

99126  
PN-ACD-992

**IMPROVED PERFORMANCE MONITORING  
FOR THE  
BANGLADESH DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP**

**Report to The Asia Foundation/Bangladesh**



**James Fremming, Management Systems International**  
**Dr Zarina Rahman Khan, Dhaka University**  
**Dr Habibur Rahman, Dhaka University**  
**Dr Steven Rood, University of the Philippines-Baguio and Associates in Rural  
Development, Inc**

**July 4, 1998**

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The consulting team was assisted by many persons dedicated to the goal of the Democracy Partnership. Dr. Karen Casper, TAF Representative, Nilan Fernando, Assistant Representative, and Dr. Nawshad Ahmed, Senior Program Officer at TAF, were tireless in their helpful planning and facilitation of our consultations and travels in Bangladesh. The entire Asia Foundation staff in Dhaka was exceptionally kind and gracious in making our working visit a productive and enjoyable one. The Responsive Government Team at USAID/Bangladesh, led by Acting Team Leader Fazlul Karim and supported by Acting Mission Director Ann Arness, provided critically important information, assistance, and participation throughout our technical assistance. Our colleagues at BRAC, particularly Rafiqul Islam, Senior Trainer, Dr. Mohammad Golan Samdani Fakir, Director of Training, and Dr. Salehuddin Ahmed, Director of Programs, contributed not only the availability of a site for the performance measurement workshop, but significant time and thoughtful attention to current issues facing the Partnership. Finally, we were fortunate during our assistance to share information and perspectives with numerous representatives from implementing NGOs in the partnership, as well as with NGO staff and village group members in the field. This provided us with irreplaceable insight regarding the core principles and activities of the Partnership.

Most of all, we are grateful for the time and thought offered by all those we worked with. If our assistance has been successful, it is in large part due to the constructive ideas and active participation offered by our friends and colleagues in the Democracy Partnership.

J F  
Z R K  
H R  
S R

## **CONTENTS**

|  | <u>Page</u> |
|--|-------------|
| Acknowledgements                                   | 1           |
| Contents   | ii          |
| Introduction                                       | 1           |
| Methodology  | 1           |
| The Results Framework                              | 3           |
| Indicators and Data Collection                     | 6 to 23     |
| Performance Monitoring Plan                        | 7 to 17     |
| Management of Performance Monitoring               | 23          |
| Conclusion Suggested Follow-On Actions             | 24          |
| <br>   |             |
| Annexes  |             |
| • Technical assistance terms of reference          |             |
| • Schedule of activities for the consulting team   |             |
| • Performance Measurement Workshop agenda          |             |
| • Performance Measurement Workshop flipchart notes |             |
| • Democracy Partnership Operating Principles       |             |

## **INTRODUCTION**

The Democracy Partnership, comprised of the U S Agency for International Development (USAID), The Asia Foundation (TAF), and the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC), promotes the democratic aspirations of the socially and economically disadvantaged. The Partnership's current program is at its midway point, and was judged by the Partners to require a review of the performance monitoring system, including recommendations for improving upon current indicators and assistance in re-wording the DP's strategic objective statement. Such a review was conducted in late May and early June, 1998, by a team of four consultants: James Fremming, Management Systems International (team leader), Dr. Zarina Rahman Khan, Dhaka University, Dr. Habibur Rahman, Dhaka University, and Dr. Steven Rood, University of the Philippines-Baguio and Associates in Rural Development, Inc.

## **METHODOLOGY**

The team reviewed a variety of documents describing the DP's current results framework and indicators, the system for managing data collection and analysis, and the uses of performance data. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for the consultancy, as well as other preparatory documents, outlined concerns and perceived problems with the current performance monitoring system, including:

- Indicator definitions, measurement criteria and data collection methods are not uniformly understood among Partnership staff, NGO<sup>1</sup> staff and others
- The data collection process is very time consuming for some NGOs, to the point of decreasing the time available for implementing DP activities
- Data collection and use are not well matched: some data collected are not used by the Partnership, and some data that are needed are not collected
- There is insufficient clarity concerning which NGOs are most appropriate for collecting which subsets of performance data; further, the roles and responsibilities among the Partners for data design, collection, analysis and reporting need clarification
- Defining target populations and maintaining baseline values for indicators have become problematic, since the program has been expanding considerably in recent years
- The rapid appraisals done by DP staff to obtain "qualitative" data directly from DP customers (i.e., the socially and economically disadvantaged) do not complement the other data provided primarily via the NGOs. Through use of both of these data collection channels, the intended comprehensive picture is not as clearly drawn as had been expected
- In the DP results framework, the indicators at the Strategic Objective level do not capture higher-level impact from all five Intermediate Results

---

<sup>1</sup> Various terms are used to refer to the twenty-plus grassroots-level organizations implementing DP programs in the field. While in a technical sense these organizations are subgrantees to TAF's overall cooperative agreement with USAID, many people involved with the Partnership prefer language that more closely describes these groups' activities. "Implementing NGOs" was a phrase commonly used during our conversations; the consulting team is comfortable using this term, and we also use the shorter "NGOs" to refer to these implementing organizations.

The team found these concerns to be generally valid. In addition, a number of other technical and organizational issues were identified through our discussions with Partnership staff, NGOs and the NGOs' membership groups. These issues are described below in our analysis of the results framework, associated indicators and the current system of managing the performance monitoring system.

The team was tasked with carrying out a diagnosis of the current performance monitoring system and reviewing the results framework. Results of the diagnosis, vetted with Partnership staff and NGOs, would contribute to the DP's consideration of next steps toward upgrading the effectiveness of the monitoring system. An upgraded system should be responsive to requirements both internal (essentially implementation-focused grants management) and external (primarily USAID's reporting via its annual Results Review and Resource Request [R4]).

