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INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to address one of the longstanding challenges in the practise of World Vision (WV); which is the capturing and demonstrating the contribution to positive change in the communities and lives of individuals it works with. Obviously, there are multiple layers to this challenge, but at the heart of it is having solid foundations for monitoring and evaluation practise.

In this paper we will focus on the framework that defines the point of reference for impact i.e. the recipients of humanitarian aid and development programs. There are multiple attempts across the industry to define and operationalize this concept, some favouring philosophical considerations about the role of recipients e.g. active Vs passive, whereas others preferring the rigorousness of more technical frameworks. Traditionally, WV refers to this group using the term beneficiaries. Beyond the philosophical nuances, we place the emphasis at establishing a framework that is using consistent language and systems across the board.

We engage in this exercise firstly by taking a global view on the situation and defining the problem. Secondly, we map the existing definitions and systems in MEER and the partnership and conduct a review of the industry to explore the operational framework of other aid organizations. Thirdly, by building on the previous review, we present a new conceptual framework for defining and measuring the recipients of humanitarian aid, the ‘Typology of Beneficiaries’. This document will serve as the basis for the development of the new technical framework that will align the definitions and systems across the region. We conclude with the necessary steps and expected challenges in this process.

Effective humanitarian responses depend as much on knowledge as they do on funding or logistics. Indeed, without knowledge, responses cannot hope to succeed. The international humanitarian community’s ability to collect, analyse, disseminate and act on key information is fundamental to effective response’.

(Mahmood et al., 2010).1

---

SECTION A: THE LANDSCAPE OF HUMANITARIAN AID

In 2013, international organizations targeted 78 million people around the world for humanitarian assistance in emergencies through UN coordinated appeals. Although there is no comprehensive global picture of the scale of humanitarian need, some of the striking statistics for 2013 alone include: 10.7 million newly displaced by conflict or persecution, an unprecedented 33 million internally displaced people (IDPs) along with 16.7 refugees, accounting to a total of 49.7 million people living in forced displacement, the highest since WWII. In total, the international community responded to the dramatic scale of the needs in 2013 with a record US$22 billion in funding.

In total, the international community responded to the dramatic scale of the needs in 2013 with a record US$22 billion in funding.

In 2012, World Vision was operating 1.614 Area Development Programs (ADP) and responding to 87 emergencies, mobilizing US$2.67 billion and reaching approximately 120 million children across 95 countries. By 2016, WV aims to contribute to the well-being of 150 million of the world’s most vulnerable children by 2016.

Both sources testify to the epic proportions of the global humanitarian needs, which are escalating over the last decade. The latest report by UN OCHA confirms that the number of people requiring international humanitarian assistance and the cost of helping them has increased significantly (see figure 1). Inter-agency appeals typically target 60-70 million people each year, compared with 30-40 million ten years ago. Funding requirements have more than doubled, to over US$10 billion per year.

Challenges of a Shifting Landscape

Humanitarian organizations are increasingly faced with different layers of pressure: demographic changes, funding drainage, natural and technological disasters, ongoing and future conflicts, climate change and so on. It is also likely that the number of situations where humanitarian crisis lasts longer will increase because of these different layers (For a more comprehensive discussion see the debate notes from the discussion at the international review of the Red Cross).

Among the various challenges, organizations are also called upon to reflect on the overall accountability of the humanitarian system. According to Crisp, during the 1970s and 1980s, humanitarian organizations were largely exempt from serious evaluation or critical analysis. However, the need to deliver aid in increasingly complex environments; the greater absorption of public and private funding by humanitarian organizations and the increasing ability of the international media to

---

4 International Review of the Red Cross, 2011. What are the future challenges for humanitarian action?
document such emergencies, has placed growing pressure on the humanitarian system to deliver results and demonstrate accountability.

**The Need for Evidence in Humanitarian Aid**

The last two decades saw a dramatic expansion in the mechanisms available to the international community to provide humanitarian aid. This included rising aid budgets, the development of specialist UN agencies, military humanitarianism and the massive development of the non-governmental sector. Humanitarian agencies began embracing evaluations with the major humanitarian actors – AusAid (Australian Government Overseas Aid Program), DANIDA (Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Denmark), ECHO (European Commission Humanitarian Office), OECD (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development), SIDA (Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency), and UNHCR (United Nations High Commission for Refugees) – all producing their own evaluation policies, guidelines and manuals.

Evaluations of humanitarian efforts are now common practice and have attracted unprecedented levels of donor funding and agency commitment, as well as public and political interest. In 1986, the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and Development Assistance Committee (DAC) published a set of evaluative criteria for assessing international development interventions. These evaluation criteria were adopted by all major development agencies. The need to demonstrate accountability with the use of high-quality tools and rigorous methodologies is now dictating the rules of engagement between humanitarian agencies and donors and, some may argue, communities.

**Evidence in MEER**

In its latest 2014 report, the Active Learning Network for Accountability and Performance in Humanitarian Action (ALNAP) highlights the need to stay on par with the latest developments in evidence building. As it is pointed out, despite progress over the past 20 years, there appears to be room for improvement in the quality and use of evidence in international humanitarian action.

As a full member of ALNAP, World Vision is taking this mandate very seriously across the partnership and particularly in MEER. The role and function of the Learning Hubs (LHs) and the fact that 7 of the top 10 (including the top 4) CWB reports across the partnership came from MEER is a testimony to the commitment of this region.

MEER is traditionally taking a leading role at developing and pilot-testing the latest methodological approaches and tools developed by the knowledge units in the partnership, including LEAP 3.0, the
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Technical Approaches and Horizon 3.0. In this regard, MEERO is facilitating the smooth alignment of the region with the latest developments at the partnership. Part of this role includes the development of tailored tools and processes which are meant to supplement the existing ones from the partnership i.e. Evidence Base Framework, Roadmap to Evidence, LHs Evidence Base Framework and other (for more information contact the SEU MEER).

Problem Statement and Purpose

One of the longstanding challenges that lies at the epicentre of the evidence building discussion, is the definition and operationalization of the recipients of humanitarian aid. Currently, MEER does not have a universal framework that defines clearly the concept and methodology used to register and measure the number of individuals who benefit from the programs and initiatives implemented.

This gap creates a series of important problems that can potentially put at risk the quality of the monitoring systems and data collected. Some of the problems include: lack of reporting consistency and accountability, double counting, lack of common language, lack of global reporting indicators, difficulty at determining program impact and other. Action is required to bridge this gap before it damages the reputation of the organization and hinders its capacity to generate funding which ultimately will damage the communities it supports.

Recognizing this emerging need, the Strategy & Evidence Unit and the Development, Learning & Impact Unit proposed an action plan to develop a framework that will align the concept of beneficiaries across sectors and types of programs in MEER.

