



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# USAID/Nepal 2014-2019 Performance Management Plan

**June 19, 2014**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Social Impact, Inc., under the USAID Transparency, Accountability, and Performance (TAP) Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC).

# USAID/Nepal

## 2014-2019 Performance Management Plan

**DISCLAIMER**

**The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.**

USAID Transparency, Accountability, and Performance (TAP)  
Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC)  
Contract No. AID-OAA-I-10-00013  
Task Order No. AID-367-TO-14-00001

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms .....	1
<b>I. USAID/Nepal’s Performance Management System .....</b>	<b>3</b>
Introduction .....	3
PMP Development Process and Methodology .....	4
PMP Content, Format and Timing .....	5
Transitioning to a PMP System .....	6
Performance Management Tasks and Responsibilities .....	6
Monitoring and Analysis of Key Performance Data .....	8
A. Activity/Implementing Mechanism Level .....	8
B. DO Level Results Statements .....	9
C. CDCS Results Framework (Across the DOs and Goal) Level .....	10
Third Party Performance Management .....	10
Reviewing and Reporting Results .....	11
Updating and Modifying the PMP .....	11
<b>II. CDCS Results Framework .....</b>	<b>12</b>
CDCS Integration Approach .....	14
<b>III. Performance Monitoring .....</b>	<b>16</b>
Indicator Development and Selection Criteria .....	16
Development of Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS) .....	21
<b>IV. Project/Activity Oversight .....</b>	<b>21</b>
Integrated Site Visits .....	21
Data Quality Assurance Procedures .....	21
<b>V. Evaluation .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VI. Learning Plan .....</b>	<b>24</b>
Analyzing Performance Data .....	24
Reviewing Results .....	25
Data Collection Triggers .....	26
Communicating and Sharing Learning .....	26
Learning Agenda Questions .....	27
<b>Annex I: Performance and Context Indicator Reference Sheets .....</b>	<b>29</b>
Goal: Context and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets .....	29
DO 1: Context and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets .....	38
DO 2: Context and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets .....	63
DO 3: Context and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets .....	95
<b>Annex II: Evaluation Plan .....</b>	<b>128</b>
<b>Annex III: Multi-Year Evaluation Plan .....</b>	<b>129</b>

<b>Annex IV: USAID/Nepal Task Schedule .....</b>	<b>131</b>
<b>Annex V: USAID/Nepal Glossary of Terms.....</b>	<b>134</b>
<b>Annex VI: USAID/Nepal Indicator Tracking Table.....</b>	<b>140</b>
<b>Annex VII: References .....</b>	<b>147</b>
<b>Annex VIII: Indicator Reference Sheet Templates and Instructions.....</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>Annex IX: Results Change Tracking Table .....</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>Annex X: Data Quality Assessment Worksheet .....</b>	<b>158</b>
<b>Annex XI: Source Verification Checklist.....</b>	<b>165</b>
<b>Annex XII: Mission M&amp;E Budget Tool.....</b>	<b>167</b>

# ACRONYMS

ADS	Automated Directives System
AOR/COR	Agreement Officer's Representative/ Contracting Officer's Representative
BCC	Behavior Change Communication
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
CFUG	Community Forest User Group
CIAA	Center for the Investigation of Abuse of Authority (Government of Nepal)
COP	Chief of Party
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DEC	Development Experience Clearinghouse
DDC	District Development Committees
DDO	District Development Office
DfID	Department for International Development (United Kingdom)
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
DO	Development Objective
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
DRG	Democracy, Rights, and Governance
DRR	Disaster Risk Reduction
EGR	Early Grade Reading
EGRA	Early Grade Reading Assessment
EGRP	Early Grade Reading Program
EIG	Education for Income Generation
FCHV	Female Community Health Volunteer
FECOFUN	Federation of Community Forestry Users Nepal
FNCCI	Federation of Nepalese Chambers of Commerce and Industry
FFP	Food for Peace
FTF	Feed the Future Initiative
FO	Front Office
FY	Fiscal Year
GCC	Global Climate Change
GCCI	Global Climate Change Initiative
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GESI	Gender Equality and Social Inclusion
GHI	Global Health Initiative
GON	Government of Nepal
HDI	Human Development Index
HIV/AIDS	Human Immunodeficiency Virus/Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome
ICT	Information Communication Technology
IFC	International Finance Corporation
IHDI	Income-Adjusted Human Development Index
ILO	International Labor Organization
IP	Implementing Partner
IQC	Indefinite Quantity Contract
IR	Intermediate Result
JICA	Japan International Cooperation Agency
LGBT	Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender
LOP	Life of Project

MCC	Millennium Challenge Corporation
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring & Evaluation
MoE	Ministry of Education
MoF	Ministry of Finance
MoHP	Ministry of Health and Population
MOWCSW	Ministry of Women, Children, and Social Welfare
NEAT	Nepal Economic, Agriculture, and Trade Program
NGO	Non-governmental organization
NMR	Newborn Mortality Rate
OCA	Organizational Capacity Assessment
OFDA	Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (USAID)
PACOM	Pacific Command (U.S. Department of Defense)
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
PFM	Public Financial Management
PFMRAF	Public Financial Management Risk Assessment Framework
PIRS	Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PMPPOC	Performance Management Plan Point of Contact
PPD	Program and Project Development Office
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
PPR	Performance Plan and Report
PWD	Person with Disability
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation <i>plus</i> Conservation
RF	Results Framework
RFP	Request for Proposal
RFQ	Request for Quotation
SBCC	Social and Behavior Change Communication
SI	Social Impact
SSRP	School Sector Reform Program (Government of Nepal)
Sub-IR	Sub-Intermediate Result
TAP	Transparency, Accountability, and Performance
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
VDC	Village Development Committee
ZOI	Zone of Influence

# I. USAID/NEPAL'S PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

## Introduction

USAID/Nepal has developed this comprehensive 2014-2019 Performance Management Plan (PMP) as a single, Mission-wide source of information aimed at assisting USAID/Nepal to manage for results in order to achieve its highest development goals. Performance management bridges and informs all components of the Program Cycle, from strategy design and project design to implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. Using a variety of tools to monitor, analyze, learn, and adjust programming, performance management contributes to the evidence base for USAID's management decisions, builds credibility of program reporting, and strengthens the knowledge base to achieve development results (see **Figure 1**).

This Mission-wide PMP reflects USAID/Nepal's Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS), which was approved in April 2014 and covers the period FY 2014 through FY 2019. The CDCS will guide approximately \$400 million in investments over the next five years. The overall goal for the Mission, as stated in the CDCS, is **"a more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal."** Three development objectives (DOs) contribute to achievement towards this goal and reflect the key development hypotheses that will inform USAID/Nepal's projects and activities over the 5-year CDCS period:

- DO 1: More Inclusive and Effective Governance
- DO 2: Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth to Reduce Extreme Poverty
- DO 3: Increased Human Capital

Consistent with Agency guidance, the PMP will enable the Mission to monitor and manage a core set of performance indicators that reflect appropriate targets, baselines, and data collection and analysis approaches. As a living document, the PMP will provide a basis for continuous assessment and learning about the progress achieved towards the Mission's intended results. This will facilitate constant awareness of progress on the Mission's Results Framework and help identify and address operational constraints throughout the implementation process. The PMP will also forge a consistent understanding on the status of performance management actions and will facilitate communication across all Mission teams, as well as with implementing partners (IPs), USAID/Washington, the Government of Nepal (GON), and other external stakeholders.

**Figure 1:**

Program Cycle Elements	Performance Management Tools / Tasks	Learning Opportunities	Resource Planning
Agency Policy and Strategy	Linking Agency-level requirements and guidance to Mission practice: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Presidential Initiatives</li> <li>• Earmark requirements</li> <li>• Foreign policy priorities</li> <li>• ADS requirements</li> </ul>	Facilitates the utilization of all knowledge sources to identify what is working, what is	Supports portfolio reviews, analysis of results achievement, and spending.

Program Cycle Elements	Performance Management Tools / Tasks	Learning Opportunities	Resource Planning
CDCS	Reflecting and refining the approved CDCS goal, development objectives (DOs), and intermediate results (IRs). Includes links to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evaluation questions</li> <li>• Illustrative indicators</li> <li>• Relevant Mission Orders</li> </ul>	not working, and what needs to change.  Supports decisions to adapt implementation, performance indicators, targets, and results as necessary.	Encourages the use of results-based data in development of spend plans.
Project Design and Implementation	Serves as a foundation for identifying: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project and activity-level indicators</li> <li>• Data collection methods</li> <li>• Reporting frequency</li> </ul> Guides the inclusion of performance management language in solicitations. Ensures adequate budgets for performance management requirements are included in all procurements. Guides activity-level performance analysis.	Coordinates and supports sharing of learning within the Mission, and with stakeholders, partners, and beneficiaries.	
Evaluation and Monitoring	Guides activity, project, and higher level monitoring, analysis, evaluation, and learning. Includes mechanism to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Track and collect indicator data</li> <li>• Conduct site visits and other compliance or verification activities</li> <li>• Conduct data quality assessments (a type of site visit)</li> <li>• Manage and oversee evaluations</li> <li>• Review and assess cross-sectoral and/or cross-team achievement of results</li> <li>• Report performance data</li> <li>• Better inform management decisions based on collection, analysis, and utilization of data</li> <li>• Maintain and verify performance data</li> </ul>	Guides the development and data collection for Mission learning.  Supports cross-sectoral use of prior learning, analysis, and evaluations.  Guides the use of results in analysis and in design / redesign.	

## PMP Development Process and Methodology

The PMP was developed with assistance from Social Impact (SI) under the Transparency, Accountability, and Performance (TAP) Indefinite Quantity Contract (IQC). SI provided technical assistance in Nepal and the United States from May through beginning of June 2014. Two Strategic Planning and Performance Management Technical Advisors from SI assisted USAID/Nepal's Office of Program and Project Development (PPD) in leading the Mission-wide PMP process. Each of the technical advisors worked closely with the DO teams (including various Technical Offices that comprise each DO) to fully develop the PMP.

SI adopted a facilitative and collaborative approach to working with the Mission, so that USAID/Nepal's DO teams remained at the center of the process. This entailed a concentrated effort over a four week, in-country period to: (1) review and validate the intended results statements as articulated in the CDCS to ensure that the development hypothesis matches the Mission's latest thinking, (2) select and finalize the set of Goal, DO and IR level performance and context indicators, 3) develop C/PIRS reflecting the Mission and country context and priorities, 4) compose a schedule of performance monitoring tasks, 5) compile performance indicator reference sheets for all context and performance indicators, 6) develop an evaluation plan, 7) develop a learning plan, 8) compose Data Quality Assurance (DQA) procedures, and 9) create a tracking table for performance indicators. The tasks were completed in a manner that engaged USAID staff and led to staff ownership of the final product. The SI Team also conducted a background document review (including the CDCS, various analyses that informed the CDCS, USAID/Nepal Mission Orders, and a number of other documents referenced in **Annex VII**) and key informant interviews with Washington-based representatives from the Office of Strategic Planning (SPO), the Office of South and Central Asia Affairs, and the Office of Food for Peace.

USAID/Nepal's Program and Project Development Office (PPD) and Front Office provided overarching technical direction for the development of the PMP and helped the Mission focus and concentrate its efforts. PPD conveyed the clear message that the PMP is a Mission priority, helped schedule meetings with Mission personnel, shared background documents, and provided valuable input on Mission policies, procedures and priorities.

## **PMP Content, Format and Timing**

This PMP content and format are based on and guided by current USAID guidance – including the ADS 200 series and the revised PMP Toolkit<sup>1</sup>– and were informed by working sessions with staff from each of the Mission's technical offices and PPD. The PMP includes content describing how USAID/Nepal will approach monitoring, evaluation, and learning; and delves into the roles, timing, and management procedures needed to undertake these tasks. This PMP also includes a number of templates and tools for data collection, analysis, and planning; and exceeds Agency requirements in a number of key ways:

- **An integration approach for performance management:** USAID/Nepal has developed a cross-sectoral CDCS which works to advance the Agency's integrated approach. The PMP reflects this integration in a deliberate way through the indicators, management plan, and learning approaches. A separate section on USAID/Nepal's integration approach is included in this PMP to ensure integrated monitoring and learning across the CDCS.
- **An expanded template for Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS):** The Mission has utilized a PIRS template that includes additional information meant to inform Mission staff, implementing partners, auditors, and other donors and stakeholders to better understand the operating context and priorities of USAID/Nepal and the GON. The template includes links to other results as well as other non-required fields to ensure applicability and utility for USAID/Nepal's performance management needs (see **Annex I** for completed PIRS/CIRS; see **Annex VIII** for blank PIRS/CIRS template).

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://usaidlearninglab.org/library/performance-management-plan-toolkit-guide-missions>

- **A Learning Plan:** This PMP includes a Learning Plan, aimed at supplementing the Mission's implementation of the Collaborating, Learning and Adapting methodology (see **Figure 3**).
- **A Task Schedule:** This PMP includes a schedule of key performance monitoring tasks and responsibilities (see **Annex IV**).
- **An Indicator Tracking Table:** This PMP includes an indicator tracking table, which includes baseline values and timeframes, targets, rationales for targets, and actual values. The data tables will be updated on an annual basis in order to facilitate data analysis and use for management purposes, including preparation for portfolio reviews (see **Annex VI**).

The PMP development process was carried out following CDCS approval, and concurrently with project design and development processes. The next stage of PMP development and refinement will occur as DO teams finalize their Project Appraisal Documents (PADs) and issue awards to implement these activities. These details will inform changes to the sub-IR results statements, indicators, and targets, and will determine data collection methods and other PIRS details with all relevant IPs. USAID/Nepal's performance management cycle will continue far beyond this process, however, with ongoing project monitoring as well as regular Portfolio Reviews, reporting, and evaluations.

## Transitioning to a PMP System

The PMP should not be viewed as simply a document, but rather the foundation of a dynamic performance management system. USAID/Nepal will be transitioning to AIDTracker Plus approximately in August 2014. AIDTracker Plus will serve as the Mission's primary means of storing, maintaining, modifying, analyzing and presenting performance data. The interface for users will allow staff to analyze baselines, targets, and actuals of indicators and compare data. This system, combined with the PMP narrative as well as the templates, tools, tasks, and responsibilities outlined in this PMP, will ensure that the PMP serves as a foundation for effective and useful performance management for the Mission. USAID/Nepal conducts its own internal GIS-based analyses based on geo-referenced performance data, captured and reported at the district and village development committee (VDC) level. These analyses will further bolster the ability of the Mission to adjust its activities and projects based on continuous learning.

## Performance Management Tasks and Responsibilities

Responsibility for performance management tasks are shared by all Mission staff, but are specifically designated for PPD and DO teams by various approved Mission Orders, as well as the ADS and other guidance. This includes designations for AORs/CORs in procurement, reporting, and management<sup>2</sup>. The Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Task Schedule (see **Annex IV**) is designed to aggregate all of the Mission's performance management tasks. This schedule helps ensure that all tasks are scheduled appropriately and assigned to the responsible individuals to realize economies of scale and scope, and to lessen the management burden to the Mission. Performance management tasks included in the USAID/Nepal schedule

---

<sup>2</sup> As reflected in Administrator Shah's all staff cable from August 2012 announcing the utilization of the Program Office as agents of change for the Agency and assigning ten key roles and responsibilities.

are organized around seven (7) distinct categories of key performance management activities:

1. **Performance planning and management** (see USAID/Nepal Mission Order 203 Performance Monitoring)  
This captures all planning activities related to the mission-wide implementation of USAID/Nepal's PMP. Illustrative activities include:
  - Mission-wide PMP updates and revisions
  - Modification of USAID/Nepal's Performance Indicator Reference Sheets
  - The completion and modification of project and activity-level M&E plans
  
2. **Performance reviews and analysis**  
This captures activities that pertain to USAID/Nepal's review, analysis, and utilization of performance data. Illustrative examples include:
  - Bi-annual mission-wide portfolio reviews (focus on performance; one at the beginning of the FY looking and planning ahead, and another at the end PPR)
  - DO-specific portfolio reviews
  - Quarterly financial reviews
  
3. **Collecting and uploading data into AIDTracker Plus** (see USAID/Nepal Mission Order 203: Performance Monitoring, to be updated with specific guidance on AIDTracker Plus)  
This captures all activities related to the accurate input of Goal, DO, IR, and sub-IR level performance data into AidTracker Plus. Illustrative examples include:
  - Accurately inputting DO- and IR-level performance data into AIDTracker Plus from USAID/Nepal's internally-stored data sources (e.g. pdf, .doc, xls files, etc.)
  
4. **Integrated site visits** (see USAID/Nepal site visit template)  
USAID/Nepal will conduct site visits that are aimed not only at monitoring performance and assuring quality of data, but also aimed to glean feedback from implementers, government agencies, and beneficiaries as to potential hindrances and successes of the work. To minimize management burden, USAID/Nepal will schedule site visits to include multiple types of activities. Integrated site visits will include staff members from both PPD and the relevant DO team(s). Optionally, these visits may also include any other support officers, such as contracting officers, Development Outreach Coordinators, finance officers, etc., that wish to attend. Site visit reports will be shared with PPD and stored on a shared drive. A/CORs will circulate emails to PPD when a new site visit report has been uploaded. Illustrative site visits could include:
  - Meetings with IPs inclusive of standard monitoring checks and learning from integrated site visits
  - Data Quality Assessments (DQAs)
  - Monitoring and following up on geo-referenced / geo-enabled performance and geocoded activities data management
  - Visits/discussions with a small set of beneficiaries
  - District-level meetings with a broad group of stakeholders
  - Facilitated discussion between USAID, IPs, and beneficiaries
  
5. **Performance and impact evaluations** (see Mission Order 203.1 Evaluation)  
This captures all activities related to the planning and implementation of USAID/Nepal's evaluation plan. Illustrative activities include:
  - Planning and budgeting for evaluations
  - Drafting SOWs for evaluations and procuring evaluation services

- Managing evaluations

**6. Learning opportunities** (see **Figure 3** for the Learning Agenda Section of PMP)

This captures all activities related to learning, including but not limited to the implementation of USAID/Nepal's learning agenda. Illustrative activities include:

- Dissemination of research and evaluation findings
- Learning events, both within USAID/Nepal and with its external partners and beneficiaries
- Synthesizing and aggregating results by and across DOs, IRs and Sub-IRs
- Geospatial analysis of performance and activities data, geo-visualization; sharing and dissemination; inclusion of geospatial analysis considerations in future project design
- The regular modification of USAID/Nepal's learning agenda

**7. Reporting** (see PPR guidance for given year)

This captures all reporting activities that will utilize USAID/Nepal's performance data as a major input. Illustrative examples include:

- The Performance Plan and Report (PPR)
- USAID/Nepal's Operational Plan (OP)

PPD, working with the entire Mission, guides the Mission's overall performance management effort, including this Mission-wide PMP, and all associated tools to improve program performance and impact through high quality, evidence-based decision-making. DO teams are responsible for the analysis of data at the DO level and in working with AOR/CORs to identify whether or not the DO teams are on track to meet their intermediate results and objective. Finally, AORS/CORs are critical to successful Mission performance monitoring, as most performance data will be collected by data sources managed at the activity/implementing mechanism level. The task schedule and specific responsibilities for each of the above mentioned items is included in **Annex IV**.

## **Monitoring and Analysis of Key Performance Data**

There are three main levels of monitoring and analysis for USAID/Nepal, and specific roles and responsibilities related to each level. These include:

### **A. Activity/Implementing Mechanism Level**

USAID/Nepal's AORs/CORs are on the front lines of USAID's performance monitoring, as they monitor activities at the implementation level throughout the Mission's portfolio. Specifically, AORs/CORs monitor the quality and timeliness of key outputs and outcomes, assess data quality, approve activity Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plans<sup>3</sup>, and assist in monitoring. Taken together, the AORs/CORs' role is to ensure and verify that:

- Activity level performance data (typically outputs, but potentially outcomes as well) is accurate – which means that the implementing partner's periodic performance reporting is reviewed, comparing the actuals to the baseline and target, and reviewing the data against the activity's PIRS from the Activity-level M&E plan and/or reviewing the data against the Mission's PIRS included in the DO M&E plans and the Mission-wide PMP. When the AOR/COR is confident that the data being reported by

---

<sup>3</sup> Formerly called Performance Monitoring Plans (PMPs)

the implementing partner (IP) is accurate and represents the best data available, that information will be added to AIDTracker Plus;

- Reported data meets minimum data quality standards – the AOR/COR will ensure that any reported data by the implementing partner has been the subject of a data quality assessment before the performance data is being reported in the Performance Plan and Report (ADS 203.11.2) or has been reviewed for data quality prior to reporting to any external audience (ADS 578.3.1)<sup>4</sup>;
- Data collection methods are appropriate (and match the PIRS requirements);
- Baselines and targets are consistent with M&E plans and PIRS;
- Determine whether the actuals reported by the partner meet, do not meet, or exceed the target. If a performance indicator's actuals do not meet or exceed the target, the AOR/COR will identify the reasons that the targets were not met, and determine whether the targets are appropriate and relevant, whether implementation changes have affected performance, and/or whether the indicator itself needs to be revised;
- Baselines, targets, and actuals are entered into AIDTracker Plus, as guided by PPD;
- The implementing partner is reporting performance data to USAID in accordance with the award mechanism and/or activity/implementing mechanism M&E plan; and
- Implementing partners review and monitor GESI data and results.

## **B. DO Level Results Statements**

The key monitoring and analysis value added by the DO team is to assess achievement across the relevant DO level results statement(s) using activity level output and outcome data, as well as DO M&E plan data collected outside of the activity/implementing mechanism M&E plan. The PPD M&E Specialist will work closely with DO teams to ensure data quality and measure progress against indicators. Because certain data is often reported by multiple implementing partners, the DO team will also review aggregated data or other data that require calculation in order to determine the extent to which targets have been met. The DO team will collect additional performance data, including data for context indicators, and information on critical assumptions and risks. The DO team is responsible for managing the analysis of all performance data at the IR and DO levels, and for understanding the breadth of data limitations for all relevant performance data. Taken together, the DO team's role is to assess:

- Whether each of the DO-level results statements (IRs and the DO) is making progress. All of the indicators that measure a single result statement should be assessed together to determine whether they are meeting, exceeding, or not meeting their targets. Based on the analysis of each of the result's indicators, the DO team should make a judgment about whether that result statement is being achieved.
- Whether the results framework of each IR should be re-examined in order to determine whether the IR will be achieved by the end of the CDCS. Each result statement, including the IR, should be assessed for whether as a group they are supporting the achievement at the IR-level. Similarly, any relevant context indicators at this level will

---

<sup>4</sup> See **Annex XI** for a Source Verification Form to use when verifying data from IPs

be analyzed to determine whether or not assumptions are holding true.

- As individual results are assessed to be underperforming, the DO team should determine whether the targets have been appropriately set, whether context data can help explain performance at the results level, or even whether the indicators might be the wrong ones to measure the results. If the DO team determines that the data is “good enough,” they may need to determine whether any activity-level or development hypothesis changes need to be taken.

### **C. CDCS Results Framework (Across the DOs and Goal) Level**

PPD will monitor and analyze performance of the CDCS goal – the highest level of achievement of the Mission’s strategy. This responsibility includes monitoring the performance data of the high-level critical assumptions, risks, and context indicators. PPD will also help integrate individual DO-level monitoring and analysis across the Mission to identify commonalities among the DOs, cross-cutting issues, assess the relative weights of DO-specific assumptions and risks, and assess the contributions of individual DO results to the achievement of the CDCS Goal.

### **Third Party Performance Management**

While monitoring activities are the responsibility of the AOR/COR, the DO team, and PPD, there are times when third party assistance can supplement and augment the Mission’s monitoring efforts. Third parties are not involved with the activity itself, the implementing partner, or even the DO team, and can be more objective when collecting and analyzing data. Third party support also aids in the management and resource difficulties often encountered throughout the performance management process, helping to alleviate contractual and time burdens. The third party, whether from another office, USAID/Washington, the Mission’s M&E support contractor, local research firms or universities, or from an independent consultant, will not be used to conduct all of the AOR/COR and/or DO teams’ monitoring. This is in agreement with ADS 203.3.11.3 and the Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 302 on the requirements for USAID Contracting Officer’s Representatives, which state that monitoring is a required responsibility of USAID staff.

The four primary reasons for tasking a third party with monitoring tasks will include:

- The AOR/COR and/or DO team does not have the technical expertise, visualization skills or analytical knowledge necessary to assess the performance data. In particular, using third party monitors may be required in order to help the AOR/COR to understand and analyze the performance data trends.
- The AOR/COR and/or DO team has identified a problem with the quality of the data, but does not have the expertise to analyze the data in order to either clean the data or understand mitigation efforts to improve data quality. In such cases, a third party monitor may be required in order to help determine solutions to problematic data.
- The AOR/COR and/or DO team needs a more objective party to help supplement USAID monitoring efforts. Data is often politically or culturally sensitive, and on occasion it may be necessary to bring in a third party to give weight to the Mission’s performance data.

- The AOR/COR and/or DO team may need additional information and data in order to better understand the performance of the implementing partners, and/or DO results. At times, a third party monitor can help identify alternative data to support and help analyze the performance data in the Mission's PMP.

## Reviewing and Reporting Results

The main opportunities for reviewing performance data Mission-wide are the semi-annual portfolio reviews, the annual Performance Plan and Reports (PPRs), DQAs conducted once every three years per indicator, and ongoing monitoring by AORs/CORs. Through these opportunities, Mission staff will review evidence of what works and does not work, assess progress on project implementation and the achievement of CDCS results, and ultimately use that information in decision making. Once the Mission has established AIDTracker Plus as a performance management tool, regular AIDTracker Plus reports will provide an additional source of performance information.

Furthermore, to the greatest extent possible, performance data is disaggregated at the VDC, district, and subnational levels. This performance data can then be analyzed in conjunction with existing geo-referenced data sets to allow for a more sophisticated understanding of how geographic factors affect programmatic performance. The incorporation of location-specific information will be used to better understand contextual and geographic factors which influence the achievement or non-achievement of results. In addition, the synthesis and aggregation of results from DO, IR, and sub-IR indicators serve as an effective management tool, providing insights for Mission-wide strategic planning and decision-making.

Performance results against standard and custom indicators are reported in the first quarter of the fiscal year as part of the Mission's annual PPR. DO teams will encourage IPs to schedule their surveys and other data collection efforts to assess activity and project outcomes during the last quarter of the year (to the extent this complements program implementation schedules) so key performance data can also be reported to USAID as part of its annual reporting. DO teams will work with PPD and third parties to implement these important data collection efforts on the appropriate schedule.

## Updating and Modifying the PMP

The PMP will be reviewed, updated and modified annually to ensure its continued use and applicability as a system. The performance indicators will be further refined during the project design process and, if necessary, new indicators added/dropped as necessary during the CDCS implementation period. As new performance indicators become available, the PMP will be updated accordingly. Over the life of the CDCS, some existing indicators may need to be dropped if they have failed to be useful in measuring results. Ideally, the PMP will be updated after the annual portfolio review, or during the second quarter of each fiscal year. As mentioned above, old PMP versions will be labeled and archived to ensure they are not lost in the modification process. Outdated result statements and indicators will also be labeled as such in the AIDTracker Plus database and archived rather than deleted. Outdated result statements and indicators can also be tracked via the results change tracker table annexed in the PMP (see **Annex IX**).

Modifying the PMP also entails reviewing the indicator reference sheets and updating them as necessary. During the first quarter of each fiscal year, the Mission will review those PMP

indicators used in the PPR and determine if any new indicators should be added or existing ones dropped. As a result, any changes or modifications to these indicators reported to Washington or included in the Mission-wide PMP must be cleared by USAID/Nepal's Performance Management Plan Point of Contact (PMPPOC). The PMPPOC is PPD's designated point of contact for all correspondence with USAID/Washington related to the PMP. Substantive changes to the PMP will be approved by the Mission Director, whereas routine changes will be approved by the PMPPOC in collaboration with the DO teams. Substantive changes include changes to the Goal, DO, IR level results and indicators, whereas routine changes concern sub-IR indicators that may be dropped or added in the PPR, changes to PIRS as a result of new or ending contracts, persons responsible for reporting as a result of staff changes, etc. The Mission will also update indicator reference sheets, evaluation plans, and the task schedule as part of its Mission portfolio review and PPR processes, or as needed to reflect changes in the CDCS or in project Log-Frames. As part of the updating process, USAID/Nepal will revisit the learning plan as well as illustrative questions contained in the evaluation plan to ensure they are relevant for the coming year and modify the plan as needed. The PMPPOC will ensure that the latest version of the PMP is stored in a common location on the Nepal Mission's public drive.

Performance indicator data reported to the Mission as well as data collected directly by the Mission will be updated in the PMP regularly, as it becomes available (typically quarterly, semi-annually, or annually). Activity Managers, other DO team members, and the PPD all have responsibilities for updating AIDTracker Plus with relevant performance indicator data. The Mission's PMPPOC oversees and guides the performance indicator data and information entered into AIDTracker Plus. **Annex IV** includes more details on tasks and responsibilities for updating the PMP.

## II. CDCS RESULTS FRAMEWORK

USAID/Nepal's CDCS results framework reflects the Mission's overall development hypothesis and guiding strategy. This framework outlines how projects and activities will lead to the achievement of the Mission's DOs and, ultimately, the Goal of **"a more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal,"** serving as the foundation for the Mission's performance management system. The framework functions as an integral tool for effective performance management in focusing activity planning, facilitating communication regarding program intent and content, helping to spot emerging issues, and providing a structure for designing learning and evaluation activities.

The below results framework depicts USAID/Nepal's Goal, Development Objectives, and Intermediate Results.

# Goal: A More Democratic, Prosperous, and Resilient Nepal

## DO 1: More Inclusive and Effective Governance

IR 1.1: Peaceful Political Environment Sustained

IR 1.2: Accountability of Selected Institutions Strengthened

IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

IR 1.4: Public Policy and Performance Improved

## DO 2: Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth to Reduce Extreme Poverty

IR 2.1: Agriculture-Based Income Increased

IR 2.2: Small Enterprise Opportunities Expanded

IR 2.3: Resilience of Targeted Natural Resources and Related Livelihoods Improved

IR 2.4: Economic Growth Policy and Performance Improved

## DO 3: Increased Human Capital

IR 3.1: A Better-Skilled, Literate Population

IR 3.2: A Healthier and Well-Nourished Population

IR 3.3: Social Sector Policy and Performance Improved

## **CDCS Integration Approach**

USAID/Nepal explicitly recognizes that much of its work touches upon multiple sectors of programming. Correspondingly, many of the ways in which USAID/Nepal collects and reports performance data reflects a number of key cross-cutting themes. When appropriate, USAID/Nepal has used standard cross-cutting indicators from the Office of U.S. Foreign Assistance Resources (F) to measure progress towards cross-cutting results.

### **Integration of Democracy and Governance throughout USAID/Nepal's Development Objectives**

The Agency's ADS supports a cross-sectoral (or integrated) approach to strategic planning, stating that, "all DOs and IRs should be designed to be mutually reinforcing, where possible"<sup>5</sup>. USAID/Nepal's CDCS reflects this integrated approach and views GON capacity building, accountability, and systems strengthening as critical contributors to USAID/Nepal's achievement of each of its Development Objectives.

USAID/Nepal's Results Framework reflects this integrated approach; each DO contains an IR that is directly related to the improvement of policy and performance. Within the context of the PMP, USAID/Nepal measures not only its performance against critical DO1 indicators, but also the extent to which other DO teams are contributing to the mission-wide goal of making Nepal more democratic and inclusive. The Mission's Learning Agenda and Evaluation Plan questions also address integration at length.

One of the cross-cutting approaches to achieve an increase in democracy and inclusion is through capacity building. The Mission is building the capacity of local Civil Society Organizations/Non-Governmental Organizations (CSO/NGOs) that in turn build the capacity of government institutions, making the GON responsive and accountable to people. The Mission is also tracking GON capacity/accountability by monitoring the GON's capacity to responsibly manage Operating Unit obligated funds. All DO teams monitor and measure not only the increase in capacity of the USG supported CSO/NGOs, but the capacity of the government institutions themselves.

### **Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI)**

Gender Equality and Social Inclusion (GESI) is of critical importance to Nepal as barriers to equality and inclusion remain high. Across sectors, the Mission has taken special care to ensure that data is collected on the extent to which women and marginalized groups have access to (and utilize) democratic processes, income-generating opportunities, and service delivery systems. Within DO 1, USAID/Nepal has partnered with organizations led by women and representatives of marginalized groups. Overall, USAID/Nepal's interventions across DOs directly target Nepal's marginalized and disadvantaged population inclusive of women and the poorest of the poor. The targeted 20 districts of USG interventions are also predominantly populated by the marginalized and disadvantaged. Therefore, when feasible, inclusion is measured via the collection of disaggregated data by sex, caste/ethnicity and geographic location of beneficiaries, budget allocations and set-asides by government institutions for the targeted population, and through measuring increased capacity of partner organizations as providers of services to the target population.

---

<sup>5</sup> ADS 201.3.3.3

Consistent with ADS 205.3.6 and USAID's Gender Equality/Female Empowerment, USAID/Nepal: (1) collects appropriate sex-disaggregated data, (2) asks clear questions about male and female roles to uncover intended and unintended positive and negative changes, (3) has developed and utilizes indicators designed to track changes in key gender gaps from baseline to end line, and (4) uses appropriate qualitative and quantitative methodologies.

The PMP also includes indicators that measure the effectiveness of CSO/NGOs in promoting GESI. The Mission's M&E Specialist and GESI advisor monitors and reviews annual data against planned targets, with attention to gaps between the extent to which females and males and members of marginalized groups are participating in and benefitting from projects and activities. The M&E Specialist and GESI advisor also ensure that data for sex-disaggregated and gender sensitive indicators in the PMP are routinely updated and available for use during portfolio reviews.

### **Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)**

Through its work in building resilient communities, ecosystems, and institutions, USAID/Nepal is collectively contributing to the goal of disaster risk reduction. Nepal – and in particular, the Kathmandu Valley - faces a high risk of a catastrophic earthquake, presenting potential challenges in all development sectors, with ripple effects across the country. Rapid, unplanned urbanization and weak construction and regulatory mechanisms have resulted in infrastructure that is extremely vulnerable to a seismic event. The Embassy Kathmandu Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) Office tracks and measures DRR. PPD is working in collaboration with the DRR Office to inform programming and exchange information. DRR Office representatives were included in the initial PMP design process and are invited to attend regular portfolio update meetings whenever possible to inform and reduce vulnerability.

### **Youth**

USAID/Nepal defines youth according to USAID's Policy on Youth in Development, which recognizes individuals aged 10-29 as youth. It also recognizes that youths are at times more narrowly defined as individuals aged 15-24. To the greatest extent possible, USAID/Nepal disaggregates its youth-focused programming by age as follows: 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, and 25-29. The GON defines youth as individuals aged 16-40 which would not be useful to the Mission to accurately measure project impacts on youth in the country. Therefore the Mission is defining youth in accordance with USAID's Policy instead of GON.

Collecting age-disaggregated data will be used to inform programming related to child marriage, prevention of gender-based violence, trafficking in and migration of persons, local conflict among youth, youth participation in MSMEs, civil society, political party and VDC level planning.

### **Building Resilience**

USAID/Nepal recognizes that each sector will build resilient communities and institutions using a slightly different approach. Resilience will be tracked at the community level as well as nationally. Resilience is measured in a slightly different manner across DOs. Data analysis is comparatively conducted across DOs. A common approach to measuring resilience is measuring *institutional* resilience across all DOs<sup>6</sup>.

---

<sup>6</sup> See complete Definition **Annex V** for definition of "more resilient". The Mission defines one facet of "more resilient" as resulting in institutions experiencing decreased vulnerability to and increased capacity to respond to various shocks. Through the Mission's focus on building the capacity of CSOs and accountability of GON across Objectives, institutional resilience is measured.