In addition to collecting technical information and perspectives from Partnership staff and implementing NGOs (in the field as well as in Dhaka), we planned and facilitated a two-day workshop on June 10 and 11 to allow Partnership staff and several representatives from DP NGOs the opportunity to work together in response to our preliminary recommendations for adjustments to the framework and indicators. From the workshop, we developed a set of recommendations in the form of a draft Performance Monitoring Plan and suggestions for short-term and long-term actions by the Partnership for sustaining an improved approach to performance monitoring and reporting.

The consultancy terms of reference, the daily schedule for the consulting team, the workshop agenda and flip-chart notes from the workshop are included as annexes to this report.

Our findings and recommendations are presented here in four sections:

- First is a discussion of the current DP results framework and proposed refinements to it, as discussed and affirmed by DP staff.
- Next is the set of performance indicators, with focus on the refinements considered jointly by the team, DP staff, and a representative group of NGOs in our various discussions.
- Third, we summarize findings concerning management of performance monitoring; these issues are in part a consequence of the choices made regarding the indicators themselves but they also involve more generic factors to consider in any plan for program performance monitoring.
- The final section is a conclusion in the form of suggested actions for Partnership consideration in follow-up to our consultancy.

## **THE RESULTS FRAMEWORK**

### **The existing framework**

The current DP framework features one strategic objective **Broadened Participation in Local Decision Making and More Equitable Justice, Especially for Women in Targeted Areas**. This is also USAID/Bangladesh's Strategic Objective 3, except that the Mission's SO includes an Intermediate Result in strengthening sustainable garment workers' labor organizations (IR 6). This IR is not included in the DP's program.

The Partnership's objective is supported in the framework by five intermediate results:

- 1 Advocacy of customer interests strengthened,
- 2 Quality of elections enhanced,
- 3 Competence of local elected bodies to identify and meet customer needs strengthened
- 4 Awareness of legal rights and obligations increased,
- 5 Quality of alternative dispute resolution improved

Associated performance indicators in the current framework are described in the USAID R4 particularly the 1997 version that includes reporting for all indicators. An additional source which features brief rationale, indicators and assumptions in the framework, is the Partnership's tabular "results" document. The reader is referred to these documents for description of these indicators.

### **An alternative framework**

Through analysis of the existing results framework, and discussions of possible improvements with the consulting team and NGO staff, the Partnership has agreed to use a new strategic objective and set of intermediate results to guide its planning and reporting in the future. Finalizing the performance indicators, data collection and analysis approaches, and USAID submission of a revised framework to USAID/Washington remain to be done, but the Partnership staff has affirmed that the basic structure of the new framework is preferred to the existing one. The new framework is presented in outline form on the following page.

**Strategic Objective IMPROVED REPRESENTATION OF INTERESTS OF DISADVANTAGED PEOPLE, ESPECIALLY WOMEN, IN TARGET AREAS**

- Indicators*
- 3 1 *Customer confidence in local governmental effectiveness*
  - 3 2 *Customer confidence in local electoral processes*
  - 3 3 *Customer confidence in local justice processes*
  - 3 4 *Percent of dispute resolutions involving women which result in decisions favorable to the woman*
  - 3 5 *Number of marriages registered*

**Intermediate Result 3 1 Responsiveness of local elected bodies and government institutions increased**

- Indicators*
- 3 1 1 *Percent of Local Elected Bodies using best practices*
  - 3 1 2 *Number of collective action initiatives by DP-supported NGOs that lead to satisfactory government response*
  - 3 1 3 *Number of associations advocating member interests in target communities*
  - 3 1 4 *Percent of customers aware of roles and responsibilities of IFB members*

**Intermediate Result 3 2 Quality of elections enhanced<sup>2</sup>**

- Indicators*
- 3 2 1 *Percent of eligible voters casting their votes according to their own choice*
  - 3 2 2 *Percent of voters having knowledge of LEB candidates election agenda*
  - 3 2 3 *Number of NGO group members elected to LEBs*
  - 3 2 4 *Number of person attending locally organized meetings for projection of candidates*
  - 3 2 5 *Percent of LEB candidates following the Election Commission s Code of Conduct*

**Intermediate Result 3 3 Customer access to justice improved**

- Indicators*
- 3 3 1 *Percent of dispute resolution cases featuring improved ADR techniques*
  - 3 3 2 *Number of women ADR clients served*

---

<sup>2</sup> Performance reporting for this IR is expected for time periods that feature elections. At other times, only narrative reporting on activities related to voter awareness, etc. is expected.

**The strategic objective** From the USAID Country Strategic Plan approved in 1995 the Partnership “inherited” two separate objectives, which subsequently were merged into the current objective. The R4 agreements with USAID/W in 1998 (draft) included an invitation to the Mission to consider a revision to the SO with the intention of simplifying the framework and clarifying the scope of intended results at the SO level.

The new SO identified by the DP, “Improved representation of interests of disadvantaged people, especially women in targeted areas,” is thought to be a statement that remains faithful to the stated goal of the Partnership – to broaden participation by the socially and economically disadvantaged in the democratic institutions of Bangladesh (see DP Operating Principle # 1). Some discussion took place with Partnership staff as to whether the new SO adequately captures the participation side of the Partnership’s goal and activities. On balance, the consultants feel the new SO does capture the participatory emphasis of the Partnership. In addition, part of the appeal of this formulation is that it broadens its description of democratic processes beyond standard notions of participation, allowing for “interest representation” via alternative dispute resolution and other channels. Since the overall results framework features intermediate results in local governance and elections as well as access to justice, arguably the core “development hypothesis” of the DP remains. As noted in the Partnership’s “results” document of 1997 (SO rationale section), “[s]upport is focused on results that help to empower customers to participate in the democratic process, and that encourage democratic institutions to be more open, just and responsive to expressed customer needs and interests.” We assume that this focus will be continued (and strengthened) under the new SO, since improved representation of interests of disadvantaged people is unlikely to effectively occur without their meaningful participation in decision making.