At a first step, the structure of programs across the region were analysed in order to come up with thematic categories that would enable the better understanding and conceptualisation of the nature of beneficiaries across WV’s programs. Towards this end key stakeholders across the region, including members of senior leadership (for the full list of people, please see annex 1), were consulted. The following five thematic categories were identified and agreed upon:

1. ADVOCACY
2. DEVELOPMENT
3. EMERGENCY RESPONSE
4. SPONSORSHIP
5. FAITH IN DEVELOPMENT

Next, a mapping exercise of the existing operationalization of the concept of the beneficiaries in the region was carried out. This involved receiving information from key stakeholders within each of the identified sectors. The following offices provided input for this purpose: South Caucasus, Albania and Kosovo, BiH, JWG, Jordan, Afghanistan and MEERO. The questions included:

1. What is the working definition of beneficiaries, direct and indirect?
2. What is the exact methodology that is used to calculate beneficiaries?
3. What other categories of beneficiaries are you using and how are they defined and measured?
4. Are there any additional areas that would potentially require a separate definition and operationalization of beneficiaries, besides the five already mentioned?

5. Can you share 1-2 documents (e.g. evaluation, report, publication etc) that demonstrate how the concept of beneficiaries is defined and monitored?

The purpose of this exercise was to map the existing definition and operationalization of the concept across the identified thematic categories in MEER and understand the challenges of developing a universal definition that synthesizes indicators across these categories. The review included the formal guidelines from the partnership, to ensure that the framework will build on these too.

An extensive industry review was also conducted to explore the operational framework of other international aid organizations that work with/for children. The review included: ChildFund, UNICEF, Save the Children, Catholic Relief Services, ActionAid and Oxfam. The results from both exercises are presented and discussed in section B.

Finally, in section C, the conceptual framework for the **typology of beneficiaries** is presented and discussed along with the expected challenges. We conclude by outlining the recommended process for developing the technical framework that will provide the guidelines and tools to measure and monitor beneficiaries within each sector as well as aligning the concept across sectors.

---

Note that these thematic categories are used for conceptualization purposes only and should not be seen as an attempt to type beneficiaries based on those. The aim is to come up with a ‘universal’ concept of beneficiaries which, however, acknowledges and caters for the particularities of the various WV programs.
SECTION B: THE STATE OF THE PRACTISE

Recommended Guidelines in the Partnership

According to the latest recommendations on estimating numbers of direct participants in a project or program, coming from the Global Office of Strategy Management (GOSM), the foundational unit for estimating the number of children reached by WV is the individual project. The operational definition for calculating direct participants is the following: ‘Direct child participants in a WV relief or development project are boys or girls up to 18 years of age to whom one or more of the following statements apply’. See statements below.

Table 1: The structure of the typology of beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They play an active role in the project</td>
<td>• Actively participating in groups or networks supported by WV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Taking part in training organized by WV or a WV partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Spending time in child-friendly spaces or drop-in centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Acting as peer educators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Volunteering in community activities organized by the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They receive goods distributed as part of the project, given to them</td>
<td>• Family food rations or non-food relief supplies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either directly or through their families</td>
<td>• Micronutrient supplements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Insecticide-treated mosquito nets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They receive services carried out as part of the project by WV or a WV</td>
<td>• Immunizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partner</td>
<td>• Screening and referral for malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They receive information disseminated as part of the project by WV</td>
<td>• HIV awareness materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or a WV partner</td>
<td>• Child rights awareness materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Information broadcast by radio or TV providing there are means of assessing with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>reasonable confidence the number of children actually listening/viewing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They benefit directly from the project outcomes</td>
<td>• Delivery by birth attendants trained through the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Better family health practices by care-givers trained through the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved quality of education through project interventions in the schools they attend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Greater access to health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Increased family food security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With regards to consolidating the number of participants across projects, this is only advised if it can be proved that participants are different individuals and there is no overlap between projects. If this is not possible, then 100% overlap should be assumed and only the larger number across projects should be taken into consideration towards the counting of program participants. The report also notes that we should use the term, “estimating” rather than “measuring” unless the numbers can be verified with some precision. For aggregating the number of beneficiaries at regional and global level, the same report provides the following guidelines:

**Regional**
The total children reached in one region will normally be the sum of the totals for all the NOs in that region (because NO programmes do not overlap). If there are regional projects covering multiple countries, their numbers will normally be counted already in the NO totals. Numbers for regional projects should only be included if it is certain that there is no double counting.

**Global**
Global totals for the first progress estimate have been calculated by summing the numbers for all NOs, taking data from the PIH and eliminating double counting manually by the method described above, and these have not been broken down by region. However, for the future, regions should track their own progress by periodically calculating totals reached as described above, with GOSM support.

**Operationalization of Beneficiaries in MEER**
In MEER, the concept of humanitarian aid recipients is captured under the term ‘beneficiaries’ and it is classified to various subgroups, with different operationalization processes for each one. In this section, we provide the current definitions and operationalizations used by the NOs of MEER in order to highlight the existing discrepancies. These are not the final definitions of beneficiaries, which will be unpacked via a separate exercise during the second phase.

According to the latest report\(^\text{12}\) prepared by the DLI unit to explore this topic, there two main approaches that are used in MEEER. Of these two the most commonly adopted one is the first approach (Approach 1).

**Approach 1: Direct and Indirect Beneficiaries**

**Direct beneficiary**
Person or organization directly affected by the intervention whether intended or unintended. Some people may be beneficiaries without necessarily belonging to the group targeted by the intervention. Similarly, the entire eligible group does not necessarily consist of beneficiaries.

---

\(^{12}\) Draft Report, 2014, Discussion on definition of beneficiaries, Prepared by DLI unit.
Indirect beneficiary
A person, group of persons or organization which has no direct contact with an intervention, but is affected by it via direct beneficiaries (e.g. firms which have used technology transfer networks set up by a public intervention to innovate).

Approach 2: Primary, Secondary and Tertiary beneficiaries.

Primary Beneficiary
Primary beneficiaries are the intended clients of the project. Participation of primary beneficiaries is essential in projects which are expected to have a direct positive impact on defined groups of people. Examples of Primary beneficiaries are: Employees, Owners/Stockholders, Customers, Suppliers, Stakeholder.

Secondary Beneficiaries
Secondary beneficiaries are those who perform as intermediaries within a project. The main role of secondary beneficiaries is linking local governance with national policies. In a few cases, secondary stakeholder plays a role also in consensus building, conflict management, decision making and financing. Examples of secondary beneficiaries are: Intermediate government, Local government, NGOs, The General Public.

Tertiary Beneficiaries
Tertiary beneficiaries are those actors who are considered to have significant influence on the success of a project. Tertiary Beneficiaries provide technical assistance, backstopping, extension and training services in their area of competence. They participate in decision-making and action taking and in awareness raising activities. Tertiary beneficiary may assist in marketing, and provide financial support through investments. Example of Tertiary beneficiaries are Line agencies, Enterprises and companies, Banks, National government & authorities, NGOs.

Mapping exercise across sectors
The definitions below were synthesized from information provided by stakeholders in each respective sector across the NOs (see annex 1). The main components from each definition and included in one comprehensive version.

