs/earlyrecoveryfinal.pdf">http://www.cic.nyu.edu/peacebuilding/docs/earlyrecoveryfinal.pdf</a> ) and in the Presidential Statement following the UN Security Council debate on peacebuilding on 20 May 2008 ( <a href="http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N08/348/63/PDF/N0834863.pdf?OpenElement">http://daccessdds.un.org/doc/UNDOC/GEN/N08/348/63/PDF/N0834863.pdf?OpenElement</a> ).
Reference period for baseline	UNDP Institutional Strategy and Performance Framework 2008-11	2008
Target data value		Report on the implementation of recommendations of UN Secretary-General's report on Peacebuilding in the Immediate Aftermath of Conflict set out progress on strengthened capacity of UN leadership, clarity on roles and responsibilities, faster and more flexible financing.,
Reference period for target	2008-11	2008-11

Milestone 2008/09	Early Recovery Policy incorporating DRR, finalised and rolled out; Full SURGE capacity established; UNDP allocates sufficient human resources to effectively contribute to relevant system-wide coherence processes; Fiduciary Principles Accord agreed with the World Bank.	By end 2008, broad international support for PM initiative to improve international support for stabilisation and early recovery including: better international leadership/strategy, increased civilian capacity, and faster and more flexible funding; OECD DAC working group on financing for early recovery established; two early recovery focus countries identified and progress made towards addressing the early recovery gaps in these countries; UN-World Bank agreement on Fiduciary Principles Accord.
-------------------	--	---

Milestone 2009/10	<p>10 additional cases of new or strengthened policies/ mechanisms, or institutional capacities, in place at the country level</p> <p>Specific new cases of strengthened coordinated response in at least 3 countries</p>	<p>International agreement on changes to donor practices to address the early recovery gaps; Ambitious UN Secretary General's Report (May 2009); UN and World Bank commits to a number of specific reforms within an agreed timeframe in order to improve integrated planning practices; country level leadership; the speed, flexibility and predictability of MDTF funding; and mechanisms for timely deployment of the right calibre staff to the field; the General Assembly approves revisions to the Peacebuilding Fund's terms of reference to make it better suited to support recovery. UN leadership strengthened in a number of post conflict countries (2 focus countries plus x more) through DOCO.</p>
Additional Comments	<p>Support was provided to (in some of them in collaboration with the Framework Team and as part of the UNDP/DPA Joint Programme on Strengthening National Capacities for Conflict Prevention):</p> <p>Ethiopia, Lesotho, Yemen, Thailand, Mauritania, Ukraine, Fiji, Kenya, Nepal, Comoros, Malawi, Zimbabwe, Haiti, Guyana, Colombia, Ecuador, Peru, Ghana, Sierra Leone, Nigeria, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Cyprus, Georgia, Armenia, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Sudan, Maldives, Papua-New Guinea, Occupied Palestinian Territories, Lebanon, Sri Lanka, Jordan, Chile, Madagascar, Cameroon.</p>	

	Success measure
Description	Continental Early Warning System triggering Africa Union Peace & Security Council to task the Panel of the Wise or Africa Standby Force at least once (exercise or reality) by 2011.
Data provider	AU
Data set used	Africa Union Reporting; HMG reporting
Link to external data source (if applicable)	
Baseline data value	Peace & Security Council operational; Panel of the Wise named but not operational; Continental Early Warning System in progress.
Reference period for baseline	Africa Peace and Security Architecture: 2006.
Target data value	Continental Early Warning System triggering Africa Union Peace & Security Council to task the Panel of the Wise or Africa Standby Force at least once (exercise or reality) by 2011.
Reference period for target	2008-11

Milestone 2008/09	At least one AU mediation implemented; continental Early Warning System reporting; EASBRIG command level exercise realised.
Milestone 2009/10	Africa Union military exercise (RECAMP) uses Continental Early Warning System; Peace & Security Council and Panel of the Wise.
Additional Comments	

DSO Indicator 3.2		Effective implementation of DFID security and development policy in priority countries
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	New Country Assistance Plans (CAPs) for the 10 Security & Development (S&D) countries include analysis of S&D challenges, including small arms and radicalisation.	Increased DFID spend on programmes that improve security and access to justice for the poor in S&D countries.
Data provider	DFID	DFID
Data set used	CHASE monitoring of policy implementation	CHASE monitoring of policy implementation
Link to external data source (if applicable)	Internal reference: Quest Document 1540511	Internal reference: Quest Document 1540511
Baseline data value		£35 million
Reference period for baseline	2007	2007
Target data value	10 CAPs	25% increase
Reference period for target	2011	2011

Milestone 2008/09	6 CAPs	15%
Milestone 2009/10	8 CAPs	20%
Additional Comments		

DSO Indicator 3.3		Effective DFID response to prioritised humanitarian crises
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Effective DFID response to all quick onset humanitarian crises.	Approximately 10% further funding for Disaster Risk Reduction after humanitarian crises to which DFID has provided a response of over 500,000.
Data provider	CHASE, DFID Evaluation Department	DFID country offices
Data set used	CHASE and Evaluation Department evaluations of DFID humanitarian response to crises.	Project documents, including DFID annual reviews.
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value		0%
Reference period for baseline	2006	2007
Target data value		100%
Reference period for target		

Milestone 2008/09		Assessment mission makes initial recommendations on DRR within three months of disaster.  Where practicable, initial funds allocated within six months.
Milestone 2009/10		Assessment mission makes initial recommendations on DRR within three months of disaster.  Where practicable, initial funds allocated within six months.
Additional Comments		