## **Geographic Targeting**

The primary focus of the Mission's programming is in the middle hills and the Terai portions of Nepal's Far-Western, Mid-Western, and Western Development Region. Cross-sectoral programming is particularly concentrated in the Far-Western and Mid-Western region. This area is a focus because 1) it is defined by the traditionally excluded populations, where the decade long conflict originated, and which is predominantly populated by the most marginalized and vulnerable, 2) it has a higher level of poverty than the national average (32.5% vs 25.2%) and higher level of stunting (45.2% vs 40.5%), and 3) it is typified by high population density and vulnerability to climate change, yet possesses significant unmet agricultural, economic and natural conservation potential. USAID/Nepal also selected these regions as they fall within the Zone of Influence (ZOI) as defined by the Feed the Future initiative, and promote greater cross-sectoral programmatic integration, currently predominantly concentrated in 6 districts within the ZOI.

Whenever possible, USAID/Nepal captures geographically disaggregated performance data at either the district or VDC level. Collecting sufficiently disaggregated data will allow USAID/Nepal to more effectively track results across geographic units, including sex and caste/ethnicity. USAID/Nepal also analyzes this geographically disaggregated data for customized analysis via mapping of geo-referenced data. Subsequently, the Mission can then track and adapt programming accordingly.

## **III. PERFORMANCE MONITORING**

### **Indicator Development and Selection Criteria**

Through a series of facilitated Development Objective and Intermediate Results team meetings over a two-week period, the Mission identified a list of PMP indicators associated with each CDCS result and assumption. These indicators are intended to track performance and to determine programmatic effectiveness over the life of the strategy. Throughout this process, SI and the Mission carefully vetted the indicators to ensure they reflected the strategic intent of these results statements. They also worked to ensure that each indicator met the five USAID quality standards of validity, integrity, precision, reliability, and timeliness as described in ADS 203.3.11.1.

For each statement, the team began with a common understanding of what the result was hoping to achieve. Through a participatory process, the teams determined and defined the most applicable indicators to measure that result. Indicators were selected based on which were most practical, useful, and meaningful, keeping in mind the management and resource burden required to collect and analyze relevant data for each indicator. Mission staff worked to consider a balance between this burden and the quantity and quality of data needed for informed decision-making.

The Mission has utilized a mix of both context and performance indicators as well as standard and custom indicators to measure progress toward CDCS results.

- **Performance Indicators:** The Mission has included a number of performance indicators measuring particular characteristics or dimensions of each results statement. These indicators serve as the basis for observing progress and measuring actual results

compared to expectations (see **Figure 2**).

- **Context Indicators:** The Mission has also included context indicators measuring conditions or assumptions relevant to the performance of projects and programs. By measuring factors that are beyond the Mission's management control, the Mission can determine whether the country's context changes to the extent that a project or strategy must be adapted in order to be successful (see **Figure 2**).

**Figure 2:**

<b>USAID/Nepal Indicator Table</b>		
<b>Results/ Indicators</b>	<b>Type</b>	<b>PPR Yes/No</b>
<b>Goal: A More Democratic, Prosperous, and Resilient Nepal</b>		
CTX Goal 1: Average sub-score on Freedom House Index for select political rights and civil liberties subcategories	Context/Custom	N
CTX Goal 2: Nepal's Natural Hazards Risk Composite Score	Context / Custom	N
CTX Goal 3: Growth in (real) gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (4-15)	Context/Standard	N
Goal 4: Human Development Index (HDI) score	Performance/Custom	N
Goal 5: <b>TBD</b> Social Inclusion score on Nepal's Social Inclusion Survey	Performance/Custom	N
<b>DO1: More Inclusive and Effective Governance</b>		
CTX 1-1: Change in World Bank Government Effectiveness Index Score (2.2-2)	Context/Standard	N
CTX 1-2: Freedom in the World Political Rights sub-score for Electoral Process (2.3.2-13)	Context/Standard	N
1-1: Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal access to social, economic, and political opportunities (GNDR 4)	Performance/Standard	Y (2015)
<b>IR1.1: Peaceful Political Environment Sustained</b>		
1.1-1: Country political stability and absence of violence value score (1.6.4)	Standard	Y (2014)
1.1-2: Percent of successfully mediated local level disputes among women, youth or people from marginalized groups	Custom	Y (2014)
<b>IR1.2: Accountability of Selected Institutions Strengthened</b>		
1.2-1: (cross-cutting) Percent of operating unit program funds obligated through partner country systems (CBLD 2)	Custom	Y (2014)
1.2-2: (cross-cutting) Percent change in GON development budget execution rate	Custom	Y (2014)
<b>IR1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased</b>		

1.3-1: (cross-cutting) Local Organizational Capacity Assessment Score (CBLD-5) (2.4.1)	Standard	Y (2014)
1.3-2: (cross-cutting) Percent of targeted local institutions that have annual plans (forestry, education, agriculture/livestock) with budget allocation specifically for marginalized groups	Custom	Y (2014)
<b>IR1.4: Public Policy and Performance Improved</b>		
1.4-1: (cross-cutting): Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed; Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation; Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decreed; Stage 4: Passed/approved; Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (4.5.1-24) (IR2.4-1*)	Standard	Y (2014)
1.4-2: Percent of targeted institutions meeting all minimum performance standards of GON (disaggregated by sector/institutions).	Custom	Y (2014)
1.4-3: (cross-cutting) <b>TBD</b> Percent of respondents satisfied with government services as provided by target institutions	Custom	Y (2015)
<b>DO2: Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth to Reduce Extreme Poverty</b>		
CTX 2-1: Change in sales volume of selected agricultural inputs	Context/Custom	N
CTX 2-2: Nepal's Ease of Doing Business "Distance to Frontier" Score	Context/ Custom	N
2-1: Prevalence of poverty: percent of people living on less than \$1.25 per day (4-17)	Performance / FTF Standard	Y (2015)
2-2: Women's empowerment in Agriculture Index Score (4.5-19)	Performance / FTF Standard	Y (2015)
2-3: Growth in (real) gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (4-15)	Performance / Standard	Y (2014)
<b>IR2.1: Agriculture-Based Income Increased</b>		
2.1-1: Daily per capita expenditures (as proxy for income) in USG assisted areas (4.5-9)	FTF Standard	Y (2015)
2.1-2: Gross margin per hectare, animal or cage of selected product (4.5-16,17,18)	FTF Standard	Y (2015)
<b>IR2.2: Small Enterprise Opportunities Expanded</b>		
2.2-1: Number of medium, small, and micro-enterprises established and/or expanded as a result of USG assistance.	Custom	Y (2015)
2.2-2: Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation (4.5-2)	Standard	N
<b>IR2.3: Resilience of Targeted Natural Resources and Related Livelihoods Improved -</b>		
2.3-1: Number of hectares of biological significance and/or natural resources showing	Standard	Y (2014)

improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (4.8.1-26)		
2.3-2: Quantity of greenhouse gas emissions, measured in metric tons of CO2, reduced or sequestered as a result of USG assistance (4.8-7)	Standard	Y (2014)
2.3-3: Number of stakeholders with increased capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate change (4.8.2-26)	Standard	Y (2014)
2.3-4: Number of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance (4.8.1-6)	Standard	Y (2014)
<b>IR2.4: Economic Growth Policy and Performance Improved</b>		
2.4-1: (cross-cutting) Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed; Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation; Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decreed; Stage 4: Passed/approved; Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun. (IR 1.4-1*) (4.5.1-24)	Standard	Y (2014)
<b>DO3: Increased Human Capital</b>		
CTX 3-1: Average primary school dropout rate for students grades 1-3 within EGRP Zone of Influence	Context/Custom	N
CTX 3-2: General government expenditure on health as a percentage of Total Health Expenditure (THE)	Context/Custom	N
3-1: Percent of births attended by a skilled birth attendant (doctor or nurse) (3.1.6.1-1) *proxy for maternal mortality ratio	Performance/Standard	Y (2014)
3-2: Modern method contraceptive prevalence rate (3.1.7-38) *proxy for fertility rate	Performance/Standard	Y (2014)
3-3: Newborn mortality rate (3.1.6-60)	Performance/Standard	Y (2014)
3-4: Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age (3.1.9-11)	Performance/Standard	Y (2014)
3-5: Proportion of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text (3.2.1-27)	Performance/Standard	Y (2015)
<b>IR3.1: A Better- Skilled Literate Population</b>		
3.1-1: Average Early Grade Reading Assessment Score among students in USAID/Nepal's Zone of Influence	Custom	Y (2015)

3.1-2: Adult literacy rate of target population in FtF Zone of Influence (ZOI)	Custom	Y (2015)
<b>IR3.2: A Healthier and Well-Nourished Population</b>		
3.2-1: Percent of births receiving at least 4 antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy (3.1.6.1-2) *proxy for maternal mortality	Standard	Y (2014)
3.2-2: Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age (3.1.9.1-4)	Standard	Y (2014)
3.2-3: Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet (3.1.9.1-1)	Standard	Y (2014)
<b>IR3.3: Social Sector Policy And Performance Improved</b>		
3.3-1: Dollar value of School Sector Reform Program budget allocated to improving early grade reading outcomes	Custom	N
3.3-2: Percent of women from marginalized groups attended by skilled doctor, nurse or midwife during last birth	Custom	Y (2015)
3.3-3: Nepal Health Sector Plan III approved (Y/N)	Custom	N
3.3-4: Number of districts scaling up and implementing integrated IMCI/NCP (Integrated Management of Childhood Illness/Newborn Care Program) package	Custom	N

The Goal, DO and IR level indicators reflect the priorities and foci of USAID/Nepal's programming. DO 1's performance indicators measure different facets of governance. Two important aspects of this cross-cutting DO include: 1) measuring the bottom-up approach of building local CSO capacity in order to influence and increase governance of targeted institutions to provide services to the targeted populations, and 2) measuring the financial accountability of targeted government institutions. DO 2's performance indicators are heavily focused on agriculture, since: (a) USAID/Nepal receives substantial funding from the Feed the Future Initiative to alleviate extreme poverty, and (b) nearly 80% of Nepalis derive their livelihoods from economic activities in the agricultural sector<sup>7</sup>. DO 3's funding is concentrated on family planning, maternal and child health, nutrition, HIV/AIDS and early grade literacy. The health projects focus on the reduction of mortality, morbidity and stunting, while the education projects focus on early grade reading. Hence, the performance indicators under this DO most accurately measure these elements.

Policy and Performance is tracked across the portfolio in order to measure service providers' ability to implement policy. Across the DOs, technical teams are working directly and indirectly to influence and shape policy, as well as to improve policy implementation. DOs 1 and 2 will track the same policy indicator at the IR level, while DO 3 uses custom indicators to track health

<sup>7</sup> It should be noted that USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) will also be making significant contributions to the achievement of DO 2 during the 5-year CDACS period. However, this PMP will be modified at a later date to include these activities.-The FTF PAD amendment approving usage of FTF funding for FFP was approved on May 13, 2014.

and education. It is important to note that the Mission may not always work on the formulation and implementation of the same policy. That is, USAID/Nepal may be contributing: 1) to the development of a policy, but not its implementation and/or 2) to tracking the implementation of an existing policy that USAID did not necessarily help develop.

Performance indicators selected reflect the integration and use of governance across DOs. As noted above, governance and inclusion are common threads throughout the Mission's portfolio. The data captured via indicators tracking progress towards results in DOs 2 and 3 also inform DO 1's results as related to the increase of accountability and governance across sectors and targeted institutions.

## **Development of Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)**

The PIRS were customized for USAID/Nepal in order to streamline the process of inputting PIRS information into AIDTracker Plus once rolled out.

Following indicator selection, the DO teams focused on completing a detailed Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) for each indicator. Particular attention was directed to defining how the indicators will be utilized to reflect the Nepal context. During the facilitated PIRS completion process, the teams confirmed the appropriateness, practicality and utility of each proposed indicator.

PIRS are intended to be useful as stand-alone resources for the Mission, IPs, stakeholders, and potential auditors. For this reason, they include rich, detailed information that will be useful for the life of the CDCS. Mission staff took the time to think about custom indicators as well as about how to utilize standard indicators for the specific situation in Nepal. This thinking and analysis is reflected and carefully documented in the PIRS. The PIRS were completed to capture the maximum amount of information possible.

## **IV. PROJECT/ACTIVITY OVERSIGHT**

### **Integrated Site Visits**

As discussed in Section I of the PMP, USAID/Nepal will conduct regular integrated site visits. These site visits will be comprised of more than meetings between USAID and IPs. They may include district-level meetings with a wide variety of stakeholders, more intensive sessions with project/activity beneficiaries, and/or meetings and discussions that include ministry-level GON officials from Kathmandu. Visits will also engage multiple USAID projects across DOs in the district or region to encourage cross learning, collaboration and coordination among USAID projects. The purpose of these integrated site visits is both to monitor project/activity performance *and* to provide USAID (and implementing partners) an opportunity to learn about what is working and what is not, in order to inform the direction and possible amendment of programming.

USAID/Nepal's PPD team will issue tools to the Mission that provide details as to how to most effectively conduct integrated site visits.

### **Data Quality Assurance Procedures**

High quality data is the cornerstone of evidence-based decision-making. USAID/Nepal will use consistent data quality assessment (DQA) procedures to verify and validate the measured values of the actual performance data. These assessments are essential to understand data quality strengths and weaknesses based upon ensuring that standard and consistent uses of definitions, data collection methods, and calculation techniques are used by USAID/Nepal and all of its partners. As required, DQAs will be conducted for all externally reported indicators within three years before submission to USAID/Washington.

Each completed PIRS in the PMP has a section devoted to data quality issues and the date when a data quality assessment is scheduled. The PIRS are intended to capture not only information related to specific indicator characteristics and procedures for data collection, but also any data limitations that are immediately identified when a performance indicator is defined. As a result, the PIRS are a key source of information chronicling all aspects of the Mission's set of utilized indicators.

However, the basis of conducting these specific assessments relies on the use and application of the DQA Worksheet (see **Annex X**). On an on-going basis, the Mission will continue to examine data quality through these structured assessments to ensure that performance data reasonably meets these five standards of data quality:

1. *Validity*: data clearly and adequately represents the intended result;
2. *Reliability*: data reflects stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time;
3. *Integrity*: data collected has safeguards to minimize the risk of transcription error or data manipulation;
4. *Precision*: data has a sufficient level of detail to permit management decision-making (e.g., the margin of error is less than the anticipated change); and
5. *Timeliness*: data is available at a useful frequency, is current, and is timely enough to influence management decision-making.

The DQA Worksheet applies a series of related questions to the data (and the processes that produce the data) for each performance indicator. USAID/Nepal will complete and file a DQA worksheet for each relevant PIRS in the Mission-wide PMP. The goal of the DQA Worksheet is to gain a better understanding of the data collection process and system for the specific indicator. The individuals conducting the DQA will need enough understanding of the system to adequately answer the questions on the worksheet.

USAID/Nepal will follow these promising practices to the best of its ability to ensure the systematic application of the DQA process to promote deeper understanding of its performance management system, which will result in learning and, ultimately, improvements that impact the Mission's intended development results:

1. In order to minimize the burden of conducting DQAs on dozens of reported performance indicators, USAID/Nepal will identify which indicators will require DQAs and conduct DQAs on a rolling basis (preferably quarterly).

2. The Mission will attempt to structure DQA teams whenever possible with two to four members and, ideally, have the AOR/COR serve as the lead. Additional team members may include other DO/technical office members, the Program Office, and other support offices.
3. The Program Office will work with the rest of USAID/Nepal, particularly the technical offices, to establish a Mission-wide “acceptable level” of data quality and develop a response for those indicators that fall below the minimum threshold.
4. For performance indicators where multiple IPs report data and, thus, the Mission will need to aggregate the data across the IPs in order to report to external stakeholders, either the DO team leader or AOR/COR (depending on the purpose statement or result to which the indicator is linked) will compile a summary DQA report from all of the relevant individual IP-level DQAs.
5. Action plans will be utilized with the DQA Worksheet (see **Annex X**) to ensure that any identified recommendations will be acted upon in a timely manner.
6. USAID/Nepal will ensure that DQA Worksheets are distributed to IPs and other data sources after report completion. In addition, USAID-partner meetings may be scheduled to further discuss findings, needed actions, and/or resolution of identified actions.

AORs/CORs with guidance from the Program Office will work with the Contracts Office to ensure that all contract and grant awards include a section on data quality. As COR/AORs are responsible for conducting data quality assessments for their awards/contracts, they will also verify data quality before data are entered into AidTracker Plus.

## V. EVALUATION

USAID/Nepal is committed to using evaluation to enhance accountability and learning within the Mission. This is in line with USAID’s ADS and the Evaluation Policy, both of which focus on building evaluation into project and activity designs, decreasing bias, increasing utilization, and enhancing the level of rigor used in decision-making for both performance evaluations as well as impact evaluations. USAID/Nepal’s Mission Order on Evaluation, as well as a number of How-To Notes and Technical Notes include further guidance for staff regarding evaluation triggers, best practices, Statements of Work for Evaluation, and adoption of USAID guidance to the Mission’s context. These tools should be used to plan, manage, and use evaluation throughout the life of the CDCS.

PPD will take primary responsibility for planning, developing, and implementing the Mission’s evaluation plan. Each technical team is responsible for working with PPD to develop and regularly update an evaluation plan for all required and optional evaluations of their portfolio. All large projects and innovative/pilot projects are required to undergo an evaluation, while others will be evaluated when a need for data is identified. PPD and the technical offices will work together to determine an evaluation purpose, a limited number of evaluation questions, a dissemination and utilization plan, and to establish a realistic budget to gather, analyze, and report on the desired information.

**Annex II** includes a draft evaluation plan along with identified questions for a number of activities and projects. This plan includes two (2) performance evaluations at the goal level, as well as:

- DO1: 3 performance evaluations and 1 large-scale survey (and follow-on studies)
- DO2: 8 performance evaluations and 1 impact evaluations
- DO3: 3 performance evaluations and 2 impact evaluations

These questions, budgets, and timeframes will be reviewed and modified as the Mission moves further along the PAD process and identifies additional evaluation needs. Evaluation plans will be reviewed, analyzed and developed at the DO and project levels, including consideration of links to monitoring data and the learning plan. As stated in the Mission Order on Evaluation, for each evaluation, the relevant DO team will complete a Management Response Plan (following the template in Annex 1 of the Mission Order), which will be reviewed during the Portfolio Review and during other appropriate learning activities.

## VI. LEARNING PLAN

USAID's renewed emphasis on learning as an integral part of the program cycle is reflected in USAID/Nepal's PMP. The Mission recognizes the utility of purposive learning to coordinate efforts, make course corrections, and ultimately ensure effective development programming. In doing so, the Mission has identified a number of ways through which staff will systematically and deliberately promote learning both inside and outside of the Mission.

This Learning Plan reinforces and enhances overall efforts throughout the Program Cycle and goals for Performance Management. This plan outlines how USAID/Nepal will:

- **Collaborate.** Coordinate activities to increase synergy and reduce duplication of effort. Work with others where it makes sense.
- **Learn.** Draw on a wide range of knowledge sources and perspectives. Test our development hypotheses. Share learning about what works and what doesn't. Use development methodologies that catalyze learning for our beneficiaries.
- **Adapt.** Based on our learning, make iterative course corrections while we implement to improve overall effectiveness.

### Analyzing Performance Data

Performance monitoring data should help USAID/Nepal understand progress toward intended results, assess the logic of development hypotheses, and test assumptions. In order to promote learning across the Mission, many teams will be analyzing data not only via disaggregation, but also by analyzing indicators with respect to their relationships with one another at the sub-IR, IR, and DO levels. Future mechanisms might include provisions for data analysis at the activity level to assist AOR/CORs in reviewing progress toward results and assessing the need for course corrections. The Mission will also analyze performance management data and context indicators at the CDCS results framework level, including relevant geospatial data, in conjunction with the semi-annual portfolio review.

Alongside these indicators, sub-IR level indicator data collected by small geographic units are synced with the activities in the field. A results / performance based GIS will be developed for all the projects within the CDCS area, and online and static visual products will be delivered. Sub-IR level indicator reference sheets will have a provision to capture such data.

USAID/Nepal will apply the process of integrating geo-referenced performance data - along with other relevant geospatial information - in new project design.

## Reviewing Results

USAID/Nepal will go beyond regular monitoring of the PMP (see **Annex IV**), to conduct regularly scheduled learning events. These will include:

- **Portfolio reviews:** Semi-annual portfolio reviews will be scheduled in late October or early November, in time for the PPR reporting, and in April or May. USAID/Nepal recognizes that portfolio reviews provide a unique opportunity for learning about what has been working, what hasn't been working, what have been the constraints to achieving results, what have been the catalysts to achieving results. In concert with the Front Office, USAID/Nepal's PPD will work to ensure that learning features a prominent place in the portfolio review process, and that candid discussions of implementation challenges take place.
- **Project- and activity-level annual reports:** USAID/Nepal's AORs/CORs will work together with IPs to produce high-quality tailored annual reports. These reports will not only ensure that progress against the Mission's performance indicators is tracked over time, but also that the projects and activities are making real contributions to USAID/Nepal's depth of knowledge in the field. To the greatest extent possible, these reports will be completed just prior to the Mission's annual portfolio review and, per the Mission Order on Performance Monitoring, will be uploaded to AidTracker Plus.
- **Integrated site visits:** As discussed in Section I and Section IV of the PMP, USAID/Nepal will conduct regular integrated site visits. One of the primary purposes of these site visits will be to ensure that both USAID/Nepal staff and the Mission's implementing partners learn as much as possible, as directly as possible, from their experiences in the field<sup>8</sup>. Information gathered from integrated site visits should inform IP work plans.

Beyond the above events, the Mission will engage in learning via other events with a variety of external stakeholders. These may include:

- **Regularly scheduled partner meetings:** Each DO team will be responsible for holding regularly scheduled partner meetings by DO. The meetings may cover logistics and details regarding project/activity implementation, but a significant portion of these meetings should be specifically devoted to learning. This may include a discussion of the partner's contribution towards USAID/Nepal's learning agenda, unintended project consequences of programming, reasons behind the attainment or non-attainment of a particular performance target, etc. Additionally, PPD and the Front Office will be responsible for holding annual Mission-wide partner meetings with implementing

---

<sup>8</sup> See Section I, page 7, number 4 of PMP for comprehensive definition of Site Visits.

partners across all DOs. Such meetings will include discussions of the USAID/Nepal learning agenda, progress toward achieving DOs, common challenges, promising approaches, lessons learned from implementation, etc.

- **District-level meetings:** On an annual basis, USAID/Nepal will schedule a large meeting with a broad group of stakeholders at the district level. These meetings may include: USAID/Nepal staff, the interagency, GON officials, local government officials, project/activity beneficiaries, and all co-located implementing partners. The emphasis of these meetings should be on knowledge sharing and dissemination. To minimize management burden, these meetings will be timed to take place in close proximity with integrated site visits. Information gathered from these meetings should inform IP work plans to the greatest possible extent.
- **Learning Summit:** On an annual basis, USAID/Nepal will convene a day-long event to share knowledge with a broad group of external stakeholders. The focus of the event will be exclusively on learning. Illustrative examples of topics that could be covered during the event include:
  - Dissemination/discussion of research/evaluation findings by USAID and by other donors, GON, civil society, and academia
  - Lessons from other development partners (including the GON)
  - Development of USAID/Nepal's learning agenda

## Data Collection Triggers

Aligned with the ADS, USAID/Nepal will use its performance monitoring to determine when additional data collection is needed. Triggers for evaluations, assessments, or other data collection might include particularly strong or weak performance or changes in the institutional, economic, political, or social climate.

Each of USAID/Nepal's DO teams is tracking assumptions and context indicators that go beyond the manageable interest of the Mission. Major changes in one of these critical assumptions should spur an immediate re-assessment of both USAID/Nepal's causal logic and its DO- and/or IR-level performance indicators and targets.

Examples of potential data collection triggers could include: (1) a major shift in Nepal's political landscape, (2) a major disruption to Nepal's peace process, (3) a large-scale climatic or environmental event (e.g. an earthquake or a major disruption in weather patterns), etc.

## Communicating and Sharing Learning

Communicating findings and sharing learning is crucial to ensure data is used as widely as possible. As such, USAID/Nepal commits to sharing performance information internally and externally where feasible. Implementing partners may be requested to present findings from internal evaluations or assessments to a Mission-wide audience rather than just their COR or DO teams. Other evaluations and assessments should include team briefings and brown bags to a broad audience. Technical offices should be collaborating with one another, the Program Office, and with implementers throughout the life cycle of monitoring and evaluation activities to identify learning gaps, understand findings, and apply recommendations.

Furthermore, DO teams will work with the Evaluation contractor at the outset of each evaluation to articulate the team’s intentions for using the findings and to develop a plan for disseminating results. The dissemination plan will include internal as well as external audiences (such as GON counterparts, research institutions, USAID/W technical bureaus, USAID/Nepal staff, and other donors). USAID/Nepal will work with implementers to deliver the knowledge products and/or events that would be most likely to reach these audiences.

## Learning Agenda Questions

USAID/Nepal has identified a number of gaps in knowledge that it wishes to examine further throughout the life cycle of this CDCS (see **Figure 3**). This preliminary list is expected to be refined as new gaps become evident and new knowledge becomes available. The questions in this learning agenda may be answered through external data collection, internal brown bags and facilitated discussions, assessments, or other mechanisms. As the list of questions is refined, teams will also need to refine their thoughts on how to most appropriately and effectively answer these questions.

**Figure 3:**

LEARNING AGENDA QUESTION	POSSIBLE INPUTS TO INFORM
To what extent do Nepalis (with a particular emphasis on marginalized groups and women) perceive the government as an effective institution that provides quality services in a timely manner?	New DO 1 survey on gender/social inclusion, academic papers/articles
How should USAID better integrate gender equality & social inclusion (GESI) in our projects? How do we measure social inclusiveness?	Review of GESI-related performance indicators
How do we overcome GESI-related barriers to improve service delivery?	Survey of implementing partners, stakeholders within service delivery systems, technical assessments, further analysis
How has USAID’s work in Nepal impacted or changed cultural norms around gender and social inclusion over the life of the CDCS?	Women’s Empowerment in Ag, Index Score, new gender/social inclusion survey tool
Across USAID/Nepal’s portfolio, what techniques or approaches are most important for local-level capacity building? In particular, what are the most effective techniques for building local evaluation capacity?	Synthesis of USAID/Nepal evaluations with local capacity building components
How is USAID affecting the market for domestic capacity development sector in Nepal? What is the best way to strengthen Nepal’s civil society to generate demand for capacity development, without distorting the market?	Synthesis of USAID/Nepal evaluations with local capacity building components, survey w/civil society organizations and stakeholders

How can USAID effectively promote evidence-based decision-making and policy making?	Synthesis of USAID/Nepal evaluations with significant policy components
How effectively is the mission collaborating across sectors to learn, inform, and improve programming?	Internal survey, survey with implementing partners
What is USAID (at large) learning that could inform or benefit USAID/Nepal?	Review of research/evaluations available centrally through Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC), ProgramNet, technical bureau resources
What is USAID learning about integrating governance across sectors that we can learn from and utilize in our implementation?	Survey of implementing partners, project evaluations (as relevant), DO1 survey results
How can PPD facilitate learning within the mission? How can PPD continue to drive the learning agenda?	TBD - internal
How can USAID/Nepal support greater donor harmonization?	TBD
How can USAID/Nepal improve collaboration and information exchange across the embassy to improve learning?	TBD - internal
How do we better leverage interagency resources to achieve USG goals?	TBD
To what extent does integration of sector-specific programs with governance improvements yield greater development results?	Survey of implementing partners, project evaluations (as relevant).
What impact do USAID/Nepal's geographic co-location and program integration efforts have on the long-term sustainability and program outcomes of the development goals?  * NOTE: This learning agenda question may be answered after the 5-year lifespan of the CDCS.	TBD. Options include sustainability framework (proxies) / ex post facto portfolio analysis
Across sectors, what strategic trade-offs has USAID/Nepal had to make over time? Are there areas of programmatic focus where the Mission should be working, but currently isn't?	Project design documents and evaluations for USAID/Nepal, assessments, GON strategic planning documents

# **ANNEX I: PERFORMANCE AND CONTEXT INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS**

**Goal: Context and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets**

## USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX Goal 1

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**Context Indicator Goal 1:** Average sub-score on Freedom House Index for select political rights and civil liberties subcategories

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** Condition

### CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Since the Freedom House Freedom of the World report began in 1972, each country and territory has been assigned two numerical ratings—one for political rights and one for civil liberties—based on a 1 to 7 scale. Underlying those ratings are more detailed assessments of country situations based on a 40-point scale for political rights and a 60-point scale for civil liberties. Freedom House now releases these aggregate scores for political rights and civil liberties for each country in order to provide more nuanced information about country trends beyond the 7-point rating scales used previously.

#### POLITICAL RIGHTS

- 1** – Countries and territories with a rating of 1 enjoy a wide range of political rights, including free and fair elections. Candidates who are elected actually rule, political parties are competitive, the opposition plays an important role and enjoys real power, and the interests of minority groups are well represented in politics and government.
- 2** – Countries and territories with a rating of 2 have slightly weaker political rights than those with a rating of 1 because of such factors as political corruption, limits on the functioning of political parties and opposition groups, and foreign or military influence on politics.
- 3, 4, 5** – Countries and territories with a rating of 3, 4, or 5 either moderately protect almost all political rights or strongly protect some political rights while neglecting others. The same factors that undermine freedom in countries with a rating of 2 may also weaken political rights in those with a rating of 3, 4, or 5, but to a greater extent at each successive rating.
- 6** – Countries and territories with a rating of 6 have very restricted political rights. They are ruled by one-party or military dictatorships, religious hierarchies, or autocrats. They may allow a few political rights, such as some representation or autonomy for minority groups, and a few are traditional monarchies that tolerate political discussion and accept public petitions.
- 7** – Countries and territories with a rating of 7 have few or no political rights because of severe government oppression, sometimes in combination with civil war. They may also lack an authoritative and functioning central government and suffer from extreme violence or rule by regional warlords.

#### CIVIL LIBERTIES

- 1** – Countries and territories with a rating of 1 enjoy a wide range of civil liberties, including freedoms of expression, assembly, association, education, and religion. They have an established and generally fair legal system that ensures the rule of law (including an independent judiciary), allow free economic activity, and tend to strive for equality of opportunity for everyone, including women and minority groups.

**2** – Countries and territories with a rating of 2 have slightly weaker civil liberties than those with a rating of 1 because of such factors as limits on media independence, restrictions on trade union activities, and discrimination against minority groups and women.

**3, 4, 5** – Countries and territories with a rating of 3, 4, or 5 either moderately protect almost all civil liberties or strongly protect some civil liberties while neglecting others. The same factors that undermine freedom in countries with a rating of 2 may also weaken civil liberties in those with a rating of 3, 4, or 5, but to a greater extent at each successive rating.

**6** – Countries and territories with a rating of 6 have very restricted civil liberties. They strongly limit the rights of expression and association and frequently hold political prisoners. They may allow a few civil liberties, such as some religious and social freedoms, some highly restricted private business activity, and some open and free private discussion.

**7** – Countries and territories with a rating of 7 have few or no civil liberties. They allow virtually no freedom of expression or association, do not protect the rights of detainees and prisoners, and often control or dominate most economic activity.

The gap between a country's or territory's political rights and civil liberties ratings is rarely more than two points. Politically oppressive states typically do not allow a well-developed civil society, for example, and it is difficult, if not impossible, to maintain political freedoms in the absence of civil liberties like press freedom and the rule of law.

Because the designations of Free, Partly Free, and Not Free each cover a broad third of the available scores, countries or territories within any one category, especially those at either end of the range, can have quite different human rights situations. For example, those at the lowest end of the Free category (2 in political rights and 3 in civil liberties, or 3 in political rights and 2 in civil liberties) differ from those at the upper end of the Free group (1 for both political rights and civil liberties). Also, a designation of Free does not mean that a country or territory enjoys perfect freedom or lacks serious problems, only that it enjoys comparatively more freedom than those rated Partly Free or Not Free (and some others rated Free).

<http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world-aggregate-and-subcategory-scores#.U4RkOfmSxMU>

In addition, in order to generate debate and discussions within countries as to areas that are most in need of reform, Freedom House releases the scores for the seven subcategories that fall under political rights and civil liberties. These subcategories, drawn from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, represent the fundamental components of freedom, which include an individual's ability to:

- a) Vote freely in legitimate elections;
- b) Participate freely in the political process;
- c) Functioning of government;
- d) Exercise freedoms of expression and belief;
- e) Be able to freely assemble and associate;
- f) Have access to an established and equitable system of rule of law;
- g) Enjoy social and economic freedoms, including equal access to economic opportunities and the right to hold private property.

The key subcategories relevant to USAID/Nepal includes C through G, particularly:

- c) Functioning of government, including corruption and accountability
- d) Exercise freedoms of expression and belief, including religious institutions;

e) Be able to freely assemble and associate, including public discussions and NGOs;
f) Have access to an established and equitable system of rule of law, including equal treatment for all citizens;
g) Enjoy social and economic freedoms, including equal access to economic opportunities and the right to hold private property, including social freedoms.
<b>Numerator:</b> Score for c + Score for d + score for e + score for f + score for g <b>Denominator:</b> 5
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> Average sub-score for the 5 subcategories
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> Subcategory
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):</b> This indicator is based on reviews of data and experts' assessments of different aspects of political rights and civil liberties, and changes in the score will indicate an improving or deteriorating process. Improving scores will indicate that democratic governance is being strengthened through improved access to legal aid by vulnerable populations in the targeted districts, more effective and efficient governance institutions through increases in transparency and accountability, increased citizen participation in decision-making, including input on the delivery of public services, and improved opportunities. The FAF standard indicator will not be used because the subcategories are more relevant to DO 1 than the entire Freedom House score (which is the standard).
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Data Source:</b> Freedom House subcategory scores available at <a href="http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world-aggregate-and-subcategory-scores#.Ux2f7-ddVmh">http://www.freedomhouse.org/report/freedom-world-aggregate-and-subcategory-scores#.Ux2f7-ddVmh</a>
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> USAID/Nepal PPD Team will directly access the Freedom House website to collect survey data, calculate the individual scores for the 5 subcategories, and then divide by 5 to get the average.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annually (available publically at March of each year for the previous year)
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Murari Adhikari
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> N/A
<b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; hard copy of the Freedom House Index scores kept as backup in the DO Team files.
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Data Quality Considerations (optional):</b> This indicator should be reviewed annually, comparing actuals to baseline and target. The trend over time for this indicator should also be examined. The disaggregated data should also be analyzed, to see if there is a difference between political rights and civil liberties (graphically depict this data, as disaggregated). The achievements of this indicator should be compared to the achievements of the other DO indicators to assess whether the Mission is making progress towards achieving the DO. Analysis for this indicator should also include reviewing context indicators for DO 1.
This indicator should be reviewed during preparation for the annual performance/strategy portfolio review, and then during the portfolio review.
<b>BASELINE</b>
<b>Baseline Trend (optional):</b> Established with the PPR; For FY 2013 the subcategory scores were c = 6, d = 12, e = 8, f = 5, g = 9, for a total score of 40, and an average score of 8 as the baseline.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b> During discussions with Freedom House about the source documents for the civil liberties and political rights scoring, the DO team may find that the source documents are more relevant and sensitive to the impact of USAID's DO 1 achievements. In that case, it may be a good strategy to switch this indicator to that data source.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> National
<b>CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR</b>
<b>Changes to Indicator:</b>
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Maria Barron DGO 6-10-14</b>

## USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX Goal 2

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**Context Indicator Goal 2:** Nepal’s Natural Hazards Risk Composite Score

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** Risk

### CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** This composite score will be aggregated based upon data provided by the Natural Hazards Risk Atlas (NHRA). The NHRA assesses and analyses the risks of 12 major natural hazards worldwide, including: seismic activity, tsunamis, volcanoes, landslides (driven by both earthquakes and heavy rain), flooding, tropical storms and cyclones, storm surges, severe storms, extra-tropical cyclones, wildfires and drought. The composite score also captures socio-economic resilience to these shocks. **PLEASE INSERT MORE DETAIL REGARDING MAPLECROFT DEFINITIONS AND METHODOLOGY.**

More specific methodological data is available at: <http://maplecroft.com/themes/nh/>

**Unit of Measure:** Composite Score (1-10)

**Disaggregated by:** District, hazard type **PLEASE CONFIRM THAT THIS TYPE OF DISAGGREGATION IS POSSIBLE, WHEN THE DATA IS AVAILABLE.**

**Rationale or Management Utility:** If Nepal were to suffer from a major environmental disaster, USAID/Nepal would need to shift from development programming to humanitarian response. Knowing Nepal’s level of environmental hazard risk (disaggregated by risk type) will allow USAID/Nepal to develop contingency plans to respond to possible environmental hazards.

### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID

**Data Source:** Maplecroft’s Natural Hazards Risk Atlas. DO 2 staff will extract composite score directly from Maplecroft website.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** USAID/Nepal will download the Natural Hazards Risk Atlas: <http://maplecroft.com/themes/nh/>

**Note:** USAID/Nepal will need to pay for access to this data source.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annually

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Netra Sharma

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** Maplecroft

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Data Quality Considerations (optional):** **TBD – data not yet available**

### BASELINE

**Baseline Trend (optional):** **TBD – data not yet available**

**Other Notes:** Please note that USAID/Nepal will need to pay for access to this data source.

### CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR

**Changes to Indicator:**

**Other Notes (optional):**

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-4-14**

**USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX Goal 3**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**Context Indicator Goal 3:** Growth in (real) gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (4-15)

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** Condition

**CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by E3. Annual percentage growth rate of GDP per capita based on constant local currency. GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. GDP at purchaser's prices is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources.

**Unit of Measure:** Annual percent change, calculated by dividing the most recent year's GDP per capita by that for the preceding year and subtracting one.

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** A steady increase in this objective is necessary, though not sufficient, for sustainable broad-based economic growth that reduces poverty and provided domestic resources for sustainable investments in all other development objectives. The pattern of growth and the distribution of and access to the income, wealth and assets it produces are also important. This is the most common indicator of economic growth. If GDP is growing faster than the population growth rate, average household incomes should be rising and the rate of poverty declining and the society should gradually have more resources to invest in vital social services and infrastructure.

This is the most common indicator of economic growth. If GDP is growing faster than the population growth rate, average household incomes should be rising and the rate of poverty declining and the society should gradually have more resources to invest in vital social services and infrastructure. Annual report should be the percent of all USAID-assisted countries with GDP per capita growth >2.0%.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** N/A

**Data Source:** World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: [http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?\\_program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI](http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/source&source=WDI)

**Method of Data Acquisition:** USAID/Nepal PPD will directly access the website to collect data.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual, end of FY.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Murari Adhikari and PPD's Performance Monitoring POC.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** N/A

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Data Quality Considerations (optional):** Does not include measures of household economic activities and can only use rough estimates of informal economic sector activities. Does not imply that all households or economic actors benefit from an increase or suffer from a decrease in the growth rate.

**BASELINE**

**Baseline Trend (optional):** [Insert year] 4.9%, and insert the trend

**Other Notes (optional):**

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 5-26-14**

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – Goal 4**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**Performance Indicator Goal 4:** Human Development Index (HDI) score

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No  Yes  If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: \_\_\_\_\_ **Indicator Type:** Custom, Goal

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** The Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite measure of health, education and income that was introduced in the first Human Development Report in 1990 as an alternative to purely economic assessments of national progress, such as GDP growth. It soon became the most widely accepted and cited measure of its kind, and has been adapted for national use by many countries. HDI values and rankings in the global Human Development Report are calculated using the latest internationally comparable data from mandated international data providers. Previous HDI values and rankings are retroactively recalculated using the same updated data sets and current methodologies, and are presented in Table 2 of the Statistical Annex of the 2013 Report. *The HDI rankings and values in the 2013 Human Development Report cannot therefore be compared directly to HDI rankings and values published in previous Human Development Reports*

**Unit of Measure:** Index score

**Disaggregated by:** Income, Health, Education, Inequality, Poverty, Gender, Ethnicity, Sub-national level

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** The HDI was created to emphasize that people and their capabilities should be the ultimate criteria for assessing the development of a country, not economic growth alone. The HDI can also be used to question national policy choices, asking how two countries with the same level of GNI per capita can end up with such different human development outcomes. For example, the Bahamas' GNI per capita is higher than New Zealand's (by 17%) but life expectancy at birth is about 5 years shorter, mean years of schooling is 4 years shorter and expected years of schooling differ greatly between the two countries, resulting in New Zealand having a much higher HDI value than the Bahamas. These striking contrasts can stimulate debate about government policy priorities, and used to track and measure how Nepal is becoming a stronger country.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** N/A

**Data Source:** Refer to <http://hdr.undp.org/en/statistics/hdi/> and <http://hdr.undp.org/en/countries/profiles/IDN>

**Method of Data Acquisition:** USAID/Nepal PPD will directly access the website to collect data.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual (released in/around March of each year)

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Murari Adhikari and PPD's Performance Monitoring POC.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** N/A

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; hard copy of Nepal country scores in a backup file in the PPD office.

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):** N/A

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):** N/A

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):** TBD, component indicators of the index comes from different sources and are updated at different times. For instance this 2012 HDI index figure for Nepal could be comprised of 2010 data for one factor and 2012 data for another.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):** N/A

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis (optional):** Compare actual HDI levels to baseline and target. Compare HDI levels between CDCS target and non-target provinces. Compare HDI levels and trends in CDCS target provinces to other results indicators for these provinces.

**Mission/Team Review (optional):** Annual Portfolio Review.

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

<b>Baseline Timeframe</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Baseline aggregate score for Nepal = <b>XXX</b> (for year 2012), with a positive trend. <b>[2014 report with 2013 data should be coming out soon]</b>
<b>Rationale for Targets</b> <i>(optional)</i> : <b>Targets should be set slightly higher than the trend over the last 5 – 10 years.</b>
<b>Other Notes</b> <i>(optional)</i> :
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 5-25-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – Goal 5 TBD**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**Performance Indicator Goal 5:** TBD Social Inclusion Score on Nepal’s Social Inclusion Survey (can be refined to measure increase inclusion)

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No  Yes  If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: \_\_\_\_\_ **Indicator Type:** Custom, Goal

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** TBD

Methodology and measure to be inserted here.

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** Index score

Insert how score is determined here or any scale/ percentage/ etc..

**Disaggregated by:** cast/ethnicity, district, VDC, National, sex , age

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** TBD

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** TBD

**Data Source:** Nepal Social Inclusion Survey 2017, 2019

**Method of Data Acquisition:** The Nepal Social Inclusion Survey is an ethnographic survey that captures nationally representative, household-level, geographically disaggregated data from 15,000 households across 42 distinct ethnic groups.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Survey to be conducted every 2/3 years?

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** PPD-TBD

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** TBD- Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology Tribhuvan University Kathmandu

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus.

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):**

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):** TBD

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):** TBD

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):** TBD

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis (optional):** Data would be used to inform the level of increased successful inclusion of marginalized and target groups in USG target areas exposed to USG interventions across sectors.

**Mission/Team Review (optional):** TBD

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe (optional):** Nepal Social Inclusion Survey Report - Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology Tribhuvan University Kathmandu, Nepal 2012

**Rationale for Targets (optional):** TBD

**Other Notes (optional):** This PIRS is a place holder based on a lack of current country wide data source for tracking inclusion. This PIRS was drafted as a placeholder on recommendation of the Mission considering funding the Central Department of Sociology/Anthropology Tribhuvan University to conduct the Nepal Social Inclusion survey again. The survey cost is \$684,210 per survey (anticipated conducting 2x).

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 6-4-14**

**DO I: Context and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets**

**USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX 1-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**Context Indicator 1-1:** Change in World Bank Government Effectiveness Index Score (2.2-2)

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** Condition

**CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

Government effectiveness is defined as the quality of public services, the quality of the civil service and the degree of its independence from political pressures, the quality of policy formulation and implementation, and the credibility of the government's commitment to such policies. This is a composite indicator, which includes surveys of perceptions, leading to some degree of subjectivity.

<http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/pdf/ge.pdf>

Data are drawn from 15 sources and not all data sources are public. At the DO level, this remains a very good indicator although it remains possible to construct a marginally better one yet at a significantly higher cost in terms of labor and resources.

**Unit of Measure:** The composite measures of governance are in units of a standard normal distribution, with mean zero, standard deviation of one, and running from approximately -2.5 to 2.5, with higher values corresponding to better governance.

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** This indicator is intended to inform a broad range of stakeholders about general trends, most likely to be used for planning and budgeting of assistance. At the DO level, improvements in government effectiveness are expected for the life of the CDCS, although annual variations are not likely.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Data Source:** World Bank <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/index.aspx>;

Annual Reporting Frequency, issued in 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter in the following year (e.g. Sept 2014, the 2013 data will be released).

This link will be checked and potentially updated. The current composite of indicators formulating the Government Effectiveness Index satisfies the current need for context information.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Internet

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Kirshna Pathak

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** N/A

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** USAID/ Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Data Quality Considerations (optional):** This aggregate indicator broadly captures government effectiveness, so it is difficult to attribute changes in the score directly to U.S. assistance. U.S. contribution to changes in the score is more likely. Additionally, Much of the data used in this indicator is subjective, based on perceptions of survey respondents, non-governmental organizations, commercial business information providers and public sector organizations worldwide. The data is updated annually, though there may be a time lag between updates, making it difficult to reference on an annual basis.

The governance indicators produced by the World Bank may provide higher level national data. It may not provide disaggregated data relevant to change the progress at local level focusing to marginalized groups. The mission will collect primary data from the working area and use to see the progress against DOs and goal.

**BASELINE**

<b>Baseline Trend</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Historical data is available for this indicator. Index score 2013.
<b>Other Notes</b> <i>(optional)</i> :
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units</b> : National
<b>Baseline Units</b> <i>(optional)</i> : National
<b>CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR</b>
<b>Changes to Indicator</b> :
<b>Other Notes</b> <i>(optional)</i> :
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 6-4-14</b>

<b>USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX 1-2</b>
<b>Goal:</b> A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal
<b>DO 1:</b> More inclusive and effective governance
<b>Context Indicator 1-2:</b> Freedom in the World Political Rights sub-score for Electoral Process (2.3.2-13)
<b>Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:</b> Condition
<b>CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</b>
<p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> “Electoral process” is a sub-element of the Political Rights component of Freedom House’s <i>Freedom in the World</i> survey. The three main questions used to determine the sub-score for Electoral Process are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Is the head of government or other chief national authority elected through free and fair elections?</li> <li>• Are the national legislative representatives elected through free and fair elections?</li> <li>• Are the electoral laws and framework fair?</li> </ul> <p>Scores for this measure range from a low of 0 to a perfect score of 12.</p>
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> A numerical score ranging from 0 to 12 with 12 being best.
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> N/A
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):</b> Changes in score will reflect an improving or deteriorating electoral environment, and help planners determine need and estimate impact. Average improvement in score can demonstrate positive impact of USG assistance, while changes in country scores can be used to determine priorities and better allocate resources. The data from this indicator can be used for both assessing the contribution of USG assistance as well as for planning purposes.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Data Source:</b> Freedom House Freedom in the World index. Annually
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Acquire data from Freedom House Index on www
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Ramesh Adhikari
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> NA
<b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<p><b>Data Quality Considerations (optional):</b> This indicator is a broad measure that by averaging a number of variables may fail to reflect improvements in some areas and declines in others. Because other assistance providers’ activities or other external factors can affect election processes, attributing change to USG programs is difficult. Positive indicators may suggest USG <i>contribution</i>. Report preparation takes a year so data is only available for the previous year.</p> <p>This indicator is based on reviews of data and experts’ assessments of different aspects of the election process, and changes in the score will indicate an improving or deteriorating election process. Improvements in elections will contribute to long-term improvement in democratic and representative political processes.</p>
<b>BASELINE</b>
<b>Baseline Trend (optional):</b> Historical data is available for this indicator. Index score 2013.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> <i>National</i>
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> National
<b>CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR</b>
<b>Changes to Indicator:</b>
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 6-4-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** N/A

**Performance Indicator 1-1:** Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal access to social, economic, and political opportunities

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2015 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: \_\_\_\_\_ **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** This indicator will be used to gauge the effectiveness of USG efforts to promote gender equality by measuring changes in target population attitudes about whether men and women should have equal opportunities in social, political, and economic spheres. Any program in any sector that has gender equality or women’s empowerment as an objective should report against this indicator. This indicator will be particularly relevant to programs that seek to address or change social norms, especially those around gender. Illustrative programs include those designed to raise broad awareness of human rights, programs that train journalists to report more responsibly on gender issues, education programs designed to change social norms and gender roles, programs designed to increase the political participation of women, youth development and empowerment, or behavior change in the health sector, among others.

The unit of measure is a proportion, expressed in the form of X/Y, where the numerator is the number of persons in the target group whose scores on the equal opportunity survey have increased over time and the denominator is the total number of persons who participated in the relevant training/programming.

**Unit of Measure:** Proportion expressed in the form X/Y; See definition for Numerator and Denominator

**Disaggregated by:** Sex; Numerator, Denominator

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** The indicator will be used to measure the extent that USG supported gender equality and women’s empowerment programs are changing attitudes. The information will be used for planning and reporting purposes by bureau-level and in-country program managers, and will support reporting to external stakeholders such as Congress, NGOs, and international organizations. This indicator measures changes in societal attitudes and norms about gender equality that may proxy for deeper structural changes in the social, political, and economic spheres.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** Cooperative agreement or contract for periodic DO1-related surveys

**Data Source:** Data for this indicator will be collected by survey, once at the start of relevant USG-funded training/programming and a second time at the end of the training/programming. The survey may be read to program beneficiaries who are illiterate. Each COTR or AOTR would be responsible for ensuring that implementers collect these data.

Respondents will be asked: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

- Women should have equal rights with men and receive the same treatment as men do.
  - o Strongly Disagree
  - o Disagree
  - o Neither Agree nor Disagree
  - o Agree
  - o Strongly Agree
- On the whole, men make better political leaders than women and should be elected rather than women. (r)
  - o Strongly Disagree
  - o Disagree
  - o Neither Agree nor Disagree
  - o Agree
  - o Strongly Agree
- When jobs are scarce, men should have more right to a job than women. (r)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Strongly Disagree</li> <li>o Disagree</li> <li>o Neither Agree nor Disagree</li> <li>o Agree</li> <li>o Strongly Agree</li> </ul> <p>To score the opportunity measure, responses are coded as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-2 = Strongly Disagree</li> <li>-1 = Disagree</li> <li>0 = Neither Agree nor Disagree</li> <li>+1 = Agree</li> <li>+2 = Strongly Agree</li> </ul> <p>The items with an (r) should be reverse-scored. In other words, those items followed by an “r” that have a score of -2 should be recoded as a score of +2, -1 should be recoded as +1, +1 as -1 and +2 as -2.</p> <p>For example, for item 2 (“On the whole, men make better political leaders than women and should be elected rather than women”), a response of ‘strongly agree’ would be re-coded as “- 2” and a response of ‘strongly disagree’ would be re-coded as “+2.” Responses on each item should be added to yield a score between -3 and 3. A higher score indicates greater agreement that men and women should have equal opportunities.</p> <p>The proportion of participants whose score increased across time should be reported as a fraction, where the numerator is the number of persons in the target group whose scores have increased across time and the denominator is the total number of participants in the relevant training/programming.</p>
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Survey results delivered in 2015, 2017, and 2019
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Baseline, mid-term, final
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Maria Barron
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> Contract TBD- fill in once awarded
<b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> USAID/ Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> After first survey year- fill in year once known
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b> These questions have been validated in the World Values Survey, and AfroBarometer in Africa and Ibero-American surveys in Latin America.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> The anticipated award will allow for additional studies of the data to understand limitations or extract cross-tabulations for more information
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> The data will be used to understand the change in women’s and men’s perceptions related to women’s empowerment. Adverse changes in USAID project locations would signal a backsliding of support to women’s equality and a need to analyze USAID’s messaging and approach
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> DO1 level review is anticipated in year 2015, 2017 and 2019
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b> The baseline will be conducted in 2015
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> Please insert once set after 2015
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National with oversampling in the 20 USAID districts
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> National average with baseline for each of the 20 USAID districts
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Maria Barron DGO 6-10-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.1-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**IR 1.1:** Peaceful political environment sustained

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** N/A

**Performance Indicator 1.1-1:** Country political stability and absence of violence value score

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 1.6.4 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** *Political stability and absence of violence* is a Worldwide Governance Indicator that measures the perceptions of the likelihood that the government of Nepal will be destabilized or overthrown by unconstitutional or violent means, including domestic violence and terrorism. Because conflict is a complex social phenomena, this indicator will be interpreted in conjunction with other indicators and a thorough assessment of the country context.

**Unit of Measure:** The percentage change from the previous year.

**Disaggregated by:** None

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):**

This is the higher-level indicator, which has been selected to give the agency a sense of how effective the Nepal government has been in addressing the underlying conflicts and the challenges posed to its legitimacy.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** N/A

**Data Source:** This information is prepared annually by the World Bank Institute, which combines over two dozen data streams.

See <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/pdf/pv.pdf> for more information about the indicator’s methodology and interpretation, and [http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/mc\\_countries.asp](http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/mc_countries.asp) to access the latest data.

The score is drawn from the following data sources:

1. EIU (Economist Intelligence Unit) Orderly transfers
  - a. Armed conflict
  - b. Violent demonstrations
  - c. Social Unrest
  - d. International tensions / terrorist threat
2. GCS (World Economic Forum, Global Competitiveness Report) Cost of Terrorism
3. HUM (Cingranelli Richards Human Rights Database and Political Terror Scale) Frequency of political killings (CIRI)
  - a. Frequency of disappearances (CIRI)
  - b. Frequency of tortures (CIRI)
  - c. Political terror scale (PTS)
4. IJT (iJET Country Security Risk Ratings) Security Risk Rating
5. IPD (Institutional Profiles Database) Intensity of internal conflicts: ethnic, religious or regional
  - a. Intensity of violent activities...of underground political organizations
  - b. Intensity of social conflicts (excluding conflicts relating to land)
6. PRS (Political Risk Services International Country Risk Guide) Government stability
  - a. Internal conflict
  - b. External conflict
  - c. Ethnic tensions
7. WMO (Global Insight Business Conditions and Risk Indicators)
  - a. Civil unrest: How widespread political unrest is, and how great a threat it poses to investors. Demonstrations in themselves may not be cause for concern, but they will cause major disruption if they escalate into severe violence. At the extreme, this factor would amount to civil war.

- b. Terrorism: Whether the country suffers from a sustained terrorist threat, and from how many sources. The degree of localisation of the threat is assessed, and whether the active groups are likely to target or affect businesses.
- 8. WCY (Institute for Management and Development World Competitiveness Yearbook) The risk of political instability is very high
- 9. WJP (World Justice Project Rule of Law Index) Factor 3.2: Civil conflict is effectively limited (Order and Security)

Together the 9 data sources which inform the WGI, Political Stability and Absence of Violence score form a fairly comprehensive measure of the peacefulness of the political environment.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** World Bank data from publicly published report on www

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Please insert

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** N/A

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** USAID/ Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):**

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):** TBD

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):** This dataset is one of the leading measures of government effectiveness in post-conflict and fragile states environments. There have been concerns about the weight given to certain data streams, but in general the data is accepted throughout the governance and conflict mitigation communities. The indicator is calculated annually, and there is a time delay of up to 18 months. See <http://info.worldbank.org/governance/wgi/faq.htm#3> for additional info.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):** additional indicators will be used to measure progress towards this IR. Other indicator used 1.1-2 "Percent of successfully mediated local level disputes"

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis (optional):** The desired long-term outcome is to mitigate or alleviate the underlying sources of political and social instability. In instances where governments or regimes have not addressed social, ethnic, or economic conflicts, this indicator has been shown to rise over time.

**Mission/Team Review (optional):** TBD

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe (optional):** The baseline is the previous year's numbers, with the indicator value determined at the end of the year when the next year's values are published.

**Rationale for Targets (optional):** TBD

**Other Notes (optional):**

**GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION**

**Data Reporting Units:** National

**Baseline Units (optional):** National

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 5-30-14**

### USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.1-2

<b>Goal:</b> A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal
<b>DO 1:</b> More inclusive and effective governance
<b>IR 1.1:</b> Peaceful political environment sustained
<b>Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:</b> N/A
<b>Performance Indicator 1.1-2:</b> Percent of successfully mediated local level disputes among women, youth or people from marginalized groups
<b>Performance Plan and Report Indicator:</b> No ___ Yes <u>X</u> If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): <u>2014</u> If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: Custom Indicator Type: Outcome/ Impact
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</b>
<p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Conflicts at the community level (gender based violence, caste based discrimination, land encroachment, access to natural resources, exclusion of vulnerable group in accessing development budget) are tracked by implementers through mediation projects. Mediated cases are cases that are counted as resolved by implementers. Mediated cases are cases that do not escalate past the local level.</p> <p>Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29</p> <p>Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)</p> <p>Numerator: number of mediated cases Denominator: total number of cases submitted</p>
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> Present and number
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> VDC, Type of dispute, age, sex, cast/ethnicity
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):</b> Locally resolved conflicts not escalating to higher levels are a direct measure of maintained and increased peace. This indicator data will be used to inform DO 1 as to the stability at the local levels where conflict erupts more frequently and can lead to destabilization at large.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> CMM Partners: CARE, Mercy Corp, Safer World, Sajhedari , Mandawi
<b>Data Source:</b> CMM partner records and surveys
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Partners will submit data quarterly and annually
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Quarterly/ Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Reshma Thapa (AOR), Sabita Shrestha (AAOR)
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> Implementing partners
<b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> USAID/ Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> 2015
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b> Counting mediations across implementers where some work in multiple VDCs in a given district while others cover fewer VDCs.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> Careful aggregation of data at Mission level when cumulatively rolling up data from IPs
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> If the percentage of the cases registered and mediated is increased there will be more stabilization at the local level contributing to the DO 1 level.

<b>Mission/Team Review</b> <i>(optional)</i> : TBD
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe</b> <i>(optional)</i> : 2014 TBD
<b>Rationale for Targets</b> <i>(optional)</i> : TBD
<b>Other Notes</b> <i>(optional)</i> :
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units</b> : District, VDC
<b>Baseline Units</b> <i>(optional)</i> : District, VDC
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 5-30-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.2-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**IR 1.2:** Accountability of selected institutions strengthened

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** 3.2 A Healthier and Well-Nourished Population, 3.3 Social Sector Policy and Performance Improved

**Performance Indicator 1.2-1:** Percent of operating unit program funds obligated through partner country systems (CBLD 2)

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No  Yes  **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** Custom **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Operating units should enter the percentage in the results field and provide the numerator and denominator values where specified as disaggregates. The result entered for this indicator is calculated using the following numerator and denominator.

**Numerator:** the dollar value of an operating unit’s annual program allocation obligated (or sub-obligated via a bilateral agreement) through partner country systems during the fiscal year. The term “partner country system” is defined in ADS 220.1.

**Denominator:** the total value of the current year program allocation for the Operating Unit. An operating unit’s annual program allocation includes new obligating authority (NOA), carryover funds, and transfers from other US Government agencies.

Missions that obligate funds into a SOAG/DOAG and sub-obligate funds into awards the year following the appropriation should treat these funds as if they were carry-over funds. For example, the full amount of funds obligated into a SOAG/DOAG in FY 11 should be included in the denominator for FY 12, and any funds that are sub-obligated through local systems should be counted in the numerator for FY 12. Partner country systems can be at the sovereign and sub-sovereign level. Funds obligated through regional governmental organizations are not included since these are defined as international organizations. An obligation is defined as a binding agreement that will result in an outlay (payment) either immediately or in the future. Budgetary resources (appropriations or other legal authorizations) must be available before obligations may be legally incurred.

For out-year budget levels, please follow the latest CDCS guidance.

**Unit of Measure:** Percent

**Disaggregated by:** Numerator, Denominator

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** This indicator measures progress towards strengthening partner country capacity to improve aid effectiveness and sustainability by increasing use of reliable partner country systems and institutions to provide support to partner countries. It will be used by senior staff, Bureau-level planners and by Country-level managers to assess progress in achieving USAID Forward’s Objective 1 of IPR and to plan for improvements in programming directly with public sector institutions.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** N/A

**Data Source:** Data will be collected by each operating unit annually from budget, acquisition and assistance records kept in the operating unit.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Please insert Comptroller?

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Every 3 years

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Please insert

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** Partner Country Assistance Team

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** USAID/ Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus; any other place these records will be kept?

DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> You should still do a DQA for this Indicator – set time
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b> This indicator is a proxy for improved capacity of financial management systems. Without appropriate controls and pro-active monitoring/capacity building efforts, increasing funds through partner country systems could in fact have the reverse of the intended effect (increasing funds to an institution not yet ready to manage those funds could make the institution vulnerable to corruption, mission-drift, etc.). Therefore it is essential that operating unit staff monitor implementation for unintended consequences.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> This indicator tracks operating unit progress towards meeting the stated target of USAID Forward’s IPR Objective 1: “strengthen partner country capacity to improve aid effectiveness and sustainability.” It is a direct measure of the objective to: “increase obligations of program funds through partner country systems.”
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> TBD
BASELINE AND TARGETS
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b> Baseline Figure for Fiscal Year
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> Please insert
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> National
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 5-30-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.2-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**IR 1.2:** Accountability of selected institutions strengthened

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** N/A

**Performance Indicator 1.2-2:** Percent change in GON development budget execution rate

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2014 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: Custom Indicator Type: Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

Annual percent change in expenditure of development budget over one year period. Development Budget execution rate = Annual Development Expenditure divided by Annual total Development Budget Allocation .

**Unit of Measure:** Percent

**Disaggregated by:** Numerator, denominator; National

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** An increase in the rate of development expenditure shows an increase in GON ability to manage budget and spending hence is an example of strengthened institutions.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:**

**Data Source:** Ministry of Finance Economic Survey; Nepal Rastra Bank’s website

**Method of Data Acquisition:** WWW Internet

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annually

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Kishore KC

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** N/A

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** USAID/ Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):**

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):** **FY 2015**

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):** This data comes from the GON financial review. The availability of data may depend on the timing of their review may not be available in a timely manner.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):** The Finance Ministry point of contact for USAID can provide some hints about the trend of expenditures.

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis (optional):** The data will be compared on a year to year basis to determine the trend and cause of the slow or improved execution. Execution will be examined through discussion with the Ministry officials and reviewing media reports.

**Mission/Team Review (optional):** During the portfolio review the expenditure pattern of GON will be reviewed and analyzed.

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe (optional):** Pervious year budget

**Rationale for Targets (optional):**

**Other Notes (optional):**

**GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION**

**Data Reporting Units:** National

**Baseline Units (optional):** National

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 6-10-14**

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.3-1**

**Goal:** A More democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**IR 1.3:** Accountability of selected institutions strengthened

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** 1.4 Public Policy and Performance Improved, 2.1 Agriculture-based income increased, 2.3 Resilience to Targeted Natural Resources, 3.1 Better-Skilled Literate Population, 3.2 Healthier and well-nourished population

**Performance Indicator 1.3-1:** Local Organizational Capacity Assessment Score (CLBD 5) (2.4.1)

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 2.4.1 **Indicator Type:** Standard, Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** USAID Standard Definition: This indicator reports the capacity of local organizations measured by changes in scores across seven key capacity areas using the Organizational Capacity Assessment (OCA) tool, which can be found at the following location: J:\Procurement Reform Objective Two\Organizational Capacity Assessment. The key capacity areas include:

- Governance
- Administration
- Human Resources Management
- Financial Management
- Organizational Management
- Program Management
- Project Performance Management

The result entered for this indicator is calculated using the following numerator and denominator. **Numerator:** The total number of points scored. **Denominator:** The total number of points possible, which may vary depending on the inclusion of optional OCA sections where relevant (e.g. the sub-grant management section may or may not be relevant to the organization depending on program).

Operating units should record score data for each organization in their performance management plan files so changes in scores for each organization can be monitored over time (it is not necessary to report each organization’s score in the PPR). In addition, each operating unit must include in their performance management plan files: the assessment tool used, a description of the methodology employed for its implementation, and the data source identified as the basis for the rating of each factor. For purposes of indicator reporting, at the time of the award a “local organization” must,

- Be organized under the laws of the recipient country;
- Have its principal place of business in the recipient country;
- Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the recipient country or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a recipient country; and
- Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the recipient country.

The term “controlled by”, means a majority ownership or beneficiary interest as defined above, or the power, either directly or indirectly, whether exercised or exercisable, to control the election, appointment, or tenure of the organization’s managers or a majority of the organization’s governing body by any means, e.g., ownership, contract, or operation of law. “Foreign entity” means an organization that fails to meet any part of the “local organization” definition.

Government controlled and government owned organizations in which the recipient government owns a majority interest or in which the majority of a governing body are government employees, are included in the above definition of local organization.

For regional platforms the definition of a local organization can be expanded to include regional organizations that meet the following criteria:

- Be organized under the laws of a country in the region served by the platform;
- Have its principal place of business in the region;
- Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the region; and
- Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the region.

Both direct and indirect awardees should be included, as well as those local organizations who received USG assistance—such as training—to strengthen capacity, without receiving an award.

Note: If an operating unit wishes to use an alternative assessment tool, for example one generated through the human and institutional capacity development (HICD) methodology or the IDF tool, it should at a minimum include the factors identified in the OCA.

USAID/Nepal Refined Definition: The OCA suggested by F is focused on local capacity development for organizations that are implementing partners to USAID through direct procurement, and are usually defined as “interest” groups rather than CSOs and NGOs, which are the target local organizations for DO 1, as well as the other DOs where CSO and NGO capacity is an important sub-result. However, the DO 1 relevant organizations are not necessarily going to be managing sub-grants or otherwise be funded directly by USAID/Nepal. As well, the governance focused capacity building is to advance USAID/Nepal’s DO 1 objectives and results, specifically to increase governance via CSOs/NGOs increasing Government institution capacity to provide services. As a result, the DO 1 team will use the Organizational Capacity Assessment Tool (OCAT) developed and updated by PACT (and the future implementer of the CSO activity) which focuses on seven capacity areas scores that are critical to effective CSOs and NGOs, most of which are related to the OCA described above:

- Internal governance,
- Management practices,
- Human resources,
- Financial resources,
- Service delivery,
- External relations, and
- Sustainability.

Scored CSOs/NGOs will be USAID implementing partners across all three DOs, which may include sub-awardees. Note that some capacity building under DOs 2 and 3 might be focused on government institutions and therefore might need to use alternative OCAT to the ones used by DO 1. It is recommended, however, that **all DO teams use this same OCAT when working with CSOs and NGOs to improve their capacity. Please ensure.**

**Unit of Measure:** Score percentage; Each dimension is scored along a seven-point scale of whole-number increments, where 0 = N/A, 1 = needs urgent attention, and further gradations up to 6 = acceptable, needs maintaining.

**Disaggregated by:** Type of CSO/NGO (e.g., service delivery, watchdog, advocacy, women’s organization), location, dimensions on OCAT

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** In order to measure program progress in fostering effective and sustainable CSOs/NGOs, the assessment tool will be used to evaluate their capacity along its seven dimensions. The baseline scores will help determine the training and technical assistance needs for each organization, as well as across organizations. Subsequent measurements will be used to assess improvements in the organization’s capacities as a result of project assistance. Using the standard F indicator will help the Mission measure progress across

<p>the CDCS results framework, which will support the cross-cutting and integrated multi-sectoral approach of the Mission’s strategy. Even if there are slightly different OCAs used to measure the changes in capacity of different types of organizations, the mission will still be able to aggregate and generally report on improved capacity. Note: it should, however, note the number of different (or partial) OCAs used throughout the Mission to report on the aggregated results.</p>
<p><b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b></p>
<p><b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> DO 1 Sajhedari Bikaas (2012-2017), Civil Society Activity (TBD), and CTIP II (2016-2020), DO 2 Hariyoban (2011-2016), Kisan (2013-2018), DO 3 Saath Saath (2011-2016). <b>Note that we have to check to see if these projects are employing OCAT.</b></p>
<p><b>Data Source:</b> Completed OCAT scorecards for each organization collected by each activity.</p>
<p><b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> The OCAT is administered before a CSO/NGO receives assistance, and then every year on an annual basis for the remainder of the program, whether or not the organization continues to receive direct assistance, to track its progress both during and after the period of direct assistance. For the first several times the OCAT is administered, it is done on a joint basis between the CSO/NGO being scored and the IR 1.2 implementing partner (IP), so that the CSO/NGO “owns” the results. However, baseline scoring may require more support from the implementing partner, which then must gradually and consistently decrease at each subsequent measurement until eventually the OCAT becomes a tool for full self-assessment by each CSO/NGO.</p> <p>The OCAT is administered via both a facilitated discussion of the questions for each of the seven dimensions, and documentation or other evidence to support the conclusions of that discussion. The baseline results are then used, also jointly by the CSO/NGO in question and the IR 1.2 IP, to develop an appropriate organization-specific workplan of training, mentoring, technical assistance, etc. Normally this assistance is targeted at the dimensions on which an organization scored lowest, but this may not necessarily be the case, so the workplan must always be developed jointly. If an organization continues to receive assistance in subsequent years, the annual scoring is used to tailor the coming year’s assistance to the organization’s evolving capacity-building needs.</p> <p>Once the OCAT has been administered, the original copies of the scorecards with documentation supporting the scores must be collected and reviewed by the IP technical leads to assess the quality and completeness of the scoring. The final scores and correctly totaled and averaged score are then documented in the IP’s M&amp;E database and/or data tracking system. The completed scorecards must then be filed in a secure location.</p> <p>OCAT summary results across all assisted organizations are also used to discern the most common needs and prioritize the implementing partner’s development of training, mentoring and technical assistance modules to address those needs.</p> <p>Finally, the annual scores are also used to track program progress in achieving capacity-building goals. In addition to each organization’s individual scores, average changes along each dimension of the CSOs/NGOs assisted in any given year measures overall program progress.</p>
<p><b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annually for each organization. Across all organizations, data will be coming in throughout the year as a CSO/NGO becomes a beneficiary of capacity-building assistance.</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Each AOR/COR for DO 1 Sajhedari Bikaas (Meg Nalbo), Civil Society Activity (TBD), and CTIP II (TBD), DO 2 Hariyoban (Netra Sharma), Kisan (Danielle Knueppel), DO 3 Saath Saath (Niramaya Limbu)</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> COP of each implementer DO 1 Sajhedari Bikaas (Nick Langton), Civil Society Activity (TBD), and CTIP II (TBD), DO 2 Hariyoban (Judy Oglethorpe), Kisan (Bill Collis), DO 3 Saath Saath (XX)</p>
<p><b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> USAID/ Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus</p>
<p><b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b></p>
<p><b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b></p>
<p><b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> 2014</p>
<p><b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b> Every activity may not be addressing all aspects of the OCAT to help improve the organizations’ score</p>

<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations</b> <i>(optional)</i> : We will focus on and track the sections of the OCAT where USAID assistance is targeted.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis</b> <i>(optional)</i> : This indicator should be reviewed annually, comparing actuals to baseline and target. The trend over time for this indicator should also be examined. The disaggregation data should also be analyzed, to see if there is a difference based on location (e.g., NGOs/CSOs in one district might score differently than NGOs/CSOs in another), type of NGO/CSO (e.g., women’s NGOs/CSOs might be scored differently than environmental NGOs/CSOs), and by capacity area (e.g., most NGOs/CSOs, regardless of location and type, might score the lowest in the same broad capacity area, which could allow for joint training or other capacity assistance across all of the CSOs/NGOs). The achievements of this indicator should be compared to the achievements over time to assess whether the Mission is making progress to achieving the IR. The team reviewing progress for this indicator should include DO 2 and DO 3 team members, to assess the capacity of health, environment, agriculture, and other basic service delivery and advocacy CSOs/NGOs. Analysis for this indicator should also include reviewing context indicator 1.2-CX1.
<b>Mission/Team Review</b> <i>(optional)</i> : This indicator should be reviewed during preparation for the annual performance/strategy portfolio review, and then during the portfolio review. The DO team may invite the relevant implementing partners from DO 1, DO 2, and DO 3 to the pre-portfolio review to hear their lessons learned and to understand their perspectives.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe</b> <i>(optional)</i> : FY 2015, baselines should be conducted after the DO 1 IR 1.2 CSOs/NGOs have been identified in concert with the IR 1.2 implementing partner(s). The average baseline for all CSOs/NGOs should be used. Note, as new organizations are “baselined”, the average baseline will need to be adjusted to include the new CSOs/NGOs. The actuals will not need to be adjusted as new organizations are added, because the data reported will be the average.
<b>Rationale for Targets</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Targets should be based on at least a single improvement in score from the baseline (so if the aggregate baseline for all organizations is 3.5, the target should be a score of 4.5).
<b>Other Notes</b> <i>(optional)</i> :
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 6-4-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.3-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**IR 1.3:** Civic participation and advocacy increased

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** 2.3 Resilience of Targeted Natural Resources and Related Livelihoods, 3.1 Better-Skilled Literate Populations

**Performance Indicator 1.3-2:** Percent of targeted local institutions that have annual plans (forest, education, agriculture/livestock) with budget allocation specifically for marginalized groups

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2014 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: Custom – resilience **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

Numerator: number of annual plans and budgets in place and implemented

Denominator: number of institutions targeted to have annual plan and budget in place and executed

Institutions are defined as: the government line agencies based in the VDC (geographical location) and district level mandated for providing services in education, agriculture/livestock. Institutions also include the non-government forestry institutions at the national level.