Thematic sector 1: Development Programs
In development programs, the term beneficiaries refers to children, youth and adults living in WV communities where WV or our partners are operating. They are separated in two main categories:

Direct beneficiaries
1. **Direct participants** are people who physically participate in WV activities. This number is mainly used for reporting at output level.
2. **Direct beneficiaries** are people who directly and immediately benefitted from activities, whose names and addresses are known and who, if needed, can be reached for verification regarding the benefit they received. They need to actually participate in a project by attending a training, receiving a service (e.g., women receiving a PNC exam), or receiving something tangible (e.g.,
take-home hygiene kit). If projects include constructing or rehabilitating community infrastructures, all community members who have access to them are considered direct beneficiaries.

**Indirect beneficiaries**
Refers to the household members of direct beneficiaries who were positively affected by WV programs.

**Calculation methodology**
The program monitoring and evaluation plans define the methodology, frequency and means of verification. These are collected and monitored at program level and verified at NO level. Beneficiaries are usually counted from the Indicator Tracking Tables (ITTs). The calculation method for direct beneficiaries can be specific, using activity attendance sheets, or approximations i.e. taking into consideration an ideal number of estimated participants per training, the number of students in a school, etc.

For indirect beneficiaries, the average household number per country is identified and then becomes a coefficient that is multiplied by the number of respective (direct) beneficiaries. For gender disaggregation, the household members are split i.e. in a country with an average number of six household members the calculation formula would consider 1 man, 1 woman, 2 boys, and 2 girls.

**Thematic sector 2: Advocacy Programs**
In advocacy, beneficiaries are children, youth and adults living in WV communities where WV or our partners have advocated for the increase in the number and/or the quality of services. In this regard, three types of beneficiaries are identified:

**Direct beneficiaries**
Refers to those who are enrolled in, or benefit from, government services and/or WV programmes. They are divided into two subgroups:

1. **Direct participants** are people who physically participate in activities. This number is mainly used for reporting at output level.
2. **Direct beneficiaries** are people who directly and immediately benefit from activities, whose names and addresses are known and who, if needed, can be reached for verification of the benefit they received. **For example:** If WV supported three health care posts, then they (posts) are direct participants. If these health posts provided improved/new service and counselling to 900 children/women, then they are considered direct beneficiaries. The assumption is that if required they can be identified from the health post records.

**Indirect beneficiaries**
Refers to those who benefit from policy level changes in areas where WV has been one of the active influencers. The definition also includes the families of children who are enrolled or benefit from government services or programmes.
Potential Beneficiaries
Refers to those who live in a region where new services are created or the quality of current services increases. Currently this group was classified as "direct beneficiaries" with the note (children living in the region/area of new services).

Calculation methodology
For the calculation of direct beneficiaries, a sample of delivered government services in a geographic area is calculated\(^\text{13}\) and multiplied by the number of government services per region or per country providing a rough aggregate number. This method is based on the premise that all other factors are equal across the area that is covered in the calculation, i.e. size of government services, beneficiary numbers, costs, etc.

For the calculation of indirect beneficiaries, the direct beneficiaries (children) are multiplied by two, based on the assumption that most children have two parents. To address concerns about single parents, they consider that this methodology compensates for families with more than one child.

Thematic sector 3: Emergency Response Programs
In response programs, the definition of beneficiaries is mostly dictated by donors. In principle, every grant comes with its own requirements for monitoring and evaluating impact, although convergences may exist. Currently, WV response programs are focused in complying with grant specifications and for this reason a universal definition of beneficiaries of Emergency Programs does not exist.

Calculation methodology
The methodology for calculating direct beneficiaries varies from grant to grant. For calculating indirect beneficiaries, the number of direct beneficiaries is multiplied by the number that represents the average size of household. This calculation is based on the assumption of a ‘spillover effect’, whereby family members benefit from the services and/or goods received by the direct beneficiary.

The biggest challenge in response programs with regards to the calculation of beneficiaries is the multiple counting of aid recipients aka ‘double counting’\(^\text{14}\). This situation may result from ‘reoccurring beneficiaries’, referring to recipients who receive multiple benefits from a single program through the course of a grant and/or ‘overlapping beneficiaries’, referring to recipients who receive multiple benefits from several programs.

Thematic Sector 4: Sponsorship Programs
In sponsorship, more broadly, the term beneficiaries refers to registered children (RCs), i.e., children who are enrolled in the sponsorship program, and other community members who enjoy ‘shared direct benefits’. Shared direct benefits refers to the goods and services that registered children, their families and other members of their community receive through program activities.

\(^{13}\) The exact methodology for the calculation of what is considered to be delivered services was not provided.
\(^{14}\) Note, however, that double counting is a common problem that cuts across all types of programs and funding streams
With regards to disaggregating between direct and indirect beneficiaries, as MEER is aligning with the latest Sponsorship in Programming (SIP) approach and activities are planned and implemented together with development programs, registered and non-registered children are equally regarded as primary beneficiaries. However at partnership level, especially in ADPs with more than ten years of operations, sometimes only registered children are considered direct beneficiaries, as they are in the focus of sponsorship activities.

**Thematic Sector 5: Faith Based Programs**
According to the annual Christian Commitments Assessment (ACCA), the primary focus in FinD programs is local faith communities, not individuals per se. Specifically, NOs success at implementing/integrating FinD programs is evaluated against four criteria: (1) Capacity to establish relations with local faith communities and traditions, regardless of religious background, (2) Developing a prominent and dynamic role in child focus issues, in relation with other local religions entities/communities, (3) Becoming an Influencing leader or active member of numerous local other world religions NGOs networks, (4) Establishing informal partnerships with different local faith communities and traditions.

We also reviewed the Christian Commitment Assessment (CCA) log sheet & quantitative indicators data, which provided more information about quantitative indicators that are used to assess progress and success. In addition to the four criteria mention above, the log sheet requests quantitative information about people trained and beneficiaries of WV interventions (see standard 6), without however operationalizing the terms. Under standard 9, there is special reference to children beneficiaries, classifying two categories that provide some form of operationalization i.e. # of children benefitting from any SNC activity supported by WV, # number of children participating in regular Spiritual nurture activities. The same standard also refers to families as beneficiaries, i.e. # of families equipped to support their children’s spiritual development, # of families engaged in SNC.

**Industry Mapping**
In addition to the regional mapping exercise, we conducted an industry research to collect information about how other international humanitarian organizations define and operationalize the concept of aid recipients. The investigation included a detailed review of the information that was available on the official website of these organizations and their latest annual report (when available). The review included organization with a similar mandate: ChildFund, UNICEF, Save the children, Catholic Relief Services, ActionAid and Oxfam (see annex 2 for a description).

In addition to the secondary review, we communicated directly with these organizations, sharing the scope and vision of the ToB and asking about their latest developments in this area, as well as inviting them to engage with us further at taking this discussion to the next level. We will update this report accordingly as we receive their feedback.