<b>DSO Indicator 3.4</b>	<b>Improved international system for humanitarian assistance</b>	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Increased percentage of global humanitarian financing committed through pooled funding mechanisms	Effective DRR policies and strategies in place in at least 10 priority countries
Data provider	Development Initiatives	International Strategy for Disaster Reduction (OCHA), World Bank, UNDP, DFID country offices
Data set used	Global Humanitarian Assistance	DFID annual reviews of support to ISDR, World Bank and UNDP
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value	8%	10%
Reference period for baseline	2007	2007
Target data value	12%	100 per cent
Reference period for target		

Milestone 2008/09	9%	Clear progress in at least 3 countries
Milestone 2009/10	11%	Clear progress in at least 3 additional countries
Additional Comments		

<b>DSO Indicator 3.5</b>	<b>Enhanced HMG coherence of assessment, planning and implementation of conflict prevention and stabilisation</b>	
	Success Measure	
Description	Increased use of joint analysis and jointly developed and agreed strategies, planning and programming across key Whitehall departments.	
Data provider	Cabinet Office, FCO, MOD, DFID	
Data set used	Reports / reviews from CPP and of country specific HMG plans/strategies (e.g. of UK Afghanistan Strategy and Helmand Plan, Better Basra Action Plan). SU Stakeholder surveys. PSA Review, reports and data.	
Link to external data source (if applicable)	N/A	
Baseline data value	Zero based reviews and the PSA review should provide a baseline	
Reference period for baseline	N/A	
Target data value	To be determined based on the PSA review.	
Reference period for target	2008-2011	

Milestone 2008/09	
Milestone 2009/10	
Additional Comments	

## DSO 4: Develop a global partnership for development (beyond aid)

DSO Indicator 4.1	High quality research and evidence based policies for achieving the MDGs.	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	1. Increased number of users of CRD Research from R4D (DFID's Research Portal) – (a) increase in number of hits; (b) increase in number of registrations for e-mail alerts and RSS feeds.	High quality research in the six priority themes of the new research strategy (Growth, Agriculture, Climate Change, Health, Governance in challenging environments & Future Challenges and Opportunities), using a doubled budget, achieved by new management arrangements for research.
Data provider	CRD, EvD, CABI	DFID
Data set used	1. Communication and Information Management Resource Centre (CIMRC), monitoring and evaluation of the Research Portal R4D	Research Strategy monitoring and evaluation framework.
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value	1(a) 50% increase from 2006 baseline of 7,500 users a month; 1(b) 20% increase from 2006 baseline of 25	Available third quarter 2009/10
Reference period for baseline	a) 7,500 (2006) b) Not available	Not available
Target data value	1(a) 200% increase from 2006 baseline; 1(b) 100% increase from 2006.	Research of high quality and being taken-up (progress report - final data not available until 2013+)

Milestone 2008/09		
Milestone 2009/10		
Additional Comments	The Composite Publications Index will be used as an additional measure of quality when data become available (1 <sup>st</sup> quarter 2010/11).	Note: Wording of this success measure has been altered slightly to better reflect the current situation (applicable from 2009 Autumn Performance Report).

	Success measure
Description	DFID policy making processes strengthened to maximise DFID policy's relevance, evidence base and impact on poor people.
Data provider	DFID
Data set used	6 monthly (April and November) forward agenda of policy items for Development Committee consideration; Development Committee minutes; Development Committee Annual Report; Evaluation studies.
Link to external data source (if applicable)	
Baseline data value	All major policy is approved and reviewed by the Development Committee (DC), a cross Departmental committee which helps ensure policy is quality assured, discussed and owned throughout the organisation. In April and November each year the DC agree areas where new policy is needed to ensure the relevance and prioritisation of DFID's policy work. All Policy papers are required to include an implementation plan and be reviewed by the Development Committee after 18 months to help ensure effective delivery and implementation. Reviews and evaluations by independent experts are conducted on a case by case basis, particularly for high profile policies.
Reference period for baseline	2007-2008 financial year
Target data value	Targets for the next three years: 1. The role of the Development Committee will be reviewed each year to ensure it continues to be as effective as possible in providing oversight and direction of DFID policy. 2. A DFID best practice guide to policy making will be published and action taken to ensure it is being implemented 3. DFID approach to evaluation of policy will be strengthened and published as part of the DFID wide evaluation policy. 4. The link between policy and research will be strengthened through establishing integrated policy and research teams with DFID's Policy and Research Directorate.

Milestone 2008/09	
Milestone 2009/10	
Additional Comments	

<b>DSO Indicator 4.2</b>	<b>Cross-Whitehall agreement and support for coherent, pro-development forums and programmes</b>
	Success measure
Description	Whitehall Policy Coherence
Data provider	Centre for Global Development
Data set used	Commitment to Development Index
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<a href="http://www.cgdev.org/section/initiatives/_active/cdi/">http://www.cgdev.org/section/initiatives/_active/cdi/</a>
Baseline data value	5.5
Reference period for baseline	2007
Target data value	Increase
Reference period for target	2010

Milestone 2008/09	
Milestone 2009/10	
Additional Comments	The CDI data are not sensitive to short term fluctuations and success is defined, only, as an increase in the CDI.

<b>DSO Indicator 4.3</b>	<b>More structured and strategic joint DFID/FCO engagement with Large Emerging Economies on global development issues including within the context of G8/G20 processes.</b>	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	UK works effectively with Large Emerging Economies to develop and promote shared positions for at least three significant international events in 2009-2010.	At least five new joint initiatives, in total, established each year with Brazil, Russia, China, India and South Africa.
Data provider		DFID (MECAB Directorate)
Data set used		Report on extent of dialogue and cooperation with BRICS on external aid and development.
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value		Not applicable
Reference period for baseline		Not applicable
Target data value		At least five new joint initiatives, in total, established each year with Brazil, Russia, China, India and South Africa.
Reference period for target		Annual assessment

Milestone 2008/09		Five joint initiatives with Brazil, Russia, China, India and South Africa (government or non-government entities from these countries) in year.
Milestone 2009/10		Five joint initiatives with Brazil, Russia, China, India and South Africa (government or non-government entities from these countries) in year.
Additional Comments	Note: Change in wording of DSO indicator 4.3 and this success measure in recognition of importance of working with Large Emerging Economies – which includes the BRICs but also e.g. Mexico.	For the current measure the five initiatives are total and not with each of the BRICS.  DFID now working with Large Emerging Economies, which includes the BRICS and other countries. As a result this indicator is currently under review.

