

## Coverage indicators

I'd like a quick clarification. The proposal defines coverage indicators (to be indicated for the SDAs) very clearly as three levels of reach: # of specialists trained, # of institutions/provinces covered by training, and # of people served by trained specialists. However, all the possible "coverage" indicators for ACS in all the materials are really outcome indicators -- % of people who know TB symptoms, or # of districts with action plans, i.e., measuring not just the number of people reached by the activities, but the result of those activities.

By analogy to the technical side, ACS coverage indicators would be, for example in program communication -- # of materials produced, # of distribution points or TV stations, # of print runs or population exposed. However, I see that these are lousy indicators, especially here in Kazakhstan: the numbers won't change over time (they' try to have the greatest audience reach from the start) and are expensive to measure (you need to buy marketing surveys to get media reach).

So – I've put in some proposed coverage indicators that are really outcome indicators. Is there any problem that this is apples and oranges? That is, on the technical side the indicators in this chart (4.4b) will be measuring reach, but the ACS indicators will be measuring outcome. Do we need to footnote this discrepancy?