The new SO continues the emphasis on the interests of women, which has been a feature of the earlier objective. The overall “customer map” of the SO, as a matter of fact, is not intended to change as a consequence of the change in the objective statement. While the specific articulation of target groups is a relatively recent phenomenon for the DP’s performance monitoring, the desire for clarity regarding the intended scope of impact of the Partnership’s program has been ongoing for some time. The new SO’s specification to “target areas” delineates the fact that the objective is not intended, at this stage at least, to be national in scope. The coverage of DP programs includes a wide variety of democracy-related issues and groups around the country, but the strict size of DP interventions is limited to some 300 to 400 of the country’s approximately 4,000 unions. With unions averaging about 25,000 or persons, the estimated scope of impact is less than one-tenth the total population of Bangladesh. Thus “in target areas” is warranted. In addition, this specification allows for indicators and intermediate results to be *ipso facto* also specified to target areas. This adds clarity and consistency to the framework.

We should note that the limitation to target areas is not to be interpreted as a limitation in importance or long-term significance of the objective. Given the size of Bangladesh, the magnitude of needs for democratic development, and the level of resources available to the Partnership, a targeting of interventions may be viewed as a suitable management response to current conditions. Further from a strategic perspective the SO is “located” at the local level (with the periodic exception of national-level electoral and selected locally relevant policy interventions) because it has been this level at which democratic reforms have been seen in recent years to offer especially good prospects. The further replication of exemplary practices to areas beyond DP intervention areas, and the “bubble-up” of

democratic innovation to the national level are theoretically possible to envision. Such expansion of impact is explicitly not part of the current program, but in future strategic planning discussions the Partnership would be advised to consider the “optimization” of results reached in target areas through replication or expansion.

**Intermediate results** The Partnership has internally agreed to consolidate IRs from five in number to three, without implying any change in the DP activity plan. Such consolidation was a natural outgrowth of discussions at the performance measurement workshop on June 10 and 11. The former IR 1 (Advocacy of customer interests strengthened) was judged to be captured under the new IRs (especially IR 3.1, Responsiveness of local elected bodies and government institutions increased). Former IR 2 (Quality of elections enhanced) remains as IR 2 in the new framework. Former IR 3 (Competence of local elected bodies to identify and meet customer needs strengthened) is incorporated in the new IR 1. Former intermediate results 4 and 5 (Awareness of legal rights and obligations increased, and Quality of alternative dispute resolution improved) are captured in the new IR 3 (Customer access to justice improved).

As suggested above, no immediate implication for the DP’s program approach is apparent from these changes. Switching to three IRs is seen as a way of making the results framework simpler and clearer. Some implementing NGOs at first expressed some concern in our workshop that the new framework may call for implementers to be directly associated with grassroots membership groups, but others responded that the references to “representation of interests” (the SO) and “responsiveness of local elected bodies and government institutions” (IR 1) carry the assumption that these processes may be supported through a variety of interventions.

Others asked if the elimination of one or more of the existing IRs may throw into question the importance of some ongoing or planned DP activities. The consultant team feels that this is not the case, since conceptually the IRs tend to be broader in meaning than in the earlier version, and a preliminary review by the Partnership suggests that the contents of the current workplan is not affected by the modification in IRs.

At the workshop, participants noted potential advantages to the new IR structure:

- The reduction in overlap across IRs helps to strengthen the focus of activities.
- Changes in wording help to clarify the primary locus of advocacy (local institutions).
- Responsiveness of local elected bodies is given an appropriately more broad context, and
- The consolidation of IRs encourages the prospect of capturing both “supply” and “demand” factors within each IR.

In addition, the smaller number of results in the overall framework offers an ‘efficiency opportunity’ for managing performance measurement, in that fewer indicators are likely to be necessary to adequately capture four results (1 SO plus 3 IRs) than six (1 SO plus 5 IRs).

## **INDICATORS AND DATA COLLECTION**

As we engaged the Partnership in revising indicators and identifying steps for improving data management, it became evident that clarity in measurement, efficiency in data collection, and user-

friendliness in reporting are priorities. With these factors in mind, we offer the indicators discussed below (and summarized in the draft performance monitoring plan) as suggestions for inclusion in the new framework. While not all the necessary DP decisions have been made concerning indicators to select or instruments of data collection to use, the consulting team finds these indicators to meet the clarity, efficiency and user-friendliness priorities. From the efficiency standpoint in particular, we note that the total number of indicators in the new framework (those labeled “P” in the performance monitoring plan are considered the minimum to include, others are supplementary suggestions for the Partnership to discuss and consider) is markedly less than that in the old one. Nine in the new, nineteen in the old.

PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN FOR THE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP

Strategic Objective and Intermediate Results

4 July 1998

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR   | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT  | DATA SOURCE  | METHOD/APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION   | DATA ACQUISITION BY DP   |                              | ANALYSIS USE & REPORTING   |   |
|---|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|--|---|
|   |   |  |   | SCHEDULE/FREQUENCY   | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S) & TEAM | SCHEDULE BY MANAGEMENT EVENT   | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S) & TEAM                            |
| <b>USAID/Bangladesh Strategic Objective 3 IMPROVED REPRESENTATION OF INTERESTS OF DISADVANTAGED PEOPLE ESPECIALLY WOMEN IN TARGET AREAS</b> |   |  |   |  |                              |  |   |
| 3 1 Customer confidence in local governmental effectiveness<br><br>[P]  | Definition Mean rating of local government effectiveness by a probability sample of adults in target Unions (disaggregated by sex)<br><br>Unit Mean score | Annual probability survey of adults in target unions conducted by an external contractor and or BRAC | Using a pre tested checklist of local needs and government responses (see Philippines GOLD Project) survey collects individual ratings of local government (Union) effectiveness Individual respondents ratings in several key topical areas are gathered in each Union Scores are reported for total adult population in the DP coverage area, and disaggregated by sex<br><br>An illustrative sampling procedure is the following Five respondents chosen by probability methods are interviewed in each Union, resulting in a total sample of about 2000 in the full DP coverage area From this approach, statistically powerful data may be collected concerning the overall coverage area, but generalizations concerning customer confidence in individual Unions would not be valid To collect data generalizable on a Union by Union basis would require a much larger (and more costly) sample | Annual in time for R4 analysis and reporting   | TAF and contractor BRAC      | Annual (ca November December)  | Initial data presentation by TAF analysis for R4 by RGT |
| 3 2 Customer confidence in local electoral processes  | Definition Mean rating of the quality of local electoral processes by a probability sample of adults in target Unions (disaggregated by sex)              | See indicator 3 1  | As with 3 1 but with a checklist oriented to select critical electoral processes jointly identified by the DP and NGOs with technical assistance as needed  | Unlikely to be annual since data are only meaningfully collected surrounding time of elections Data for this | As with 3 1                  | Keved to elections If an election has not taken place in time for R4 | As with 3 1   |