## DSO 5: Make all bilateral and multilateral donors more effective

DSO Indicator 5.1	Improved global performance against Paris Declaration commitments
	Success measure
Description	Improved global performance against Paris Declaration commitments
Data provider	OECD DAC
Data set used	Paris monitoring surveys, 2006, 2008, 2010
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/document/0/0,3343,en_2649_15577209_41203264_1_1_1_1.00.html">http://www.oecd.org/document/0/0,3343,en_2649_15577209_41203264_1_1_1_1.00.html</a>
Baseline data value	Paris survey results 2005
Reference period for baseline	2005
Target data value	Paris declaration targets met at global levels
Reference period for target	

Milestone 2008/09	Global performance against Paris targets on track
Milestone 2009/10	
Additional Comments	The next OECD/DAC Paris Declaration Survey will take place in 2010 with findings available from 2011. There are particular issues with the indicators that are based on the Paris Declaration surveys <b>where there are have been some</b> methodological problems . <b>These reflect changes in the weighting used to calculate of 2006 and 2008 indicators which made targets for DFID more challenging;</b> inconsistencies in data provided by donors and government <b>where there was at times poor data capture ; and non-reflection of</b> DFID funds that are channelled to government through other donors. (For more detail see Beyond Accra paper of July 2009) <b>The OECD-DAC is strengthening</b> the methodology of the Paris Declaration survey <b>due in 2011</b> to address these issues .

DSO Indicator 5.2	Delivery of 2005 Gleneagles commitments
	Success measure
Description	By 2010, global ODA increased by US\$50 billion from 2004 level.
Data provider	OECD Development Assistance Committee (DAC)
Data set used	DAC/Development Cooperation Monitoring Report
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<a href="http://fiordiliji.sourceoecd.org/pdf/dac09/432009011e-07-statisticalannex.pdf">http://fiordiliji.sourceoecd.org/pdf/dac09/432009011e-07-statisticalannex.pdf</a>
Baseline data value	N/A
Reference period for baseline	
Target data value	Global ODA above US\$130 billion (2004 US\$)
Reference period for target	2010

Milestone 2008/09	
Milestone 2009/10	
Additional Comments	

DSO Indicator 5.3		Improved effectiveness of the European Commission	
	Success measure	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Commitments for general budget support and sector policy support programmes from the EDF.	i) 40% of field missions are joint by 2010 ii) 66% of country analytic work, including diagnostic reviews, are joint by 2010; iii) 100% of donor capacity-development support provided through co-ordinated programmes consistent with partners' national development strategies, by 2010.	
Data provider	European Commission	European Commission	
Data set used	Europe Aid Co-operation Office Indicators. The indicator follows the increase in the percentage of total annual commitments earmarked for general budget support and sector policy support programmes (SPSPs) and not earmarked for classical project support. The percentage for SPSPs details the percentage for sector budget support within the SPSP.	Statistical tables from "Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration".	
Link to external data source (if applicable)			
Baseline data value	30.2%	Baseline figures: 33%, 48%, 33% respectively	
Reference period for baseline	2006	2006	
Target data value	40%	i) 40% ii) 66% iii) 100%	
Reference period for target	2011	2011	

Milestone 2008/09		
Milestone 2009/10		
Additional Comments		The next OECD/DAC Paris Declaration Survey will take place in 2010 with findings available from 2011.

	Success measure	Success measure	Success measure
Description	To increase the overall effectiveness and efficiency of European Community external assistance through a more coherent blending in the deployment of European Investment Bank loans and European Commission grants	Monitoring the performance of EC aid through its project portfolio.	The EC strengthens its capacity to promote policy coherence for development (PCD) by improving all mechanisms, instruments and procedures for PCD, as assessed by biennial PCD report.
Data provider	Outputs of the Expert Working Group	EC	EC
Data set used	The number of meetings of the Expert Working Group The number of UK objectives on better value-added included in the final framework The take-up of this framework in different EU blending instruments.	ROM synthesis reports	Findings within biennial PCD report-due 2009 and 2011; and any annual reporting we might get from the Commission.
Link to external data source (if applicable)			
Baseline data value	Issue of loans and grants covered effectively in the report of the Fundamental Review	71% of projects with very good or good performance in 2007	To be formulated in 2009 on issue of biannual PCD report
Reference period for baseline	None yet	2007	
Target data value	Loans and grants issue is an integral part of the negotiations on the next EU Financial Perspective (2014-2020)	Increase projects with very good or good performance by 3% over the starting baseline of 71% in 2007.	Improved EC policy coherence for development demonstrated in 2011 BCD biennial report
Reference period for target	2011	2011	2011

Milestone 2008/09			
Milestone 2009/10			
Additional Comments	Note: Slight revisions to this success measure reflecting that the Fundamental Review of the Budget (FRB) was no longer key to delivering on this objective (applicable from 2009 Autumn Performance Report).		