**ChildFund International**
The review did not return an explicit definition for beneficiaries by Childfund. Based on an analysis of the content they have on their website and reports, we assume that the operationalization they use is similar to the one WV is using for development programs, i.e. Direct and Indirect beneficiaries, without however any specific information on the operationalization of the two concepts.
UNICEF
A concrete operationalization of the concept was not found on their online knowledge centre or latest annual report. Based on the descriptions and size of reported figures, we can infer that the terminology they use is based on direct and indirect beneficiaries. There is however no specific information on the operationalization of the two concepts.

Save the Children
Although we could not find a reference dedicated to these concepts, information on the website of the organisation and their latest annual report 2013, seems to suggest the use of the categories direct and indirect beneficiaries. There is no specific information nevertheless on the operationalization of the two concepts.

However, we did find an evaluation report carried out by Crowe Clark Whitehill LLP on behalf of Save the Children International that addressed the beneficiary concept more explicitly. The term “reached” was used to refer to the provision of humanitarian aid, which was directly and indirectly reached. More specifically, ‘directly reached’ refers to individuals who: received one or more project/program inputs from a Save the Children member or its implementing partner, participated in activities of a Save the Children member or its implementing partner, accessed services provided by Save the Children or one of its implementing partners, received inputs, activities or services from individuals/institutions to whom Save the Children or its partners have provided sustained support.

‘Indirectly reached’ refers to: individuals who received messaging via a communication campaign, IEC and/or awareness raising efforts or events conducted or supported by a Save the Children member or one of its implementing partners, and the family or community members whose well-being is expected to be enhanced by a person reached directly by Save the Children or one of its implementing partners.

Catholic Relief Services
CRS maintains a well-developed online knowledge database of CRS. We managed to find clear references regarding the operationalization of humanitarian aid recipients. At a conceptual level, recipients are classified under two categories, ‘communities’ and ‘participants’. ‘Communities’ are individual women, men, girls and boys who fall into different social-economic groups i.e. young or elderly, abled or disabled, program participants or nonparticipants. Communities include local leaders, members of community-based organizations and members of local government. ‘Program participants’ are individuals whom the program aims to assist. Other commonly used terms for program participants. include beneficiaries, clients and people affected by disaster.

We also found references to a technical framework that CRS developed specifically for measuring and monitoring aid recipients more efficiently, the Beneficiary and Service Delivery Indicators (BSDI). For all CRS projects, beneficiary registration data (unique beneficiary identifier, gender and age) and service delivery data (type, date and GPS location of service delivery) are all linked through project number. Beneficiary data reside in an agency-wide database that includes the project’s financial data which are analyzable alongside performance data. BSDI is based on a categorization of services within
each of CRS’ established program areas and definitions for the direct and indirect beneficiaries of each service category.

In this regard, the BSDI framework identifies three categories of humanitarian aid projects: (1) Projects with the primary intention of delivering a particular benefit to an identifiable person or group of persons (Direct Beneficiaries, Indirect Beneficiaries), (2) Projects with the intention of enhancing a particular policy environment and (3) Projects with the intention of strengthening institutions or empower communities. Although the details of how each category is framed and how beneficiaries in each category are calculated is not explicitly discussed in the concept paper, the proposed methodology and logic of the framework is noteworthy.

**ActionAid**

Although the term “beneficiaries” was widely used across resources found in the online knowledge bank of the organization to describe the recipients of humanitarian aid, there was no clear information on the conceptual or technical use of the term. Based on the way the term ‘beneficiaries’ was used in the annual reporting and on the size of the figures provided, we are confident that the term is used similarly to the way it is used in WV development programs, which is direct and indirect beneficiaries.

**Oxfam**

The primary language that was found on Oxfam’s online knowledge resources and latest annual report distinguishes individuals receiving aid between those directly and those indirectly benefiting from aid programs, without providing detailed information on how the two groups are calculated. According to the organisation’s **policy on program evaluation**, they follow the terminology put forward by The Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), as it is found in the **glossary of evaluation and results based management**. According to that, ‘beneficiaries’ are individuals, groups, or organizations, whether targeted or not, that are benefitted, directly or indirectly, from the development intervention. Unfortunately, no further information is provided in terms of technical operationalization.

**Mapping results**

This review compiled information from different sources in order to understand what the current state of practice is regarding the typing of beneficiaries and their calculation. We more specifically brought together the main approaches deployed in the Global Office, in MEERO, and in a number of other organisation doing humanitarian/ development work. We also undertook a more detailed exercise whereby we identified five thematic sectors (development, advocacy, emergency report, sponsorship, and faith in development) to better understand how beneficiaries are typed, operationalised, and calculated within these five sectors. Towards this end we consulted with key stakeholders of each sector in different NOs of MEER.

The main impression we were left with after completing this review is that there is a lot of discrepancy regarding especially the typing and operationalisation of beneficiaries. This discrepancy occurs in multiple levels both within WV, within MEER, between different thematic sectors, and between WV and other humanitarian organisation.
We now present the most important findings that emerged from this review:

- Development: Despite the sound definition and operationalization shared in this exercise, as the previous regional exercise revealed, there still seems to be some debates regarding the definitions across the NOs, between direct and indirect, or primary, secondary and tertiary.
- Advocacy: Not clear how potential beneficiaries are calculated and what is the assumed impact.
- Emergency response: there is no system to bridge the different operationalizations across grant reporting. In counting beneficiaries, double-counting is a common problem, as it is with other sectors (such as development).
- Sponsorship: despite efforts to align the operationalization, there is still assumed discrepancy among older ADPs regarding the definition of direct beneficiaries.
- FinD: They operate on a broader definition that includes individuals, institutions and religious leaders, without a clear technical alignment between the levels or with the other sectors.

Moreover we identified that despite the lack of consistency, all sectors have made significant efforts to progress in this area, which is verified by the fact that each key stakeholder provided a concrete definition for their sector. This also confirms the ongoing efforts and dedication of the organization to tackle this challenge.

It is interesting to note, as the industry review revealed, that with the exception of CRS which appears to be leading this discussion in the industry, none of the other organizations had published a document in which they explain the conceptual and technical operationalization they use to measure and monitor the people who engaged with and support with their programs. Of course, we acknowledge that this may be because the information was not available via an electronic source, so we will update this Inference should we hear back from them.

In sum, this review has proven to be a very useful exercise as it allowed the positioning of MEER in this specific area of the industry. What we have discovered is that MEER may not be leading the developments in this area but it is certainly not well behind and has the prospect of shaping the global agenda. The development of the ToB will be the first step in this direction.
SECTION C: CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The Typology of Beneficiaries (ToB) is meant to be a comprehensive framework that takes into account the unique contextual differences and funding requirements between and within sectors and programs to provide an all-inclusive operationalization for defining, calculating and monitoring the recipients of humanitarian aid. The framework will be sensitive to the socio-political and cultural diversity of the context but also take into consideration the monitoring and reporting requirements of each program (i.e. donor requirements).