Local government (District Development Committees, Municipalities and VDCs) also considered as institution who have own annual plan and budget. Local government will invest in the development works and providing services to the people especially excluded and marginalized populations.

Plans are specific to: interventions along with budget for a fiscal year focusing to the marginalized groups in the sectors like forest, education, and agriculture/livestock at VDC and district level

Health and Water plans are not counted or included as budget allocations are not disaggregated towards marginalized groups. Service provision is used to track inclusion in the Health sector.

Delivery allocations are the measure for inclusion which is captured by Indicator 3.3.2

Marginalized: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not included in this definition)

**Unit of Measure:** Number

**Disaggregated by:** Sector; District, VDC, National

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional):** The institutions will allocate budget for the marginalized groups that will enable them to take part in the development process. Through this budget allocation, the marginalized groups will receive financial information about the central government line agencies (health, education, forest, water, agriculture/livestock and local government that informs the basis for further advocacy to allocate more budget based on equity.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** Through CSO partners (community institutions i.e. self-help groups, CBOs, Cooperatives, NGOs, alliance/network of CSOs)

**Data Source:** Annual plan with budget of institutions - (education, forest, agriculture/livestock) and local government

**Method of Data Acquisition:** There is a mechanism in the district level where District Development Committees collect and compile plan and budget of each organization - education, forest, agriculture/livestock, VDCs, Municipalities and DDC itself. Further, CSO can obtain copies of work plan with budget from the agencies listed above.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Quarterly

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Krishna Pathak

<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> Designated focal person at partner organization
<b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> USAID/ Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> FY 2015
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b> There is chances of not having budget line items in the annual plans of agencies (mentioned above) explicitly. Likewise, CSO may have difficulty in accessing above-mentioned agencies plan and budget. In this case, CSOs may choose option to ask information with listed institutions referring to right to information law.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> Data verification; reviewing of data generation to reporting processes and templates, reviewing skills of personnel in data management and supporting to improve system and skills in data management at partners level. Maintain reference sheet of activity at partners and mission level.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> The institution's (education, forest, agriculture/livestock and local government) budget will empower marginalized people to pursue development activities as per their needs and choice. This will help to gain benefits to their livelihoods and socio-political status in the area.
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> TBD
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b> Year 1 (actual time TBD)
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> Want to see incremental changes in enjoying services (health, education, waster, livelihoods) by the marginalized people
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b> None
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> National
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 6-10-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.4-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**IR 1.4:** Public policy and performance improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** 2.4 Econ Growth Policy and Performance Improved, 3.3 Social Sector Policy and Performance Improved

**Performance Indicator 1.4-1:** Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed; Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation; Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decreed; Stage 4: Passed/approved; Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2014\_ If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: 4.5.1-24 Indicator Type: Output/ Custom

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of agricultural enabling environment policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture that:

Stage 1: ...underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy / regulation / administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy / regulations / administrative procedures).

Stage 2: ...underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure.

Stage 3: ... underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreed to improve the policy environment for small-holder-based agriculture.)

Stage 4: ...underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decreed) of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).

Stage 5: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).

Do not “double-count” policies that passed through several stages during the reporting year. Report only the highest stage completed during the reporting year, e.g. of a policy was analyzed then presented for stakeholder consultation, report one policy at Stage 2.

Note for DO 1 at the Sub-IR level other related policies tracked by stages will include. The PIRS for the below should include stage definition where applicable :

2.3.3-8 Number of political parties receiving USG assistance to help them develop more programmatic platforms and policy agendas.

2.2.1-3 Number of draft laws subject to substantive amendment and final vote in legislatures receiving USG assistance

1.5.3-16 The number of anti-TIP policies, laws or international agreements strengthened with USG assistance

2.4.1-12 Number of public policies introduced, adopted, repealed, changed or implemented consistent with citizen input

**Unit of Measure:** Number

**Disaggregated by:** Type of Policy, Sector (note DO 2 also collecting), and Stage -- 1: Analyzed 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation 3: Presented for legislation/decreed 4: Passed/approved 5: Passed for which implementation has begun

<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> The indicator measures the number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. Insofar as a favorable business environment is essential for inclusive economic growth, this indicator serves as a useful measure of the extent to which the policy environment effectively encourages growth.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Implementing partners collect information (which IPs) and assist in developing legislation, regulations, and other reforms.
<b>Data Source:</b> IP records: documentation of request for assistance with drafting, notes from drafting meetings.
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Quarterly and Annual Reports (NDI, TAF, IFES, CTIP, PACT)- Observation and analysis of the Nepal government status of the various policies being addressed.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Ramesh Adhikari
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> M&E Officers of USAID DGO implementers and such other M&E Officers or COPs of partner organizations that are implementing relevant USAID programs
<b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> USAID/ Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> 2015- note DQAs are conducted on a given indicator and since this indicator is used by both DO 1 and 2 the DQA on this indicator will cover all related sectors*
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b> Data are useful to track performance of implementing partners working on policy reform. However, the outcomes for this indicator are greatly dependent on host country political and government processes. Decision-makers should look at country context when using data for performance decisions.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> USAID/Nepal will closely assess reported values against indicator definitions of the five stages and periodically review data collection process to ensure accurate reporting. Tracking stages of policy will also allow for analysis of quality of policy, note since all policies (beneficial or departmental) are counted the quality of policy will be tracked separately.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> Analyzing the stage that various policies are in provides an indicator of the enabling environment for that sector and the extent of policy work still needed.
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> Pipeline Review and Annual Reports
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b> 2014
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> TBD
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National, district, municipality and VDC level
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> National, district, municipality and VDC level
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 6-4-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.4-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**IR 1.4 :** Public policy and performance improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** 2.4 Econ Growth Policy and Performance Improved, 3.3 Social Sector Policy and Performance Improved (where applicable)

**Performance Indicator 1.4-2:** Percent of targeted institutions meeting all minimum performance standards of GON (by sector/institutions)

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2014 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: Custom Indicator Type: Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Minimum Performance Standards for District Development Committees, Municipalities, and Village Development Councils as established by Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Development (MFALD) for targeted District Development Committees, Municipalities and Village Development Councils. The Ministry performs an annual assessment of each local government and determines if they pass or fail the assessment. We will only target those local bodies targeted by our USAID programs.

Performance targets have been established to Counter Trafficking in Persons (CTIP) and are tracked annually by the Ministry of Women, Children, and Social Welfare (MWCSW), including the National Minimum Standards (NMS) and Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) to support victims. NMS defines a victim centric approach in addressing the concerns of human trafficking victims from rescue to reintegration process between the government and (GON and NGO) shelter services. The NMS ensures that the quality of the services and support provided by different stakeholders are consistent in ensuring the rights of the victims/survivors. The Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for rehabilitation centers focuses on standardizing the institutional care provided to human trafficking victims by aligning it to the principles of the NMS and rights based approach. We will only target those shelters targeted by our USAID programs.

**Unit of Measure:** For targeted governments the unit of measure will be the % of the targeted local bodies and shelters passing the assessment exercise.

**Disaggregated by:** USAID will disaggregate by geographic location and affiliated Ministry (MFALD or MWCSW)

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (optional).** The measured performance of local government appears to be a relatively well accepted procedure for measuring performance and relatively routine at this time.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** The Sajhedari Bikaas project (2012-2017) and the CTIP program (2010-2016) and CTIP II (2016-2021) implementer will collect project data from partner shelters.

**Data Source:** Annual assessment materials may be obtained from MFALD and the CTIP implementer.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Checking MFALD annual reports and CTIP implementer annual reports.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** CORs managing Sajhedari (Meg Nalbo/Ramesh Adhikari) and AORs managing CTIP (Sabita Shrestha/Reshma Thapa)

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** Sajhedari (Pact’s Chief of Party Nick Langton) and CTIP (The Asia Foundation’s Chief of Party Nandita Baruah)

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** USAID/ Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):** 2014

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):** Every three years

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):** The range of institutions needs to be expanded to a more representative sample of GON institutions’ improved service delivery; at present it is not representative enough to determine whether the “government” writ large is improving service delivery. There may be some political influences that impact the assessment processes.

<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> DGO will conduct more research to include other GON institutions' standards during the design of new programs for elections, political processes, and public financial management to identify related GON performance standards.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> For the MFALD Minimum Standards for the Performance for Local Government, the data analysis will show if the performance of targeted local governments is improving where USAID's program Sajhedari is working. Because all local government bodies are tracked, it will be easy to monitor if the improvement is district-wide or in the targeted Village Development Committees. The CTIP project generated data will be limited to the shelters assisted under the program.
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> To occur annually during portfolio reviews.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b> MFALD baseline data will be taken in 2013. Sajhedari's work with local governments began in earnest in late 2013 and would not have influenced the MFALD results. MWCSW NMS and SOP was established in 2012 and disseminated in 2013. The current CTIP project will serve to identify a baseline in 2013 and the follow-on CTIP II will continue to collect data for shelters implementing NMS and SOP through the life of its program.
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> These are the GON standards and can be collected more easily as well as tracked in partnership with the target institution.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b> DGO will conduct more research to include other GON institutions' standards during the design of new programs for elections, political processes, and public financial management to identify related GON performance standards.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> Village Development Committee level reporting will be identified.
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b>
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Kasia Kedzia SI 6-4-2014</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 1.4-3**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 1:** More inclusive and effective governance

**IR 1.4:** Public policy and performance improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** 2.4 Econ Growth Policy and Performance Improved, 3.3 Social Sector Policy and Performance Improved

**Performance Indicator 1.4-3:** TBD Percent of respondents satisfied with government services as provided by target institutions

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2015 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: Custom Indicator Type: Please insert

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Please insert

Respondents ...

Satisfied...

Government Services:

Targeted Institutions:

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** Number and Percent

**Disaggregated by:** sex, ethnicity/cast, age, district, vdc

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** Please insert

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** Please insert

**Data Source:** TBD – DG Survey

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Please insert

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Please insert

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Please insert

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** Please insert

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** Please insert

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):** Please insert

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):** Please insert

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance:** Please insert

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):** Please insert

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis (optional):** Please insert

<b>Mission/Team Review</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Please insert
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Please insert
<b>Rationale for Targets</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Please insert
<b>Other Notes</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Please insert
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:</b> PIRS Template:

**DO 2: Context and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets**

**USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX 2-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**Context Indicator 2-1:** Change in sales volume of selected agricultural inputs

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** Critical Assumption

**CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Annual change in the total sales volume (in 1000s of metric tons) of chemical fertilizer and seeds.

Data is provided to NEKSAP by Ministry of Agricultural Development. More precise definitions for these terms not available at this time.

**Unit of Measure:** Sales volume (1000s of metric tons)

**Disaggregated by:** Type of input (seeds, fertilizer)

**Rationale or Management Utility:** Nepal’s farmers are heavily dependent upon access to both seeds and fertilizer in order to increase agricultural productivity. Lack of access to these agricultural inputs severely constrains both agricultural yields and smallholder income.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Data Source:** NEKSAP crop situation report, “Input supplies” section

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Via public web access: <http://neksap.org.np/crop-situation-update>

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Danielle Knueppel

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** N/A

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus.

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Data Quality Considerations:** Data are aggregated and presented in NEKSAP report, but original data is provided by Nepal’s Ministry of Agricultural Development (MOAD). Data quality assessments have not been conducted.

**BASELINE**

**Baseline Trend:** Baseline data available from Neksap 2013 crop situation report.

**Other Notes (optional):**

**CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR**

**Changes to Indicator:**

**Other Notes (optional):**

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-3-14**

**USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX 2-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**Context Indicator 2-2:** Nepal’s Ease of Doing Business “Distance to Frontier” Score

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** Condition

**CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** This measure shows the distance of each economy to the “frontier.” The frontier represents the highest performance observed or each of the indicators across all economies measured in *Doing Business* since the inclusion of the indicator. An economy’s distance to frontier is reflected on a scale from 0 to 100, where 0 represents the lowest performance and 100 represents the frontier. For example, a score of 75 in DB 2013 means an economy was 25 percentage points away from the frontier constructed from the best performances across all economies and across time. A score of 80 in DB 2014 would indicate the economy is improving. In this way the distance to frontier measure complements the annual ease of doing business ranking, which compares economies with one another at a point in time.

**Unit of Measure:** Percent

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Rationale or Management Utility:** Successful entrepreneurship (both agricultural and non-agricultural) depends in part upon a stable and favorable operating environment for businesses.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Data Source:** World Bank Ease of Doing Business Report:

<http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploreeconomies/nepal/>

**Method of Data Acquisition:** USAID/Nepal staff will extract data from the following website:

<http://www.doingbusiness.org/data/exploreeconomies/nepal/>

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Anita Mahat-Rana

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** N/A

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Data Quality Considerations:** The World Bank utilizes its own internal methods for ensuring data quality.

**BASELINE**

**Baseline Trend:** Baseline data available in World Bank’s 2014 Ease of Doing Business Report.

**Other Notes (optional):**

**CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR**

**Changes to Indicator:**

**Other Notes (optional):**

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-3-14**

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** N/A

**Performance Indicator 2-1:** Prevalence of poverty: percent of people living on less than \$1.25 per day

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2015 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: 4-17, 4.5-13 **Indicator Type:** Impact

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** *The MDGs define this level as those living in “extreme poverty”. Although we do not use the word “extreme” in this title, we are referring to the same measure used by the UN for the MDGs.)* This indicator measures Millennium Development Goal Target 1a. Halving extreme poverty refers to the period 1990 to 2015. The applicable poverty line is \$1.25 dollars per person per day, converted into local currency at 2005 “Purchasing Power Parity” (PPP) exchange rates then adjusted for cumulative inflation from 2005 to the month and year the population-based survey data were collected using the relevant consumer price index. The use of PPP exchange rates ensures that the poverty line applied in each country has the same real value. Measurement is based on the value of average daily consumption expenditure per person, where food and other items that a household consumes out of its own production are valued as if the household purchased those items at market prices. For example, all members of a household of four people are counted as poor if the household’s average daily consumption expenditures are less than \$5 per day at 2005 PPP after adjusting for local inflation since 2005. The poverty rate is estimated by dividing the measured number of poor people in a sample of households by the total population in the households in the sample.

Data for this indicator must be collected using the Consumption Expenditure methodology of the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). Missions are encouraged to use the LSMS Integrated Survey in Agriculture Consumption Expenditure module, which has been incorporated in the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators. Feed the Future will collect consumption-expenditure data in order to calculate prevalence of poverty for this indicator, as well as per capita expenditures to be used as a proxy for income. Expenditures are used instead of income because of the difficulty in accurately measuring income and because expenditure data are less prone to error, easier to recall and are more stable over time than income data.

The most convenient single source is the World Bank’s online DataBank (<http://databank.worldbank.org/ddp/home.do?Step=12&id=4&CNO=2>). Using data from the DataBank, Table 2 shows, for each FTF country, the 2005 PPP exchange rate (in bold), annual average values of the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for years 2006-2011, and finally the local currency equivalent of \$1.25 at 2005 PPP, adjusted by cumulative inflation since 2005 as outlined above. Values for additional countries can be downloaded from the DataBank.

To calculate the local currency equivalent to the \$1.25 line at the prices prevailing in a given month—for example, the household survey data cited in the example above—requires monthly CPI data. These are compiled by the International Monetary Fund in its publication International Financial Statistics. USAID employees can gain access to those data through the Economic Analysis and Data Services (EADS). Alternatively, E3 staff can download data from this source. Currently, all IMF CPI data are normalized so that 2005=100, which makes the calculation described above particularly simple.

**Numerator:** Total population within targeted FTF ZOI living on less than \$1.25 per day **Denominator:** Total population within targeted FTF ZOI districts

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** Number, Percent.

Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the

<p>total population in the ZOI. Enter:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Percentage of people from sample living on &lt;\$1.25/day</li> <li>2. Percentage of people in FNM households from sample living on &lt;\$1.25/day</li> <li>3. Total population of people in FNM households in the ZOI</li> <li>4. Percentage of people in MNF households from sample living on &lt;\$1.25/day</li> <li>5. Total population of people in MNF households in the ZOI</li> <li>6. Percentage of people in M&amp;F households from sample living on &lt;\$1.25/day</li> <li>7. Total population of people in M&amp;F households in the ZOI</li> <li>8. Percentage of people in CNA households from sample living on &lt;\$1.25/day</li> <li>9. Total population of people in CNA households in the ZOI</li> </ol>
<p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Gendered Household Type: Adult Female no Adult Male (FNM), Adult Male no Adult Female Adult (MNF), Male and Female Adults (M&amp;F), Child no Adults (CNA), caste/ethnicity</p> <p>Note: In FEEDBACK's 2013 FTF Population-Based Survey, baseline values were not reported for Child no Adults (CNA) households due to the low number of observations (N&lt;25) for this category.</p>
<p><b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> This measures the first goal of the Feed the Future Initiative as well as a Millennium Development Goal. It is the purpose of the Feed the Future Initiative. All objectives, program elements, and projects are designed to reduce poverty.</p>
<p><b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b></p>
<p><b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> FEEDBACK, Bureau for Food Security's central M&amp;E contractor</p>
<p><b>Data Source:</b> Data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) the Nepal Living Standards Survey (NLSS), if the data were collected within the previous two years and a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by a Feed the Future Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) contractor, using the country-specific LSMS methodology and the Feed the Future M&amp;E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators.</p>
<p><b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Data collected by conducting national-level household surveys.</p> <p>Extraction of baseline, final, and (potentially) mid-term population-based survey reports by centrally-funded BFS M&amp;E contractor, and/or from Nepal Living Standards Survey</p>
<p><b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Approximately every two years (baseline, midterm, endline)</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Danielle Knueppel</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> FEEDBACK, centrally-funded FTF M&amp;E contractor</p>
<p><b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus</p>
<p><b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b></p>

<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> DQAs conducted and managed by USAID's Bureau for Food Security. Contact Salik Farooqi, BFS M&E Point of Contact, for more information.
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> DQAs conducted and managed by USAID's Bureau for Food Security. Contact Salik Farooqi, BFS M&E Point of Contact, for more information.
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b>
(1) Data for this indicator is precise for measuring impacts, but only partly attributable to USAID programs. Can only provide context for tracking performance, which is useful for management decision- making purposes.
(2) <b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> The Bureau for Food Security (BFS) has developed consumption expenditure modules for collecting poverty data for all missions, standard collection, and methodology. The Living Standards Methods Survey of collection and poverty data have been vigorously tested for reliability over the past several years.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> USAID/Nepal will analyze data to determine differences between poverty levels within and without ZOI, as well as differences in poverty levels within different household types.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> USAID/Nepal will use this data to inform its own internal portfolio reviews, as well as an annual portfolio review with USAID's Bureau for Food Security.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Baseline data collected by FEEDBACK in 2013
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets are based on BFS and USAID/Nepal strategic planning processes, articulating what USAID's FTF programming can realistically expect to achieve over USAID/Nepal's 5-year CDCS period.
<b>Other Notes:</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National, FTF ZOI
<b>Baseline Units:</b> National, FTF ZOI
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2-2**

**Goal:** A More Democratic, Prosperous, and Resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** N/A

**Performance Indicator 2-2:** Women’s empowerment in Agriculture Index Score

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2015 **yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 4.5-19 **Indicator Type:** Impact

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** The Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) measures the empowerment, agency, and inclusion of women in the agriculture sector in an effort to identify and address the constraints that hinder women’s full engagement in the agriculture sector. The WEAI is composed of two sub-indexes; the Five Domains of Empowerment sub-index (5DE) measures the empowerment of women in five areas; and the Gender Parity sub-Index (GPI) measures the average level of equality in empowerment of men and women within the household. The WEAI is an aggregate index reported at the ZOI level and is based on individual-level data on men and women within the same households and data on women living in households with no adult male.

The 5DE sub-index assesses whether women are empowered across the five domains examined in the WEAI. Each domain is weighted equally, as are each of the indicators within a domain. The five domains, their definitions under the WEAI, the corresponding indicators, and their weights for the 5DE are provided in detail on p. 39 of the Feed The Future indicator handbook.

The 5DE is a measure of empowerment rather than disempowerment. A woman is defined as empowered in the 5DE if she reaches the threshold of empowerment in 80 percent or more of the weighted indicators. For disempowered women, the 5DE also shows the percentage of indicators in which those women meet the threshold of empowerment. The 5DE contributes 90 percent of the weight to the WEAI.

The GPI reflects the percentage of women who are as empowered as the men in their households. It is a relative equality measure that demonstrates the equality in 5DE profiles between the primary adult male and female in each household. In most cases, these are husband and wife, but they can be the primary male and female decision-maker regardless of their relationship to each other. For households that have not achieved gender parity, the GPI shows the gap that needs to be closed for women to reach the same level of empowerment as men. By definition, households without a primary adult male are excluded from this measure, and thus the aggregate WEAI uses the mean GPI value of dual-adult households. The GPI contributes 10 percent of the weight to the WEAI.

The 5DE score ranges from zero to one, where higher values indicate greater empowerment. It is constructed using a robust multidimensional methodology known as the Alkire Foster Method (see <http://www.ophi.org.uk/research/multidimensional-poverty/alkire-foster-method/> for information on the method). The score has two components. First, it reflects the percentage of women who are empowered (He). Second, it reflects the percentage of domains in which those women who are not yet empowered (Hn) still have adequate achievements (Aa). The 5DE formula is:  $5DE = \{He + (Hn \times Aa)\}$ , where  $He + Hn = 100\%$  and  $0 < Aa < 80\%$ .\*

The GPI also ranges from zero to one, with higher values indicating greater gender parity, and is constructed with two factors. First, it shows the percentage of women whose empowerment scores are lower than the men’s in the household (HGPI)\*\*. Second, the GPI shows the percentage shortfall in empowerment scores (IGPI) for those women who do not have gender parity. The overall formula is the product of these two numbers, following the Foster Greer Thorbecke “poverty gap” measure:  $GPI = \{1 - (HGPI \times IGPI)\}$ .

The WEAI score is computed as a weighted sum of the ZOI-level 5DE and the GPI. Thus, improvements in either the 5DE or GPI will increase the WEAI. The total WEAI score =  $0.9\{He + (Hn \times Aa)\} + 0.1\{1 - (HGPI \times IGPI)\}$ .

<p>Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29</p> <p>Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)</p>
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number</p> <p>Please enter these three data points:</p> <p>10. Score for 5DE sub-index</p> <p>11. Score for GPI sub-index</p> <p>12. Total population in the ZOI</p>
<p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Household Type, age, caste/ethnicity</p> <p><b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> Feed the Future supports the inclusion of poorer and more economically vulnerable populations in economic growth strategies in the agriculture sector in order to have a transformational effect on regional economies and restructure local production, distribution, and consumption patterns for long-term, sustainable development. Because women play a prominent role in agriculture and due to the persistent economic constraints they face, women’s empowerment is a main focus of Feed the Future. Empowering women is particularly important to achieving the Feed the Future objective of inclusive agriculture sector growth. The WEAI was developed to track the change in women’s empowerment levels that occurs as a direct or indirect result of interventions under Feed the Future.</p>
<p><b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b></p>
<p><b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Bureau for Food Security’s central M&amp;E contractor.</p>
<p><b>Data Source:</b> Population-based Survey report conducted by FEEDBACK, FtF’s M&amp;E contractor</p>
<p><b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> For the ZOI survey, the M&amp;E contractor should conduct a population-based survey using the WEAI methodology and the Feed the Future M&amp;E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators.</p>
<p><b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Approximately every two years (baseline, midterm, endline)</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Danielle Knueppel, Manju Tuladhar</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> Bureau for Food Security’s central M&amp;E contractor will provide data to USAID.</p>
<p><b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus</p>
<p><b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b></p>
<p><b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> DQAs conducted and managed by USAID’s Bureau for Food Security. <b>Contact Salik Farooqi, BFS M&amp;E Point of Contact, for more information.</b></p>
<p><b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> DQAs conducted and managed by USAID’s Bureau for Food Security. <b>Contact Salik Farooqi, BFS M&amp;E Point of Contact, for more information.</b></p>
<p><b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Because this is a composite indicator of two sub-indices (one of which itself has five sub-components), collection of accurate data will likely require a large investment of both time and resources.</p>
<p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> N/A – data quality issues for this indicator addressed within USAID’s Bureau for Food Security.</p>
<p><b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b></p>

<b>Data Analysis:</b> USAID/Nepal will analyze sub-components of composite index score to determine the most critical constraints to women's empowerment in agriculture.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> USAID/Nepal will use this data to inform its own internal portfolio reviews, as well as an annual portfolio review with USAID's Bureau for Food Security.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Baseline data collected by FEEDBACK 2013
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets based on BFS and USAID/Nepal strategic planning processes, articulating what USAID's FTF programming can realistically expect to achieve over USAID/Nepal's 5-year CDCS period.
<b>Other Notes:</b> It is important to note that these data are to be collected only for USAID's targeted Zone of Influence (ZOI), not for all districts in Nepal.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National, FTF ZOI
<b>Baseline Units:</b> National, FTF ZOI
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

### USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2-3

<b>Goal:</b> A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal
<b>DO 2:</b> Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty
<b>Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:</b>
<b>Performance Indicator 2-3:</b> Growth in (real) gross domestic product (GDP) per capita
<b>Performance Plan and Report Indicator:</b> No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): <u>2014</u> If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: <u>4-15</u> Indicator Type: <u>Outcome/Impact</u>
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION
<p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Missions are not expected to report on this indicator. The information is tracked by EGAT.</p> <p>Annual percentage growth rate of GDP per capita based on constant local currency. GDP per capita is gross domestic product divided by midyear population. GDP at purchaser's prices is the sum of gross value added by all resident producers in the economy plus any product taxes and minus any subsidies not included in the value of the products. It is calculated without making deductions for depreciation of fabricated assets or for depletion and degradation of natural resources.</p>
<p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Annual percent change, calculated by dividing the most recent year's GDP per capita by that for the preceding year and subtracting one.</p>
<p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Numerator, Denominator</p>
<p><b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> A steady increase in this objective is necessary, though not sufficient, for sustainable broad-based economic growth that reduces poverty and provided domestic resources for sustainable investments in all other development objectives. The pattern of growth and the distribution of and access to the income, wealth and assets it produces are also important.</p> <p>This is the most common indicator of economic growth. If GDP is growing faster than the population growth rate, average household incomes should be rising and the rate of poverty declining and the society should gradually have more resources to invest in vital social services and infrastructure. Annual report should be the percent of all USAID-assisted countries with GDP per capita growth &gt;2.0%</p>
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID
<p><b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> N/A</p>
<p><b>Data Source:</b> World Bank World Development Indicators (WDI), most easily obtained annually from EADS/ESDB at: <a href="http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/sourc e&amp;source=WDI">http://esdb.eads.usaidallnet.gov/query/do?_program=/eads/esdb/sourc e&amp;source=WDI</a></p>
<p><b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Data is extracted from World Bank's World Development Report, available at: <a href="http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/EXTWDRS/0,,contentMDK:20227703~pagePK:478093~piPK:477627~theSitePK:477624,00.html">http://econ.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/EXTDEC/EXTRESEARCH/EXTWDRS/0,,contentMDK:20227703~pagePK:478093~piPK:477627~theSitePK:477624,00.html</a></p>
<p><b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Data published annually by the World Bank.</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Anita Mahat-Rana, Gautam Bajracharya</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> Data downloaded from World Bank's external website.</p>
<p><b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's PPD shared drive, AIDTracker Plus system</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p><b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> TBD- please set date</p>
<p><b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> - TBD- please set date. All Indicators are subject to USAID DQAs</p>
<p><b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Does not include measures of household economic activities and can only use rough estimates of informal economic sector activities. Does not imply that all households or economic actors benefit</p>

from an increase or suffer from a decrease in the growth rate.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Data to be reviewed along with other indicators that more specifically measure inclusion in economic activities.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> USAID/Nepal will analyze this data to learn about the speed of Nepal's economic growth.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Regular portfolio reviews
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> 2012 baseline data collected from World Bank.
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> <i>(optional):</i> TBD
<b>Other Notes:</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> N/A – national level
<b>Baseline Units</b> <i>(optional):</i> N/A – national level
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.1-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**IR 2.1:** Agriculture-based income increased

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 2.1-1:** Daily per capita expenditures (as proxy for income) in USG assisted areas

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes  **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2015 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 4.5-9 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**Note:** Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in the F Indicator Handbook, although the numbering is the same.

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** This indicator will measure the daily per capita expenditures of rural households as a proxy for income, based on the assumption that increased expenditures is strongly correlated to increased income. Data for this indicator must be collected using the Consumption Expenditure methodology of the Living Standards Measurement Survey (LSMS). Missions are encouraged to use the LSMS Integrated Survey in Agriculture Consumption Expenditure module, which has been incorporated in the Feed the Future M&E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators. Feed the Future will collect consumption-expenditure data to calculate prevalence of poverty and daily per capita expenditures to be used as a proxy for income.

Expenditures are used instead of income because of the difficulty in accurately measuring income and because expenditure data are less prone to error, easier to recall and are more stable over time than income data.

The daily per capita expenditure figure must be converted to constant 2010 USD. The steps to convert daily per capita expenditure data collected in the country' local currency units (LCU), e.g. Honduran lempira, Ghana cedis, Tanzania shillings; to constant 2010 USD (2005 PPP adjusted to 2010 US prices) are:

- 1) Convert LCU at the time of the survey to LCU at 2005 prices, by dividing by the Consumer Price Index (CPI) for the survey month and year (you will need to divide the CPI for the survey month/year by the CPI for 2005 if 2005 is not the base year for the country's CPI.)
- 2) Convert 2005 LCU to 2005 US\$ by dividing by the 2005 PPP conversion rate.
- 3) Convert US\$ in 2005 prices to US\$ in 2010 prices by multiplying by 111.65, which is the US CPI for 2010.

**Unit of Measure:** 2010 US dollar

**Disaggregated by:** Enter the indicator value for the overall indicator and for each disaggregate category. Enter the total ZOI sub-population covered by each disaggregate for the disaggregate categories only, and FTFMS will sum across disaggregates to get the total population in the ZOI. Enter:

13. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) of sample
14. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) of FNM households from sample
15. Total population of people in FNM households in the ZOI
16. Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) MNF households from sample

17.	Total population of people in MNF households in the ZOI
18.	Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) in M&F households from sample
19.	Total population of people in M&F households in the ZOI
20.	Average daily per capita expenditures (in 2010 USD) in CNA households from sample
21.	Total population of people in CNA households in the ZOI
<p><b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> There is a relationship between increased incomes and improved food security, reduced poverty, and increased consumption of nutritious food. The usefulness of an income proxy methodology derives from the importance of a change in household income and its impact on the overarching Feed the Future goal of reducing poverty and hunger. Thus, measurement of household income (through this proxy) is one logical choice for monitoring the effects of policies and programs oriented towards accomplishing this goal.</p>	
<p><b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b></p>	
<p><b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> FEEDBACK, Bureau for Food Security central M&amp;E contractor</p>	
<p><b>Data Source:</b> Data are drawn from one of two sources: 1) Nepal Living Standards Survey (NLSS) secondary data, the Living Standards Measurement Survey or similar national-level survey, if the data were collected within the previous two years and a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the ZOI; or 2) primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the ZOI by FEEDBACK, a Feed the Future Monitoring and Evaluation (M&amp;E) contractor, using the country-specific LSMS methodology and the Feed the Future M&amp;E Guidance Series Volume 8: Population-Based Survey Instrument for Feed the Future ZOI Indicators.</p>	
<p><b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Extraction of baseline, final, and (potentially) mid-term population-based survey reports by centrally-funded BFS M&amp;E contractor.</p>	
<p><b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Data should be collected in the ZOI for baseline, mid-term (ideally), and final reporting.</p>	
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Danielle Knueppel</p>	
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> FEEDBACK and BFS M&amp;E Unit</p>	
<p><b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus</p>	
<p><b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b></p>	
<p><b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> TBD- please set date.</p>	
<p><b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> USAID/BFS is responsible for conducting DQA. Contact Salik Farooqi, BFS M&amp;E Point of Contact, for more information.</p>	
<p><b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(3) Data collected for the indicator represents well the intended result.</li> <li>(4) The Bureau for Food Security (BFS) has developed consumption expenditure modules for collecting poverty data for all missions, standard collection, and methodology.</li> <li>(5) Data for this indicator is precise for measuring impacts, but only partly attributable to USAID programs. Can only provide context for tracking performance, which is useful for management decision-making purposes.</li> <li>(6) The Living Standards Methods Survey of collection and poverty data have been vigorously tested for reliability over the past several years.</li> <li>(7) Nepal Mission use limitation: Availability of data is only every 5-6 years. The next NLSS may be available for final evaluation, but midterm will likely require field-based surveys to measure this indicator. The midterm will likely be conducted by FEEDBACK in 2015.</li> </ul>	

<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> USAID/Nepal will use indicator 4.5-16-18 (gross margin per hectare) to measure progress towards agriculture-based income increases.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> This proxy indicator serves as a direct measure for income increase. The 2011 NLSS was used for setting baseline. However, it is unclear when the next set of data will be available; therefore, a field survey may be done by FEEDBACK in 2015.
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> Baseline, midterm, and final
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> The PBS baseline was in 2013 and used secondary data from the 2011 NLSS. This secondary data source was used to calculate the baseline for this indicator in the PBS. The baseline figure is \$2.54 nationally and \$2.12 in the FTF ZOI.
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets based on BFS and USAID/Nepal strategic planning processes, articulating what USAID's FTF programming can realistically expect to achieve over USAID/Nepal's 5-year CDCS period.
<b>Other Notes:</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National, regional, and FTF ZOI
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> National, regional, and FTF ZOI
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.1-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**IR 2.1:** Agriculture-Based Income Increased

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 2.1-2:** Gross margin per hectare, animal or cage of selected product

**Note:** Indicator title has been changed slightly from the title in the F Indicator Handbook, although the numbering is the same.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes  **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2015 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 4.5-16, 17, 18 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** The gross margin is the difference between the total value of small-holder production of the agricultural product (crop, milk, eggs, meat, live animals, fish) and the cost of producing that item, divided by the total number of units in production (hectares of crops, number of animals for milk, eggs; pond area in hectares for pond aquaculture or cage count for open water aquaculture). Gross margin per hectare, per animal, or per cage, is a measure of net income for that farm/livestock/fisheries-use activity.