DSO Indicator 5.4		Improved effectiveness of the International Finance Institutions	
	Success measure	Success measure	
Description	Country Global Results (i) Improve portfolio quality as measured by MDB reporting systems: % of project outcomes rated satisfactory or highly satisfactory (ii) Strengthen the results framework of country strategies: number (%) of MDB Country Strategies approved in the previous 2 years with explicit baseline data, monitoring indicators, and clearly defined outcomes to be reached	Managing Resources: Further progress on decentralisation and better quality presence in the field: (i) % of internationally recruited staff based in country offices (ii) % of portfolio managed by country offices	
Data provider	(a) World Bank (b) AsDB and (c) AfDB	(a) World Bank (b) AsDB and (c) AfDB	
Data set used	COMPAS (Multilateral Development Banks Common Performance Assessment System); the Deputies Reports for the IDA 15, AsDF X and AfDF 11 replenishments; for the World Bank the CAS Retrospective report (when available); The World Bank's Quarterly Business Review; for AsDB the Annual Report on Portfolio Performance; Medium and Long Term Strategic Frameworks for each bank etc.	Various MDB Reports (often internal documents) including: for the AfDB the Quarterly Budget and Performance Monitoring Report, Annual Report and the Programme Work and Budget Paper; for the World Bank the report on Moving towards a Global Bank October 2008, the Strategic Staffing Update and the CAS Retrospective (due in FY09); for AsDB the Review of the Resident Missions' Operations September 2008; Medium and Long Term Strategic Frameworks for each bank etc.	
Link to external data source (if applicable)			
Baseline data value	(i) WB: 81% AsDB: 70%: AfDB: 78% (ii) 10%	(i) WB:21% AsDB: 12%: AfDB: 5% (ii) WB: 30% AsDB: 28% AfDB: 0%	
Reference period for baseline	2006	2006	
Target data value	(i) WB: 84% AsDB: 80%: AfDB: 81% (ii) 75%	(i) WB:25% AsDB: 15%: AfDB: 7% (ii) WB: 35% AsDB: 31% AfDB: 15%	
Reference period for target			

Milestone 2008/09			
Milestone 2009/10			
Additional Comments			

	Success measure
Description	Managing Partnerships: Implementation of the following Paris Declaration targets: (i) % of field missions that are joint;(ii) % of country analytic work that is joint; (iii) % of capacity-development support provided through coordinated donors programmes consistent with partners' national development strategies (iv) Number of Project Implementation Units (PIUs) parallel to country structures.
Data provider	OECD DAC
Data set used	Annual Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration (covering 2007 and 2008).
Link to external data source (if applicable)	
Baseline data value	(i) WB:21% AsDB:5% AfDB:19% (ii):WB:48% AsDB:49% AfDB:57% (iii) WB:52% AsDB:37% AfDB:40% (iv) WB:7.4 AsDB:6.5 AfDB:7.1
Reference period for baseline	2006
Target data value	As per Paris Declaration Indicators 2010.
Reference period for target	

Milestone 2008/09			
Milestone 2009/10			

Additional Comments	<p>The next OECD/DAC Paris Declaration Survey will take place in 2010 with findings available from 2011.</p> <p>There are particular issues with these indicators that are based on the Paris Declaration surveys <a href="#">where there are have been some</a> methodological problems .<a href="#">These reflect changes in the weighting used to calculate of 2006 and 2008 indicators which made targets for DFID more challenging; inconsistencies</a> in data provided by donors and government <a href="#">where there was at times poor data capture; and non-reflection of DFID funds that are channelled to government through other donors.</a> (For more detail see Beyond Accra paper of July 2009) <a href="#">The OECD-DAC is strengthening the methodology of the Paris Declaration survey due in 2011</a> to address these issues .</p>
---------------------	---

<b>DSO Indicator 5.5</b>	<b>Improved effectiveness of the UN system</b>	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Country/Global Results: UN Agencies* achieve 2 or better against an annual performance framework by 2011. UN Agencies* annual reports are results based and can be used to assess annual performance. * WHO, UNAIDS, UNFPA, UNICEF and UNDP.	Building for the Future: (i) by the end of March 2011 all new UNDAF countries planning and taking forward a One UN approach. Central governance and funding reformed agreed and delivered to better support One UN operations in country: ii) UNDP establishes firewall between operational and system manager roles.
Data provider	UN Agencies	UN Development Group Office
Data set used	Bureaux/Divisions of Planning	Annual report
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value	Achieve a score of 2 in 2009 Performance Assessment	2 countries Delivering as One
Reference period for baseline	2008/09	2007
Target data value	5 UN Agencies* achieve 2 or better against annual performance. All annual reports are results based and can be used to assess annual performance.	34 countries Delivering as One.
Reference period for target		2011

Milestone 2008/09		
Milestone 2009/10		
Additional Comments		

<b>DSO Indicator 5.6</b>	<b>Improved effectiveness of the Global Funds</b>	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Increased access to basic treatment/immunisation. GFATM: increase the number of people receiving treatment for HIV/AIDS, TB and Malaria. GAVI: The number of future deaths prevented.	Innovative finance mechanisms taken forward to facilitate increased access to treatment/services: a) IFFIm bond issues launched, contributing to target of IFFIm saving 10m lives between 2007 and 2015; b) launch of AMC pilot for the pneumococcal vaccine and successor AMC or similar initiative; c) planned expansion of IFFIm to support GAVI in taking forward its work on Health Systems Strengthening (HSS) and to improve delivery of HSS in general; d) Planned support to the World Bank Health Results Innovation Trust Fund (HRITF)
Data provider	GFATM and GAVI	GAVI/IFFIm/AMC
Data set used	GFATM report/OECD/DAC survey; (Country performance frameworks report against indicators and outputs on routine basis (6 monthly) and outcome/impact results on a yearly basis (verified by independent evaluators)).  GAVI Annual Report : WHO/UNICEF data (estimates using data from government country reporting systems, incorporated survey findings/country specific info and immunisation experts to produce best estimates).	GAVI Annual Report/Bulletins Bonds launched reported by IFFIm Lives saved based on GAVI reporting (WHO/UNICEF estimates).
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value	GFATM is 50.7m. For GAVI, 2.3m future deaths had been prevented by 05/06, 2.9m by 06/07, and 3.4m by 07/08.	IFFIm - at baseline, no money raised through bond issues. AMC - at baseline, no advanced market commitment exists.