|   |  |                   |  |   |             |  |             |
|---|--|-------------------|--|---|-------------|--|-------------|
| [P]   | Unit Mean score  |                   |  | indicator will need to be collected at election times |             | reporting RGT may inform USAID/W that data are not available for that year |             |
| 3.3 Customer confidence in local justice processes<br>[P] | Definition: Mean rating of the quality of local justice processes by a probability sample of adults in target Unions (disaggregated by sex)<br>Unit Mean score | See indicator 3.1 | As with 3.1 but with a checklist oriented to selected local justice processes and outcomes jointly identified by the DP and NGOs with technical assistance as needed | As with 3.1   | As with 3.1 | As with 3.1  | As with 3.1 |

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR   | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT  | DATA SOURCE              | METHOD/APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION  | DATA ACQUISITION BY DP |                              | ANALYSIS USE & REPORTING              |  |
|---|---|--------------------------|--|------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
|   |   |                          |  | SCHEDULE/FREQUENCY     | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S) & TEAM | SCHEDULE BY MANAGEMENT EVENT          | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S) & TEAM                               |
| 3.4 Percent of dispute resolutions involving women which result in decisions favorable to the woman | <p>Definition Of all shalish or LEB sponsored dispute resolutions involving a women disputant, the percent which result in decisions which, at least in balance support the woman s case</p> <p>Note As defined, this indicator assumes that few to none of dispute resolutions involve woman to-woman disputes Any such cases would need to be excluded from data for this indicator</p> <p>Unit Percent</p> | NGO records              | NGOs may already collect raw data for calculating the percentage DP and NGOs will need to confirm that judgments regarding favorable to the woman are relevant, accurate and uniform across NGOs | Annual                 | NGOs to TAF                  | In time for R4 reporting              | Raw data from TAF to RGT for analysis                      |
| 3.5 Number of marriages registered  | <p>Definition Number of new marriages registered with local qazi (official marriage registrars)</p> <p>Note While DP activities do not directly address marriage registration, the DP finds the number of registrations a useful indicator of improved legal awareness in target areas</p> <p>Unit Number of registrations</p>  | External contractor BRAC | Survey of registrars in all Unions in which DP supported NGOs implement programs   | Annual                 | Fall in time for R4 analysis | TAF with data collecting organization | Collection and raw reporting by TAF analysis for R4 by RGT |

|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| COMMENTS NOTES Acronyms and abbreviations DP Democracy Partnership TAF The Asia Foundation Bangladesh BRAC Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee [P] signifies a suggested priority indicator for DP consideration as it finalizes its performance monitoring plan |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR   | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT   | DATA SOURCE              | METHOD/APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION   | DATA ACQUISITION BY DP |                                 | ANALYSIS, USE & REPORTING   |                             |
|---|--|--------------------------|---|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|-----------------------------|
|   |  |                          |   | SCHEDULE/FREQUENCY     | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)& TEAM     | SCHEDULE BY MANAGEMENT EVENT  | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S)& TEAM |
| <b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT #3 1 RESPONSIVENESS OF LOCAL ELECTED BODIES AND GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS INCREASED</b>                |  |                          |   |                        |                                 |   |                             |
| 3.1.1 Percent of Local Elected Bodies using Best Practices<br><br>[P]   | Definition: Percent of Union Parishads among all target UPs for this intermediate result which implement at least four from a DP-developed list of Best Practices<br><br>Unit: Percent   | Implementing NGOs        | DP and NGOs will jointly identify a list of best practices (which would be expandable and adaptable to changing circumstances). NGOs will use this checklist (uniform in format across all DP supported NGOs) for each LEB in their target communities and submit along with a 1 paragraph explanation of their rating. | Yearly                 | TAF and implementing NGOs       | NGO SARs. NGOs include these data (along with narrative descriptions) with their SARs to TAF. | NGOs TAF                    |
| 3.1.2 Number of collective action initiatives by DP supported NGOs that lead to satisfactory government response<br><br>[P] | Definition: An official from a government entity (either a LEB or a local level office of a national government agency) takes action deemed satisfactory by petitioners in response to some collective action initiative.<br><br>Unit: | Implementing NGOs        | Implementing NGOs will keep a list of their groups' initiatives and government (typically LEB but possibly national government agency) responses that are satisfactory. Each submission should include a narrative to allow broad understanding of the meaning of the initiative and the significance of the response.  | Semi-annual            | NGOs to TAF                     | See 3.1.1   | See 3.1.1                   |
| 3.1.3 Number of associations advocating member interests in target communities  | Definition: Any local association (People's Organization) in a target community which advocates either collective or individual interest of their members to some unit of governance.<br><br>Unit: Associations                        | Implementing NGOs        | Implementing NGOs will track the activities of all associations in their target communities. For each local organization counted as advocating, a short narrative is submitted.   | Yearly                 | NGOs to TAF                     | See 3.1.1   | See 3.1.1                   |
| 3.1.4 % of Customers aware of roles and responsibilities of   | Definition: The percentage of respondents in a probability sample survey who are aware of most items on a list of LEB roles and responsibilities   | External contractor BRAC | From LEB manuals drawn up by Implementing NGOs, a list of critical roles and responsibilities (e.g. 6 in number) would be   | Yearly                 | External contractor BRAC to TAF | In time for R4 reporting  | RGT                         |