The design of the ToB will be based on a multilevel, cross-sectoral approach, which will align the programs to a common operationalization and understanding, while preserving their unique technical requirements. The vertical alignment within each sector will be achieved via the transformation of the input indicators and/or the transformation of the output indicators at sector level, so that they meet the recommended technical guidelines. The horizontal alignment across sectors will be achieved via a similar process of output indicator transformation, where each sector will be adjusted to the requirements of the framework. See figure 2 for reference.

Figure 2: Schematic representation of the Typology of Beneficiaries

The technical framework will outline the exact process and methodology via which the alignment within and between sectors will take place. This will entail an in-depth empirical process of consultation with the key-stakeholders in each sector to agree on the vertical alignment between programs. The horizontal alignment between sectors will be discussed separately once the technical specifications for each sector are agreed.
Vertical alignment within sectors

The vertical alignment within each sector will be achieved via the transformation of the input indicators at program level and/or the transformation of the output indicators at sector level, so that they meet the recommended technical guidelines of each sector. Input indicators refer to the particular codes and methodology used to define and capture the concept of beneficiaries and output indicators refer to the codes and methodology used to report it at sector level.

Figure 3: Vertical alignment within sectors

The technical details of the transformation process at input level are not available at this stage as they will rely heavily on the requirements and preferences of the key stakeholders within each sector. This process may involve the collection of additional information at program level or the dropping of existing indicators that will be considered obsolete.

The most important part of this process is that it will produce the concrete definition and operationalization of the different types of beneficiaries for each sector, i.e. classifications, types of benefits, impact etc. This in turn will be introduced to the region via the use of a universal reporting system which will align the input indicators. The system will outline the technical guidelines and methodology for collecting the information.
Horizontal alignment across sectors

The horizontal alignment will rely on the transformation process at sector level to link and consolidate information across programs in a meaningful way. This implies that the output indicators will be already transformed in a consistent technical language that can be consolidated across programs and sectors.

The technical details of the horizontal alignment will rely heavily on the conceptualization and operationalization that will be agreed at sector level. In this regard, no further consultation with key stakeholders from the sectors will be necessary. This process will be used to consolidate the information across sectors as per the agreed characteristics of beneficiary types i.e. classifications, types of benefits, impact etc.

Figure 4: Horizontal alignment across sectors

There are two important components regarding the successful horizontal alignment across sectors. Firstly, the information that is fed into the recommended system must be technically rigorous and consistent across the board. This will ensure a rich and reliable database to work from. Secondly, the recommended system that will be used to collect the information should be based on technologies that allow seamless integration with the existing input systems at sector level. At the same time, it must provide automated synthesizing of cross-sectoral information and making it available for further analysis and reporting on request.
SECTION D: TECHNICAL FRAMEWORK

The transition from the concept to the application.

In order to come up with a definition of beneficiaries, programs were clustered in five thematic categories (development, advocacy, emergency response sponsorship, and faith in development) so as to systematically identify how beneficiaries are defined and counted within and across these categories.

Our review yielded that the term ‘beneficiaries’ as well as the basic distinction of beneficiaries between ‘direct’ and ‘indirect’ transcended all the categories of programs as a common practice in the region. We have, therefore, opted to use the term beneficiary and the basic distinction between direct and indirect beneficiaries as the foundation for the technical framework.

The additional term we are adding to the terminology of the typology of beneficiaries is the concept of ‘benefit’, which is referring to any service, product, aid etc that is offered by World Vision programming to individuals (beneficiaries). This term has a more functional utility, contributing both to the precise calculation of the number of beneficiaries as well as establishing an understanding about cumulative effects per beneficiary.

The term ‘beneficiary’ refers to individuals whose lives are (positively) affected due to an intervention of World Vision. The distinction of direct and indirect beneficiaries emerges due to the nature of (many of) World Vision’s programs. As World Vision’s target is to at the end of the day to aid communities and not just individuals, it is no surprise that many of its programs have the potential to reach more people than the ones directly participating in, or benefiting directly from, these programs. Typically, the ones thought to benefit indirectly from WV’s programs are the members of the (direct) beneficiary’s household.

Apart from programs that have the capacity to reach the family of the beneficiary there are programs that aim at beneficiaries becoming multipliers and therefore ‘convey’ the benefit to other members in their community. Think, for example, of a group of nurses who receive training on a specific practice and who then organize seminars for other nurses to convey their new knowledge to them. This second group of nurses are indirect beneficiaries whereas the first group of nurses (the ones who initially received training) are direct beneficiaries who have the role of a multiplier.

A fairly difficult category of programs to tackle when defining beneficiaries is programs related to advocacy. Apart from the central issue of whether or not WV should be ‘credited’ with beneficiaries when its contribution to advocacy is not vital, there is a second issue which relates to the typology of beneficiaries and more specifically to whether individuals benefiting from advocacy should be regarded as direct or as indirect beneficiaries or even in some cases as potential beneficiaries.

Having reviewed an array of advocacy project reports and discussed these matters with key stakeholders in the area, it was agreed that beneficiaries under advocacy should be considered as direct beneficiaries. There are however a few caveats to be considered, which will be discussed next in the section devoted to counting advocacy beneficiaries. The main caveat nevertheless is that...
particularly for national-level advocacy and corresponding policies, the population affected by the policy in question are potential beneficiaries of which direct beneficiaries are those individuals who are aware of the policy and are either already benefiting from it or have the potential to benefit from it, should the need emerge.

The bottom line here is that the categories of direct and indirect beneficiaries can be used to identify beneficiaries in all of WV’s programs. However, a number of different types of programs were identified and will be presented in more detail below. These programs are qualitatively distinct with regards to: a) whether they are meant to have indirect participants or not, b) whether direct participants are also multipliers, and c) whether they concern (national level) advocacy or not. Before presenting the types of programs it should be noted that this attempted typology purely serves technical purposes (i.e., the counting of beneficiaries) and does not overrule the types of beneficiaries which are two: direct beneficiaries and indirect beneficiaries.

**Definitions in a Nutshell**

**Direct beneficiaries** are all individuals who directly receive benefits.

**Indirect beneficiaries** are members in the household of individuals who directly receive benefits.

**Benefits** are services (e.g., access to health professionals), products (e.g., commodities), events (e.g., workshops), spaces (e.g., child friendly spaces), policies, that are offered by World Vision with the goal of reaching targeted populations.

**Multipliers:** are all individuals who directly receive benefits and who are able to reach (and thus benefit) community members other than, or in addition to, their household members.

**Types of Programs**

We propose that the various programs/ activities of WV are divided into four types:

**Type 1:** Programs that only have direct beneficiaries; an example of such a program are Child Friendly Spaces (CFS).

**Type 2:** Programs that have direct and indirect beneficiaries (household members); an example of such a program are distribution of goods such as food, hygiene kits and so on distributed to a member of the family.