Reference period for baseline	GFATM baseline value is for 2007	IFFIm established 2006. AMC pilot to be launched early 2009.
Target data value	GFATM target 2010 value is 140m. GAVI target dependent on future funding as yet not agreed.	IFFIm hopes to raise \$4bn through bond launches between 2006 and 2015. AMC - expect launch of AMC early 2009 and possible successor 2010/11.
Reference period for target		

Milestone 2008/09	GFATM: Mid 2008 results are 64.65m, against an end 2008 target of 76.3m, ie. On track to meet or exceed 2008 target. GAVI: Not yet available	IFFIm has raised \$1.2bn in bond issues to date (\$1bn in November 2006, and a further \$223m in March 2008). Expect a further bond issue in the first half of 2009, details not yet known. Expect Pneumococcal pilot to be launched 2009.
Milestone 2009/10		Further bond issues dependent on market conditions and GAVI needs. Possibly too early for a second AMC to be launched in 09/10.
Additional Comments		Additional success measure indicators added (applicable from 2009 Autumn Performance Report).
	There are particular issues with these indicators that are based on the Paris Declaration surveys <a href="#">where there are have been some</a> methodological problems . <a href="#">These reflect changes in the weighting used to calculate of 2006 and 2008 indicators which made targets for DFID more challenging; inconsistencies</a> in data provided by donors and government <a href="#">where there was at times poor data capture; and non-reflection of DFID funds that are channelled to government through other donors.</a> (For more detail see Beyond Accra paper of July 2009) <a href="#">The OECD-DAC is strengthening the methodology of the Paris Declaration survey due in 2011</a> to address these issues.	

	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Increased compliance with Paris Declaration Principles: GFATM: composite indicator measuring average gap in achieving Paris targets 3, 5a, 5b, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10a, 10b. GAVI: use of country public financial management systems.	Ensure that the Global Funds have gender sensitive policies and practices to promote equity in operations and access. GFATM: actionable findings from GFATM Five Year Evaluation translated into gender sensitive performance & impact measures in future GFATM indicators, GAVI: develop and implement a policy on socio-economic and gender equality in immunisation.
Data provider	GFATM/GAVI report/OECD/DAC survey	GFATM and GAVI
Data set used	GFATM: 2006 OECD Paris Monitoring Survey: GAVI Annual Report 2006.	GFATM – 5 year evaluation results (available Nov 2008); GAVI – Annual Reports
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value	GFATM: 19% average gap. GAVI: 75%	N/A
Reference period for baseline	GFATM: baseline is 2008 (This is a new KPI). GAVI: baseline is 2005.	2007/8
Target data value	GFATM: target is 12% in 2009 (based on significant progress against 3, 7, 10a, and 10b) and 0% in 2010:  GAVI: target is 90% in 2010.	As under Description
Reference period for target		

Milestone 2008/09	GFATM: 19% gap 2008, 12% gap 2009. GAVI: Not available	GFATM: gender policy approved June 2008, implementation plan and specific targets now being developed. GAVI: Gender strategy finalised/approved 08, implementation plan, including indicators, to be approved June 09.
Milestone 2009/10		Sexual Minorities Strategy to be approved. Progress against Gender specific KPI. GAVI: Implementation Plan (with indicators and timelines) for Gender Strategy approved & implemented.
Additional Comments	The next OECD/DAC Paris Declaration Survey will take place in 2010 with findings available from 2011.	
	There are particular issues with these indicators that are based on the Paris Declaration surveys where there are have been some methodological problems . <a href="#">These reflect changes in the weighting used to calculate of 2006 and 2008 indicators which made targets for DFID more challenging; inconsistencies</a> in data provided by donors and government <a href="#">where there was at times poor data capture; and non-reflection of DFID funds that are channelled to government through other donors.</a> (For more detail see Beyond Accra paper of July 2009) <a href="#">The OECD-DAC is strengthening the methodology of the Paris Declaration survey due in 2011</a> to address these issues.	

## DSO 6: Deliver high quality and effective bilateral development assistance

DSO Indicator 6.1	Paris Declaration commitments implemented and targets met corporately and in country offices	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Improved corporate performance against Paris Declaration commitments	Improved performance against Paris Declaration targets at country level
Data provider	DFID	DFID
Data set used	Paris indicators, 2006, 2008, 2010	Paris indicators, 2006, 2008, 2010
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/document/0/0,3343,en_2649_15577_209_41203264_1_1_1_1,00.html">http://www.oecd.org/document/0/0,3343,en_2649_15577_209_41203264_1_1_1_1,00.html</a>	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/document/0/0,3343,en_2649_15577_209_41203264_1_1_1_1,00.html">http://www.oecd.org/document/0/0,3343,en_2649_15577_209_41203264_1_1_1_1,00.html</a>
Baseline data value	Paris data 2005	Paris data 2005
Reference period for baseline	2005	2005
Target data value	Paris declaration targets met at corporate level	Paris declaration targets met at country level
Reference period for target		