Gross margin is calculated from five data points, reported as totals across all IM direct beneficiaries:

- 22. Total Production by direct beneficiaries during reporting period (TP)
- 23. Total Value of Sales (USD) by direct beneficiaries during reporting period (VS)
- 24. Total Quantity (volume) of Sales by direct beneficiaries during reporting period (QS)
- 25. Total Recurrent Cash Input Costs of direct beneficiaries during reporting period (IC)

5. Total Units of Production: Hectares planted (for crops): Number of Animals in herd/flock/etc. (for milk, eggs, meat, live animals); Area in ha (for aquaculture ponds) or Number of Cages (for open water aquaculture) for direct beneficiaries during the production period (UP)

Partners should enter disaggregated values for the five gross margin data points, disaggregated first by commodity, then by the sex disaggregate categories: male, female, joint and association-applied, as applicable. Commodity-sex layered disaggregated data are required because the most meaningful interpretation and use of gross margin information is at the specific commodity level, including the comparison of gross margins received by female and male farmers. FTFMS will then use the formula below to automatically calculate the average commodity-specific Gross Margin, and the average commodity-specific Gross Margin for each sex disaggregate:

$$\text{Gross margin per ha, per animal, per cage} = [(TP \times VS/QS) - IC] / UP$$

For example, for the total production data point, partners should enter total production during the reporting year on plots managed by female, maize-producing, direct beneficiaries; total production on plots managed by male, maize-producing, direct beneficiaries; total production during the reporting year on plots managed jointly by female and male maize-producing, direct beneficiaries, if applicable; and total production on plots managed by groups (“association-applied”) of maize-producing, direct beneficiaries; if applicable. And so forth for total value and total quantity of sales; total cash recurrent input costs; and total hectares, animals or cages for maize. And so forth for other commodities. The FTFMS will automatically calculate weighted (by total hectares, animals or cages) average gross margin per ha, animal or cage for the overall commodity (e.g. gross margin/hectare for maize) and for each sex disaggregate category (e.g. gross

margin/hectare for female maize-producing direct beneficiaries.)

If a direct beneficiary sample survey is used to collect gross margin data points, the sample survey estimates must be extrapolated to total beneficiary estimated values before entry into FTFMS to ensure accurate calculation of weighted average gross margin per commodity across implementing mechanisms at the Operating Unit level and across countries for Feed the Future overall reporting.

Note: Gross margin targets should be entered at the commodity level. Targets do not need to be set for each of the five data points.

If there is more than one production cycle in the reporting year, farmer's land area should be counted (and summed) each time it is cultivated, and the other four data points (Total Production, Value and Quantity of Sales, Recurrent Cash Input Costs) summed across production cycles if the same crop was planted.

The unit of measure for Total Production (e.g. kg, mt, liter) must be the same as the unit of measure for Total Quantity of Sales, so that the average unit value calculated by dividing sales value by sales quantity can be used to value total production (TP x VS/QS). If sales quantity was recorded in a different unit of measure than the unit used for total production, sales quantity must be converted to the equivalent quantity in production units prior to entry in FTFMS. For example, if Total Production was measured in metric tons, and Total Quantity of Sales was measured in kg, Total Quantity of Sales should be divided by 1,000 before entering in FTFMS.

Also, if the form of the commodity varies between how it was harvested/produced and how it was sold, e.g. shelled peanuts are harvested but unshelled peanuts are sold, the sales form must be converted to its equivalent in the harvested/produced form prior to entry in FTFMS. For example, in Malawi, the extraction rate for shelled from unshelled peanuts is 65%. So if 1,500 kg of shelled peanuts were sold, this is equivalent to 2,304 kg of unshelled peanuts, and 2,304 should be entered as sales quantity, not 1,500, assuming that total production was measured in kg of unshelled peanuts. Country-specific extraction rates for a range of value-added commodities may be found at <http://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/ess/documents/methodology/tcf.pdf>.

Input costs included should be those significant cash costs that can be easily ascertained. Attention should be focused on accounting for cash costs that represent at least 5% of total cash costs. (Note, it is not necessary to calculate actual percent contribution of specific inputs to total input costs to determine which inputs account for at least 5% of total cash costs. Partners may simply estimate which inputs would qualify.) Most likely cash input cost items are: purchased water, fuel, electricity, seed, feed or fish meal, fertilizer, pesticides, hired labor, hired enforcement, and hired machine/veterinary services. Capital investments and depreciation should not be included in cash costs. Unpaid family labor, seed from a previous harvest and other in-kind inputs do not have to be valued and should not be included in costs.

The FTFMS will also automatically calculate the three PPR gross margin indicators listed under UNIT below by calculating operating-unit-level weighted average gross margin per hectare (includes crops and pond-based aquaculture), per animal and per cage across all relevant commodities reported by operating unit's IMs for entry into FactsInfo. Caution should be exercised when interpreting the PPR indicators, however, because non-commodity-specific average gross margin across substantially different commodities (e.g. gross margin for live cows and gross margin for eggs, for maize and for basil, for irrigated and for rain-fed rice, for maize and for pond aquaculture fish) could be meaningless or misleading. Missions are encouraged to use the FTFMS commodity-sex-specific data to understand and report on gross margins.

Please refer to the Feed the Future Agricultural Indicators Guide (<http://agrilinks.org/library/feed-the-future-ag-indicators-guide>) for additional guidance on collecting and interpreting the data required for this indicator.

**Unit of Measure:** dollars/hectare (crops, aquaculture in ponds); dollars/animal (milk, eggs, live animals, meat); or dollars/cage (open-water aquaculture)

Note: Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year or convert

<p>periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation.</p> <p>FTFMS notes: Enter the five data points into FTFMS for baseline and actual reporting. Data should be entered disaggregated to the lowest level – i.e. by commodity then by sex under each commodity. FTFMS will calculate gross margin per ha, animal or cage automatically. This calculation cannot be done without all five data points.</p> <p>FTFMS will produce a PPR report that aggregates commodity-specific gross margins data into the three FACTSInfo gross margin indicators:</p> <p>26. 4.5-16 Farmer's gross margin per unit of land</p> <p>27. 4.5-17 Farmer's gross margin per unit of animal</p> <p>28. 4.5-18 Farmer's gross margin per crate</p>
<p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Targeted commodity (type of crop, type of animal or animal product, or type of fish – freshwater or marine). Gross margin should be reported separately for horticultural products; the general “Horticulture” category should not be used. If a large number of horticultural crops are being produced and tracking gross margin for each is too difficult, gross margins may be reported for the five (5) most commonly produced horticultural products.</p> <p>District</p> <p>Sex of farmer: Male, Female, Joint, Association-applied.</p> <p>Note, before using the “Joint” sex disaggregate category, partners must determine that decision- making about what to plant on the plot of land and how to manage it for that particular beneficiary and targeted commodity is truly done in a joint manner by male(s) and female(s) within the household. Given what we know about gender dynamics in agriculture, “joint” should not be the default assumption about how decisions about the management of the plot are made.</p>
<p><b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> Improving the gross margin for farm commodities for smallholders contributes to increasing agricultural GDP, will increase income, and thus directly contribute to the IR of improving production and the goal indicator of reducing poverty.</p>
<p><b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b></p>
<p><b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> KISAN (Winrock International), HMRP (CIMMYT), M&amp;E contractor (RIDA), and upcoming SEED activity (TBD)</p>
<p><b>Data Source:</b> Farmer surveys, data collection through producer organizations, standardized group questionnaires, farm records</p>
<p><b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Review of direct beneficiary farmer/rancher sample surveys; data collection through producer organizations or farm records, activity records.</p>
<p><b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annually</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Navin Hada (KISAN COR), Danielle Knueppel (Alternate KISAN COR), Gautam Bajaracharya (M&amp;E contract COR), Amy Prevatt (Alternate M&amp;E contract COR), Seed activity TBD</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> M&amp;E officers at RIDA, Winrock International, CIMMYT, and TBD seed activity implementer</p>
<p><b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus</p>
<p><b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b></p>
<p><b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> N/A</p>
<p><b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> 2015</p>

<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Implementing partners have experienced difficulties in correctly calculating this indicator.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Work with implementing partners on correct, consistent usage and calculation of this indicator.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> This indicator will enable USAID/Nepal to measure farmers' net incomes for FTF focus crops after factoring in the costs of inputs (e.g. seeds and fertilizers) and services required for production.
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> Annually
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> 2014
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Baseline is currently underway. Targets will be set after baseline is completed.
<b>Other Notes:</b> Additional data elements can be collected so Missions and partners can calculate productivity of other factors of production. For example, water consumption in cubic meters can be collected and used in the denominator to calculate water productivity, which is important in irrigated areas, and total labor used can be collected and used to calculate labor productivity in labor-scarce settings.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.2-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**IR 2.2:** Small enterprise opportunities expanded

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:**

**Performance Indicator 2.2-1:** Number of medium, small, and micro-enterprises established and/or expanded as a result of USG assistance.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X \_\_\_ **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2015 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** Custom **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Total number of micro (1-10) small (11-50) and medium (51-100) (parenthesis = number of employees) enterprises (MSMEs). Number of employees refers to full time-equivalent workers during the previous month. MSMEs include producers (farmers). Producers should be classified as micro, small or medium-enterprise based on the number of FTE workers hired (permanent and/or seasonal) during the previous 12 months. If a producer does not hire any permanent or seasonal labor, s/he should be considered a micro-enterprise. To be counted an MSME must have received USG assistance which resulted in a loan from any financial institution, formal or informal, including MFIs, commercial banks, or informal lenders, as well as from in-kind lenders of equipment (e.g. tractor, plow) or other agricultural inputs (e.g., fertilizer or seeds), or transport, with repayment in cash or in kind. USG assistance may include partial loan guarantee programs or any support facilitating the receipt of a loan.

The indicator does not measure the value of the loans, but the number of MSMEs that received USG assistance and accessed loans. Only count the MSME once per reporting year, even if multiple loans are accessed.

An enterprise can be considered “established” if it routinely sells (for profit) a product or service in the marketplace that was produced or purchased by the entrepreneur/producer. “Expanded” refers to an already-established small enterprise that increases the value of sales by 10 percent or more from the previous reporting period.

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** Number of MSMEs

**Disaggregated by:** Size: Micro, small, medium, sex of owner/producer, age of owner/producer, caste/ethnicity of owner/producer, district

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** This indicator measures directly the sub-IR of access to business development services which contributes to the IR of expanding markets. The IR impacts on the Key Objective of increasing agricultural productivity which will help achieve the goal of reducing poverty and hunger.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** KISAN (Winrock International) is working with input service providers and capacity building for MSMEs on access to finance. The Business Literacy Program (DEPROSC) is conducting entrepreneurial training programs. Hariyo Ban is conducting forestry-based enterprise and tourism activities. The Upcoming Mobile Money Program will focus on improving access to finance among vulnerable populations.

**Data Source:** Activity records, MSME financial records, and implementing partner databases.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Questionnaire, implementing partner collects financial records from MSME.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annually

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Anita Mahat-Rana (Business Literacy Program and Mobile Money), Navin Hada (KISAN), Netra Sharma (Hariyo Ban), Jayanti Subba (Business Literacy)

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** Kisan (Winrock International), Business Literacy Program (DEPROSC), Hariyo Ban (WWF), and Mobile Money program (IP TBD)

<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> TBD- please set
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Partners may also seek to inflate numbers throughout the data collection process.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> USAID will oversee the development of their data collection instruments to ensure quality and accuracy of collection. USAID will work to develop a precise timeline with each partner to ensure collection is well thought through and submitted in a timely manner. USAID/Nepal will document the extent to which sources are unreliable or not timely, or if implementing partners do not have a system in place.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> USAID/Nepal will identify trends to determine which activities are establishing and expanding MSMEs and the extent to which there are changes in the number of women and marginalized populations who own MSMEs.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Annually
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Year 1
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> TBD
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District
<b>Baseline Units:</b> District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.2-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**IR 2.2:** Small enterprise opportunities expanded

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** 3.1: A Better-Skilled, Literate Population

**Performance Indicator 2.2-2:** Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No  Yes  If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): \_\_\_\_\_ If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: 4.5-2 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Jobs are all types of employment opportunities created during the reporting year in agriculture- or rural-related enterprises (including paid on-farm/fishery employment). Jobs lasting less than one month are not counted in order to emphasize those jobs that provide more stability through length. Jobs should be converted to full-time equivalents (FTE). One FTE equal 260 days or 12 months. Thus a job that lasts 4 months should be counted as 1/3 FTE and a job that last for 130 days should be counted as 1/2 FTE. Number of hours worked per day or per week is not restricted as work hours may vary greatly.

“Attributed to FTF implementation” includes farming and non-farm jobs where Feed the Future investments were intentional in assisting in any way to expand (or contract) jobs and where a program objective of the Feed the Future investment was job creation.

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** FTEs

**Disaggregated by:** Location: Urban, rural Duration: New, Continuing: -- New= this is the first time the person holds a job created by Feed the Future -- Continuing = the person continues to hold a job from a previous fiscal year created by Feed the Future Sex of job-holder: Male, Female (if one FTE is evenly split by a male and a female, then it would be 0.5 FTE for females and 0.5 FTE for males), **age, caste/ethnicity**

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. However, Feed the Future is concerned about creation of sustainable employment, not temporary employment (of short duration such as a period of less than one month). Data for this indicator provides a gage by which to measure the degree to which programs designed to generate jobs are proving effective.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** KISAN

**Data Source:** KISAN annual performance report

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Data will be collected through census or sampling of participating firms, depending on size; firm/farm records. The annual survey itself will be provided to USAID by M&E staff at Winrock International and DEPROSC.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Navin Hada

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** M&E staff, Winrock International

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> TBD
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Data for this indicator will represent a good portion of jobs generated through USAID programs designed to create employment opportunities. This indicator will not represent all jobs created through FTF funding, only those traceable through implementing partners.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> BFS M&E staff will work with Missions to ensure the data collection instrument and its application remains consistent for annual collection.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> The creation of new jobs through FTF indicates the start up and expansion of enterprises. Data will be analyzed to assess the extent to which FTF implementation is achieving the objective of employment generation.
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> Annual portfolio review
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b> Kisan baseline data collected 2013
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> TBD
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District
<b>Baseline Units:</b> District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.3-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce poverty

**IR 2.3:** Resilience of targeted natural resources and related livelihoods improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 2.3-1:** Number of hectares of biological significance and/or natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes  **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 4.8.1-26 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** “Improved natural resource management” includes activities that promote enhanced management of natural resources for one or more objectives, such as conserving biodiversity, sustaining soil or water resources, mitigating climate change, and/or promoting sustainable agriculture.

Management should be guided by a stakeholder-endorsed process following principles of sustainable NRM and conservation, improved human and institutional capacity for sustainable NRM and conservation, access to better information for decision-making, and/or adoption of sustainable NRM and conservation practices.

An area is considered under “improved management” when any one of the following occurs: a change in legal status favors conservation or sustainable NRM; a local site assessment is completed which informs management planning; management actions are designed with appropriate participation; human and institutional capacity is developed; management actions are implemented; ongoing monitoring and evaluation is established; adaptive management is demonstrated; or on- the-ground management impacts are demonstrated (eg. illegal roads closed, snares removed, no-fishing zones demarcated).

Reported as total number of hectares improved during the fiscal year in question, which can include maintained improvement in previously reported hectares and/or new, additional hectares.

A subset of this indicator may also be reported as “Number of hectares of natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance” if the latter indicator is used; double counting IS allowed. Higher = better

Reported as total number of hectares improved during the fiscal year in question, which can include maintained improvement in previously reported hectares and/or new, additional hectares. Improved management should be reported for activities where the USAID supported program was plausibly linked to the improvements observed. Partners should articulate clearly the benchmarks that are being used within the program to gauge success, and provide a short narrative to describe the benchmarks that have been reached in the past year.

Biologically Significant areas = areas identified as important for biodiversity through national, regional, or global priority-setting processes. Biodiversity-funded (components of) activities should report on this category regardless of overlap with other categories.

All other areas= areas with forest and/or natural resources which are outside of biologically significant areas and targeted for implementations with non-biodiversity funds. These may include areas characterized by forest production, watersheds, sustainable agriculture/aquaculture areas, areas with tree crops or agroforestry systems, etc.

**Unit of Measure:** Hectares

**Disaggregated by:** Landscapes, Districts and/or Corridors/Bottlenecks

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:**

Measure of this indicator demonstrate progress towards sustainable natural resources governance and institutions, and can inform adaptive management of programs. This indicator is a reliable annual measure that demonstrates the magnitude of USG investments in biodiversity conservation and other natural resource sectors.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Hariyo Ban (World Wildlife Fund)
<b>Data Source:</b> Hariyo Ban annual performance report.
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) will provide annual performance report to USAID/Nepal. Data is originally collected by the following methods: WWF or Government of Nepal's area survey, in some case using geo-referenced satellite data.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Netra Sharma Sapkota, Bronwyn Llewellyn
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> World Wildlife Fund Chief of Party and M&E Specialist/Staff
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> June 2014.
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Validity, integrity and reliability of data are high but regular data quality analysis is necessary. Precision is low: "improved management" is a relative term, and narrative is required to explain the quality of this management improved. Equal weight is given to unequal improvements along a continuum: eg. creating, adopting and implementing management plans may each be an improvement over a baseline. Likewise, a small management improvement across a large area may be as important as a large improvement across a small area.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Require narrative from implementing partner(s) to explain "the quality of management improved." Data can be further verified using the following data sources: DFO, National Database, Forest Operation/Management Plan, periodic reports, periodic database (HBP and GLA).
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be analyzed to understand the effect of changes in the forest cover area on the resilience of ecosystems, communities, and the livelihoods of the poor. Data may also be analyzed to inform a cost-benefit analysis for this indicator (cost per hectare).
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Annual portfolio review. Actual values for this performance indicators have been used to modify targets over the LOP.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Baseline data collected in 2012 by Hariyo Ban implementers (WWF).
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Initially the target was too low, based on a previously implemented project, over a span of five years. Therefore, targets were set higher than the progress on previous improvements.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> Landscape and District
<b>Baseline Units:</b> Landscape and District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Netra Sharma Sapkota USAID/Nepal 5-29-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.3-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**IR 2.3:** Resilience of targeted natural resources and related livelihoods improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 2.3-2:** Quantity of greenhouse gas emissions, measured in metric tons of CO<sub>2</sub>, reduced or sequestered as a result of USG assistance

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes x **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 4.8-7 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** The amount of emissions, in metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) that is reduced or sequestered as a result of USG programs in natural resources management. Relevant greenhouse gases are: CO<sub>2</sub>, methane, and nitrous oxide. Calculations should be completed using a commonly accepted GHG accounting methodology.

Only CO<sub>2</sub> sequestered in the forests and emissions related to deforestation and degradation will be measured. Calculating carbon dioxide equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e) is a way of converting quantities of other greenhouse gases into a common, comparable measure that has a well-defined global warming potential effect. For this indicator, reductions in gases like methane and nitrous oxide should be expressed as CO<sub>2</sub>e.

Carbon sequestration refers to removing CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere, either by enhancing natural sequestration (through carbon sinks such as oceans and plants) or artificially capturing and storing carbon. Activities in the land use sector which can result in reduced emissions or carbon sequestration include: forest conservation, forest fire prevention, improved forest management, tree planting and natural regeneration, agroforestry, soil conservation and activities which increase soil organic content, improved cattle and pasture management, etc.

NOTE: Regarding land use-related reduced emissions or increased sequestration, if U.S. government supported project continues to conserve the same hectares of land as in a previous year, those hectares should be included in the calculations for the current year to determine the annual emissions reductions of the project.

**Unit of Measure:** Metric tons CO<sub>2</sub> equivalent (CO<sub>2</sub>e)

**Disaggregated by:** Landscape and District

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** Reducing GHG emissions has long-term impacts on slowing climate change. Reducing GHG emissions can also have strong ancillary benefits for pollution, security, health, and women. Reducing GHG emissions and sequestering atmospheric carbon can significantly improve social and environmental conditions, enhance the livelihoods of local communities, conserve land, minimize soil erosion, and increase agricultural productivity.

CO<sub>2</sub>e is now the world-wide standard measure of carbon emissions reductions or sequestration. The land use sector, particularly deforestation, is estimated to contribute 20% of annual global greenhouse gas emissions.

Progress will be noted at UNFCCC international climate change negotiations, will be used to capture the impact of USAID’s GCC portfolio for domestic and international audiences.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** Hariyo Ban (World Wildlife Fund)

**Data Source:** Hariyo Ban annual performance report.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) will provide annual performance report to USAID/Nepal. Data is originally collected by the following methods: Carbon calculator; Carbon Map, Validation report, and references to standards

like (but not limited to) Verified Carbon Standard (VCS) and the Climate, Community, and Biodiversity (CCBA) Standard.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Netra Sharma Sapkota, Bronwyn Llewellyn
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> World Wildlife Fund COP and M&E staff
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> June 2014
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Integrity: Several different methodologies could be employed to calculate this indicator, which offers the potential for data manipulation to show the most favorable results. To avoid this situation, methods for calculating emissions should be clearly documented and easy to understand.  Carbon calculators may not be as accurate as other methods.  Precision: There could be some imprecision due to variances in reporting methodologies. This is currently being addressed through new standardized GHG accounting methodology, which will be provided to USAID/Nepal as soon as it is complete.  Reliability: Data collection and analysis may be inconsistent if a consistent methodology is not applied.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> USAID/Nepal will rely on the latest and most up-to-date standardized methodologies for measuring GHG reductions and sequestration. Data quality assessments will also be employed to ensure that high quality data is captured accurately.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be analyzed to capture changes in land use, including but not limited to changes in forest management practices.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Data will be regularly incorporated into annual portfolio review. Changes in project's focus and implementation strategy may be made based on performance data.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Baseline data collected in 2012 by Hariyo Ban implementers (WWF).
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets based upon overall Hariyo Ban goal of achieving a 3.3. million MT reduction in CO <sub>2</sub> e emissions over the LOP. Because the definition of this performance indicator allows the same hectares of conserved land to be counted over multiple years, USAID/Nepal expects that each year will see a significant increase in value for this indicator over the previous year.
<b>Other Notes:</b> Although at first data will be made available through the World Wildlife Fund, in the future additional implementing partners may contribute data.  For land use-related emissions: USAID has developed the Agriculture, Forest, and Other Land Use Carbon Calculator using standard methodologies and some default data: <a href="http://winrock.stage.datarg.net/CarbonReporting">http://winrock.stage.datarg.net/CarbonReporting</a>  The UNFCCC also provides a list of various sources of emissions data, including links to data sets, here: <a href="http://unfccc.int/ghg_data/ghg_data_non_unfccc/items/3170.php">http://unfccc.int/ghg_data/ghg_data_non_unfccc/items/3170.php</a>  Additional details on methodologies for data collection can be provided by USAID's Global Climate Change (GCC) team.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> Landscape and District
<b>Baseline Units:</b> Landscape and District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Netra Sharma Sapkota USAID/Nepal 5-29-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.3-3**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**IR 2.3:** Resilience of targeted natural resources and related livelihoods improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 2.3-3:** Number of stakeholders with increased capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate variability and change as a result of USG assistance.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes  If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2014 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: 4.8.2-26 Indicator Type: Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

Adaptive capacity is the ability to adjust to climate change, to moderate potential damages, to take advantage of opportunities, or to cope with the consequences. USG support to increase adaptive capacity should aim beyond only the near term, to also have benefits in the middle and longer term.

An increase in adaptive capacity can be shown with the use of surveys or assessments of capacities. Having the “ability to adjust” to climate change impacts will measure an objective of the project to deal with climate stresses (in the context of other stresses).

Stakeholders with improved adaptive capacity may be:

Implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change, for example: Implementing water-saving strategies to deal with increasing water stress. Making index-based micro-insurance available to assist farmers in dealing with increasing weather variability

Adjusting farming practices like soil management, crop choice, or seeds, to better cope with climate stress. Implementing education campaigns to promote the use of risk reducing practices, like use of storm shelters and bed nets that help people cope with climate stress

Using climate information in decision making, for example:

- Utilizing short term weather forecasts to inform decision-making, for example, by farmer cooperatives, disaster or water managers
- Utilizing climate projections or scenarios to inform planning over medium to longer term timescales, for example, for infrastructure or land use planning
- Conducting climate vulnerability assessment to inform infrastructure design or planning as “due diligence.”

This indicator relates most closely to two of the three main categories under the adaptation pillar: support for improved information and analysis, and implementation of climate change strategies. The narrative accompanying this indicator should describe adaptive capacity in the project context and indicate the stakeholders involved.

For the Hariyo Ban Program, individuals involved in CAPA implementation will be counted. Organizations are the CFUGs who implement CAPA, VDCs, Government line agencies involved in the CAPA planning process, and CFUGs implementing revised FoPs with climate change adaptation provisions.

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

<b>Unit of Measure:</b> Stakeholders, as defined by the project (e.g., individuals, decision-makers, or organizations (both government and non-government)).
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> Sex, age, caste/ethnicity for individuals and by landscape and district for others
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> This indicator is a measure of stakeholders' abilities to understand, plan, and act as climate stresses evolve. The ability to deal with climate change will depend on awareness, information, tools, technical knowledge, organization, and financial resources, which are partly captured by this indicator.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Hariyo Ban (World Wildlife Fund)
<b>Data Source:</b> Hariyo Ban annual performance report.
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) will provide annual performance report to USAID/Nepal. Data for this indicator should come from project documentation about activities and stakeholders engaged, ideally validated by surveys or interviews to ensure the use, retention, and continuation of risk-reducing measures, information use, or other forms of adaptive capacity. Project implementers should gather data about stakeholder's capacities through standard M&E procedures, such as quarterly and annual reports. A baseline survey or assessment of capabilities should be updated over the course of the project at regular intervals. The implementing partner will provide a separate format for monitoring of CAPA & CFOP implementation to capture disaggregated information related to disaster risk reduction and adaptation activities.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Netra Sharma, Bronwyn Llewellyn
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> World Wildlife Fund COP and M&E staff
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> June 2014
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Reliability: Consistent methods should be used from year to year to capture this indicator. Timeliness: Projects may not be able to report on this indicator in terms of actual use of information or implementation of risk reducing practices in initial years.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> USAID/Nepal will work with the implementing partner to ensure that data collection methods are standardized and consistent, and effectively capture data against this indicator. Means of data verification include the following sources: Community/Group records, Community Register, VDC report, Field Monitoring Reports, Project Reports, Activity Completion Report.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be analyzed to assess both the coverage and effectiveness of USAID/Nepal's work to improve stakeholders' resilience to climate variability and change.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Annual portfolio review.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Baseline data collected in 2012 by Hariyo Ban implementers (WWF).
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets selected based on an analysis of what was feasible and within budget for project implementation.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District and Landscape
<b>Baseline Units:</b> District and Landscape
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.3-4**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**IR 2.3:** Resilience of targeted natural resources and related livelihoods improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 2.3-4:** Number of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes  If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2014 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: 4.8.1-6 Indicator Type: Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Increased economic benefits are increases in economic earnings or consumption due to sustainable management or conservation of natural resources, which can include wages, communal revenues, non-cash benefits, and economic benefits from ecosystem services.

Number of people may be a direct count, or it may be determined by multiplying number of households with increased economic benefits by the number of people per household (Higher = Better). Number is specific to each year, not cumulative.

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** Number

**Disaggregated by:** Sex, age, caste/ethnicity, landscape and district level

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** This indicator links sustainable natural resources management to economic growth and social development objectives (livelihoods). When people receive tangible economic benefits from natural resource management or conservation, they are more likely to value and support these activities into the future, well after the project ends, creating a sustainable impact.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** Hariyo Ban (World Wildlife Fund)

**Data Source:** Hariyo Ban annual performance report.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** The World Wildlife Fund (WWF) will provide annual performance report to USAID/Nepal. Data will be collected by the WWF through Livelihood Improvement Plans (LIP) and reports, as well as its training database.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Netra Sharma Sapkota, Bronwyn Llewellyn

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** World Wildlife Fund COP and M&E staff

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):**

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** June 2014

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance:** Number of people with economic benefits does not indicate the actual or

relative size of the benefit, which may be a cash or non-cash benefit. Validity is good, integrity is high, reliability and timeliness is reasonable. Precision is variable across projects but should be consistent within projects.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Because this indicator does not capture the relative size of the economic benefit, it should be analyzed in conjunction with other (sub-IR) performance indicators for Hariyo Ban.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> This indicator will be analyzed to determine the extent to which USAID/Nepal's Hariyo Ban project is effectively implementing household-level Livelihood Improvement Plans (LIP).
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Annual portfolio review.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Baseline data collected in 2012 by Hariyo Ban implementers (WWF).
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets selected based on an analysis of what was feasible and within budget for project implementation.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District
<b>Baseline Units:</b> District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Netra Sharma Sapkota USAID/Nepal 5-29-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 2.4-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 2:** Inclusive and sustainable economic growth to reduce extreme poverty

**IR 2.4:** Economic growth policy and performance improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.4, IR 3.3

**Performance Indicator 2.4-1:** Numbers of Policies/Regulations/Administrative Procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: Analyzed Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decreed Stage 4: Passed/approved Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 4.5.1-24 **Indicator Type:** Output/outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of agricultural enabling environment policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, public investment, natural resource or water management and climate change adaptation/mitigation as it relates to agriculture that:

Stage 1: ...underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing policy / regulation / administrative procedure and/or proposal of new policy / regulations / administrative procedures).

Stage 2: ...underwent the second stage of the policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure.

Stage 3: ... underwent the third stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreed to improve the policy environment for small-holder-based agriculture.)

Stage 4: ...underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decreed) of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).

Stage 5: ...completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy / regulation / administrative procedure by relevant authority).

Do not “double-count” policies that passed through several stages during the reporting year. Report only the highest stage completed during the reporting year, e.g. of a policy was analyzed then presented for stakeholder consultation, report one policy at Stage 2.

**Unit of Measure:** Number

**Disaggregated by:** Stage -- 1: Analyzed 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation 3: Presented for legislation/decreed 4: Passed/approved 5: Passed for which implementation has begun

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** The indicator measures the number of policies / regulations / administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment whose sub-elements are specific policy sectors. Insofar as a favorable business environment is essential for inclusive economic growth, this indicator serves as a useful measure of the extent to which the policy environment effectively encourages growth.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** IFPRI (International Food Policy Research Institute) is conducting interventions to support policy reform, enactment and implementation.

**Data Source:** Records from Implementing partners (IFPRI) based on their engagement with the national government.

<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Observation and analysis of the Nepal government status of the various policies being addressed.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Anita Mahat-Rana, Gautam Bajracharya
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> PK Joshi and DB Shakya of IFPRI
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> N/A – not yet conducted
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> 2015 note DQAs are conducted on a given indicator and since this indicator is used by both DO 1 and 2 the DQA on this indicator will cover all related sectors*
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Data are useful to track performance of implementing partners working on policy reform. However, the outcomes for this indicator are greatly dependent on host country political and government processes. Decision-makers should look at country context when using data for performance decisions.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> USAID/Nepal will closely assess reported values against indicator definitions of the five stages and periodically review data collection process to ensure accurate reporting. Tracking stages of policy will also allow for analysis of quality of policy, note since all policies (beneficial or departmental) are counted the quality of policy will be tracked separately.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Analyzing the stage that various policies are in provides an indicator of the enabling environment for that sector and the extent of policy work still needed.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Annual reporting allows missions and bureaus to use data for annual portfolio reviews.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> 2014
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> Targets are based on previous policy work carried out through the NEAT program (closed out in 2013) and the ongoing IFPRI policy program.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National-level data
<b>Baseline Units:</b> National-level data
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-10-14</b>

**DO 3: Context and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets**

**USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX 3-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**Context Indicator 3-1:** Average primary school dropout rate for students grades 1-3 within EGRP Zone of Influence

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** Critical Assumption

**CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** The purpose of this indicator is to provide USAID/Nepal with an aggregate indicator on primary school dropout rates within USAID/Nepal’s EGRP Zone of Influence. Because the FLASH report presents this data in a highly disaggregated form, USAID/Nepal will need to manually re-aggregate the data from the annexes of the FLASH report.

Numerator: Sum of all dropout rate figures (male and female) within districts that are within EGRP Zone of Influence  
 Denominator: Number of districts that are within EGRP Zone of Influence.

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** Percent

**Disaggregated by:** Sex, age, caste/ethnicity, grade, district, school

**Rationale or Management Utility:** Although the explicit focus of USAID/Nepal’s Early Grade Reading Program is on improving reading outcomes rather than lowering primary school retention rates, the Mission has determined that this indicator will provide useful information on the effect of EGRP (if any) on dropout rates.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Data Source:** Ministry of Education FLASH Report (annexes)

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Data is available online to USAID/Nepal at the Ministry of Education’s website: <http://www.doe.gov.np/>

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Siena Fleischer, Jayanti Subba, Maneka Gurung

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** N/A – data collected from MOE report

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive Education Team; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Data Quality Considerations:** District-level data originally collected and tabulated by the Ministry of Education, subject to internal data quality assessment procedures. Note that USAID’s re-aggregation of this data may result in obscuring of more nuanced district-level trends.

**BASELINE**

**Baseline Trend:** N/A – not yet computed- please insert.

**Other Notes:** Please note that in 2013, this data was available in Annexes XV and XVI in the FLASH report.

**CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR**

**Changes to Indicator:**

**Other Notes:**

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 5-30-14**

**USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – CTX 3-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**Context Indicator 3-2:** General government expenditure on health as a percentage of Total Health Expenditure (THE)

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** Condition

**CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Public health expenditure consists of recurrent and capital spending from government (central and local) budgets, external borrowings and grants (including donations from international agencies and nongovernmental organizations), and social (or compulsory) health insurance funds. Total health expenditure is the sum of public and private health expenditure. It covers the provision of health services (preventive and curative), family planning activities, nutrition activities, and emergency aid designated for health but does not include provision of water and sanitation.

Numerator: General GON expenditure on health (National Health Account)

Denominator: Total health expenditure in Nepal

Should be expressed in terms of percent.

**Unit of Measure:** Percent

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** This indicator shows the fiscal commitment of the GON to health in Nepal and any trends. A positive trend would indicate that public expenditures on health are increasing, which can be a proxy for increasing government ownership and the contrary for a negative trend.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Data Source:** World Bank’s comprehensive database of Health, Nutrition, and Population Statistics, Ministry of Health and Population (MOHP)

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Data on National Health Accounts will be collected by USAID/Nepal staff from World Bank and MOHP reports: <http://data.worldbank.org/>

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Naramaya Limbu/Daniel VerSchneider

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):**

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Data Quality Considerations (optional):** N/A

**BASELINE**

**Baseline Trend (optional):** Please insert

**Other Notes (optional):**

**CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR**

**Changes to Indicator:**

**Other Notes (optional):**

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 5-30-14**

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:**

**Performance Indicator 3-1:** Percent of births attended by a skilled birth attendant (PROXY indicator for maternal mortality ratio)

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes  **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 3.1.6.1-1 **Indicator Type:** Proxy, Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Numerator: Births in a given year attended by a skilled birth attendant (SBA) at home or at health facility.