**Type 3:** Programs that have direct beneficiaries who are multipliers and who benefit community members other that (or in addition to) their household members; an example of such a program are farmers trained in a new method of cultivation who then go on to train other farmers in it.

**Type 4:** National-level advocacy programs; an example of such a program is WV advocating successfully for the passing of a bill on inclusive education.

**Figure 5:** The four types of beneficiary calculation programs.
How to Define and Calculate Beneficiaries

Counting beneficiaries is a task that is directly connected to the definition of beneficiaries. Clarity in defining beneficiaries is therefore needed in order for accurate counting to happen. Calculating per se, however, is a challenging task that is very prone to mistakes. Such problems that are innate to the process of calculating beneficiaries are lack of reporting consistency, double-counting, and lack of a common practice.

Double-counting is the biggest challenge the organization is facing. The dimension of ‘benefits’ in the terminology of beneficiaries was first introduced at the Syria Strategy Monitoring Framework. The advantage of introducing the notion of ‘benefits’ is that it allows the calculation of benefits per beneficiary, which in turn provides the capacity to use that information to identify the overlap of projects which can be used to cancel out the double-counting. At the same time it provides a qualitative dimension about the geographical distribution of the impact of programs/projects.

The main approach for the calculation of beneficiaries is based on two main premises.

The first premise is that in order to accurately count beneficiaries we need to extort crucial information from beneficiaries themselves. Take for example the risk of double-counting. If the information of how many benefits, on average, a beneficiary received was known, it could be used as a ‘constant’ to divide the total number of benefits across all programs to calculate the number of unique recipients of benefits (beneficiaries without any overlap).

\[
\text{True beneficiaries} = \frac{\text{Total beneficiaries}}{\text{Average number of benefits per individual}}
\]
As it is both impractical and expensive, if not simply unfeasible, to interview all beneficiaries in a country in order to extract the required info, it is recommended to use probability sampling to reach a representative sample that will generate the required information.

The second premise is that a single formula can be utilized in order to calculate beneficiaries, by combining information from all four types of programs. In its simplest form, the total number of beneficiaries is the sum of beneficiaries across the four types of programs. It is deemed that a formula that is used across NOs will add to the proficiency and transparency of the counting process.

Initial steps towards counting beneficiaries

There are certain preparatory steps that need to be completed in order to collect the numbers for the beneficiary calculation formula.

Step 1: Categorization of programs

Cluster WV’s actions into the four types of programs and estimate the number of benefits per program (see figure 6). Where possible, clustering has to be done a priori (i.e., when the program is initially conceptualized and before it materializes). Where an a priori decision is unfeasible or in those cases in which the program implementation does not turn out according to plan, then the necessary amendments need to be made in retrospect. For example if a Type 3 program aiming at direct beneficiaries becoming multipliers did not turn out as planned (direct beneficiaries did not become multipliers), then this program is re-clustered in retrospect to a Type 1 program.

Figure 6: Example of program classification according to type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of program</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program 1</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 4</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 5</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 6</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 7</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 8</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 9</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 10</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 11</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 12</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 12</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 14</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>120000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sum of benefits for Type 1 programs = 30500
Sum of benefits for Type 2 programs = 31500
Sum of benefits for Type 3 programs = 200
Sum of benefits for Type 4 programs = 145000
Step 2: Identify the average number of benefits per individual

This step has three stages; the first stage regards the sampling process, including the determination of the sample size and sampling unit. The second stage pertains to the methodology used to calculate the number of benefits, and the third stage is where we proceed to calculate the average number of benefits per beneficiary.

Stage 1: Sampling
a) Map programs and benefits by geographic area within an ADP (see Figure 7).
b) Decide which areas need to be sampled. The areas that need to be sampled are those in which an overlap (double-counting) is anticipated. In the example given above we have more than one programs administered in all three areas. The likelihood of beneficiaries (i.e., physical persons) receiving more than one benefit is existent in all three areas and for this reason they all need to be sampled.
c) Use the designated sampling formula to determine the number of respondents per geographic area. The ‘population’ of each area is the number of benefits. This will mean that a bigger sample will need to be deployed in Area B in comparison to areas A and C.
d) Once the sample size is determined then proceed with stratified random sampling.

Stage 2: Interview the beneficiaries sampled
a) Identify the number of benefits per beneficiary: To obtain this information, a brief survey-type checklist must be administered to a sample of beneficiaries (per geographic unit in an ADP) asking them to record the type and number of benefits they received (see figure 7 for an example).
b) Exclusively for advocacy, using the same survey-type checklist, ask respondents: i) if they know of each policy change that was put into effect in the year the report was drafted, ii) ask
respondents if they actively benefitted from that policy or if they think they will at a point be benefitted by it.

**Note:** Stage 2(b) may differ, especially if only vulnerable individuals are counted towards advocacy beneficiaries. If this is the case, then the representative sample for national advocacy programs must derive from the target population/s of the policies which were recently implemented.

### Stage 3: Calculate average number of benefits per beneficiary

Once the information above is gathered, it is fairly straightforward to calculate the average number of benefits per beneficiary in each geographic area. To calculate this number we add the total number of benefits across beneficiaries and divide this sum by the number of beneficiaries.

In the example above (figure 7), the sum of benefits across beneficiaries is: 55 (4+6+7+8+4+5+4+6+5+6) and the number of beneficiaries in our sample is: 10. So the **average number of benefits per beneficiary** is \( \frac{55}{10} = 5.5 \).

### Type 1 programs

To calculate the number of direct beneficiaries taking into account the fact that some direct recipients have received more than one benefits and so to avoid double-counting, we:

**Step 1:** Calculate the total number of benefits across all Type 1 programs (this may include HEA, development, local level advocacy etc but not Type 2, Type 3 or Type 4 programs).

**Step 2:** Divide the total number of benefits of Type 1 programs by the average number of benefits per beneficiary to come up with the number of true direct beneficiaries.
Counting Type 1 programs example:

**Step 1**: We add the benefits of all Type 1 programs (see figure 8). In this example, we add the benefits of Program 1, 3, 4, 11, and 12. The sum of benefits for these five (Type 1) programs amount to **30,500 benefits** for Type 1 programs.

**Figure 8**: Type and number of benefits for each program – Type 1 total in red circle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of program</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program 1</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>15000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 4</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 5</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>9000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 6</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 7</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>2000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 8</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 9</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
<td>9500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 10</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>25000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 11</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 12</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 13</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 14</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
<td>120000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sum of benefits for Type 1 programs = 30,500

**Step 2**: We divide the total number of benefits for Type 1 programs (30,500) which we derived through Step 1 by the average number of benefits per beneficiary (5.5) which we calculated in Stage 3 of the second initial step. This will give us the number of ‘true’ beneficiaries for Type 1 programs which is **5,545**.