|   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|
| LEB members   | as defined in relevant legislation<br><br>Unit: percent |  | drawn up. This list would then be incorporated into a questionnaire |  |  |  |  |
| <p>COMMENTS/NOTES</p> <p>1 The narratives and explanations are for the Democracy Partnership to use in consistency/quality checking. One person day per NGO report is estimated to be needed to review the report and sending queries to the NGO for clarification. An estimated two person-days will be needed for the NGOs to respond to those queries.</p> <p>2 For the strategic objective level, probability sample surveys are being proposed. A couple of points should be stressed.</p> <p>2.1 The question of an outside contractor for such a survey has been discussed. Some feel that this is not viable. It may be that training of some NGO staff would be necessary. At that point, NGO staff would not go to their own target communities but to others.</p> <p>2.2 By using indicators of customer sentiment conceptually derived from the Partnership's customer appraisal, it is not suggested that the Customer Appraisal process be abandoned. Rather, it should be focused on appraising trends, constraints, new issues and the like. (This would leave quantitative indicators to a process that is suited for them.)</p> |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |
|   |   |  |   |  |  |  |  |

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR   | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT  | DATA SOURCE                     | METHOD/APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION   | DATA ACQUISITION BY PARTNERSHIP                            |                                    | ANALYSIS, USE & REPORTING   |  |
|---|---|---------------------------------|---|--|------------------------------------|---|--|
|   |   |                                 |   | SCHEDULE/FREQUENCY   | RESPONSIBLE PERSON & TEAM          | SCHEDULE BY MANAGEMENT EVENT  | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S) & TEAM                   |
| <b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.2 QUALITY OF ELECTIONS ENHANCED</b>                                  |   |                                 |   |  |                                    |   |  |
| 3.2.1 Percent of eligible voters casting their votes according to their own choice<br><br>[P] | Definition: Percent of eligible voters who report that they voted in the most recent election for candidates of their choice with no social or political pressure including bribery (disaggregated by sex)<br><br>Unit: Percent | BRAC or external contractor     | During elections BRAC or external contractor will conduct a probability sample survey of eligible voters in the Unions of DP NGOs conducting activities intended to reinforce unencumbered voter choice<br><br>In addition, the DP will use an informal survey of NGO leadership and customers to identify critical pressures on the independence of voter choice. The resulting list will be used to identify criteria to be used in the probability survey for assessing the extent to which voters cast ballots according to their own choice. | As relevant within one month after each election in Unions | TAF                                | Results of the probability survey on an occasional basis in response to elections. Informal survey in NGO semiannual reports. | TAF and coordination with RGT for R4 reporting |
| 3.2.2 Percent of voters having knowledge of LEB candidates election agenda<br><br>[P]         | Definition: Percent of eligible voters who say they actually voted for particular candidates at least in part due to candidate agenda (positions on issues) (disaggregated by sex)<br><br>Unit: Percent                         | External contractor and/or BRAC | Probability sample surveys in target Unions   | After each election in local target areas                  | External contractor or BRAC to TAF | DP to review expected timeline of elections and relation of this to R4 reporting  | BRAC/external contractor to TAF then to RGT    |
| 3.2.3 Number of NGO group members elected to LEBs   | Definition: Number of members of DP supported voter education or legal awareness groups getting   | NGO records                     | NGOs keep record of their group members and those who run and get elected   | After every election                                       | NGOs to TAF                        | See Indicator 3.2.2   | RTG  |

|  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
|  | elected to LEBs (disaggregated by sex)<br><br>Unit: Number of individuals |  | Use narrative to report on number of those NGO group members elected to LEB chairs |  |  |  |  |
|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR   | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT  | DATA SOURCE  | METHOD/APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION  | DATA ACQUISITION BY PARTNERSHIP |                           | ANALYSIS USE & REPORTING     |                              |
|---|---|--|--|---------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------|
|   |   |  |  | SCHEDULE/FREQUENCY              | RESPONSIBLE PERSON & TEAM | SCHEDULE BY MANAGEMENT EVENT | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S) & TEAM |
| <b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 2 QUALITY OF ELECTIONS ENHANCED (CONTINUED)</b>                    |   |  |  |                                 |                           |                              |                              |
| 3 2 4 Number of persons attending locally organized meetings for projection of candidates | <p>Definition Number of voter aged individuals who attend meetings for introducing candidates and sharing knowledge of election rules and procedures NGOs community organizations or local government administration may organize these meetings (disaggregated by sex)</p> <p>Unit Number of individuals</p> | NGOs   | NGOs counts of individuals attending meetings  | Election seasons in Unions      | NGOs to TAF               | See Indicator 3 2 2          | RGT                          |
| 3 2 5 Percent of LEB candidates following the Election Commission's Code of Conduct       | <p>Definition Percent of candidates in LEB elections who abide by the election code of conduct</p> <p>Note DP currently does not feature activities in this area this indicator is offered for potential use if such activities are developed (disaggregated sex)</p> <p>Unit Percent</p>                     | NGOs possibly with technical assistance from BRAC or external contractor | DP and NGOs will consult electoral experts to develop a simple document summarizing adherence to the Code Utilizing this document, Union level committees formed by the DP affiliated NGO and local leaders will observe and record electoral activities of candidates in the NGO target areas | See Indicator 3 2 4             | NGOs to TAF               | See Indicator 3 2 2          | RGT                          |