Denominator: Live births in the same year

Multiply by 100 to expressed as a percentage

In Nepal, medical doctors and nurses - Staff Nurses and Auxiliary Nurse Midwives - are considered to be SBAs.

**Unit of Measure:** Percent

**Disaggregated by:** Caste/ethnicity (DHS further analysis), District, ecological zone (DHS and MICS)

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** Most non-abortion-related maternal deaths happen during labor and delivery or within the first few days following birth. Potentially fatal complications occur among women who do not fall into any of the traditional high-risk groups and are therefore difficult to predict and/or prevent. In Nepal, many births occur at home. Increasing the frequency of attendance of skilled birth attendants is considered by the global public health community to be a necessary component of maternal and newborn services to decrease maternal and neonatal mortality and morbidity since many of the proven interventions, such as active management of the third stage of labor, can normally only be provided by skilled birth attendants.

This indicator is used by planners and managers to identify and target geographic areas for care, when disaggregated sub-nationally, and to indicate areas of need in relation to preparation, deployment and retention of personnel. It can be used for policy discussion to develop context specific strategies to improve care for childbearing women during labor and birth.

**Note:** This indicator is primarily being employed insofar as it is a proxy for maternal mortality, which (in the case of Nepal) is not captured with sufficient frequency (only reported every ten years) or precision to be used directly.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** USAID Demographic and Health Survey (DHS)

**Data Source:** USAID NDHS (Nepal Demographic and Health Survey), UNICEF MICS (Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey). Data from MoHP Health Management Information System (HMIS) will be analyzed annually to determine trend, although it only reports facility-based births. Data from implementing partners working with marginal groups will be analyzed to compare local trends among these groups.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Data are originally collected through household surveys (DHS, MICS) and facility-based monitoring reports (HMIS).

USAID/Nepal DO 3 team will access data online:

DHS: [www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com),

MICS: [http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index\\_24302.html](http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html)

Access to data for the Health Management Information System will require private login. Reports with detailed data tables available at <a href="http://dohs.gov.np/publications/">http://dohs.gov.np/publications/</a>
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> The NDHS and MICS are published every 5 years, and are staggered such that the reports are produced at alternate (non-simultaneous) intervals. High-quality data for one of these two sources should be available every two to three years. More regular data will be available through the Health Management Information System (HMIS) annually, to track trend lines.
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Sabita Tuladhar
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> MICS: UNICEF Statistics and Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) NDHS: USAID DHS contractor and MoHP HMIS: HMIS section chief, H4L M&E Unit
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> HMIS DQA conducted March 2014
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> January 2015 (HMIS)
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> This indicator in and of itself does not measure quality of care. Additionally, because it is a proxy indicator, it does not directly measure the primary outcome of interest (namely, maternal mortality). Rather, it is an indirect measure of maternal mortality.  Because NDHS/MICS collects household data, and the HMIS only reports facility birth data, there are major discrepancies in the data across systems.  Some survey data may be missing from sampling survey due to death of a mother.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitation:</b> Appropriate redress for these data quality issues is typically handled internally within UNICEF and the USAID-funded DHS contractor. While the MICS and NDHS provide high-quality, high-cost data every 2-3 years, the HMIS can be used to adjust USAID programming more rapidly (trend line analysis).
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> This indicator should be reviewed annually, comparing actuals with baseline and target values. The trend over time for this indicator should also be examined. Disaggregation should reveal both: (a) the extent to which marginalized/excluded groups experience lower levels of access to skilled birth attendants, and (b) the extent to which USAID programming in targeted areas is affecting this indicator over time.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Mission to review data for comparison with other countries' values for this indicator throughout the region. Information will also be used to inform DO team's regular portfolio reviews.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> The MICS data will be available by the end of 2014 or early 2015.
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets should exceed the margin of error for the data collection techniques, in order to be able to accurately attribute change to USAID programming in this area. Note: national-level targets for this indicator are set by the Nepal Health Sector Plan (NHSP).
<b>Other Notes:</b> This indicator is being measured as a proxy for maternal mortality.  Note that district-level disaggregation will be possible only through the HMIS or local partners reports, but not NDHS or MICS, which only collect data at the national and sub-regional levels.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> Sub-regional
<b>Baseline Units:</b> Sub-regional
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:**

**Performance Indicator 3-2:** Modern method contraceptive prevalence rate (PROXY indicator for total fertility rate)

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 3.1.7.38 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Percent of reproductive age women in union who are currently using a modern method of contraception

Numerator: Number of women in union of reproductive age currently using a modern method of contraception

Denominator: Total number of women of reproductive age in union

**Unit of Measure:** Percentage

**Disaggregated by:** Caste/ethnicity (NDHS), district

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** MCPR is a direct measure of the desired outcome of FP/RH programs. It is directly linked to reductions in unintended pregnancy and is a measure of the functioning of the Health System.

USAID/Nepal is ultimately interested in reducing Nepal’s Total Fertility Rate (TFR), insofar as significant reductions in the fertility rate correspond with significant improvements in human capital. However, major recent changes in migration patterns (particularly the large outmigration of Nepalis to other countries) make it extremely methodologically difficult to accurately and directly capture Nepal’s Total Fertility Rate.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** USAID Demographic and Health Survey (DHS)

**Data Source:** USAID NDHS (Nepal Demographic and Health Survey), UNICEF MICS (Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey), Health Management Information System (HMIS).

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Data are originally collected through household surveys (NDHS, MICS) and monitoring reports (HMIS).

USAID/Nepal DO 3 team will access data online:

DHS: [www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com),

MICS: [http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index\\_24302.html](http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html)

[www.dohs.gov.np](http://www.dohs.gov.np)

Health Management Information System. Data tables also available in DoHS Annual Report.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** The DHS and MICS are published every 5 years, and are staggered such that the reports are produced at alternate (non-simultaneous) intervals. High-quality data for one of these two high-quality sources should be available every two to three years. More regular data will be available through the Health Management Information System (HMIS) annually, to track trend lines.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Sabita Tuladhar

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** MICS: UNICEF Statistics and Monitoring Division

DHS: USAID DHS contractor

HMIS: HMIS section chief, H4L M&E Unit

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):** HMIS DQA conducted March 2014

<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> January 2015
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> This indicator itself is a proxy indicator for total fertility rate (TFR).  Because DHS/MICS uses household surveys which collect information on all sources of contraception, while the HMIS only reports data from clients which use the public sector as a source of their contraceptive commodities and services, the data from HMIS cannot be compared directly with that from the surveys. HMIS data can, however, be used to indicate trends in modern contraceptive use.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> N/A
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> This indicator should be reviewed annually, comparing actuals with baseline and target values. The trend over time for this indicator should also be examined.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> DO3 team will incorporate review of this indicator in regular portfolio reviews.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> The MICS data will be released by the end of 2014 or early 2015.
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets should exceed the margin of error for the data collection techniques, in order to be able to accurately attribute change to USAID programming in this area.
<b>Other Notes:</b> This indicator is being measured as a proxy for total fertility rate (TFR).  Note that district-level disaggregation will be possible only through the HMIS, but not DHS or MICS, which only collect data at the national and sub-regional levels.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National and sub-regional
<b>Baseline Units:</b> National and sub-regional
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3-3**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:**

**Performance Indicator 3-3:** Newborn mortality rate

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 3.1.6-60 **Indicator Type:** Impact

**Precise Definition(s):** Numerator: Number of deaths among infants in the first 28 days of life in a given year

Denominator: Number of live births in that year

**Unit of Measure:** Per 1,000

**Disaggregated by:** Sex, caste/ethnicity

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** Reducing the neonatal mortality rate (NMR) also directly contributes to MDG 4, to reduce under-five child mortality by two-thirds between 1990 and 2015. Mortality among children in the first month of life is responsible for about 70% percent of total infant deaths.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** USAID Demographic and Health Survey

**Data Source:** NDHS (Nepal Demographic and Health Survey) or MICS (Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey). NDHS and MICS are country-specific and published every 5 years.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Data are originally collected through household surveys (DHS, MICS)

USAID/Nepal DO 3 team will access data online:

DHS: [www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com),

MICS: [http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index\\_24302.html](http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html)

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** The DHS and MICS are published every 5 years, and are staggered such that the reports are produced at alternate (non-simultaneous) intervals. High-quality data for one of these two high-quality sources should be available every two to three years.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Sabita Tuladhar

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** MICS: UNICEF Statistics and Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS)  
DHS: MoHP and USAID DHS contractor

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):**

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** 2016

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance:**

Data collection only takes place once only every several years.

Some households may not be counted due to maternal death.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Appropriate redress for these data quality issues is typically handled internally within UNICEF and the USAID-funded DHS contractor. Additionally, because the values for these indicators do not typically change drastically Year-Over-Year, USAID/Nepal is satisfied that it will have high-quality data at sufficient frequency to measure performance.

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING**

**Data Analysis:** Data to be analyzed in comparison with other countries' neonatal mortality rates, to identify regional trends. Data also regularly analyzed by Nepal's Ministry of Health and Population to identify national trends.

**Mission/Team Review:** USAID/Nepal will use this data to track neonatal mortality at the national and sub-national level, capturing change resulting from USAID's projects and activities. Performance data for this indicator will be used in USAID/Nepal's regular portfolio reviews.

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** The MICS data will be released by early 2015.

**Rationale for Targets:** Targets should exceed the margin of error for the data collection techniques, in order to be able to accurately attribute change to USAID programming in this area. Targets will be guided by MoHP's NHSP and USAID's investment in Maternal and Newborn interventions.

**Other Notes:** Note that the NDHS and MICS collect data at the national and sub-national (but not district) level.

**GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION**

**Data Reporting Units:** National and sub-national

**Baseline Units:** National and sub-national

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14**

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3-4**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:**

**Performance Indicator 3-4:** Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2014 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 3.1.9-11 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Stunting is a height-for-age measurement that is a reflection of chronic nutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children 0-59 months (i.e. under five years) who are stunted, as defined by a height for age Z score < -2.

Children with a height for age Z score < -2 and >= -3 are classified as moderately stunted. Children with a height for age Z score < -3 are classified as severely stunted. This indicator will be a measurement of any stunting, i.e. both moderate and severe stunting combined. While stunting is difficult to measure in children 0-6 months and most stunting occurs in the 9-23 month range (1,000 days), this indicator data will still be reported for all children under 5 to align with the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) data and to capture the impact of interventions over time.

The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months surveyed with a height for age Z score < -2.

The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months surveyed with height for age Z score data.

**Unit of Measure:** Percent

**Disaggregated by:** Sex, wealth quintile, ecological zone

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** Stunted, wasted, and underweight children under five years of age are the three major nutritional indicators. Stunting is an indicator of linear growth retardation, most often due to prolonged exposure to an inadequate diet and poor health. Reducing the prevalence of stunting among children, particularly 0-23 months, is important because linear growth deficits accrued early in life are associated with cognitive impairments, poor educational performance and decreased work productivity among adults. Better nutrition leads to increased cognitive and physical abilities, thus improving individual productivity in general, including improved agricultural productivity.

Reducing undernutrition by measuring the prevalence of underweight children, stunting, child's anemia or maternal anemia is among the overall goals of both Feed the Future (FTF) and the Global Health Initiative (GHI).

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** Suaahara (M&E component), FEEDBACK, BFS central M&E contractor

**Data Source:** Suaahara Baseline and Endline survey, Demographic and Household Survey (DHS), and Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, FTF ZOI baseline, midline, and endline population-based survey (PBS)

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Data are originally collected through household surveys (DHS, MICS), baseline and endline surveys (Suaahara), and midterm surveys (FTF)

USAID/Nepal DO 3 team will access data online:

DHS: [www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com),

MICS: [http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index\\_24302.html](http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html)

Suaahara baseline and endline survey reports will be provided to USAID/Nepal by Suaahara M&E contractor.

FTF baseline, midterm, and final survey reports will be collected by FEEDBACK. Baseline and final survey data will be analyzed using DHS secondary data, which is acceptable if the data were collected within the previous two years and a

<p>large enough sample was collected from clusters within the FTF ZOI. The midterm survey will include field-level primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the FTF ZOI by FEEDBACK.</p>
<p><b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b></p> <p>The DHS and MICS are published every 3-5 years, and are staggered such that the reports are produced at alternate (non-simultaneous) intervals. High-quality data for one of these two sources should be available every two to three years.</p> <p>Suaahara survey reports will be made available at the beginning and end of project implementation. FTF baseline, midterm, and final survey reports will be available in 2013, 2015, and 2018, respectively.</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Debendra Adhikari</p>
<p><b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> MICS: UNICEF Statistics and Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) DHS: USAID DHS contractor and MoHP</p> <p>Suaahara: Suaahara M&amp;E contractor FTF: FEEDBACK, centrally-funded M&amp;E contractor</p>
<p><b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus</p>
<p><b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b></p>
<p><b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> April 2014</p>
<p><b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> April 2017</p>
<p><b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> NDHS and MICS surveys are not conducted annually in Nepal, so data may not be available at the optimal intervals for evaluation. There will be a chance that recall bias will make it difficult to gather accurate data for children's birth dates.</p>
<p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Appropriate redress for the issue of recall bias is typically handled internally within UNICEF and the USAID-funded DHS contractor.</p>
<p><b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b></p>
<p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Data to be analyzed in comparison with other countries' stunting prevalence rates, to identify regional trends. Data also regularly analyzed by Nepal's Ministry of Health and Population to identify national trends at national, subnational level.</p>
<p><b>Mission/Team Review:</b> USAID/Nepal will use this data to track stunting prevalence at the national and sub-national level, as it responds to USAID programming interventions. Performance data against this indicator will be used to inform DO3 team's regular portfolio reviews.</p>
<p><b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b></p>
<p><b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> 2012 (Suaahara baseline), 2013 (FEEDBACK PBS)</p>
<p><b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets are established based on data on the last fifteen year trend of stunting, target set by Government of Nepal in the Multisectoral Nutrition plan and Nepal Health Sector plan and based on the current program efforts.</p>
<p><b>Other Notes (optional):</b></p>
<p><b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b></p>
<p><b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National and sub-national, FTF ZOI</p>
<p><b>Baseline Units:</b> National and sub-national, FTF ZOI</p>
<p><b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b></p>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3-5**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:**

**Performance Indicator 3-5:** Proportion of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2015 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 3.2.1-27 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):**

Proportion of students who attain the specified threshold at the end of two grades of primary schooling, the beginning of the third year of primary schooling, or the equivalent levels of accelerated learning programs. Students and learners in formal public primary government schools should be included. Measures of the indicator will be determined in consultation with the country, and informed by national (or regional, if applicable) curriculum standards, and by international experience. Illustrative examples include country-specific benchmarks on national assessments that have satisfactory psychometric validity and reliability and limited corruption issues or levels of oral fluency based on acceptable oral assessments, e.g. demonstrating satisfactory levels of comprehension as measured by comprehension questions on grade two texts, or reading a country-determined number of words correct per minute. The language(s) of assessment will be determined by country policies. Any assessment system with adequate psychometric validity and reliability is acceptable, e.g. ASER, EGRA, and national assessments.

A census of all the students who received the treatment or intervention is not necessary. Rather, a statistical sample that is representative of that population is adequate. Those findings then may be extrapolated to the population.

Numerator: Number of public primary students reading with sufficient understanding at the end of the first two grades of primary schooling. Denominator: Total number of students and learners at the end of the first two grades of primary schooling.

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** Percent.

**Disaggregated by:** Sex, age, caste/ethnicity, district

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:**

Learning to read is the foundation for future learning in all subjects and at all levels of education. Improvements in basic literacy also have been shown to translate to increased human capital and other population-level benefits.

This indicator is an outcome measure of the highest order for Goal 1 of the USAID Education Strategy, calling for improved reading skills for 100 million primary school children. USAID is working to produce meaningful, measurable improvement in student reading for the largest possible number of children through support for programs that: improve teaching techniques and learning materials; support regular assessments in partner countries to measure reading skills; maximize instruction time spent on basic skills in the classroom, especially reading; support instruction in native languages in early grades; and promote parental and community involvement in early grade reading.

Simple, easily understood but flexible metrics, that countries can set for themselves for the language(s) of instruction that

they use in the early grades, are essential tools for tracking student learning. The process of establishing information on early grade reading competencies and making instructional and management decisions based on the data is what is most important. Students and learners who do not have basic skills after completing two grades of primary schooling may repeat grades, drop out, or suffer academically in higher grades where they are expected to be able to use reading to learn, starting in the middle primary grades.

Information will be used at the country level for the monitoring of reading improvement programs and to make corrections when necessary. It should also be noted that this indicator aligns with the quality indicators being adopted by other development organizations, including FTI and DfID.

#### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** USAID Early Grade Reading Program

**Data Source:** Primary data source: Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) scores, as reported by reports from USAID's Early Grade Reading Program. Secondary data sources: National Assessment of Student Achievement, Education Management Information System, Ministry of Education Flash report

**Method of Data Acquisition:** EGRA is an individually administered oral assessment of foundation literacy skills requiring about 15 minutes per child. It has been designed as an inexpensive and simple diagnostic of individual student progress in reading. In addition, ministry personnel can use the results to identify schools with particular needs and develop instructional approaches for improving foundation skills (e.g., poor letter naming results may indicate the need for additional alphabet practice).

EGRA reports will be provided directly to USAID/Nepal by EGRP implementer. Secondary data sources will be provided by the Ministry of Education.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Baseline data have been collected as of March 2014. Midterm and endline Early Grade Reading Assessments will be available in 2017 and 2019, respectively. EGRP will be tracking performance data biannually.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Siena Fleischer, Jayanti Subba, Maneka Gurung

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** Early Grade Reading Program M&E contractor

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):**

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** February 2017

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance:** Because EGRA is an aggregate (composite) score that captures multiple dimensions of student reading abilities, looking only at the EGRA score may obscure more nuanced trends.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** EGRA scores should be analyzed for sub-components of total score.

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Data analysis should determine the extent to which native and non-native Nepali speaking primary students are able to improve their reading and reading comprehension skills as a result of the EGRP.

**Mission/Team Review:** USAID/Nepal Education Team will conduct an initial review of data in collaboration with and under the review of the USAID/Program Office M&E Specialist.

If non-native Nepali speaking children are not experiencing significant improvements in reading and comprehension, programmatic adjustments (in terms of focus, curriculum, etc.) should be made.

Additionally, USAID/Nepal will share these findings with the GON's Ministry of Education as USAID results contribute to the GON's National Early Grade Reading Program.

#### BASELINE AND TARGETS

**Baseline Timeframe:** Baseline data collected at the beginning of 2014.

**Rationale for Targets:** N/A – targets not yet selected.

<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District
<b>Baseline Units:</b> District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-4-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.1-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**IR 3.1:** A better-skilled, literate population

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 3.1-1:** Average Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) Score among students in USAID/Nepal’s Zone of Influence

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No  Yes  **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2015 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** N/A **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Measures average (mean) score on Nepal’s Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) by students within USAID/Nepal’s targeted Zone of Influence.

Early Grade Reading Assessment Test Components include:

- Concepts about print
- Phonemic awareness
- Listening comprehension
- Letter naming
- Letter sounds
- Syllable naming
- Nonsense word reading
- Familiar word reading
- Paragraph reading (oral reading fluency) with comprehension
- Dictation

USAID/Nepal supports EGRA and the instrument will be administered in a representative sample in 2014, 2016, and 2018. The EGRA will assist in establishing routine assessment of EGR achievement.

Numerator: Sum of all EGRA scores for all Nepali students within EGRP’s ZOI

Denominator: Total number of Nepali students within EGRP’s ZOI

**Unit of Measure:** Percent

**Disaggregated by:** Sex, caste/ethnicity, native language (Nepali vs. non-Nepali), district, EGRA stage of achievement

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** Early grade reading is a central focus of USAID’s work in Nepal, and a central pillar of the USAID Education Strategy. USAID/Nepal is implementing a large reading and reading comprehension project in Nepal, targeted specifically at students in grades 1-3. Measuring the change in the average EGRA scores of those students is absolutely essential to track the effectiveness of this project, as well as USAID’s contribution to the achievement of IR 3.1.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** USAID/Nepal Early Grade Reading Program (M&E component)

**Data Source:** Routine classroom-based reading assessments, regular reports by implementer of Early Grade Reading Program. Secondary data may be collected at the national level through the GON’s National Early Grade Reading Program.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** EGRA is an individually administered oral assessment of foundation literacy skills requiring about 15 minutes per child. It has been designed as an inexpensive and simple diagnostic of individual student progress in reading. In addition, ministry personnel can use the results to identify schools with particular needs and develop instructional approaches for improving foundation skills (e.g., poor letter naming results may indicate the need for additional alphabet practice).

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Baseline data were collected March 2014. Midterm and endline assessment data will be available 2017 and 2019, respectively.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Siena Fleischer, Jayanti Subba, Maneka Gurung

<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> Early Grade Reading Program M&E contractor
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> February 2017
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> (1) Because data is collected directly by the Early Grade Reading Program's implementing partner, it may be difficult to verify performance data in an unbiased fashion.  (2) Aggregation of data on student reading outcomes into a single EGRA composite score may obscure more nuanced trends at a more granular level.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> USAID/Nepal will commission a data quality assessment to verify data quality, and will examine more detailed disaggregated reports from M&E contractor, beyond this composite indicator.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data analysis should determine the extent to which non-native Nepali speaking children are able to improve their reading and reading comprehension skills as a result of the EGRP.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> USAID/Nepal Education Team will conduct an initial review of data in collaboration with and under the review of the USAID/Program Office M&E Specialist.  If non-native Nepali speaking children are not experiencing significant improvements in reading and comprehension, programmatic adjustments (in terms of focus, curriculum, etc.) should be made.  Additionally, USAID/Nepal will share these findings with the GON's Ministry of Education as USAID results contribute to the GON's National Early Grade Reading Program.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Baseline data collected at the beginning of 2014.
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> N/A – targets not yet selected.
<b>Other Notes:</b> Note that the secondary data source – Nepal's National Early Grade Reading Program – is linked with the School Sector Reform Program.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Siena Fleischer USAID/Nepal 5-30-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.1-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**IR 3.1:** A better-skilled, literate population

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 2.2: Small-Scale Enterprise Opportunities Expanded, IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 3.1-2:** Adult literacy rate of target population in Feed the Future (FTF) Zone of Influence (ZOI)

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_\_ Yes X **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** 2015 **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** N/A **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Percentage of persons participating in USAID’s business literacy activity within the FTF Zone of Influence who are able to read, write and perform basic mathematics at a functional level. Functional literacy is defined as possessing reading and writing skills that are adequate to manage daily living and employment tasks that require reading skills beyond a basic level.

Numerator: Number of functionally literate adults within the FTF ZOI

Denominator: Total number of functionally literate adults within the FTF ZOI

Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29

Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)

**Unit of Measure:** Percentage points

**Disaggregated by:** Sex, age, caste/ethnicity, district

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** Although many Nepali children are unable to read, the problem of illiteracy afflicts many Nepali adults, as well. Adult literacy is an essential component of improving both human capital and skill development throughout Nepal. Because literacy is a necessary subcomponent of business skill development, this performance indicator also links to DO 2.2: Small-Scale Enterprise Opportunities Expanded. Curricula introduced by the program will develop and/or enhance knowledge and literacy for beneficiaries to apply to entrepreneurship activities.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** DEPROSC (FTF business literacy sub-component)

**Data Source:** Annual report from RIDA – FTF’s M&E Contractor

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Pre and post test for literacy and numeracy, administered within targeted VDCs.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** The data are presented in an annual report. However, test data from individual cohorts come more regularly.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Jayanti Subba and Anita Mahat

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** D.E.P.R.O.S.C.

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):**

**Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** February 2017

**Potential Data Limitations and Significance:** There are two major methodological considerations. First, this test is self-administered, which leaves open the possibility of biases, errors, and misreporting. Secondly, data quality can be adversely affected by high dropout rates between the start and conclusion of the business literacy activity.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Dropout rates will be tracked over time and analyzed closely in tandem along with this performance indicator. FTF M&E contractor will prepare a brief statement to accompany pre and

post exams that emphasizes the importance of offering honest feedback to enhance the chance of accurate data collection.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data to be analyzed by USAID/Nepal to allow for adjustments in programmatic focus over time. Changes in curriculum, targeted groups, and/or geographical area may be necessary. Attendance data will need to be monitored and analyzed closely.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> USAID/Nepal Education Team will conduct an initial review of data in collaboration with and under the review of the USAID/Program Office M&E Specialist and local implementing partner.  USAID/Nepal will use this performance data not only to make programmatic adjustments, but also to inform USAID's position during budget discussions with the GON.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> August 2014
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets based upon analysis of preceding project. Targets set by USAID/Nepal's determination that complementary training should be offered on agriculture, nutrition, literacy, numeracy, access to finance, and entrepreneurship.
<b>Other Notes:</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> VDC
<b>Baseline Units:</b> VDC
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-4-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.2-1**

<b>Goal:</b> A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal
<b>DO 3:</b> Increased human capital
<b>IR 3.2:</b> A healthier and well-nourished population
<b>Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:</b> IR 1.2: Accountability of Selected Institutions Strengthened, IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased
<b>Performance Indicator 3.2-1:</b> Percent of Births receiving at least 4 antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy PROXY indicator for maternal mortality.
<b>Performance Plan and Report Indicator:</b> No ___ Yes <u>X</u> If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): <u>2014</u> If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: <u>3.1.6-2</u> <b>Indicator Type:</b> <u>Outcome</u>
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>Precise Definition(s):</b>  Percent of women who received at least four antenatal care visits during her last pregnancy from a health worker in health facility, out-reach service center, or in her home. The reference period will be the past 5 five years (for DHS) and the past 3 years (for MICS).  Numerator: Number of women reporting they received 4 or more ANC visits during their latest pregnancy  Denominator: Number of women reporting giving birth during the reference period.
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> Percent
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> N/A
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> Pregnant women who have received at least 4 ANC visits from a qualified health worker during their last pregnancy are far more likely to understand and implement best practices and standards for behavior and care during childbirth. They are also more likely to seek out skilled birth attendants when they go into labor (DO 3), thus contributing to reductions in maternal mortality.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Suaahara
<b>Data Source:</b> Nepal Demographic and Health Survey (NDHS), Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS)
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Data are originally collected through household surveys (NDHS, MICS) and monitoring reports (HMIS).  USAID/Nepal DO 3 team will access data online: DHS: <a href="http://www.measuredhs.com">www.measuredhs.com</a> , MICS: <a href="http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html">http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html</a>
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> The NDHS and MICS are published every 5 years, and are staggered such that the reports are produced at alternate (non-simultaneous) intervals. High-quality data for one of these two high-quality sources should be available every two to three years.
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Sabita Tuladhar
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> MICS: UNICEF Statistics and Monitoring Division DHS: USAID DHS contractor
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> 2014

<p><b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Not all women will recall how many ANC sessions attended – recall error is likely. Definitions among household surveys (e.g. qualified health care worker) may vary slightly. Some data may also be missing from sampling survey due to death of a mother. HMIS only reports ANC visit in public sector facilities. Because DHS/MICS uses household surveys which collect information on all ANC visits, while the HMIS only reports data from public sectors clients which includes the number of ANC visits at 4 months, 6 months, 8 months and 9 months. HMIS data cannot be compared directly with NDHS or MICS data, but can be useful to detect trends yearly.</p>
<p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> While the MICS and NDHS provide high-quality, high-cost data every 2-3 years, the HMIS can be used to adjust USAID programming more rapidly (trend line analysis).</p>
<p><b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b></p>
<p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be used to track targets against actuals, and to analyze trends over time.</p>
<p><b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Mission to review data for comparison with other countries' values for this indicator throughout the region. Information will also be used to inform DO team's regular portfolio reviews.</p>
<p><b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b></p>
<p><b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> The MICS data will be available by the end of 2014 or early 2015.</p>
<p><b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Targets should exceed the margin of error for the data collection techniques, in order to be able to accurately attribute change to USAID programming in this area.</p>
<p><b>Other Notes:</b></p>
<p><b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b></p>
<p><b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National and sub-national</p>
<p><b>Baseline Units :</b> National and sub-national</p>
<p><b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Debendra Adhikari USAID/Nepal 6-10-14</b></p>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.2-2**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**IR 3.2:** A healthier and well-nourished population

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.2: Accountability of Selected Institutions Strengthened, IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 3.2-2:** Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No \_\_ Yes X \_\_\_\_ If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2014 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: 3.1.9.1-4 Indicator Type: Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** This indicator measures the percent of children 0-5 months of age who were exclusively breastfed during the day preceding the survey. Exclusive breastfeeding means that the infant received breast milk (including milk expressed or from a wet nurse) and may have received oral rehydration salts, vitamins, minerals and/or medicines, but did not receive any other food or liquid.

Numerator: # of children 0-5 months of age who received only breast milk in the day preceding the survey X 100

Denominator: total number children 0-5 months children included in the sample.

**Unit of Measure:** Number, Percent

**Disaggregated by:** Sex, district, by age (months) from NDHS

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** Exclusive breastfeeding for 6 months provides children with significant nutrition benefits. Breast milk is the most nutrient-rich source of available nourishment for children under six months of age, which is adequate for the first six months of age. Furthermore, exclusive breastfeeding provides the additional health benefit of protecting young children from gastrointestinal infections, thereby reducing the risk of mortality due to infectious disease.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** Suaahara

**Data Source:** Suaahara annual performance report, Suaahara Baseline and Endline report, Demographic Health Survey report, FTF Population Based Survey (PBS) baseline, midterm, and endline reports.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Data is collected through household surveys (Suaahara’s annual Lot Quality Assurance Surveys, Suaahara baseline/endline evaluation, NDHS survey). Annual survey data will be presented in Suaahara’s annual performance report, provided to USAID/Nepal by Suaahara. The International Food Policy Research Institute conducts baseline and endline survey evaluations that will be provided to USAID/Nepal by Suaahara. DHS data is available at: [www.measuredhs.com](http://www.measuredhs.com).

FTF ZOI baseline, midterm, and final survey reports will be collected by FEEDBACK. Baseline and final survey data will be analyzed using DHS secondary data, which is acceptable if the data were collected within the previous two years and a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the FTF ZOI. The midterm survey will include field-level primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the FTF ZOI by FEEDBACK.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual, baseline report in 2012 and endline in 2016. The DHS is published every 5 years. FTF ZOI baseline, midterm, and final survey reports will be available in 2013, 2015, and 2018, respectively.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Debendra Adhikari

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** Suaahara, FEEDBACK (centrally-funded FTF M&E contractor)

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> April 2014
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> April 2017
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Recall bias may adversely affect accuracy of the data.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Suaahara will train enumerators to use the standard questionnaires to reduce the risk of recall bias.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data to be analyzed in comparison with other countries' exclusive breast feeding prevalence rates, to identify regional trends. Data also regularly analyzed by Nepal's Ministry of Health and Population to identify national trends at national and subnational level every five years.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Mission to review data for comparison with other countries' values for this indicator throughout the region. Information will also be used to inform DO team's regular portfolio reviews.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Suaahara baseline data collected 2012 and MICS data will be available by early 2015. The FEEDBACK FTF baseline was conducted in 2013.
<b>Rationale for Targets</b> Targets should exceed the margin of error for the data collection techniques, in order to be able to accurately attribute change to USAID programming in this area. A target is established based on target set by Government of Nepal in the Multisectoral Nutrition plan (2013-2017) and Nepal Health Sector plan.
<b>Other Notes:</b> Please note that district-level data will be made available only through Suaahara's LQAS.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National and Sub-regional (NDHS and MICS), District (Suaahara), FTF ZOI
<b>Baseline Units:</b> National and Sub-regional (NDHS and MICS), District (Suaahara), FTF ZOI
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-10-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.2-3**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**IR 3.2:** A healthier and well-nourished population

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.2: Accountability of Selected Institutions Strengthened, IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased

**Performance Indicator 3.2-3:** Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No Yes  If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): 2014 If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: 3.1.9.1-1 **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** This indicator measures the proportion of children 6-23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD), apart from breast milk. The “minimum acceptable diet” indicator measures both the minimum feeding frequency and minimum dietary diversity, as appropriate for various age groups. If a child meets the minimum feeding frequency and minimum dietary diversity for their age group and breastfeeding status, then they are considered to receive a minimum acceptable diet.

Tabulation of indicator results require that data on breastfeeding, dietary diversity, number of semi-solid/solid feeds and number of milk feeds be collected for children 6-23 months the day preceding the survey. The indicator is calculated from the following two fractions:

Breastfed children 6-23 months of age who had at least the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day / Breastfed children 6-23 months of age

Non-breastfed children 6-23 months of age who received at least 2 milk feedings and had at least the minimum dietary diversity not including milk feeds and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day

Non-breastfed children 6-23 months of age

Minimum dietary diversity for breastfed children 6-23 months is defined as four or more food groups out of the following 7 food groups (refer to the WHO IYCF operational guidance document cited at bottom):

Grains, roots and tubers

Legumes and nuts

Dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese)

Flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats) Eggs

Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables Other fruits and vegetables

Minimum meal frequency for breastfed children is defined as two or more feedings of solid, semi-solid, or soft food for children 6-8 months and three or more feedings of solid, semi-solid or soft food for children 9-23 months.

Minimum dietary diversity for non-breastfed children is defined as four or more food groups out of the following six food groups:

Grains, roots and tubers Legumes and nuts Flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats) Eggs

Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables Other fruits and vegetables
Minimum meal frequency for non-breastfed children is defined as four or more feedings of solid, semi-solid, soft food, or milk feeds for children 6- 23 months, with at least two of these feedings being milk feeds.
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> Percent
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> Sex, ecozone (NDHS and MICS), wealth quintile (NDHS and MICS), district, FTF ZOI
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> Appropriate feeding of children 6-23 months is multidimensional. The minimum acceptable diet indicator combines standards of dietary diversity (a proxy for nutrient density) and feeding frequency (a proxy for energy density) by breastfeeding status; and thus provides a useful way to track progress at simultaneously improving the key quality and quantity dimensions of children’s diets.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Suaahara , FEEDBACK (centrally-funded FTF M&E contractor), NDHS, MICS
<b>Data Source:</b> Suaahara baseline and endline evaluation reports and Annual performance report, USAID Demographic and Health Survey, Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS), FTF Population Based Survey (PBS)
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Data are originally collected through household surveys (NDHS, MICS) and the Lot Quality Assessment Survey by Suaahara. The International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) conducts the baseline and endline survey evaluation that feeds into Suaahara report.
USAID/Nepal DO 3 team will access data online: DHS: <a href="http://www.measuredhs.com">www.measuredhs.com</a> , MICS: <a href="http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html">http://www.unicef.org/statistics/index_24302.html</a>
Data from USAID’s Population-Based Survey will be made available through USAID’s FtF M&E contractor.
FTF baseline, midterm, and final survey reports will be collected by FEEDBACK. Baseline and final survey data will be analyzed using DHS secondary data, which is acceptable if the data were collected within the previous two years and a large enough sample was collected from clusters within the FTF ZOI. The midterm survey will include field-level primary data collected via a population-based survey conducted in the FTF ZOI by FEEDBACK.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual (Suaahara LQAS), The NDHS and MICS are published every 5 years, and are staggered such that the reports are produced at alternate (non-simultaneous) intervals. High-quality data for one of these two high-quality sources should be available every two to three years. FTF baseline, midterm, and final survey reports will be available in 2013, 2015, and 2018, respectively.
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Debendra Adhikari
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> MICS: UNICEF Statistics and Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) NDHS: USAID DHS contractor and MoHP USAID project specific data provided by Suaahara FEEDBACK, centrally funded FTF M&E contractor
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> April 2014
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> April 2017
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Recall bias may adversely affect accuracy of the data.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Suaahara’s M&E contractor will train enumerators to use the standard questionnaires to reduce the risk of recall bias. Data quality will also be assessed by checking for reliability of data through repeated survey of sub samples.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>

<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> Data to be analyzed in comparison with other countries' minimum acceptable diet prevalence rates, to identify regional trends. Data also regularly analyzed by Nepal's Ministry of Health and Population to identify national trends at national, subnational level every five years.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Information will also be used to inform DO team's regular portfolio reviews.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> Suaahara Baseline data was reported 2012 and MICS data will be available by early 2015. FEEDBACK's FTF baseline PBS was conducted in 2013.
<b>Rationale for Targets</b> Targets should exceed the margin of error for the data collection techniques, in order to be able to accurately attribute change to USAID programming in this area. Target will set based on Government of Nepal's Multisectoral Nutrition plan, as well as the progress made by USAID-funded Suaahara project over the last two years.
<b>Other Notes:</b> Please note that district-level data will be made available only through Suaahara's LQAS.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National and Sub-regional (NDHS and MICS), District (Suaahara), FTF ZOI
<b>Baseline Units:</b> National and Sub-regional (NDHS and MICS), District (Suaahara), FTF ZOI
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Debendra Adhikari USAID/Nepal 6-10-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.3-1**

**Goal:** A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal

**DO 3:** Increased human capital

**IR 3.3:** Social sector policy and performance improved

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:** IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased, IR 1.4: Public Policy and Performance Improved, IR 2.4: Economic Growth Policy and Performance Improved

**Performance Indicator 3.3-1:** Dollar value of School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) budget allocated to improving early grade reading outcomes.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** No  Yes  **If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):** N/A **If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** N/A **Indicator Type:** Outcome

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition(s):** Dollar (USD) value of the amount of money in the Ministry of Education’s pooled (multi-donor) budget for the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) that is specifically allocated to projects, programs, initiatives, and activities focused on education reform and includes a key objective to improve early grade (grades 1-3) reading outcomes, including but not limited to reading comprehension. Note that this amount should reflect only those funds allocated to early grade reading through the SSRP – other MOE and donor funds allocated for that purpose should not be captured here. Funding streams from USAID’s Early Grade Reading Program (EGRP) and for on-budget support through Government to Government should not be captured here.