Milestone 2008/09	DFID performance in DAC Paris Evaluation surveys	<b>Africa Division</b> (i) 66%; (ii) 70%; (iii) 90% of offices achieve target (excluding major breaches of core principles). <u>Baseline:</u> i) DFID score in 2006 survey. Evaluation report on UK performance, March 2008. ii) Business Support Team established in September 2008.
Milestone 2009/10		
Additional Comments	The next OECD/DAC Paris Declaration Survey will take place in 2010 with findings available from 2011.  Interim assessments of DFID performance on a number of Paris Declaration indicators to be available through ARIES; reported in 2010 Annual Report.	The next OECD/DAC Paris Declaration Survey will take place in 2010 with findings available from 2011.  Interim assessments of DFID performance on a number of Paris Declaration indicators to be available through ARIES; reported in 2010 Annual Report.
	There are particular issues with these indicators that are based on the Paris Declaration surveys <u>where there are have been some methodological problems .These reflect changes in the weighting used to calculate of 2006 and 2008 indicators which made targets for DFID more challenging; inconsistencies in data provided by donors and government where there was at times poor data capture; and non-reflection of DFID funds that are channelled to government through other donors. (For more detail see Beyond Accra paper of July 2009) The OECD-DAC is strengthening the methodology of the Paris Declaration survey due in 2011 to address these issues.</u>	

DSO Indicator 6.2	DFID programmes in fragile states are consistent with the DAC principles	
	Success measure	
Description	Proportion of bilateral aid delivered as Programme Based Approaches (PBAs) in fragile states.	
Data provider	DFID	
Data set used	2006: DFID commissioned data on Paris Declaration indicator 9, extracted from the OECD 2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, CLEAR team Jan 2007. Quest documents 916002 and 931597. Latter lists all states making returns for DFID in this survey and indicates which were regarded as fragile (12) at time of data 2008: Similar data extracted from 2008 Survey. Quest document 1885139 shows states making returns for DFID in this survey and indicates which were regarded as fragile (16) at time of data.	
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<a href="http://www.oecd.org/document/20/0,3343,en_2649_15577209_38521876_1_1_1_1,00.html">http://www.oecd.org/document/20/0,3343,en_2649_15577209_38521876_1_1_1_1,00.html</a> <a href="http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/Full-2008-Survey-EN.pdf">http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/Full-2008-Survey-EN.pdf</a>	
Baseline data value	56%	
Reference period for baseline	2005 data published in 2006 survey	
Target data value	55% (general target for DFID programme as a whole is 66%)	
Reference period for target	2009 data published in 2010	
Milestone 2008/09	Data only updated biennially	
Milestone 2009/10	Target year	

Additional Comments	<p>The next OECD/DAC Paris Declaration Survey will take place in 2010 with findings available from 2011.</p> <p>Interim assessments of DFID performance on a number of Paris Declaration indicators to be available through ARIES; reported in 2010 Annual Report.</p> <p>There are particular issues with these indicators that are based on the Paris Declaration surveys <a href="#">where there are have been some methodological problems</a> .<a href="#">These reflect changes in the weighting used to calculate of 2006 and 2008 indicators which made targets for DFID more challenging</a>; inconsistencies in data provided by donors and government <a href="#">where there was at times poor data capture</a> ; and <a href="#">non-reflection of</a> DFID funds that are channelled to government through other donors. (For more detail see Beyond Accra paper of July 2009) <a href="#">The OECD-DAC is strengthening</a> the methodology of the Paris Declaration survey <a href="#">due in 2011</a> to address these issues .</p>
---------------------	--

	Success measure
Description	DFID programmes in fragile states achieve Paris targets on joint mission and joint analysis
Data provider	DFID Country Offices
Data set used	<p><b>2006:</b> DFID commissioned data on Paris Declaration indicator 10a &amp; 10b, extracted from the OECD 2006 Survey on Monitoring the Paris Declaration, CLEAR team Jan 2007. Quest documents 916002 and 931597. Latter lists all states making returns for DFID in this survey and indicates which were regarded as fragile (12) at time of data.</p> <p><b>2008:</b> Similar data extracted from 2008 Survey. Quest document 1885139 shows states making returns for DFID in this survey and indicates which were regarded as fragile (16) at time of data.</p>
Link to external data source (if applicable)	<p><a href="http://www.oecd.org/document/20/0,3343,en_2649_15577209_38521876_1_1_1_1,00.html">http://www.oecd.org/document/20/0,3343,en_2649_15577209_38521876_1_1_1_1,00.html</a></p> <p><a href="http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/Full-2008-Survey-EN.pdf">http://siteresources.worldbank.org/ACCRAEXT/Resources/Full-2008-Survey-EN.pdf</a></p>
Baseline data value	44% for joint missions; 46% for joint analysis
Reference period for baseline	2005 data published in 2006 survey
Target data value	66% for joint missions; 66% for joint analysis
Reference period for target	2009 data published in 2010

Milestone 2008/09	Data only updated biennially
Milestone 2009/10	Target year
Additional Comments	<p>The next OECD/DAC Paris Declaration Survey will take place in 2010 with findings available from 2011.</p> <p>Interim assessments of DFID performance on a number of Paris Declaration indicators to be available through ARIES; reported in 2010 Annual Report.</p> <p>There are particular issues with these indicators that are based on the Paris Declaration surveys <a href="#">where there are have been some methodological problems</a> .<a href="#">These reflect changes in the weighting used to calculate of 2006 and 2008 indicators which made targets for DFID more challenging</a>; inconsistencies in data provided by donors and government <a href="#">where there was at times poor data capture</a> ; and <a href="#">non-reflection of</a> DFID funds that are channelled to government through other donors. (For more detail see Beyond Accra paper of July 2009) <a href="#">The OECD-DAC is strengthening</a> the methodology of the Paris Declaration survey <a href="#">due in 2011</a> to address these issues .</p>