Note These indicators do not include measurement of results of activities conducted outside the electoral season (e.g voter awareness programs) Such reporting can be done narratively by NGOs to TAF and passed on to the RGT for reporting in the R4 text or in the comments section of the R4's Performance Data Tables

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR  | INDICATOR DEFINITION AND UNIT OF MEASUREMENT  | DATA SOURCE | METHOD/APPROACH OF DATA COLLECTION OR CALCULATION  | DATA ACQUISITION BY PARTNERSHIP  |                           | ANALYSIS USE & REPORTING   |                              |
|--|---|-------------|--|--|---------------------------|--|------------------------------|
|  |   |             |  | SCHEDULE/FREQUENCY   | RESPONSIBLE PERSON & TEAM | SCHEDULE BY MANAGEMENT EVENT   | RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S) & TEAM |
| <b>INTERMEDIATE RESULT 3.3 CUSTOMER ACCESS TO JUSTICE IMPROVED</b>                     |   |             |  |  |                           |  |                              |
| 3.3.1 Percent of dispute resolution cases featuring improved ADR techniques<br><br>[P] | Definition Of all local dispute resolution ( <i>shalish</i> and LEB) cases in target unions percent which are observed to apply on a continuing basis at least 4 of the DP's six criteria for improved ADR (disaggregated by sex of complainant)<br><br>Unit Percent of cases | NGOs        | DP and NGOs together identify and operationalize critical criteria for improved ADR techniques. NGOs have suggested that approximately six of these probably could be agreed upon fairly easily. Some of these criteria may reasonably include features of traditional <i>shalish</i> . Since the target group of clients is women, the DP and NGOs may wish to include a criterion that captures quality of treatment of women in dispute resolution. | Annually consider benefit of including at least qualitative reporting of this in NGOs' semi-annual reports to TAF. | NGOs to TAF               | For annual R4 reporting possibly on a semi-annual basis for internal reporting to TAF. | NGOs to TAF to RGT           |
| 3.3.2 Number of women ADR clients  | Definition Number of women clients in DP supported ADR cases<br><br>Unit Number of women  | NGOs        | NGOs report number of women served through their ADR services. If cases undergo any appeals or remediation, individual women are not counted more than once. If a woman is served more than once under separate cases she is counted more than once.   | See 3.3.1  | See 3.3.1                 | See 3.3.1  | See 3.3.1                    |

### **Strategic Objective indicators**

The six SO indicators under the old framework were of two types. First was two perception-based (customer confidence) indicators the data for which are collected by the Partnership staff using its protocol for the annual customer appraisal. Second were four indicators that addressed results of activities in the LEB and alternative dispute resolution (ADR) arenas.

Data collection for the customer appraisal has served two purposes:

- To provide general-population, survey-like data for the Partnership and the R4 and
- To allow the Partnership staff to renew its awareness of customer needs through direct and focused interaction with customers.

These two purposes are meritorious and should continue to be promoted. They are, however, not entirely complementary in practice. Since the customer appraisal currently applies rapid appraisal techniques within a non-statistical sampling frame, generalizing findings for R4 reporting is problematic. Second, while the protocol for gathering data on customer confidence in access to equal justice and their ability to influence local decisions allows for collection of fairly in-depth information, the scaling method for categorizing responses and the interview setting allow substantial room for measurement error.

We suggest, then, that the partnership separate the two purposes of the customer appraisal. Use a contractor or BRAC to design and conduct a probability survey on customer confidence issues applying statistical sampling methods and a refined version of the current data collection instrument. The sampling frame would be intended to produce data generalizable to the adult populations of all of the unions in which the Partnership is working. For the customer appraisal, continue with RRA techniques, but consider customizing the data collection to particular issues or customer subgroups of current annual interest. Since the appraisal would not be constrained by rigorous sampling methods, it may be utilized for exploring new areas of intervention, learning lessons from particular activities or sites, and so on.

For the particular SO indicators regarding customer confidence, we suggest:

Indicator 3.1 **Customer confidence in local governmental effectiveness**

Indicator 3.2 **Customer confidence in local electoral processes**

Indicator 3.3 **Customer confidence in local justice processes**

These indicators would utilize a pre-tested checklist of “behaviorally anchored” items to derive individual respondents’ confidence ratings, as used in USAID/Philippines GOLD project and elsewhere. The team finds these to be appropriate SO-level indicators in that ‘customer confidence’ is one fairly direct attribute of the responsiveness of local institutions, especially when such confidence is measured in terms of actual access to services and experience with the institutions’ effectiveness.

The sampling procedure for collecting data for these indicators will require some careful consideration of the balance of survey cost and the Partnership’s need for information. Initially

our suggestion is to plan for statistical generalizability to all customers across all Unions in the DP activity area. We do not recommend annually collecting data that would provide statistical representativeness at a Union-by-Union level, since this would require an impracticably large overall sample. Collecting information from, for example, five probabilistically selected individuals in each of the 400 Unions should result in generalizability of survey results to the overall coverage area, with sampling error within standard professional polling limits (e.g., 3 to 5 percent). If statistically reliable information is needed at the Union level, occasional focused studies should be applied to this need.

We consider these three indicators to be a “minimum set” of indicators for the SO reflecting as a group the level of public confidence affected by the three intermediate results. From a technical standpoint, however, our preference would be to add one or two indicators that rely on some other (non-perception-based) data collection approach. Thus the PMP includes two other SO-level indicators for DP consideration.

**Indicator 3.4 Percent of dispute resolutions involving women which result in decisions favorable to the woman, and**

**Indicator 3.5 Number of marriages registered**

Indicator 3.4 represents an attempt to capture people-level impact in the dispute resolution area (alternative or other). Since DP-supported NGOs already do monitor ADR results closely, the added burden for data collection here may be minimal. But while the act of collecting the data may not be difficult, interpreting the meaning of results and setting of targets are likely to be more difficult. Assuming that we can identify with the NGOs a feasible operational definition of “decision favorable to the woman” is it necessarily the case that all such decisions are compatible with the SO? To the extent that non-disadvantaged women are involved in the population of DP-targeted disputes, for example, the results may be distortive. In addition, would we be realistic to assume that the percentage of decisions favorable to women would proceed on some incrementally increasing path? These issues are beyond our team’s ability to address at this point and thus we present this indicator as an option for consideration.