![Sum of direct beneficiaries of Type 1 programs](30500 ÷ 5.5 = 5,545)

**Note**: The number that was just produced is the sum of direct beneficiaries of Type 1 programs in a specific geographical unit within an ADP. This process has to be repeated for all units within an ADP. To calculate the total number of direct beneficiaries of Type 1 programs within an ADP we add the sum of direct beneficiaries of all geographic units. Similarly to calculate direct beneficiaries of Type 1 programs within an NO we add the direct beneficiaries of all ADPs.

**Type 2 programs**

To calculate the number of direct beneficiaries and avoid double counting we need to take into account that some direct beneficiaries have received more than one benefit. Again, we need to
establish the number of benefits per recipient, across all the geographical areas where there is overlap. There are three steps to be followed:

**Step 1:** Calculate the total number of benefits across all Type 2 programs (this may include HEA, development, local level advocacy etc, but not Type 1, Type 3 or Type 4 programs).

**Step 2:** Divide the total number of benefits of Type 2 programs by the average number of benefits per recipient to come up with the number of true direct beneficiaries of Type 2 programs.

**Step 3:** Multiply the number of true direct beneficiaries of Type 2 programs with the average number of household members minus one (1). We subtract one (1) from the average number of members in a household because the one member of the household (that we are subtracting) is counted already as a direct beneficiary.

**Counting Type 2 programs example**

**Step 1:** Add the benefits of all Type 2 programs. This means adding the benefits of Programs 2, 5, 6, 7, and 9 (see figure 9) which will give us a total of 31500 benefits for Type 2 programs.

**Figure 9:** Type and number of benefits for each program – Type 2 total in red circle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of program</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program 1</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 4</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 5</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 6</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 7</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 8</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 9</td>
<td>Type 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 10</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 11</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 12</td>
<td>Type 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 13</td>
<td>Type 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 14</td>
<td>Type 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Step 2:** Divide the total number of benefits for Type 2 programs (31500) which was calculated in Step 1 by the average number of benefits per beneficiary (5.5) which was calculated through the second initial step. We come up with the number of ‘true’ beneficiaries for Type 2 programs which is 5.727.
This number represents the number of direct beneficiaries for Type 2 programs. However, this type of programs (Type 2) has also got indirect beneficiaries and so we proceed to step 3 in order to estimate the total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries which will give us the total number of beneficiaries for Type 2 programs.

Step 3: We multiply the total number of direct beneficiaries of Type 2 programs by the average number of household members minus one. For the purposes of this example, the hypothetical average household size is 4. Therefore, if we plug the numbers into the equation this gives us the total number of beneficiaries for Type 2 programs: 17.181.

Note: The number that was just produced is the sum of beneficiaries (direct and indirect) for Type 2 programs in a specific geographical unit within an ADP. This process has to be repeated for all units within an ADP. To calculate the total number of beneficiaries of Type 2 programs within an ADP we have to add the beneficiaries of Type 2 programs from all geographic units. Similarly to calculate beneficiaries of Type 2 programs within an NO we add the beneficiaries of all ADPs.
**Type 3 programs**

To count beneficiaries of Type 3 programs we need to look at each Type 3 program separately and follow the next three steps.

**Step 1:** Determine who the beneficiaries reached by the multiplier are and distinguish if other family members are amongst beneficiaries or not (see third column of the table below).

**Step 2:** Define who the indirect beneficiaries are in the community, how many they are, and whether their family members are also benefitted (see column 4 of the table below). The number of the indirect beneficiaries in the community should be already estimated by the NO.

**Step 3:** Calculate the total number of beneficiaries for each program separately before adding them up.

**Figure 10:** Example calculation of Type 3 program beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 3 Programs</th>
<th>Brief description of program</th>
<th>Are family members beneficiaries?</th>
<th>Define population who is indirect beneficiaries</th>
<th># of indirect beneficiaries</th>
<th>Total beneficiaries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program 1</td>
<td>Midwifery training of 20 nurses to train other nurses</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Other nurses in community (N=100)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20 * 100 = 200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2</td>
<td>Train 10 farmers to build greenhouses and sell cheap fresh fruits to community.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The community members who buy products + Farmers families</td>
<td>Community members[(Average number of clients per farmer × Farmers) + (Average HH size - 1 × Farmers)] Hypothetically: (20 × 10) + (3 × 10) = 230</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 3</td>
<td>Train 30 teachers to train other teachers on raising awareness on domestic violence</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>The community members who will attend the teacher seminars + teacher families</td>
<td>Community members[(Average number of participants per seminar × Teachers) + (Average HH size - 1 × Teachers)] Hypothetically: (30 × 30) + (3 × 30) = 990</td>
<td>990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total Type 3 beneficiaries 1420</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The number that was just produced is the sum of beneficiaries (direct and indirect) for Type 3 programs in a specific geographical unit within an ADP. This process has to be repeated for all units within an ADP. To calculate the total number of beneficiaries of Type 3 programs within an ADP we have to add the beneficiaries of Type 3 programs from all geographic units. Similarly to calculate beneficiaries of Type 3 programs within an NO we add the beneficiaries of all ADPs.
Note: Before proceeding to estimate the number of beneficiaries per advocacy program, the contribution of WV to the advocacy work leading to the policy in question coming into effect should have been already established.

Type 4 programs
This type refers to national level advocacy only. As mentioned in the previous sections, local level advocacy is calculated using the methodology of the previous types, depending on the scope and population under study.

For national level advocacy programs, beneficiaries are calculated by taking into account individuals who belong to the targeted population, who are aware of the policy change, and who are either already benefiting from it or believe they will benefit from it if the need emerges. To achieve this, the following four steps should be followed.

Step 1: Identify the targeted population for each policy and estimate its size in each ADP (see Column 3 in figure 11).

Step 2: Take a stratified random sample of each of these populations across ADPs.

Step 3: Ask respondents whether they are aware of the policy and whether they have benefitted or will be benefitting from it. This will allow us to estimate the percentage of the targeted population that is actually aware of the policy and benefits/ will benefit from it.

Step 4: The above has to be repeated for every ADP until the entire targeted population in the National Office is covered. We then proceed to estimate the percentage of the targeted population in the NO that is actually benefitted from each policy, by estimating the mean percentage of coverage across all corresponding ADPs.

Counting Type 4 programs example
Below we have two advocacy programs. As figure 11 shows, the first program concerns inclusive education and the population it targets are children with disabilities who are estimated to be 2500 in a specific ADP. The second program concerns access of children to after school services and the target population here are children living in rural areas (of and ADP) and who are estimated to be 120.000 for the particular ADP (Step 1).

Figure 11. Identification of target beneficiaries for each policy in ADPs.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type 4 programs</th>
<th>Name of Policy</th>
<th>Target Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program 1</td>
<td>Inclusive Education</td>
<td>Children with disabilities. Size in ADP = 2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program 2</td>
<td>Access of children from rural areas to afterschool services</td>
<td>Children from rural areas. Size = 120 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Step 2 we need to select a random representative sample of these two populations in each ADP and interview them in order to determine how many of them are actually benefiting from the policy’s implementation (Step 3). As figure 12 below shows, 80% of children with disabilities, and 40% of children living in rural areas are benefitting from the corresponding policies.