	Success measure
Description	No. of country strategies with programming decisions informed by joint analysis with other government departments about political change, conflict dynamics or fragility.
Data provider	Regional Divisions
Data set used	<p>Regional divisions will report on this as part of their Divisional Performance Frameworks (DPFs). This will be an aggregate across Africa and South Asia divisions.</p> <p>Internal reference: S Asia - <a href="http://dfidinsight/Stellent/groups/quest/documents/document/pub_007419.pdf">http://dfidinsight/Stellent/groups/quest/documents/document/pub_007419.pdf</a> and QUEST: 1847855;</p> <p>Internal reference: Africa - <a href="http://dfidinsight/Stellent/groups/quest/documents/document/pub_007410.pdf">http://dfidinsight/Stellent/groups/quest/documents/document/pub_007410.pdf</a> and DPF returns.</p>
Link to external data source (if applicable)	
Baseline data value	5 in Africa; 2 in South Asia
Reference period for baseline	2007-08
Target data value	All 11 in Africa; all 5 in South Asia

Reference period for target	2010-11
-----------------------------	---------

Milestone 2008/09	7 in Africa; at least 3 in South Asia
Milestone 2009/10	9 in Africa; at least 4 in South Asia
Additional Comments	

<b>DSO Indicator 6.3</b>	<b>Portfolio quality</b>
	Success measure
Description	Increase the portfolio quality of DFID's bilateral projects from 72% to 75%.
Data provider	DFID
Data set used	ARIES project cycle management database
Link to external data source (if applicable)	
Baseline data value	72%
Reference period for baseline	2007/08 (annual average)
Target data value	75%
Reference period for target	2010

Milestone 2008/09	73%
Milestone 2009/10	74%
Additional Comments	<p>DFID's target for improved portfolio quality seeks improvement in an index which assesses the performance of projects and programmes of £1 million or more in DFID's portfolio scored in the last 24 months. Data used to produce this index come from our performance management system. Operational projects are scored annually to assess the likelihood of achieving their intended objectives (Annual Reviews). Projects are then scored on completion according to whether they achieved their intended objectives (Project Completion Reports). In each case, a five point scale is used (shown in the table below). For the purpose of calculating the index a percentage of each project's commitment value is included on a "sliding scale" related to the project score. This is then expressed as a proportion of the total commitment value of all eligible projects scored 1-5 to produce the index:</p> <p>DFID's project scores and the proportion of each project's commitment that is included in the index :</p> <p>Score 1: Likely to be completely achieved = 100%</p> <p>Score 2: Likely to be largely achieved = 75%</p> <p>Score 3: Likely to be partly achieved = 50%</p> <p>Score 4: Only likely to be achieved to a very limited extent = 25%</p> <p>Score 5: Unlikely to be achieved = 0%</p> <p>Analysis over time has shown that some fluctuation can occur as substantial commitments move in and out of the portfolio (for example, the completion of one high-value project can result in a noticeable rise or drop in the overall figure).</p> <p>The method of calculating the index was changed between 2005-08 and 2008-11 PSA periods in an attempt to reduce the volatility in the index, to be more discriminating in measuring success, and to make the index better able to show trends. The changes were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2008-11, we include all projects scored 1-5 in the calculation using a sliding scale recognising the success of projects. The score from the most recent performance review within the previous 24 months is used in the index calculation.</li> <li>• In 2005-08, only projects within the previous 24 months which scored 1-2 were used in the calculation, other scores had no contribution to the index calculation.</li> </ul>

## DSO 7: Improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the organisation

DSO Indicator 7.1	Achievement spending and efficiency targets by 2010/11	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Achievement of CSR spending targets: (i) Spending in Africa; (ii) MIC/LIC split; (iii) Education (iv) Water in Africa; (v) Aid for trade; (vi) Research	Achievement of Comprehensive Spending Review (CSR) 2008-11 efficiency targets
Data provider	DFID	DFID
Data set used	DFID expenditure data (from ARIES)	DFID expenditure data (from ARIES)
Link to external data source (if applicable)		
Baseline data value	As set in 2006/07 reference period (if applicable)	As set out in Delivery Agreement
Reference period for baseline	2006/07	2006/07
Target data value	(i) Double spending in Africa from 05 levels to £3000m; (ii) Spend 90% of bilateral expenditure in LICs; (iii) Spend £1bn a year on education by 2010 (iv) Spend £200m on water in Africa by 2010; (v) Spend £409m on "Aid for trade" activities by 2010; (vi) Spend £200m on research by 2010	DFID has agreed a Value for Money (VfM) target of £492 million by the end of the CSR (2008-11) period, comprising: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) £157 million savings by allocating the multilateral programme more effectively;</li> <li>b) £257 million savings by allocating the bilateral programme more effectively;</li> <li>c) £66 million savings by improving the quality of DFID's portfolio of projects;</li> <li>d) £12 million savings by reducing administration costs; and</li> <li>e) £155 million additional savings to be delivered in 2010/11.</li> </ul>
Reference period for target	2010/11	2010/11

Milestone 2008/09		£159 million
Milestone 2009/10		£323 million (cumulative savings)
Additional Comments		

DSO Indicator 7.2	Financial management, compliance and control	
	Success measure	Success measure
Description	Improvement in DFID financial management capacity against 2008 Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy (CIPFA) review baseline.	
Data provider	DFID	
Data set used	CIPFA model or Public Audit Forum indicator set for Financial Management; ARIES data on budget management.	
Link to external data source (if applicable)	CIPFA financial management model scoring	
Baseline data value	CIPFA score of 26 out of 48	
Reference period for baseline	2008/9	
Target data value	Improved scores against baseline	
Reference period for target	2010/11	

Milestone 2008/09	N/A	
Milestone 2009/10	Create Management Accounting team and appoint Divisional Accountants. Improve quality of management reporting from ARIES system. Introduce monthly financial monitoring reports into Divisions.	
Additional Comments	Revised CIPFA scores are expected to be available in Summer 2010.	