With indicator 3.5, the situation is different. This indicator is currently part of the DP’s PMP, but some NGOs found data collection difficult in their localities. This problem could be addressed by tasking a contractor or BRAC to collect data. If the Partnership were to find it useful to continue collecting data for this indicator, it probably should be used at the SO level in the framework (rather than at the IR level as in the old framework) since marriage registration may be an act of “institutional responsiveness” that reflects cultural and attitudinal changes not closely associated with any current DP activities. A focused evaluative study may enhance DP understanding of the relevance of this indicator to the SO.

Finally, we recognize that the proposed SO-level indicators display some imbalance in that the priority indicators are exclusively perception-based and the optional two just described focus on results primarily derived from IR 3. Since from a methodological standpoint we would prefer to include a mixture of opinion and other data at the SO level, we do advise that the Partnership look carefully for non-opinion-based indicators to add to Indicators 3.1 through 3.3. At the same time

we are aware of the need to contain performance measurement costs, one way of doing so is by keep the overall number of indicators low. One option for resolving this would be to conduct an evaluative study focused on marriage registrations, but to omit this from the routine performance monitoring system. This would allow “performance management space” for an additional SO-level indicator. Among the candidates available, Indicator 3.1.2 (Number of collective action initiatives by DP-supported NGOs that lead to satisfactory government response) described below is a possibility since arguably it captures “representation of interests” rather directly. As the DP continues its discussion of performance measurement options, it might include discussion of this approach to reaching a better balance in measurement method at the strategic objective level.

### **Indicators for Intermediate Result 3.1 (Responsiveness of local elected bodies and government institutions increased)**

**Indicator 3.1.1 Percent of local elected bodies using “best practices”** A similar indicator is currently being used by the Partnership. The current proposal, as detailed in the PMP table makes use of the data collection capability of the NGOs to develop, along with Partnership staff a checklist of best practices that could be pre-tested and uniformly utilized across all NGOs. Instead of a count of LEBs, the indicator is a percentage, so that the “saturation level” of best practices within the target areas can be derived. In addition, using a percentage in lieu of a count prevents targets from being met as an artifact of program expansion. The suggested reporting procedure includes brief explanations from NGOs for their best practice ratings of LEBs; this offers the opportunity of qualitative reporting on this critical area of local democracy.

**Indicator 3.1.2 Number of collective action initiatives by DP-supported NGOs that lead to satisfactory government response** As with the previous indicator, this calls for short narratives from the NGOs to allow for interpretation. As they become more experienced with advocacy and with data collection, some uniformity and smoothness in collecting the information should evolve. The focus of the indicator is on advocacy efforts that elicit preferred government response, rather than just on counts of the number of efforts made. Targets will need to be set cautiously, especially at first when responsiveness of institutions is especially uncertain.

In addition to these two priority indicators, the team suggests that the DP consider the following:

**Indicator 3.1.3 Number of associations advocating member interests in target communities** This indicator may be taken as a complement to 3.1.2, since the volume of advocacy is an input to collective actions resulting in positive governmental response. Data for a similar indicator is currently being collected by the NGOs. If it is not included in the R4 reporting, it may be a useful piece of information for semiannual NGO reporting to TAF.

**Indicator 3.1.4 Percent of customers aware of roles and responsibilities of LEB members** This would call for a probability-sample survey including each of the target Unions, conducted by BRAC or a contractor. Intention of the indicator is to capture legal and political awareness through a uniform checklist in the data collection instrument. As we have noted above, we would expect the probability survey to provide reliable data on customer awareness across all DP target Unions as a group, but not within each of them.

### **Indicators for Intermediate Result 3 2 (Quality of elections enhanced)**

The indicators we suggest for this IR include two “priority” measures and three that are suggested as supplements to these two. Note that all indicators for this IR are election-focused, so that collection and reporting are limited to the timing of elections. Thus internal and external performance reporting for this result is likely not to be done every year, and data collection may be necessary on occasion more than once per year. DP-supported legal awareness and voter awareness activities do not appear directly in the framework. Instead the impacts of these activities are assumed to be evident in the indicators that are included. To provide performance reviewers with additional information on the voter awareness and legal awareness activities the partnership may narratively describe key results in these areas to accompany the quantitative reporting. The priority indicators are

#### **Indicator 3 2 1 Percent of eligible voters casting their votes according to their own choice**

This is intended to capture the extent to which those who voted in the most recent election in target areas did so with no social or political pressure, thus displaying a level of legal and political awareness. BRAC or an external contractor would survey probability samples of adults in targeted areas using a pre-tested checklist of potential pressures on voters as a basis for the survey interviews.

#### **Indicator 3 2 2 Percent of voters having knowledge of LEB candidates’ election agenda**

Also to be based on a probability sample survey in DP Unions, this indicator would provide a gauge of the extent to which voters in the DP coverage area choose candidates based (at least in part) on what they understand to be candidates’ positions on issues. The accuracy of voter descriptions of candidates’ agenda is not the focus here, and it will not be assessed. Instead, the data collection instrument may ask the respondent (a) if he/she voted in the recent election (b) if yes, did respondent consider candidates’ agenda in the decision to vote, and (c) if yes again can the voter give at least one position of one of the candidates. As with Indicator 3 1 4, the expected sample size of the survey would allow statistical generalization to the entire DP coverage area for voter awareness but not to individual Unions.