**Unit of Measure:** Dollar value

**Disaggregated by:** N/A

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:** USAID/Nepal’s primary programmatic focus is improving early grade reading outcomes. This approach not only contributes significantly to the literacy rates of the Nepali population, but also reflects the strategic education priorities of USAID writ large, as articulated in the agency’s Education Strategy.

As one of the donors contributing to both the budget and the strategy of the SSRP, USAID has a significant role to play in influencing how funding streams within the SSRP are allocated. To the extent that USAID can ensure that the SSRP allocates sufficient funding for the purpose of improving early grade reading outcomes, USAID/Nepal will not only (indirectly) influence early grade reading outcomes, but also policy and strategic priority within the Ministry of Education.

The SSRP has a comprehensive and participatory annual budget development process. GON and pooled and non-pooled donors research, document and debate the funding allocations to implement key education reforms. Final funding levels are decided as part of the Annual Strategic Implementation Plan and Budget, finalized before the start of the Nepali new fiscal year in July. Early grade reading has been identified as a core SSRP objective, and USAID continues to be the lead donor driving reform in this area.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** School Sector Reform Program (SSRP)

**Data Source:** Government of Nepal’s Annual Strategic Implementation Plan and Budget, Joint Consultative Meeting and Joint Annual Review.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** USAID/Nepal will extract the budget data from the GON’s Annual Strategic Implementation Plan and Budget, as the report is made available.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Annual

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Siena Fleischer, Jayanti Subba and Maneka Gurung

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** Ministry of Education – Foreign Aid Coordination Section

**Location of Data Storage:** USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):**

<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> TBD- please set time frame for USAID DQA
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Because the SSRP is not directly administered by USAID, USAID will have limited access to the raw budget data. In addition, USAID may not have the ability to directly monitor the extent to which funds allocated to early grade reading within the SSRP are expended as articulated according to the budget (budget execution).
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> Data will be analyzed within the broader context of the School Sector Reform Program (SSRP) budget. It is important to note that USAID will be tracking not only the dollar amount of SSRP funding dedicated to early grade reading outcomes, but also the <u>proportion</u> of those funds in relation to the total SSRP budget. That analysis will yield insight into the strategic priorities of the SSRP, as well as the extent to which USAID is successfully focusing high-level attention on the issue of early grade reading.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> USAID/Nepal Education Team will conduct an initial review of data in collaboration with and under the review of the USAID/Program Office M&E Specialist.  USAID/Nepal will review the data internally, and use it to inform USAID's position during budget negotiations with the GON, the other donors contributing to the SSRP, and other stakeholders.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> 2014
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> N/A
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> N/A - National Level
<b>Baseline Units:</b> N/A - National Level
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Siena Fleischer USAID/Nepal 5-30-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.3-2**

<b>Goal:</b> A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal
<b>DO 3:</b> Increased human capital
<b>IR 3.3:</b> Social sector policy and performance improved
<b>Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:</b> IR 1.4: Public Policy and Performance Improved, IR 2.4: Economic Growth Policy and Performance Improved
<b>Performance Indicator 3.3-2:</b> Percent of women from marginalized groups attended by skilled doctor, nurse or midwife during last birth
<b>Performance Plan and Report Indicator:</b> No ___ Yes ___X___ If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s): <u>2015</u> If yes, link to foreign assistance framework: <u>Custom</u> <b>Indicator Type:</b> <u>Outcome</u>
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</b>
<p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Numerator: Number of pregnant women from marginalized groups within USAID targeted area (14 districts) in a given year attended by a skilled birth attendant (SBA) doctor and nurse.</p> <p>Denominator: Expected Live births in the same year in USAID targeted area (14 districts)/100.</p> <p>Doctors, nurses and nurse midwives are defined as Skilled Birth Attendants by the Nepali Government.</p> <p>Youth is disaggregated by age groups: 15-19, 20-24, 25-29</p> <p>Marginalized Groups are composed of: Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)</p>
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> Percent
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> District, age, sex, caste/ethnicity
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> The Government of Nepal has recently made a commitment to more effectively reflect the interests of – and provide services to – marginalized and socially excluded groups. While the policy itself has been officially adopted, implementation of that policy has been mixed at best. Through the Health for Life (H4L) project, USAID is providing support to local health organizations to strengthen implementation of that policy and increase access to (and utilization of) services by marginalized groups. This indicator reflects the extent to which the GON’s policies on social inclusion and are being implemented.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Health for Life (H4L)
<b>Data Source:</b> Health for Life (H4L) Annual report
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Routine data will be collected from facility reports- the Health Management Information System (HMIS). H4L will provide data to USAID/Nepal in an annual report.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Sabita Tuladhar, Dan Verschneider, Naramaya Limbu
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> USAID/Nepal Health for Life (H4L)
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> 2015
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Ensuring the accuracy and reliability of this data in a cost-effective manner may be challenging.

<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Contact the Health for Life implementing partner regarding the importance of timely, accurate, precise, and reliable data collection against this indicator. Ensure that data collection for this performance indicator is prioritized and highlighted within the overall context of the H4L M&E plan.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> USAID/Nepal will analyze data for this indicator at the District level, comparing performance between District and across regions. H4L will use this data to analyze gaps by VDCs and develop activities to focusing the VDCs that need more attention.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> USAID/Nepal's Health 4 Life team will monitor this indicator to ensure that the local capacity of the VDC-level health systems are sufficiently prioritizing service delivery (especially access to skilled birth attendants) for marginalized groups. As necessary and as the data permit, the team will use geo-referenced data to make geographic adjustments in programming.
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> 2015
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> USAID/Nepal's targets for this indicator are guided by the MoHP's NHSP and determined by the intensity of the inputs invested by USAID through H4L.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District
<b>Baseline Units:</b> District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Jonathan Shepard SI 6-11-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.3-3**

<b>Goal:</b> A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal
<b>DO 3:</b> Increased human capital
<b>IR 3.3:</b> Social sector policy and performance improved
<b>Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:</b> IR 1.4: Public Policy and Performance Improved, IR 2.4: Economic Growth Policy and Performance Improved
<b>Performance Indicator 3.3-3:</b> Nepal Health Sector Plan III approved (Y/N)
<b>Performance Plan and Report Indicator:</b> No <input type="checkbox"/> X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> <b>If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):</b> N/A <b>If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:</b> N/A <b>Indicator Type:</b> Outcome
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>Precise Definition(s):</b> The Nepal Health Sector Plan III is officially drafted/approved/implemented by the Government of Nepal.
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> Y/N
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> Stage (drafted, approved, implemented)
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> The NHSP III is the key policy document to guide the MoHP in planning and prioritizing programs in health. It is an important foundation for the Sector Wide Approach (SWAP) which is followed by all health donors, including USAID. These documents help to establish greater coherence between policies, programs, and budget allocations. The USAID implementing partner, Health for life, provides technical assistance to the MOHP to provide policy guidance and a framework that strengthens MoHP stewardship of public and private health systems. Any delay in the development or approval of the NHSP III document will have significant impact on USAID’s ability to achieve the Development Objective 3.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Health for Life (H4L)
<b>Data Source:</b> MOHP, Health for Life Reports
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> The development progress level data are collected by sharing progress at high level advisory committee meetings with the project development team and different technical working groups. The Nepal Health Sector plan endorsement data is collected after it is approved by from high level steering committee and ministerial council.
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> When achieved.
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Sabita Tuladhar, Dan Verschneider, Debendra Adhikari
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> USAID/Nepal Health for Life (H4L)
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal’s Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> TBD- please indicate
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> This is the five year plan Ministry of Health and Population will developed and endorsed. So, it will be reported only one time for drafting/approval/implementation.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> USAID/Health for Life will track the progress of development process.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> TBD
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> 2014

<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> This is an overall guiding plan for Government of Nepal and other stakeholders working in the health sector. Providing technical assistance is one of the key intermediate results of the Health for Life project, in collaboration with external development partners and USAID/Nepal's overall work in technical assistance.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> National
<b>Baseline Units:</b> National
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Debendra Adhikari USAID/Nepal 5-30-14</b>

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – 3.3-4**

<b>Goal:</b> A more democratic, prosperous, and resilient Nepal
<b>DO 3:</b> Increased human capital
<b>IR 3.3:</b> Social sector policy and performance improved
<b>Linkage(s) to other Results Statements:</b> IR 1.4: Public Policy and Performance Improved, IR 2.4: Economic Growth Policy and Performance Improved
<b>Performance Indicator 3.3-4:</b> Number of districts scaling up and implementing integrated IMCI/NCP package
<b>Performance Plan and Report Indicator:</b> No <input type="checkbox"/> X <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> <b>If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):</b> <u>N/A</u> <b>If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:</b> <u>N/A</u> <b>Indicator Type:</b> <u>Outcome</u>
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Numerator: Number of districts implementing a comprehensive integrated management of childhood illness and newborn care (IMCI/NCP) package.  Denominator: NA  A comprehensive IMCI/NCP package is the integrated package of previously separate Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses (IMCI) and the Neonatal Care Program (NCP), with some additional updates.
<b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number
<b>Disaggregated by:</b> Integrated management of childhood illness and newborn care package and nutrition
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach:</b> USAID and the Ministry of Health and Population have prioritized the improvement of maternal, newborn and child health rolling out an integrated IMCI/NCP package. This integration of IMCI and NCP will create synergy in program implementation. It is important to monitor the progress of the role out of this new policy, region by region.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b> Health for Life (H4L), Suaahara, direct G2G transfer
<b>Data Source:</b> Health for Life (H4L) Annual report, Suaahara annual report, Department of Health Services Annual Report
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b> Data are originally collected and recorded by Child Health Division and USAID implementing partners (Suaahara and H4L)
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Annual
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Sabita Tuladhar, Dan Verschneider, Debendra Adhikari
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> Health for Life and Suaahara
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> USAID/Nepal's Public Drive PPD; AIDTracker Plus
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b> 2015
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Department of Health Services/Ministry of Health and Population final report will available only one year after the program implementation. So, USAID will use the information based on the data presented by DOHS in the annual review workshop.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> USAID will ensure the data quality, contacting senior officials of the Child Health Division based on reimbursement requests from the MOHP.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis:</b> USAID will analyze the data for this indicator at the district level, comparing IMCI/NCP intervention performance between districts.
<b>Mission/Team Review:</b> Information will be analyzed as part of regular portfolio reviews. The USAID mission will use the information to track progress of the scaling up and implementation of the integrated child health (IMCI/NCP) program.

BASELINE AND TARGETS
<b>Baseline Timeframe:</b> August 2014
<b>Rationale for Targets:</b> Target will set based on approved workplan of USAID implementing partners and approved annual work plan and budget plan of MOHP.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b> NA
GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> District
<b>Baseline Units:</b> District
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: Debendra Adhikari USAID/Nepal 5-30-14</b>

## **ANNEX II: EVALUATION PLAN**

## ANNEX III: MULTI-YEAR EVALUATION PLAN

This evaluation plan will be updated as the Mission finalizes the dates of its evaluations. Teams should start from the date they need to have the report completed and work backwards to determine the timing of SOW drafting, procurement, and field work.

Evaluation	FY14				FY15				FY16				FY17				FY18			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4																
Goal: CDCS-wide performance evaluation (1) (GON restrictions) (DATES TBD)																				
Goal: CDCS-wide performance evaluation (2) (three modes of programming foreign assistance) (DATES TBD)																				
DO 1: DO-level large-scale survey and follow-on studies (governance/institutional performance/social inclusion) (DATES TBD)																				
CEPPS IV mid-term performance evaluation																				
Sajhedari performance evaluation																				
CTIP II mid-term performance evaluation (DATES TBD)																				
DO 2: DO-level performance evaluation (1) (factors reducing extreme poverty) (DATES TBD)																				
DO 2: DO-level performance evaluation (2) (resilience) (DATES TBD)																				
Business Literacy impact evaluation (DATES TBD)																				

Evaluation	FY14				FY15				FY16				FY17				FY18			
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4																
Kisan mid-term performance evaluation (1) (spillover/diffusion effect)																				
Kisan performance evaluation (2) (specific combination of ag. intervention(s))																				
IFPRI performance evaluation																				
Hariyo Ban/Initiative for Climate Change Adaptation (ICCA) performance evaluation (1) (local/community plans of action)																				
Hariyo Ban (methods TBD) performance evaluation (2) (forestry)																				
Biodiversity/Freshwater biodiversity/Wildlife Research Center/Anti-poaching Intervention(s) performance evaluation (DATES TBD)																				
DO 3: DO-level performance evaluation/retrospective analysis (DATES TBD)																				
Early Grade Reading Program performance evaluation/cost-effectiveness analysis (DATES TBD)																				
Early Grade Reading Program impact evaluation (DATES TBD)																				
Suaahara impact evaluation																				
Health for Life (H4L) performance evaluation (DATES TBD)																				

**Key**

1. Design and SOW Start																				
2. Final SOW																				
3. Awarded by																				
4. Field Work																				
5. Final Report Completed																				

## ANNEX IV: USAID/NEPAL TASK SCHEDULE

Task (Notes)	FY											
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
<b>Performance Planning</b>												
Mission-wide PMP Updates and Revisions				Annual; after Portfolio Reviews and PPRs								
Goal-level Indicator Reference Sheets – Modification					Annual							
Indicator Reference Sheets – Modification ( <i>with PPD guidance</i> )	Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly		
Indicator Reference Sheets – developed as new indicators are developed for new programs/activities ( <i>with PPD guidance</i> )	On-going, as needed											
DO M&E plans – Modification				Annual; after Portfolio Reviews and PPRs								
Activity/Implementing Partner M&E plans – modification			Annual; after Portfolio Reviews and PPRs									
<b>Performance Reviews, Analysis, and Learning</b>												
CDCS Portfolio Review (Mission-wide, including Goal, DOs, IRs, and sub-IRs)	Semi-Annual								Semi-Annual			
DO-level Portfolio Review (preparation for CDCS Portfolio Review)								Semi-Annual				Semi-Annual
Other Portfolio/Performance Reviews (could be combined with Quarterly Financial Reviews, focus	On-going, as needed											

Task (Notes)	FY											
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
on environmental compliance, activity-level performance)												
Financial Reviews (pipelines, burn-rates, additional funding needs, budget reallocations)	Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly		
Geospatial Analysis and Performance Reviews			Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly
Learning Agenda – Review and Modification	Annual											
Learning Summit	Annual											
District-level meetings (in conjunction with learning site visits)												Annual
M&E training for staff and implementing partners (Specifically after new activity/implementing mechanisms are awarded)	On-going; as needed											
Learning events (Evaluation findings brown-bags, updates of the ADS 200 series, best practices, new assessment/analysis tools, etc.)	On-going; as needed											
Partner meetings	Annual											
<b>Collecting Data</b>												
Performance and Context Indicators – Goal level	On-going; as needed											
Performance and Context Indicators – DO M&E plan level	On-going; as needed											
Performance and Context Indicators – Activity level	On-going; as needed											
Baselines – Goal level indicator modification	On-going; in conjunction with PMP modifications											

Task (Notes)	FY											
	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	March	April	May	June	July	Aug	Sept
Baselines and targets – DO M&E plans and activity/implementing mechanism M&E plans	On-going; as soon as possible after PAD approvals											
<b>Uploading Data to AIDTracker Plus</b>												
Performance and Context Indicator data (including geographic components) uploaded into AIDTracker Plus	Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly		
<b>Site Visits</b>												
Data Quality Assessments – required	Every 3 years, staggered					Every 3 years, staggered						Every 3 years
Site Visits – regularly scheduled (includes environmental mitigation/management procedures)	On-going; as needed											
Integrated Site Visits	Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly			Quarterly		
<b>Evaluations (Specific evaluation tasks are included in the separate Evaluation Plan Task Schedule)</b>												
Evaluation Plans Updated (as part of a formal decision process, e.g., Portfolio Reviews)	Annual											
Evaluation Plans Updated (as evaluation “triggers” occur)												
<b>Reporting</b>												
Performance Plan and Report		Annual										
Operational Plan								Annual				

**Color Code**

DO teams lead with input from PPD

PPD and DO teams collaborate

PPD leads with input from DO teams

## ANNEX V: USAID/NEPAL GLOSSARY OF TERMS

The Tables Below Contain All Relevant Definitions

CDCS Goal and DO Measurable Definitions Table				
DO / IR	Term	Definition	IR Causal Logic/Rationale	IR Relationship to DO
<b>Goal: A More Democratic, Prosperous, and Resilient Nepal</b>				
	MORE DEMOCRATIC	Resulting in: Increased inclusion of marginalized people (Dalit, Janajati, Muslim) and women in the USAID targeted 20 districts; Increased civic and political freedoms of women and marginalized populations in targeted districts.		
	MORE PROSPEROUS	Resulting in: Increased livelihoods for targeted populations, including women, members of marginalized groups, and the poorest of the poor (less than \$1.25 per day).  Increased gains in income over time across socio-economic classes.		
	MORE RESILIENT	Resulting in individuals, institutions, and ecosystems experiencing decreased vulnerability to – and increased capacity to respond to - climactic, seismic, economic, health, and political shocks.		
	YOUTH	Individuals aged 10-29. The age-disaggregated groups that will be utilized by USAID/Nepal are as follows: 10-14, 15-19, 20-24, and 25-29.		
	MARGINALIZED POPULATIONS	Dalit, Janajati, Muslim (note that women are tracked separately and not included. Also LGBT and disabled individuals are not directly targeted by programming and therefore not counted separately)		

**DO 1: More Inclusive and Effective Governance**

<b>1.0</b>	<b>MORE INCLUSIVE</b>	Incorporating the social, political, and economic interests of women and marginalized groups (Dalit, Janajati, Muslim) in Nepal's governance at the national, district, and village level.	A recent DG assessment found that systematic marginalization and social exclusion posed significant risks to both democratic representation and political stability.	N/A
<b>1.0</b>	<b>EFFECTIVE</b>	Securing peace, providing accountability, fostering civic participation, and improving performance (including but not limited to the representation of poor and marginalized groups).	These are the major criteria for "effective governance" in Nepal, as articulated by USAID/Nepal's recent DG assessment.	N/A
<b>1.1</b>	<b>SUSTAINED</b>	There will not be a major coup, political upheaval, civil conflict, disruption of the peace process, or other precipitous worsening of Nepal's political environment.	A major shift in Nepal's political context (such as a coup, political upheaval, etc.) would drastically divert the Nepali government's attention (and resources) away from transparent and accountable service delivery.	The effectiveness of Nepal's government will be severely adversely impacted in the event of a major political upheaval.
<b>1.2</b>	<b>ACCOUNTABILITY</b>	Government of Nepal held responsible not only for stewardship of funds, but for provision of services for Nepalis, including (but not limited to) poor, and marginalized groups (qualified as excluded or disadvantaged).	If the accountability of the Nepali government is adequately strengthened, then governance will be both more inclusive and more effective.	The government in Nepal becomes more effective (in part) to the extent that it provides accountable delivery of services to its citizens.
<b>1.3.</b>	<b>CIVIC PARTICIPATION</b>	The systematic engagement of the Nepali population (particularly marginalized groups) in governmental processes, and the inclusion and meaningful participation of marginalized people and women in decision-making processes at various levels of government.	If civic participation increases for Nepali citizens, and if they are more easily and successfully able to advocate for their interests, then governance will be more inclusive and effective.	Increased civic participation and advocacy among a representative group of Nepalis will make it more likely that their interests will be represented, making governance more inclusive.
<b>1.3</b>	<b>ADVOCACY</b>	The organized and intentional endorsement of the interests of a marginalized group of Nepalis, who have both the political space and the right to promote their economic, political, and social interests.	See above.	See above.

1.4	POLICY	Laws, rules, procedures, or regulations adopted by the GON at a national or sub-national level.	If the GON – either at a national or subnational level – is able to successfully adopt and implement new policies that more adequately address the needs of a more inclusive subset of Nepali society, then governance in Nepal will be more effective and inclusive.	Improvements in public policy decision-making (and the effective implementation of those decisions) will lead to more inclusive and effective governance for Nepal's people.
1.4	PERFORMANCE	Implementation of policy promoting inclusion of marginalized groups and/or women by targeted government institutions.	See above.	See above.
<b>DO 2: Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth to Reduce Extreme Poverty</b>				
2.0	INCLUSIVE	Sufficiently incorporating the economic interests and well-being of traditionally poor (as defined by FTF: living on \$1.25 a day or less), marginalized social/economic groups identified as disadvantaged as a result of their caste/ethnicity /religious affiliation.	N/A	N/A
2.0	SUSTAINABLE	Achieving results against performance indicators that last beyond the 5-year lifespan of USAID/Nepal's CDCS, without incurring a rapid depletion in Nepal's abundant natural resources.	N/A	N/A
2.1	AGRICULTURE-BASED INCOME	Income derived from commercial activities directly related to agriculture, agricultural trade, and production/supply of inputs.	80% of Nepal's population derives their livelihoods from agriculture and agriculture-related activities	Increases in agriculture-based incomes are essential to increases in long-term economic growth. Because a broad swathe of Nepal's population relies on agricultural income, improving the fortunes of smallholder farmers is likely to overlap significantly with inclusivity

2.2	OPPORTUNITIES EXPANDED	A marked increase in the availability of identified jobs and alternative sources of income due to an improvement in one or more of the following factors: (a) access to markets; (b) access to financial services; (c) skill level; (d) social empowerment; (e) access to agricultural inputs; (f) fair institutions to support transactions; and (g) access to market information.	Opportunities - both agricultural and non-agricultural - are a means for people to escape from subsistence-level economic activities, thereby reducing incidence of extreme poverty	Macroeconomic growth is dependent on the aggregation of large numbers of individuals and firms engaging in productive economic activity at the SME level
2.3	IMPROVED	The development of a more resilient and sustainable system of natural resource utilization and natural resource management	Preservation and effective management of natural resources will render them resilient to external shocks, and therefore more likely to continue to provide a source of income in the future	Improving the resilience of natural resources (and NRM systems) will make it more likely that economic growth will be sustainable in the long run. Also, significant economic activity in hydroelectric sector.
2.3	RELATED LIVELIHOODS	Income-generating activities that are directly dependent upon the productive utilization of natural resources	"Related livelihoods" refers to incomes generated from natural resource exploitation. Preservation and effective management of those natural resources will render them resilient to external shocks, and therefore more likely to continue to provide a source of income in the future	Improving the resilience of natural resources (and NRM systems) will make it more likely that economic growth will be sustainable in the long run. Also, significant economic activity in hydroelectric sector.
2.3	RESILIENCE	Resistance to - and readiness for - a wide range of system-wide climactic, environmental, and/or economic shocks	Preservation and effective management of natural resources will render them resilient to external shocks, and therefore more likely to continue to provide a source of income in the future	Improving the resilience of natural resources (and NRM systems) will make it more likely that economic growth will be sustainable in the long run. Also, significant economic activity in hydroelectric sector.

2.4	POLICY AND PERFORMANCE IMPROVED	Tangible (and desirable) changes in one or more of the following areas: (a) policy reform, (b) policy formulation, (c) enabling environment, (d) policy implementation	Without proper policy and enabling environment, entrepreneurship is stymied and inclusive economic growth never fully materializes	Without proper policy and enabling environment, entrepreneurship is stymied and inclusive economic growth never fully materializes
<b>DO 3: Increased Human Capital</b>				
3.0	INCREASED HUMAN CAPITAL	Increased levels of educational attainment and improvements in the health and nutrition status among an inclusive set of the Nepali population, including but not limited to marginalized groups and the poorest of the poor.	Feeds up to goal: human capital accumulation necessary for prosperity. Increased human capital is both a condition and consequence of economic growth.	N/A
3.1	BETTER SKILLED	Sustained measurable improvement in reading comprehension abilities and functional literacy skill	Skill development – including but not limited to basic reading comprehension – is essential for increasing human capital and a foundational skills for life	Connecting people - especially marginalized groups - with education opportunities will lead to accumulation of human capital and gradual betterment of society
3.2	HEALTHIER	Incurring significant reductions in mortality, morbidity, and total fertility rate over time, as a result of increased health service utilization and behavior change.	Health is essential component of human capital development. NOTE: Nutrition, water, and sanitation are understood to be significant sub-components of health.	Human capital accumulation cannot take place without a healthy and well-nourished population.
3.2	WELL NOURISHED	Incurring significant reductions in stunting and wasting as a result of increases in the use of nutrition services and the use of proper nutrition and hygiene practices (11 in total) leading to improved nutritional status for children under five and pregnant and lactating women.	See above.	Human capital accumulation cannot take place without a healthy and well-nourished population.
3.3	SOCIAL SECTOR	Health and Education	In the absence of adequately strong systems in the social sector, USAID will not be able to achieve DO 3.	Improvements in human capital depend (in part) on institutional capacity and the successful

				development and implementation of policies that enable the health and education systems in Nepal to function effectively.
<b>3.3</b>	POLICY	Health or education-related laws, rules, budgets, procedures, or regulations adopted by the GON at a national or sub-national level.	See above.	See above.
<b>3.3</b>	PERFORMANCE	Implementation of policy by officials, health workers, teachers, and other related actors in the social sector.	See above.	See above.

## ANNEX VI: USAID/NEPAL INDICATOR TRACKING TABLE

USAID/Nepal Indicator Summary and Data Tracking Table																			
No.	Performance Indicators	Indicator Type/ Source	Unit of Measure	B.L. Year	B.L. Value	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		L.O. CDCS Target	Actual To Date
						T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A				
<b>GOAL: A More Democratic, Prosperous, and Resilient Nepal</b>																			
CTX 1	Average sub-score on Freedom House Index for select political rights and civil liberties subcategories	Context / Custom	Average sub-score for the 5 sub-categories			N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
CTX 2	Nepal's Natural Hazards Risk Composite Score	Context / Custom	Composite score			N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
CTX 3	Growth in (real) gross domestic product (GDP) per capita	Context / Standard (4-15)	Annual percent change			N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
Goal 4	Human Development Index (HDI) Score	Performance / Custom	Index Score	2013															
Goal 5	TBD Social Inclusion score on Nepal's Social Inclusion Survey	Performance / Custom	Index Score	2012															
<b>DO 1: More Inclusive and Effective Governance</b>																			
CTX 1-1	Change in World Bank Government Effectiveness Index Score	Context/ Standard (2.2-2)	Index Score	2013		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
CTX 1-2	Freedom in the World Political Rights sub-score for Electoral Process	Context / Standard (2.3.2-13)	Composite Score	2013		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
1-1	Proportion of target population reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal	Performance / Standard (GNDR 4)	Proportion																

## USAID/Nepal Indicator Summary and Data Tracking Table

No.	Performance Indicators	Indicator Type/ Source	Unit of Measure	B.L. Year	B.L. Value	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		L.O. CDCS Target	Actual To Date
						T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A				
	access to social, economic, and political opportunities																		
<b>IR 1.1: Peaceful Political Environment Sustained</b>																			
1.1-1	Country political stability and absence of violence score	Performance / Standard (1.6.4)	The percent change from the previous year.																
1.1-2	Percent of successfully mediated local level disputes among women, youth or people from marginalized groups	Performance / Custom	Percent, number	2014															
<b>IR 1.2: Accountability of Selected Institutions Strengthened</b>																			
1.2-1	Percent of operating unit program funds obligated through partner country systems	Performance / Custom (CBLD 2) (cross-cutting)	Percent																
1.2-2	Percent change in GON development budget execution rate	Performance / Custom (cross-cutting)	Percent																
<b>IR 1.3: Civic Participation and Advocacy Increased</b>																			
1.3-1	Local Organizational Capacity Assessment Score	Performance / Standard (CBLD 5) (2.4.1) (cross-cutting)	Composite Score	2015															
1.3-2	Percent of targeted local institutions that have annual plans (forestry, education, agriculture/livestock) with budget	Performance / Custom	Number, percent																

## USAID/Nepal Indicator Summary and Data Tracking Table

No.	Performance Indicators	Indicator Type/ Source	Unit of Measure	B.L. Year	B.L. Value	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		L.O. CDCS Target	Actual To Date
						T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A				
	allocation specifically for marginalized groups	(cross-cutting)																	
<b>IR 1.4: Public Policy and Performance Improved</b>																			
1.4-1	Number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: analyzed; Stage 2: Drafted and presented for stakeholder consultation; Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decreed; Stage 4: Passed/approved; Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun	Performance / Standard (cross-cutting) (4.5.1-24)	Number	2014															
1.4-2	Percent of targeted institutions meeting all minimum performance standards of GON (disaggregated by sector/institutions)	Performance / Custom	Number, percent																
1.4-3	<b>TBD</b> Percent of respondents satisfied with government services as provided by target institutions	Performance / Custom (cross-cutting)	Percent																
<b>DO 2: Inclusive and Sustainable Economic Growth to Reduce Extreme Poverty</b>																			
CTX 2-1	Change in sales volume of selected agricultural inputs	Context / Custom	Sales Volume	2014		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
CTX 2-2	Nepal's Ease of Doing Business "Distance to Frontier" Score	Context / Custom	Percent	2014		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
2-1	Prevalence of Poverty: percent of people living on less than \$1.25 per day	Performance / FTF Standard (4-17)	Percent	2013															

## USAID/Nepal Indicator Summary and Data Tracking Table

No.	Performance Indicators	Indicator Type/ Source	Unit of Measure	B.L. Year	B.L. Value	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		L.O. CDCS Target	Actual To Date
						T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A				
2-2	Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index Score	Performance / FTF Standard (4.5-19)	Index Score	2013															
2-3	Growth in (real) gross domestic product (GDP) per capita	Performance / Standard (4-15)	Annual percent change	2012															
<b>IR 2.1: Agriculture-Based Income Increased</b>																			
2.1-1	Daily per capita expenditures (as proxy for income) in USG assisted areas	Performance / FTF Standard (4.5-9)	2010 USD	2013															
2.1-2	Gross margin per hectare, animal or cage of selected product	Performance / FTF Standard (4.5-16, 17, 18)	Dollars/hectare	2014															
<b>IR 2.2: Small Enterprise Opportunities Expanded</b>																			
2.2-1	Number of medium, small, and micro-enterprises established and/or expanded as a result of USG assistance	Performance / Custom	Number of MSMEs																
2.2-2	Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation	Performance / Standard (4.5-2)	Number of FTEs	2014															
<b>IR 2.3: Resilience of Targeted Natural Resources and Related Livelihoods Improved</b>																			
2.3-1	Number of hectares of biological significance and/or natural resources showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance	Performance / Standard (4.8.1-26)	Number of hectares	2012															

## USAID/Nepal Indicator Summary and Data Tracking Table

No.	Performance Indicators	Indicator Type/ Source	Unit of Measure	B.L. Year	B.L. Value	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		L.O. CDCS Target	Actual To Date
						T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A				
2.3-2	Quantity of greenhouse gas emissions, measured in metric tons of CO2, reduced or sequestered as a result of USG assistance	Performance / Standard (4.8-7)	Metric tons CO2 equivalent (CO2e)	2012															
2.3-3	Number of stakeholders with increased capacity to adapt to the impacts of climate change	Performance / Standard (4.8.2-26)	Number of stakeholders	2012															
2.3-4	Number of people with increased economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance	Performance / Standard (4.8.1-6)	Number of people	2012															
<b>IR 2.4: Economic Growth Policy and Performance Improved</b>																			
2.4-1	Number of policies/regulations/administrative procedures in each of the following stages of development as a result of USG assistance in each case: Stage 1: analyzed; Stage 2: Drafted and presented for stakeholder consultation; Stage 3: Presented for legislation/decreed; Stage 4: Passed/approved; Stage 5: Passed for which implementation has begun (1.4-1)	Performance / Standard (4.5.1-24)	Number of policies/ regulations/ administrative procedures	2014															
<b>DO 3: Increased Human Capital</b>																			
CTX 3-1	Average primary school dropout rate for students grades 1-3 within EGRP Zone of Influence	Context / Custom	Percent			N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	

## USAID/Nepal Indicator Summary and Data Tracking Table

No.	Performance Indicators	Indicator Type/ Source	Unit of Measure	B.L. Year	B.L. Value	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		L.O. CDCS Target	Actual To Date
						T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A				
<b>CTX 3-2</b>	General government expenditure on health as a percentage of Total Health Expenditure (THE)	Context / Custom	Percent			N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A		N/A	
<b>3-1</b>	Percent of births attended by a skilled birth attendant (doctor or nurse) (proxy for maternal mortality ratio)	Performance / Standard (3.1.6.1-1)	Percent	2014															
<b>3-2</b>	Modern method contraceptive prevalence rate (proxy for fertility rate)	Performance / Standard (3.1.7-38)	Percent	2014															
<b>3-3</b>	Newborn mortality rate	Performance / Standard (3.1.6-60)	Per 1,000	2014															
<b>3-4</b>	Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age	Performance / Standard (3.1.9-11)	Percent	2012															
<b>3-5</b>	Proportion of students who, by the end of two grades of primary schooling, demonstrate that they can read and understand the meaning of grade level text	Performance / Standard (3.2.1-27)	Percent	2013															
<b>IR 3.1: A Better-Skilled, Literate Population</b>																			
<b>3.1-1</b>	Average Early Grade Reading Assessment Score among students in USAID/Nepal's Zone of Influence	Performance / Custom	Percentage Points	2013															
<b>3.1-2</b>	Adult literacy rate of target population in FTF Zone of Influence (ZOI)	Performance / Custom	Percentage Points	2014															
<b>IR 3.2: A Healthier and Well-Nourished Population</b>																			
<b>3.2-1</b>	Percent of births receiving at least 4 antenatal care (ANC) visits during pregnancy *proxy for maternal mortality	Performance / Standard (3.1.6.1-2)	Percent	2014															

## USAID/Nepal Indicator Summary and Data Tracking Table

No.	Performance Indicators	Indicator Type/ Source	Unit of Measure	B.L. Year	B.L. Value	2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019		L.O. CDCS Target	Actual To Date
						T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A	T	A				
3.2-2	Prevalence of exclusive breast-feeding of children under six months of age	Performance / Standard (3.1.9.1-4)	Percent	2012															
3.2-3	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet	Performance / Standard (3.1.9.1-1)	Percent	2012															
<b>IR 3.3: Social Sector Policy and Performance Improved</b>																			
3.3-1	Dollar value of School Sector Reform Program budget allocated to improving early grade reading outcomes	Performance / Custom	USD value	2014															
3.3-2	Percent of women from marginalized groups attended by skilled doctor, nurse or midwife during last birth	Performance / Custom	Percent	2014															
3.3-3	Nepal Health Sector Plan III approved (Y/N)	Performance / Custom	Y/N	2014															
3.3-4	Number of districts scaling up and implementing integrated IMCI/NCP package	Performance / Custom	Number of districts	2014															

## **ANNEX VII: REFERENCES**

F Bureau: Master Indicator List; Cross-Cutting Indicator Reference Sheets; Indicator Reference Sheets, Objectives 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5.