<b>DSO Indicator 7.3</b>		<b>Improved leadership and management of people</b>	
	Success measure	Success measure	
Description	IIP continual assessment	Improved results from the Management Survey	
Data provider	DFID	DFID	
Data set used	Rolling IIP mini-reviews of DFID work units	Management Survey	
Link to external data source (if applicable)			
Baseline data value	IIP accreditation in 2007	2007 survey data - Q6 (challenge) baseline 59% ; Q12 (change management) baseline 46%; Q17 (tackling poor performance); and Q20 (induction) baseline 52%	
Reference period for baseline	2007	2007	
Target data value	IIP accreditation	Improved survey results notably - Q6 (challenge) – target 2010 65%;ii) Q17 (tackling poor performance) target 2010 55%;iii) Q20 (induction) – target 2010 65%.	
Reference period for target			

Milestone 2008/09		
Milestone 2009/10	IIP accreditation	
Additional Comments	This success measure is under review. DFID will not seek formal iIP re-accreditation.	

<b>DSO Indicator 7.4</b>		<b>A healthy, safe and secure workplace</b>	
	Success measure	Success measure	
Description	Zero fatalities or injuries on active duty	Improved proportion of staff who feel they have a healthy and safe workplace	
Data provider	DFID	DFID	
Data set used	DFID records	Management Survey	
Link to external data source (if applicable)			
Baseline data value	2007/08 data worldwide (need to collect overseas data)	2007 survey data - current Q10 baseline 84%	
Reference period for baseline	2006/07 (UK only)	2007	
Target data value	As per description	90% response on Management Survey Q10;	
Reference period for target			

Milestone 2008/09		
Milestone 2009/10		
Additional Comments		

DSO Indicator 7.5		Developing and changing the workforce	
		Success measure	Success measure
Description	Affordable workforce aligned with delivery of corporate objectives through strategic workforce planning		Diverse workforce
Data provider	DFID, HMG		DFID
Data set used	DFID Management Surveys; Civil Service People Survey for 2009-10.		Diversity report
Link to external data source (if applicable)			
Baseline data value	2007 Management Survey		To be advised
Reference period for baseline	2007		2006
Target data value	Improvement against Management Survey Q19 (People I manage have skills to deliver on their objectives)		Sustained or positive trends in equality indicators.
Reference period for target			

Milestone 2008/09		
Milestone 2009/10		
Additional Comments	Data source has been DFID's own management surveys. The Civil Service People Survey (Autumn 2009) asks slightly different questions. Full analysis will be undertaken when full results are available for the People Survey in 2010 and reported in the 2010 Annual Report.	

DSO Indicator 7.6		Investing in IT and business change	
		Success measure	Success measure
Description	Achieving the benefits of programmed IT and business change		Improvement in Capability Review score
Data provider	DFID		Cabinet Office Capability Review Team
Data set used	Benefits Realisation Plans (where available) for recently completed projects, Project Reports for recently completed projects, ad-hoc feedback from key users		Capability Review Score
Link to external data source (if applicable)	N/A		
Baseline data value	Respective Project Initiation Documents for recently completed projects		2007 Capability Review Scores: Department was assessed as being 'strong' or 'well placed' in 7 of the 10 elements.
Reference period for baseline	Variable, depending on project details		2008
Target data value	On track to deliver programmed benefits of projects launched		2009: Scores raised, especially in the three areas where capability was assessed as a "development area" ("build capability" element) and "urgent development area" ("build common purpose" and "plan, resource and prioritise" elements).  2011: Improvement on 2009 scores.
Reference period for target	Dependent on project details		March 2009 and March 2011

Milestone 2008/09		(i) "Homegrown" change programme - Making it Happen (MiH) - in place (to replace Corporate Plan) (ii) Action Plans for 5 Themes (Communications, Money, People, Results and Systems) finalised (iii) Internal Communications Strategy implemented (end 2008) (iv) Internal Consultancy established and 3 projects initiated/completed (end-2008) (v) High Level Change Programme disseminated (end 2008) (vi) Capability Review Self Assessment shows progress across all elements. To be submitted to Cabinet Office by 5 January 2009
Milestone 2009/10	i) All legacy systems made redundant by the launch of ARIES will be decommissioned. ii) All overseas sites with satellite links will have secondary links added. iii) The smart-card (Dual Factor Authentication Project) solution will be in place. iv) The security DVD will have been produced and been made available to all DFID staff. v) Chapter continues to aid the answering of PQs, Ministerial Correspondence and Invitations.	
Additional Comments	N/A	

<b>DSO Indicator 7.7</b>	<b>Greater public support for and understanding of development</b>
	Success measure
Description	Improvement in measurable public support for development
Data provider	ONS, Comic Relief or other similar.
Data set used	See above
Link to external data source (if applicable)	
Baseline data value	To be determined
Reference period for baseline	2007
Target data value	To be determined from 2008 baseline
Reference period for target	2010/11

Milestone 2008/09	
Milestone 2009/10	
Additional Comments	Key performance indicators are currently being reviewed and these will be outlined in the Annual Report 2010.

<b>DSO Indicator 7.8</b>	
	Success measure
Description	Successful implementation of the priority actions in the Results Action Plan (RAP).
Data provider	DFID: Finance and Corporate Performance Division (FCPD).
Data set used	RAP implementation report to the Management Board via the Quarterly Report.
Link to external data source (if applicable)	The Results Action Plan is published at <a href="http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Pubs/files/results-action-plan08.pdf">http://www.dfid.gov.uk/Pubs/files/results-action-plan08.pdf</a>
Baseline data value	Table 2 in the Results Action Plan sets out the actions, with baselines where applicable. Note that the Results Action Plan will be reviewed annually and as the actions are completed the priority list will change.
Reference period for baseline	Variable.
Target data value	Full implementation of the priority actions in the Results Action Plan by 2011.
Reference period for target	2008-2011

Milestone 2008/09	Independent Advisory Committee on Development Impact established, agreement on mutual accountability at High Level Forum in Accra, September 2008.
Milestone 2009/10	
Additional Comments	