Figure 12. Percentage of confirmed beneficiaries from each advocacy program in an ADP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program 1 (Inclusive education)</th>
<th>Program 2 (afterschool services)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative sample Response</td>
<td>Representative sample Response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 1 No</td>
<td>Respondent 1 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 2 Yes</td>
<td>Respondent 2 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 3 Yes</td>
<td>Respondent 3 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 4 Yes</td>
<td>Respondent 4 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 5 No</td>
<td>Respondent 5 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 6 Yes</td>
<td>Respondent 6 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 7 Yes</td>
<td>Respondent 7 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 8 Yes</td>
<td>Respondent 8 Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 9 Yes</td>
<td>Respondent 9 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent 10 Yes</td>
<td>Respondent 10 No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We need to perform the same exercise in all ADPs of the country in order to produce the percentage of potential beneficiaries in the whole NO who are actually benefiting from each advocacy program. As figure 13 shows, in an NO with three ADPs we have varying percentages of target population that is benefitted from each advocacy program. We need to produce the average of the three percentages for each program to come up with the percentage of the NO’s target population that is actually benefitted from each program.

Figure 13. Producing the average percentage of target population benefitted for each advocacy program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of target population benefitted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy Program 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADP C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For Advocacy Program 1 for example, this would be (80% + 50% + 65%)/3 which is 65%. That means that 65% of the total target population in an NO were beneficiaries of Advocacy program 1. Since we know the total size of the target population in an NO we perform the corresponding calculation to produce the number of beneficiaries. If therefore the total number of children with disabilities in the NO is 10,000. If we multiple this to the respective percentage (65%) then we can estimate that 6,500 children with disabilities would have benefitted from Advocacy program 1.
An important note for advocacy beneficiaries

What is presented here is the method to calculate advocacy’s beneficiaries in a manner that is consistent with the approach we follow for other programs. It is recognized however, that the work of advocacy is not fully reflected in the number of beneficiaries only. It is advised that advocacy maintains its own internal monitoring processes that allow an evaluation of advocacy work on those indicators of success that are most pertinent to advocacy.

Some of the internal monitoring indicators may include:

1) Total numbers of beneficiaries for whom WV contributed to policy advancements addressing causes of vulnerability, but we may not have any evidence of implementation of the policies yet.

2) Numbers for whom WV contributed to policy advancements addressing causes of vulnerability, and we have some evidence that the policies have started to be implemented, but we may not have direct evidence that individuals are aware or feeling the benefits.

Note: These calculations should not be added to the total number of beneficiaries. The only number to be counted towards the grand total of beneficiaries in an NO is the number that is produced through the methodology described above under program Type 4.

Putting the pieces together

To calculate the total number of beneficiaries for the entire National Office across all ADPs, the total number of direct beneficiaries of Type 1 programs plus the total number of direct and indirect beneficiaries of Type 2 and Type 3 programs, and the beneficiaries of advocacy needs to be added.
ANNEXES

Annex 1

List of stakeholders (in alphabetical order) who contributed to the development of the conceptual framework of the ToB:

**Senior Leadership**

1. Catalina Buciu, Regional Director, Strategy and Evidence Unit
2. Clare Seddon, Field Support Director, Development, Learning, and Impact
3. Hendrik-Jan Harbers, Regional Director, Humanitarian & Emergency Affairs
4. Janes Immanuel Ginting, Regional Director (former), Strategy and Evidence Unit
5. Lauren Taylor, Field Support Director, Development, Learning, and Impact
6. Rein Dekker, National Director, World Vision Albania and Kosovo

**Regional Technical Experts**

7. Giorgos Filippou, Evidence Base Manager, Strategy and Evidence Unit
8. Jasenko Eminovic, Ministry Quality Manager, Development, Learning and Impact

**Regional stakeholders**

10. Jocelyn Penner, Deputy Policy Director & LH Lead for Policy Change for Children
11. Kate Kobaidze, Sponsorship Transformation Leader, Sponsorship
12. Liana Poghosyan, Strategy, Quality and Evidence Director for South Caucasus
13. Mihai Pavel, Fr., FinD Leader, Development, Learning and Impact
14. Mindy Roduner, Senior Program Officer, World Vision Afghanistan
15. Sami Khoury, DM&E Manager (former), World Vision JWG
Annex 2

Descriptive information about the organizations included in the industry mapping.

ChildFund International

Formerly known as Christian Children's Fund, it is a child development organization based in Richmond, Virginia, United States. It provides assistance to deprived, excluded and vulnerable children in 30 countries, including the United States. Its main source of income are individual contributors in the form of monthly child sponsorships. Their services include vocational training, literacy training, food distribution, educational programs, early childhood development, health and immunization programs, nutritional programs, water and sanitation development, and emergency relief.

UNICEF

It was created by the United Nations General Assembly on December 11, 1946, to provide emergency food and healthcare to children in countries that had been devastated by World War II. In 1953, UNICEF became a permanent part of the United Nations System and its name was shortened from the original United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund but it has continued to be known by the popular acronym based on this previous title. It is the main UN organization defending, promoting and protecting children’s rights. It also works towards protecting the world’s most disadvantaged children.

Save the Children

Is an international non-governmental organization that promotes children's rights, provides relief and helps support children in developing countries. It was established in the United Kingdom in 1919 in order to improve the lives of children through better education, health care, and economic opportunities, as well as providing emergency aid in natural disasters, war, and other conflicts.

Catholic Relief Services

Is the international humanitarian agency of the Catholic community in the United States. Founded in 1943 by the U.S. bishops, the agency provides assistance to 130 million people in more than 90 countries and territories in Africa, Asia, Latin America, the Middle East and Eastern Europe. A member of Caritas Internationalis, the worldwide network of Catholic humanitarian agencies, CRS provides relief in emergency situations and helps people in the developing world break the cycle of poverty through community-based, sustainable development initiatives.
**ActionAid**

Is an international non-governmental organization whose primary aim is to fight poverty and injustice worldwide. It was founded in 1972 as a child sponsorship charity with the focus primarily being to provide children with an education. It now works with local partners in over 45 countries, across a field of thematic areas, including Education, Food rights, Women's rights, Democratic Governance, Emergencies and conflict and Climate change. According to their latest annual report, in 2013 the organization reached 27 million impoverished and disadvantaged people.

**Oxfam**

Was originally founded in Oxford, Oxfordshire in 1942 as the Oxford Committee for Famine Relief by a group of Quakers, social activists and Oxford academics. Today, it is an international confederation of 17 organizations working in approximately 94 countries worldwide to find solutions to poverty and what it considers as injustice around the world. Each organization (affiliate) works together internationally to achieve a greater impact through collective efforts. Their business model is working directly with communities and seeks to influence the powerful, to ensure that poor people can improve their lives and livelihoods and have a say in decisions that affect them.