Guidance for Global Health Initiative Country Strategies GHI, Guidance 2.0.

PEPFAR Next Generation Indicators Reference Guide, version 1.2, February 2012.

USAID/Nepal Country Development Cooperation Strategy, 2014-2019.

USAID Automated Directives System (ADS) chapters: 200 on Introduction to Programming Policy; 201 on Planning; 203 on Assessing and Learning; 205 Integrating Gender Equality and Female Empowerment in USAID's Program Cycle dated 7/17/13

USAID/Nepal: Draft Mission Order: Evaluation

USAID/Nepal: Mission Order: Performance Monitoring

USAID/Nepal: Draft Mission Order: GESI

# ANNEX VIII: INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET TEMPLATES AND INSTRUCTIONS

USAID/Nepal Context Indicator Reference Sheet – Indicator No. ##	
Goal:	
DO 1:	
IR 1.1:	
Sub-IR 1.1.1:	
Number/Name of Context Indicator:	
Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:	
CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s):	
Unit of Measure:	
Disaggregated by:	
Rationale or Management Utility <i>(optional)</i> :	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID	
Data Source:	
Method of Data Acquisition:	
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:	
Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:	
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID <i>(optional)</i> :	
Location of Data Storage <i>(optional)</i> :	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Data Quality Considerations <i>(optional)</i> :	
BASELINE	
Baseline Trend <i>(optional)</i> :	
Other Notes <i>(optional)</i> :	
GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION	
Data Reporting Units:	
Baseline Units <i>(optional)</i> :	
CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR	
Changes to Indicator:	
Other Notes <i>(optional)</i> :	
THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: CIRS Template:	

### Instructions for Completing the Context Indicator Reference Sheet

**Goal:** Enter the full name and number of the relevant results statement.

**DO 1:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement.

**IR 1.1:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement.

**Sub-IR 1.1.1:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement.

**Number/Name of Context Indicator:** As applicable, enter the full name and number of the relevant results statement. Note that the number for Context Indicators should be linked to the relevant result number, for example Indicator “1.1.CX1” for an indicator at the IR level, or indicator “1.1.1.CX1” for an indicator at the Sub-IR level.

**Indicate whether this is a Condition, Critical Assumption, or Risk Indicator:** As applicable, enter the full name and number of the relevant results statement.

#### CONTEXT INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Define the specific words or elements used in the indicator. Remember to define any terms that may be ambiguous. For example how do you define training? Is there a minimum requirement or standard? How are classrooms defined? How is “improvement” qualified and so forth?

**FOR STANDARD INDICATORS:** The first section – labeled “USAID standard definition:” – should be inserted from the foreign assistance standard indicator reference sheet. The second section – labeled “USAID/Nepal’s use of this standard indicator:” – is where additional information specific to USAID/Nepal can be included. (For standard indicators where additional details (i.e., Malawi specific) are not needed, then delete the “USAID standard definition” and “USAID/Nepal’s use of this standard indicator” labels.)

**FOR CUSTOM INDICATORS:** Since there is no standard indicator definition, the two labels utilized above are not needed.

**FOR ALL PERCENTAGE INDICATORS:** Need to define both the numerator and denominator at the end of the definition.

**Unit of Measure:** Enter the unit of measure (number of..., percentage of..., or US dollars). Clarify the minimum or maximum values if needed (e.g., minimum score is 1.0 and maximum score is 5.0). Clarify if the number is cumulative or specific to the year.

**Disaggregated by:** List any planned ways of disaggregating the data (sex – male/female, youth/adult, urban/rural, region, etc.) and, if possible, justify why useful.

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** Briefly describe why this particular indicator was selected to measure the intended result and how it will be useful for managing performance.

#### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID

**Data Source:** Identify the source of data (e.g., ministry database or report; ledger of patient names, document review, structured interviews, focus group interviews, written survey, direct observation, self-reported information, and so forth). If more than one partner is reporting against a given indicator you can note it here as well. Always useful to be as specific as possible regardless of type of data source.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Describe the tools and methods for collecting the raw data. For example, participant sign-in sheets will be completed for each day of training, at the end of the training the completed sheets will be sent to the IP activity manager who will review the data for accuracy and completeness, the data will then be entered into the M&E database by the M&E data entry clerk for the completed training activity. If the indicator is constructed, such as an index or an expert panel assessment, describe the procedure for construction. Who collects the raw data and where is it stored before it gets to USAID?

**Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:** Describe how often data will be received by USAID and when.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:** Insert USAID/Nepal staff member(s) by title.

**Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):** Insert implementing partner or other external partner supplying data to USAID/Nepal when applicable. Be specific as possible, including titles.

**Location of Data Storage (optional):** Ideally, this is the pathway on USAID/Nepal’s shared drive to the specific folder and file. Important to note this as specifically as possible. In addition, a second reference to any relevant ‘actuals’ calculation notes is highly recommended for previously reported data.

<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Data Quality Considerations</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Enter the date of the most recent data quality assessment and the names of the reviewers if conducted within the past 3 fiscal years.
<b>BASELINE</b>
<b>Baseline Trend</b> <i>(optional)</i> : State the timeframe (quarter, year, etc.) that will serve as the baseline value for this indicator. If baselines have not been set, identify when and how this will be done. While this information is optional for the PIRS, data tracking tables must identify a baseline timeframe and value. See ADS 203.3.9 for more information on baselines.
<b>Other Notes</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Changes made to targets during annual reviews can be discussed here as well as any other noteworthy items.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units</b> : State the spatial units for reporting the indicator data, based on which data is aggregated to project level. In USAID/Nepal, the geographic units are fixed as VDC/Municipality and District. Sum of the data from these units is the project level data. Although there may be data disaggregated at units below VDC/Municipality level, the reporting units are VDC/Municipality or District. A table showing the data for each reporting unit must be attached with this. This reporting requirement may not apply to indicators that provide only qualitative information or statements.
<b>Baseline Units</b> <i>(optional)</i> : State the spatial units for reporting the baseline for this indicator, based on which performance profile at sub-project level geographic units may be created. In USAID/Nepal, the geographic units are fixed as VDC/Municipality, and District. If the baseline is not disaggregated at these units, mention the unit properly – whether the baseline data is for district, project, national or any other geographic levels.
<b>CHANGES TO CONTEXT INDICATOR</b>
<b>Changes to Indicator</b> : Document here any changes to indicator, such as a change in the how the data is collected, not changes in the indicator data. Specify (1) the date of the change (2) the change that was made, and (3) the reason for the change.
<b>Other Notes</b> <i>(optional)</i> : Use this space as needed.
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:</b> Insert full date. <b>CIRS Template:</b> Insert version number and date.

**USAID/Nepal Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – Indicator No. ##**

<b>Goal:</b>
<b>DO 1:</b>
<b>IR 1.1/Project Purpose:</b>
<b>Sub-IR 1.1.1/Project Sub-Purpose:</b>
<b>Project Sub-Sub-Purpose:</b>
<b>Linkage(s) to other Results Statements (<i>be specific</i>):</b>
<b>Number/Name of Performance Indicator:</b>
<b>Performance Plan and Report Indicator:</b> No ___ Yes ___ <b>If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):</b> _____ <b>If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:</b> _____ <b>Indicator Type:</b>
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>Precise Definition(s):</b> [Insert definition] <b>Numerator:</b> [Insert when applicable] <b>Denominator:</b> [Insert when applicable]
<b>Unit of Measure:</b>
<b>Disaggregated by:</b>
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:</b>
<b>Data Source:</b>
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b>
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b>
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b>
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>Location of Data Storage (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>Potential Data Limitations and Significance (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>Mission/Team Review (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>Rationale for Targets (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>Other Notes (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b>
<b>Baseline Units (<i>optional</i>):</b>
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:</b> PIRS Template:

### Instructions for Completing the USAID/Nepal's Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Goal:** Enter the full name and number of the relevant results statement.

**DO 1:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement.

**IR 1.1 / Project Purpose:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement (and purpose statement).

**Sub-IR 1.1.1 / Sub-purpose:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement (and sub-purpose statement).

**Sub-sub-purpose:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant sub-sub-purpose statement.

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements (*be specific*):** Enter the full name and number of the relevant results statement – this could include other IRs or sub-IRs within the same DO, or DOs. This could also include links to GOI Development Initiatives and/or National Development Plan.

**Number/Name of Performance Indicator:** Enter the full title of the indicator. Enter the Standard Indicator Number, Presidential Indicator Number, and/or CDCS DO Number. Note that the number for Custom Indicators should be linked to the relevant result number, for example Indicator “1.1.C1” for an indicator at the IR level, or indicator “1.1.1.C1” for an indicator at the Sub-IR level.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** Enter yes or no, and clarify which reporting years(s). (For example: Yes, reporting data for fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017.) **Foreign Assistance Framework:** State program area and element aligned to funding source      **Indicator Type:** Output/Outcome/Impact

#### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Define the specific words or elements used in the indicator. Remember to define any terms that may be ambiguous. For example how do you define training? Is there a minimum requirement or standard? How are classrooms defined? How is “improvement” qualified and so forth?

**FOR STANDARD INDICATORS:** The first section – labeled “USAID standard definition:” – should be inserted from the foreign assistance standard indicator reference sheet. The second section – labeled “USAID/Nepal’s use of this standard indicator:” – is where additional information specific to USAID/Nepal can be included. (For standard indicators where additional details (i.e., Nepal specific) are not needed, then delete the “USAID standard definition” and “USAID/Nepal’s use of this standard indicator” labels.)

**FOR CUSTOM INDICATORS:** Since there is no standard indicator definition, the two labels utilized above are not needed.

**FOR ALL PERCENTAGE INDICATORS:** Need to define both the numerator and denominator at the end of the definition.

**Unit of Measure:** Enter the unit of measure (number of..., percentage of..., or US dollars). Clarify the minimum or maximum values if needed (e.g., minimum score is 1.0 and maximum score is 5.0). Clarify if the number is cumulative or specific to the year.

**Disaggregated by:** List any planned ways of disaggregating the data (sex – male/female, youth/adult, urban/rural, region, etc.) and, if possible, justify why useful.

**Rationale or Management Utility, Integration Approach (*optional*):** Briefly describe why this particular indicator was selected to measure the intended result and how it will be useful for managing performance. Also include how (and whether) this indicator helps support the Mission’s integration strategy. For example, this could be through linkages to other results statements, linkages to the GOI’s initiatives, integration at the activity level, common beneficiaries, common impact, or other.

#### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID

**Activities/Implementing Mechanisms:** List the names of the activities and the Implementing Partners (if relevant). For example, G2G “Health Capacity grant to the Ministry of Health” or “Local Governance Strengthening Program, implemented by XYZ Organization.”

**Data Source:** Identify the source of data (e.g., ministry database or report; ledger of patient names, document review, structured interviews, focus group interviews, written survey, direct observation, self-reported information, and so forth). Always useful to be as specific as possible regardless of type of data source.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Describe the tools and methods for collecting the raw data. For example, participant sign-in sheets will be completed for each day of training, at the end of the training the completed sheets will be sent to the IP activity manager who will review the data for accuracy and completeness, the data will then be entered into the M&E database by the M&E data entry clerk for the completed training activity . If the indicator is constructed, such as an index

or an expert panel assessment, describe the procedure for construction. Who collects the raw data and where is it stored before it gets to USAID?
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Describe how often data will be received by USAID and when.
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Insert USAID/Nepal staff member(s) by title.
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID (optional):</b> Insert implementing partner or other external partner supplying data to USAID/Nepal when applicable. Be specific as possible, including titles.
<b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b> Ideally, this is the pathway on USAID/Nepal's shared drive to the specific folder and file. Important to note this as specifically as possible. In addition, a second reference to any relevant 'actuals' calculation notes is highly recommended for previously reported data.
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> Enter the date of the most recent data quality assessment and the names of the reviewers if conducted within the past 3 fiscal years.
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> Enter the planned date for subsequent data quality assessments.
<b>Known Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b> Enter any major data limitations from summary section of DQA checklist or other known sources.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> Responds directly to major data limitations listed above when the USAID Operating Unit has determined that action must be taken.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> Potential examples include simple number, duplicated/unduplicated count, estimate from representative household survey, estimate taking into account projected population growth rates, and so forth.
<b>Mission/Team Review (optional):</b> Explain the internal USAID Operating Unit activities when this will be reviewed and analyzed for management and learning purposes (e.g., DO Office quarterly meeting, annual portfolio review – Q3 or September, After action review, Stakeholder meeting, etc.).
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b> State the timeframe (quarter, year, etc.) that will serve as the baseline value for this indicator. If baselines have not been set, identify when and how this will be done. While this information is optional for the PIRS, data tracking tables must identify a baseline timeframe and value. See ADS 203.3.9 for more information on baselines.
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> Explain the basis on which targets are set (e.g., identify specific trends to make reasonable projections based on anticipated level of effort and resources). While this information is optional for the PIRS, data tracking tables must include rationales for targets along with target values. See ADS 203.3.9 for more information on targets. A file pathway referencing a document with a more detailed explanation of how the targets were set could be included here.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> State the spatial units for reporting the indicator data, based on which data is aggregated to project level. In USAID/Nepal, the geographic units are fixed as VDC/Municipality and District. Sum of the data from these units is the project level data. Although there may be data disaggregated at units below VDC/Municipality level, the reporting units are VDC/Municipality or District. A table showing the data for each reporting unit must be attached with this. This reporting requirement may not apply to indicators that provide only qualitative information or statements.
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> State the spatial units for reporting the baseline for this indicator, based on which performance profile at sub-project level geographic units may be created. In USAID/Nepal, the geographic units are fixed as VDC/Municipality, and District. If the baseline is not disaggregated at these units, mention the unit properly – whether the baseline data is for district, project, national or any other geographic levels.

**Activity Performance Indicator Reference Sheet – Indicator No. ##**

<b>Project Goal:</b>
<b>Project Purpose 1.1:</b>
<b>Sub-Purpose 1.1.1:</b>
<b>Linkage(s) to other USAID Results Statements (be specific):</b>
<b>Activity Name:</b>
<b>Number/Name of Performance Indicator:</b>
<b>Performance Plan and Report Indicator:</b> No ___ Yes ___ <b>If yes, for which Fiscal Year(s):</b> _____ <b>If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:</b> _____ <b>Indicator Type:</b>
<b>PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION</b>
<b>Precise Definition(s):</b> [Insert definition] <b>Numerator:</b> [Insert when applicable] <b>Denominator:</b> [Insert when applicable]
<b>Unit of Measure:</b>
<b>Disaggregated by:</b>
<b>Rationale or Management Utility, USAID Integration Approach (optional):</b>
<b>PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID</b>
<b>Sub-Activities/Sub-contracts/Sub-awards:</b>
<b>Data Source:</b>
<b>Method of Data Acquisition:</b>
<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b>
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b>
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b>
<b>Location of Data Storage (optional):</b>
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b>
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:</b>
<b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b>
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b>
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b>
<b>Presentation of Data (optional):</b>
<b>Initial Review Conducted by (optional):</b>
<b>Team Review (optional):</b>
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b>
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b>
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b>
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b>
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b>
<b>CHANGES TO PERFORMANCE INDICATOR</b>
<b>Changes to Indicator:</b>

## Instructions for Completing the Activity Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

**Goal:** Enter the full name and number of the relevant results statement.

**DO 1:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement.

**IR 1.1:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement.

**Sub-IR 1.1.1:** Enter the full name and, as applicable, the number of the relevant results statement.

**Linkage(s) to other Results Statements** (*be specific*): Enter the full name and number of the relevant results statement – this could include other IRs or sub-IRs within the same USAID DO, or DOs. This could also include links to GOI Development Initiatives and/or National Development Plan. This section will help identify coordination needs at the activity level.

**Number/Name of Performance Indicator:** Enter the full title of the indicator. Note that the number for Custom Indicators should be linked to the relevant result number, for example Indicator “1.1.C1” for an indicator at the IR level, or indicator “1.1.1.C1” for an indicator at the Sub-IR level. If this is a foreign assistance standard indicator, include the standard indicator number. For example, indicator “1.1.1.S1/3.2.1-18” to reference the result the indicator is related to as well as the standard indicator number.

**Performance Plan and Report Indicator:** Enter yes or no, and clarify which reporting years(s). (For example: Yes, reporting data for fiscal years 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017.) **Foreign Assistance Framework:** State program area and element aligned to funding source **Indicator Type:** Standard/Custom (and optional Output/Outcome/Impact)

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Define the specific words or elements used in the indicator. Remember to define any terms that may be ambiguous. For example how do you define training? Is there a minimum requirement or standard? How are classrooms defined? How is “improvement” qualified and so forth?

**FOR STANDARD INDICATORS:** The first section – labeled “USAID standard definition:” – should be inserted from the foreign assistance standard indicator reference sheet. The second section – labeled “USAID/Nepal’s use of this standard indicator:” – is where additional information specific to USAID/Nepal can be included. (For standard indicators where additional details (i.e., Nepal specific) are not needed, then delete the “USAID standard definition” and “USAID/Nepal’s use of this standard indicator” labels.) The third section – labeled “Implementing Partner’s use of this standard indicator:” – is where additional information specific to the IP’s activity, scope of work, or sub-activities can be included.

**FOR CUSTOM INDICATORS:** Since there is no standard indicator definition, the two labels utilized above are not needed.

**FOR ALL PERCENTAGE INDICATORS:** Need to define both the numerator and denominator at the end of the definition.

**Unit of Measure:** Enter the unit of measure (number of..., percentage of..., or US dollars). Clarify the minimum or maximum values if needed (e.g., minimum score is 1.0 and maximum score is 5.0). Clarify if the number is cumulative or specific to the year.

**Disaggregated by:** List any planned ways of disaggregating the data (sex – male/female, youth/adult, urban/rural, region, etc.) and, if possible, justify why useful.

**Rationale or Management Utility** (*optional*): Briefly describe why this particular indicator was selected to measure the intended result and how it will be useful for managing performance.

### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID

**Sub-Activities/Sub-contracts/Sub-awards:** List the names of the sub-activities, components, and the sub-contractors and/or sub-awards (if relevant). For example, or “Public Accounting Training grant,” implemented by XYZ Organization.”

**Data Source:** Identify the source of data (e.g., ministry database or report; ledger of patient names, document review, structured interviews, focus group interviews, written survey, direct observation, self-reported information, and so forth). If more than one sub-awardee or sub-contractor is reporting against a given indicator you can note it here as well. Always useful to be as specific as possible regardless of type of data source.

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Describe the tools and methods for collecting the raw data. For example, participant sign-in sheets will be completed for each day of training, at the end of the training the completed sheets will be sent to the IP activity manager who will review the data for accuracy and completeness, the data will then be entered into the M&E database by the M&E data entry clerk for the completed training sub-activity. If the indicator is constructed, such as an index or an expert panel assessment, describe the procedure for construction. Who collects the raw data and where is it stored before it gets to USAID?

<b>Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition:</b> Describe how often data will be received by USAID and when.
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Data at USAID:</b> Insert USAID/Nepal staff member(s) by title.
<b>Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:</b> Insert the name of the individual who is responsible for this indicator data, who reports the data to the prime, and who sends it to USAID/Nepal. Be specific as possible, including titles.
<b>Location of Data Storage:</b> Ideally, this is the pathway on the Implementing Partner's shared drive to the specific folder and file. Important to note this as specifically as possible. In addition, a second reference to any relevant 'actuals' calculation notes is highly recommended for previously reported data.
<b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>
<b>Date of Most Recent Data Quality Assessment and Name(s) of Reviewer(s):</b> Enter the date of the most recent data quality assessment and the names of the reviewers, as well as the dates.
<b>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional):</b> Enter the planned date for subsequent data quality assessments.
<b>Known Data Limitations and Significance (optional):</b> Enter any major data limitations from summary section of DQA checklist or other known sources.
<b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations (optional):</b> Responds directly to major data limitations listed above when the USAID Operating Unit has determined that action must be taken.
<b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>
<b>Data Analysis (optional):</b> Potential examples include simple number, duplicated/unduplicated count, estimate from representative household survey, estimate taking into account projected population growth rates, and so forth.
<b>Presentation of Data (optional):</b> Include any particularly useful types of graphs or tables. In addition, to the indicator data would comparisons with other data be useful?
<b>Initial Review Conducted by (optional):</b> Insert staff member(s) by title who will conduct initial review and data analysis. This could be different than the person listed above responsible for data acquisition/collection.
<b>Team Review (optional):</b> Explain the USAID Operating Unit's and IP's activities when this will be reviewed and analyzed for management and learning purposes (e.g., USAID's annual portfolio review – Q3 or September, Stakeholder meetings, Collaborative Learning and Adapting sessions, Component reviews, conference or workshop presentation, annual reporting, quarterly strategic review sessions, evaluations, etc.).
<b>BASELINE AND TARGETS</b>
<b>Baseline Timeframe (optional):</b> State the timeframe (quarter, year, etc.) that will serve as the baseline value for this indicator. If baselines have not been set, identify when and how this will be done. While this information is optional for the PIRS, data tracking tables must identify a baseline timeframe and value. See ADS 203.3.9 for more information on baselines.
<b>Rationale for Targets (optional):</b> Explain the basis on which targets are set (e.g., identify specific trends to make reasonable projections based on anticipated level of effort and resources). While this information is optional for the PIRS, data tracking tables must include rationales for targets along with target values. See ADS 203.3.9 for more information on targets. A file pathway referencing a document with a more detailed explanation of how the targets were set could be included here.
<b>GEOGRAPHIC DIMENSION</b>
<b>Data Reporting Units:</b> State the spatial units for reporting the indicator data, based on which data is aggregated to project level. In USAID/Nepal, the geographic units are fixed as VDC/Municipality and District. Sum of the data from these units is the project level data. Although there may be data disaggregated at units below VDC/Municipality level, the reporting units are VDC/Municipality or District. A table showing the data for each reporting unit must be attached with this. This reporting requirement may not apply to indicators that provide only qualitative information or statements.
<b>Baseline Units (optional):</b> State the spatial units for reporting the baseline for this indicator, based on which performance profile at sub-project level geographic units may be created. In USAID/Nepal, the geographic units are fixed as VDC/Municipality, and District. If the baseline is not disaggregated at these units, mention the unit properly – whether the baseline data is for district, project, national or any other geographic levels.
<b>Other Notes (optional):</b> Use this space as needed.
<b>THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:</b> Insert full date. <b>PIRS Template:</b> Insert version number and date.

## ANNEX IX: RESULTS CHANGE TRACKING TABLE

Item	Source Document/Date and/or Version	Description as Listed Previously	Status <i>(Revise, Add, Drop)</i>	Revision and Date	Comments
IR X.X	Approved CDCS, dated	"Name of Result "	Revise	"New Name of Result " (approved by DO team Lead on DATE)	Reason for change

## ANNEX X: DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT WORKSHEET

USAID/Nepal has included two DQA Worksheet instruments that can be utilized by Mission staff to assess data quality of performance indicators. The benefit of this instrument is that it utilizes a streamlined format, yet still allows the assessment team to detail overarching details of each of the five data quality characteristics. The second tool has been incorporated because it provides more detailed lines of inquiry to guide the assessment team and, thereby, naturally prompt comprehensive discussions. While both instruments incorporate a component that summarizes findings and data quality improvement recommendations, the second tool has an Action Plan which specifically captures each identified needed action, the dates that these actions will be accomplished, and the responsible parties. The idea is that this will ensure identified improvements will be acted upon in a timely manner.

### DQA Instrument No. 1

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet			
DO or IR:			
Indicator:			
Unit:			
Reviewer(s):			
Date Reviewed:			
Data Source:			
Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W?			
Criterion	Definition	Yes or No	Explanation <i>(NOTE: the column below includes an illustrative example using "sales data"; the Mission will determine appropriate explanations)</i>
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Face Validity:</b> Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result?</li> <li>• <b>Attribution:</b> Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project?</li> <li>• <b>Measurement Error.</b> Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed.</li> </ul>	Y / N	<p><b>Face Validity:</b> the indicator is a direct measure of the result, i.e., sales volume of improved seed varieties directly tracks production and distribution "selected inputs for selected crops." (The focus on maize is consistent with the Mission's decision to emphasize maize and rice as staple commodities).</p> <p><b>Attribution:</b> the indicator data reflect sales by firms that have received direct assistance from a USAID project as well as those that have not. However, the policy and regulatory reforms that have resulted from USAID project interventions have benefitted all firms in the sector and thus some level of attribution across all firms is plausible. Taken as a whole, this indicator reflects a moderate to high level of attribution to USAID intervention.</p> <p><b>Measurement error:</b> the indicator data are secondary and thus prone to some level of error. However, sales data are transactional in nature and thus tend to be fairly reliable. In addition, the producer associate that aggregates the data has good procedures in place for</p>

			collecting data from its member firms and limiting transcription error. After reviewing all procedures/ systems, measurement error appears to be low.
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription? For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Were instruments, especially participant surveys, pre-tested?</li> <li>• Were staff properly trained in data collection and interacting with target communities?</li> </ul>	Y / N	See note above regarding measurement error. Also, take into consideration that instruments should be pre-tested to ensure integrity. This is especially true for participant surveys or instruments, which are translated into multiple languages. Additionally, it is critical that staff such as enumerators are properly trained in data collection and that the proper supervision is in place to ensure quality control.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels? For opinion surveys or data collection tools, which a broader in nature, were steps taken to ensure that biases are addressed?	Y / N	Sales data are transactional and thus very precise. Because this is a direct indicator of the result, it provides high value for decision-making. For data which are not precise in nature, the DQA reviewer should ask further questions to ensure that the lack of precision is not sufficient enough to distort the data.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y / N	Data are derived from sales records and reflect very stable data collection, collation and aggregation processes.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e., in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y / N	Data are collected on a semi-annual basis and plans are in place to increase frequency of data collection to quarterly.

**A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:**

Example 1:

Data for this indicator are of high quality and are highly useful for management. No actions are required at this time.

Example 2:

Data has certain weaknesses, which are being addressed in the following manner:

- Training for enumerators;
- Pre-testing of instruments; and
- Greater attention paid to quality of translation for survey questions.

**DQA Instrument No. 2**

**Data Quality Assessment Checklist and Recommended Procedures**

1. In which FY did your project begin?
2. Upon award did the Mission provide you with a list of indicators you are to report on?
3. Did the Mission provide you with complete PIRS for those indicators?

<b>USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name:</b>	
<b>Title of Performance Indicator:</b>	
<b>Linkage to Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure, if applicable (i.e. Program Area, Element, etc.):</b>	
<b>Result This Indicator Measures [For USAID only]</b> (i.e., Specify the Development Objective, Intermediate Result, or Project Purpose, etc.):	
<b>Data Source(s):</b>	
<b>Partner or Contractor Who Provided the Data:</b>	
<b>Period for Which the Data Are Being Reported:</b>	
<b>Is This Indicator a Standard or Custom Indicator?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator</b> <input type="checkbox"/> <b>Custom</b> (Created by the OU; not standard)
<b>Data Quality Assessment methodology:</b>	
<b>Date(s) of Assessment:</b>	
<b>USAID Assessment Team Members:</b>	
<b>Data Source / Implementing Partner Team Members:</b>	
<b>USAID Mission/OU Verification of DQA</b>	
<b>Team Leader Officer approval</b>	
X _____	

		YES	NO	COMMENTS
<b>VALIDITY – Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result.</b>				
1	Does the information collected measure what it is supposed to measure? (E.g. A valid measure of overall nutrition is healthy variation in diet; Age is not a valid measure of overall health.)			
2	Do results collected fall within a plausible range?			
3	Is there reasonable assurance that the data collection methods being used do not produce systematically biased data (e.g. consistently over- or under-counting)?			
4	Are sound research methods being used to collect the data?			
<b>RELIABILITY – Data should reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time.</b>				
1	When the same data collection method is used to measure/observe the same thing multiple times, is the same result produced each time? (E.g. A ruler used over and over always indicates the same length for an inch.)			
2	Are data collection and analysis methods documented in writing and being used to ensure the same procedures are followed each time?			
<b>TIMELINESS – Data should be available at a useful frequency, should be current, and should be timely enough to influence management decision making.</b>				
1	Are data available frequently enough to inform program management decisions?			
2	Are the data reported the most current practically available?			
3	Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?			
<b>PRECISION – Data have a sufficient level of detail to permit management decision making; e.g. the margin of error is less than the anticipated change.</b>				
1	Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?  (E.g. If a change of only 2% is expected and the margin of error in a survey used to collect the data is +/- 5%, then the tool is not precise enough to detect the change.)			

		YES	NO	COMMENTS
2	Has the margin of error been reported along with the data? (Only applicable to results obtained through statistical samples.)			
3	Is the data collection method/tool being used to collect the data fine-tuned or exact enough to register the expected change? (E.g. A yardstick may not be a precise enough tool to measure a change of a few millimeters.)			
<b>INTEGRITY – Data collected should have safeguards to minimize the risk of transcription error or data manipulation.</b>				
1	Are procedures or safeguards in place to minimize data transcription errors?			
2	Is there independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?			
3	Are mechanisms in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?			

SUMMARY	
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	
Significance of limitations (if any):	
Actions needed to address limitations prior to the next DQA (given level of USG control over data):	
IF NOT DATA ARE AVAILABLE FOR THE INDICATOR	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	
What concrete actions are now being taken to collect and report these data as soon as possible?	
When will data be reported?	

## **Recommendations for Conducting Data Quality Assessments**

1. Data Quality (DQ) assessor should make sure that they understand the precise definition of the indicator by checking the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet. Please address any issues of ambiguity before the DQA is conducted.
2. DQ assessor should have a copy of the methodology for data collection in hand before assessing the indicator. For USAID Missions, this information should be in the PMP's Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for each indicator. Each indicator should have a written description of how the data being assessed are supposed to be collected.
3. Each implementing partner should have a copy of the method of data collection in their files and documented evidence that they are collecting the data according to the methodology.
4. DQ assessor should record the names and titles of all individuals involved in the assessment.
5. Does the implementing partner have documented evidence that they have verified the data that has been reported? Partners should be able to provide USAID with documents (process/person conducting the verification/field visit dates/persons met/activities visited, etc.) which demonstrates that they have verified the data that was reported. Note: Verification by the partners should be an ongoing process.
6. The DQ assessor should be able to review the implementing partner files/records against the methodology for data collection laid out in the PMP (for USAID Missions only). Any data quality concerns should be documented.
7. The DQ should include a summary of significant limitations found. A plan of action, including timelines and responsibilities, for addressing the limitations should be made.

<b>DQA Follow-up Action Plan</b>				
<b>USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name:</b>				
<b>Title of Performance Indicator:</b>				
<b>Partner or Data Source:</b>				
Check when done	Task	Responsible Person/Team	Due Date	Comments
<b>Authorized IP/sub signatory:</b>				<b>(Print name)</b>
X _____				_____
<b>USAID/Nepal DQA Team Leader</b>		<b>(Print name):</b> _____		<b>Select one: AOR</b> ____
X _____				<b>Other (describe):</b> ____
				<b>COR</b> ____
<b>USAID/Nepal Development Objective/Technical Office Team Leader Approval:</b>				
X _____				<b>(Print name)</b> _____

## ANNEX XI: SOURCE VERIFICATION CHECKLIST

Performance Indicator Data Sources and Verification Documentation	
Type of Activity or Task	Documentation/Sources
Events (i.e., conference)	Sign-in sheets
	Agenda (inclusive of goal)/schedule
	Any records of IP contributing to or planning the event
	Pictures
	Any deliverables produced as a result of the event
	Copies of newspaper articles covering the event (with masthead and date)
Workshop or Training	Daily sign-in sheets ( <i>required</i> )
	Agenda/Schedule
	Curriculum
	Any presentations or hand-outs we produced for the workshop/training
	Pictures
	Copies of certificates received by graduates
	Copies of final exams/scores
Cash-for-Work	Daily sign-in sheets ( <i>required</i> )
	Photos (with workers)
Infrastructure	Photos (before, during, after)
	Engineer site reports
	Affidavits on completion by officials
	Community reports
Agriculture	Field photos (before, during, after) of harvest
	Receipts (1.e.: procurement, sales, delivery, other)
	GPS coordinates
	Trade data from Ministry
Producing Written Documents	Draft of the original documents, and final, and a record of the inputs
	Emails or copies of written inputs and revisions
	Milestone report / Score card
Day-to-day meetings/advising	Meeting notes/minutes
	Any system designed – copy of (templates) i.e.: filing system, protocol for communication, etc.
	Any procedures/protocols drafted

Media events	Newspaper articles (with masthead and date)
	Recordings of radio program with air schedule (i.e.:
	Recordings of TV program with air schedule
	Copies of print campaigns
	Print outs of number of hits on website (or screen shot of hits)
Field days	Photos (during)
	Receipts
	Sign-in sheets
Demographic information	Population-based, national household survey. (e.g., Demographic and Health Survey (DHS))
	Implementing partner-conducted survey
	Credible host country government publications/datasets (List specific name of report/dataset)
Observations	Implementing Partner site visit assessment forms and/or beneficiary proof of delivery forms
	Photos (during site visits)
Health	Health clinic patient registers (e.g., Pre-ART/ART registers, MCH register)
	Community-based registers (e.g., Health register, Nutrition register)
	Laboratory accreditation form/report
	Inoculations sign-in sheets

## ANNEX XII: MISSION M&E BUDGET TOOL

Mission Performance Management Budget Tool							
USAID/XXXX							
Result Statement	FY1	FY2	FY3	FY4	FY5	Total	Percent
<b>Goal</b>				<b>Total Program Funds</b>			<b>\$</b>
Indicator G1:							0.0%
Indicator G2:							0.0%
Indicator G3:							0.0%
External Evals. Not covered by DOs							0.0%
M&E staff salaries							0.0%
Technical Assistance							0.0%
Training							0.0%
Infrastructure and Equipment							0.0%
Support Services Contract							0.0%
Other							0.0%
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>DO Y</b>				<b>Total Program Funds</b>			<b>\$</b>
Indicator DO1:							0.0%
Indicator DO2:							0.0%
Indicator DO3:							0.0%

Project-level Indicators							0.0%
External Evals. Not covered by PO							0.0%
M&E staff salaries							0.0%
Technical Assistance							0.0%
Training							0.0%
Infrastructure and Equipment							0.0%
Support Services Contract							
Other:							
<b>Total DO Y</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>DO X</b>				<b>Total Program Funds</b>			<b>\$</b>
Indicator DO1:							0.0%
Indicator DO2:							0.0%
Indicator DO3:							0.0%
Project-level Indicators							0.0%
External Evals. Not covered by POs							0.0%
M&E staff salaries							0.0%
Technical Assistance							0.0%
Training							0.0%
Infrastructure and Equipment							0.0%
Support Services Contract							0.0%
Other: ___Data quality assessments_____							0.0%
<b>Total DO X</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Total Evaluations</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Grand Total of all M&amp;E</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>\$</b>	<b>0.0%</b>
<b>Percent Evaluations to Total M&amp;E</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	<b>0.0%</b>	