ANNEX 7
PEOPLE-CENTRED OUTPUT AND INTERMEDIATE OUTCOME INDICATORS

This annex presents a sample set of output and intermediate outcome indicators for common justice and security interventions supported by UNDP. Grounded in the people-centred approach outlined in the Guide, the indicators help teams move beyond activity-based metrics to track tangible changes in people's experiences, agency and outcomes.

The nine dimensions of change introduced in Step 2 support teams to define and measure the types of change that matter for people-centred outcomes: shifts in people's participation, inclusion, agency and access, as well as in institutional behaviour, responsiveness and accountability.

By focusing on what matters to people, such as whether they can access justice, feel safe, are treated fairly and can act when their rights are at risk, these indicators support more meaningful measurement and more accountable people-centred programming.

Intervention Area	Result type	Indicator	People-Centred Dimensions
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Output	% of legal aid services accessed by women, youth, persons with disabilities, internally displaced persons or ethnic minorities	Inclusion, Access
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Output	# of legal aid clients referred by community-based or frontline actors (e.g., paralegals, health workers, social workers, teachers, traditional leaders)	Access, Inclusion
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Output	# of legal aid delivery points (e.g., help desks, university clinics, mobile units) co-designed or revised through direct community consultations	Participation, Access
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Output	# of awareness sessions conducted by community paralegals	Access, Agency
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Intermediate outcome	% of community members who report improved understanding of their rights after awareness sessions	Access, Agency
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Intermediate outcome	% of people who report paralegal support helped them understand options and make decisions to resolve a justice problem	Access, Agency
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Intermediate outcome	% of people who report taking specific action to resolve a justice problem within [X period of time] of attending an awareness session/receiving legal advice	Access, Agency
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Intermediate outcome	% of legal aid clients who report overall satisfaction with the legal aid service, regardless of case outcome	Access, Service orientation
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Intermediate outcome	% of legal aid clients who report that their view of the justice system improved after receiving support	Service orientation, Accountability
Legal aid/legal empowerment	Intermediate outcome	% of legal aid clients who report understanding the advice or process after receiving legal aid services	Access, Agency

Community engagement/policing	Output	# of officers trained in community engagement, trauma response or conflict sensitivity	Shifting mindsets and behaviour, Service orientation
Community engagement/policing	Output	# of police-community dialogues held per quarter where community priorities are jointly defined and documented	Participation, service orientation
Community engagement/policing	Output	# of joint police-community action plans that include priorities raised by women, youth and other excluded groups	Participation, Inclusion, Accountability
Community engagement/policing	Output	# of co-designed (community and police) safety initiatives tailored to women's or youth concerns implemented within X months	Inclusion, Access
Community engagement/policing	Output	# of local/national policy documents that incorporate community policing principles	Embedding in systems
Community engagement/policing	Intermediate outcome	% of local governments or police stations with dedicated budget lines for implementing community policing strategy by end of Financial Year X	Embedding in systems
Community engagement/policing	Intermediate outcome	% of community members who report improved communication and trust with police as a result of police-community collaboration	Service orientation, Accountability
Community engagement/policing	Intermediate outcome	% of community members from vulnerable groups who report having a voice in local safety decisions (disaggregate by group type)	Inclusion, Agency
Community engagement/policing	Intermediate outcome	% of police officers who report increased understanding of community needs after participating in engagement activities	Shifting mindsets and behaviour, Service orientation
Community engagement/policing	Intermediate outcome	% of community members who report being treated with fairness and respect during their most recent interaction with police	Service orientation, Accountability
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Output	# of functional feedback or complaints mechanisms established or improved in justice/security institutions within project period	Accountability and oversight, Embedding in systems, Service orientation
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Output	# of frontline service facilities redesigned to integrate justice, legal aid and social services (e.g., police stations, one-stop centres, justice houses)	Service orientation, Embedding in systems
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Output	# of institutional reforms that incorporate feedback or priorities identified by women, youth or marginalised groups during consultations	Participation, Inclusion, Shifting mindsets and behaviour
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Output	# of inter-agency coordination mechanisms established or strengthened to address justice or security bottlenecks (e.g., justice coordination committees, multisectoral taskforces)	Embedding in systems, Accountability and oversight
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Output	# of staff trained in people-centred service delivery, including trauma-informed, victim-sensitive and inclusive practices (disaggregated by institution and gender)	Shifting mindsets and behaviour, Service orientation
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Intermediate outcome	% of users who report being treated with empathy and respect when interacting with justice/security staff	Service orientation
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Intermediate outcome	% of trained staff who actively participate in formal peer support or mentoring initiatives to promote people-centred practices	Shifting mindsets and behaviour; Embedding in systems
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Intermediate outcome	% of institutions that have adopted performance review systems incorporating people-centred service standards	Accountability and oversight, Service orientation
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Intermediate outcome	% of complaints received by oversight mechanisms that are acknowledged and responded to within 30 days	Accountability and oversight
Institutional reform (justice or security)	Intermediate outcome	% of justice or security institutions that publish annual user satisfaction results for service improvement planning	Accountability and oversight, Embedding in systems, Service orientation

Programming Tip: Using quantitative and qualitative data together

Quantitative indicators are essential for tracking trends, comparing results and demonstrating progress. But in people-centred programming, numbers alone rarely tell the full story. Qualitative methods, such as focus groups, interviews or open-ended survey questions, help uncover how people experience justice and security systems, why certain outcomes occur and what changes matter most to them. Together, these approaches provide a more accurate and actionable picture. Teams should:

→ Use quantitative data to track reach, access, satisfaction or perceptions across different groups.

→ Use qualitative insights to understand how trust is built, what makes people feel safe or why some groups still face barriers to justice and security.

Combining quantitative data and qualitative insights can help teams adjust programming in real time, ensure relevance and strengthen accountability to vulnerable and marginalized people. For example, quantitative data can show the percentage of users who report being satisfied with the mediation process, while qualitative data offers users' descriptions of what made the mediation process feel fair or unfair.