The supplementary indicators include

**Indicator 3 2 3 Number of NGO group members elected to LEBs** This indicator is applied to this IR since it is expected that election of NGO group members is a sign of the fairness of elections. NGOs collect these data currently, and a baseline exists. Expansion of the legal awareness and voter education programs to additional Unions should not require identification of a new baseline, but targets may need to be adjusted.

**Indicator 3 2 4 Number of persons attending locally organized meetings for projection of candidates** Such meetings do take place in the target Unions at least sometimes sponsored by DP-supported NGOs. In terms of improving the quality of elections, increased attendance at such

gatherings arguably is only an output (rather than impact) indicator, but it complements the other indicators and represents data that typically would readily be collectible by the NGOs

**Indicator 3.2.5 Percent of LEB candidates following the Election Commission's Code of Conduct** In this case, Union-level committees formed by the DP-supported NGOs and local leaders would observe and record candidates' conduct, guided by a simple document that summarizes the elements of adherence to the Code. This indicator, or one similar to it, could be used by the Partnership should it at some point in the future be involved in the improvement of electoral competition and candidacies

### **Indicators for Intermediate Result 3.3 (Customer Access to Justice Improved)**

For this IR, we suggest two priority indicators

**Indicator 3.3.1 Percent of dispute resolution cases featuring improved ADR techniques** There are a variety of dispute resolution mechanisms applied in the local Bangladesh setting -- through traditional *shalish* and under the aegis of LEBs, for example. The focus of indicators for this arena in the old DP framework has been ADR, but this indicator represents a refinement by being directed at percentage of cases featuring ADR techniques, rather than at the number of *shalish* or LEBs using them. This should allow for a more accurate gauge of the extent of application of ADR. Note that a criteria-based checklist can be developed with the participation of the NGOs involved in ADR activities, so that uniform counting rules are applied in the data collection

**Indicator 3.3.2 Number of women ADR clients** As with several other indicators, data for this currently are collected by the NGOs. While number of clients reveals only a crude level of information concerning "access to justice," data on case decisions and customer perceptions of the justice system are to be made available through SO-level indicators

## **MANAGEMENT OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING**

Before moving on to suggested next steps, it may be useful to summarize our findings concerning the DP's performance monitoring system

- The situation could be worse, data are in fact being collected. There is coordination among Partners and with the NGOs on data collection and reporting needs. The RGT successfully submitted its R4 report to Mission leadership and USAID/Washington this spring.
- Data collection weaknesses include
  - Some of the currently applied indicators are not as direct as they might be in relation to their results. This leads to confusion about indicator definitions ("meanings") and mixed

organizational and individual incentives for supporting the performance measurement system itself

- The groups or communities covered by some indicators are not sufficiently clear This threatens reliability of data collection and utility of annual reporting against targets
- While accomplishments in the field have been considerable, even at this middle stage of the program, many of these achievements have not been captured by the relatively narrow “reporting space” offered by the focus on R4 reporting
- There is some confusion between “external” reporting (for the R4) and internal data needs (e.g., performance monitoring for grants management) This contributes to the mixture of incentives noted above
- Data collection schemes could be more usefully informed of opportunities for improving both quality and efficiency in performance measurement through more systematic application of sampling techniques
- Techniques for collecting data suffer from insufficient uniformity across NGOs a general lack of clear measurement criteria, and insufficient training and technical assistance to those responsible for collecting data
- The difficulties encountered over this past year in collecting data and reporting on results need to be avoided in future years – starting with this summer
- The quality of data overall in the DP framework features strong points and weak points Significant strides – at least to address short term problems --can be made by taking some relatively simple technical actions Longer-term issues will need some more strategic thinking about the management of performance information
- Efficient, effective management of performance information calls for basic agreement among the Partners regarding
  - What the priority problems are that need fixing,
  - Who will be responsible for which performance measurement – related task areas in the coming months and years, and
  - How the future of the Partnership may be optimized through a strengthened team approach to performance measurement

## **CONCLUSION SUGGESTED FOLLOW-ON ACTIONS**

Next steps for the DP to take have been discussed at some length with Partnership staff The team finds that, overall, the Partnership came some distance during our technical assistance in diagnosing problems in the performance measurement system and considering solutions through revisions to the results framework, indicators and data collection approaches Following is a summary of the proposed actions (short-term and long-term) that have been discussed

**Short Term Steps (to August/September 1998)**

- Finalize identification of R4 indicators for the next R4 using the new Results Framework or the current R4 indicators as refined, for a starting point. To add context to this, we should address the likely level of effort needed to address the key weaknesses in the system. Our comparison of the “old” indicator set with the ‘new’ one shows that if we consider a “new” indicator to be one which will require fairly substantial “re-tooling” in criteria setting and data collection refinement, the indicators proposed in this report should call for only a modest amount of staff time, assuming some additional investment is made in BRAC or contractor assistance. Out of the total of 16 indicators in the PMP, we identify four “new” ones at the SO level and two at the IR level (This assumes that no indicator-based data collection will be called for in the quality of elections area). The four “new” indicators include three SO-level indicators that are expected to call for survey activity by BRAC or a contractor. Based on this admittedly preliminary analysis, utilization of the new indicator set appears not to be overly burdensome for application in the next R4.
- Identify actions for clarifying roles among partners and re-invigorating the team process among Partnership staff. These could include use of external facilitators experienced in working with organizational strengthening and team process improvement in similar contexts. Alternatively, the DP could decide that external facilitation is not necessary for these needed improvements to be accomplished.
- Consider formation of an “NGO Reference Group” to provide the Partnership staff with systematic, field-based input in areas such as dissemination of NGO best practices, collective advocacy among NGOs in selected policy areas, and participation in the planning for and assessment of performance monitoring and program evaluation.
- For any new indicators, establish baselines and targets. The USAID TIPS document on developing indicator targets, distributed at the workshop, can be an information resource for this task. In addition, Jim Fremming and possibly other members of the team may be available in the future for “virtual” consultation on such topics.
- Draft, discuss, and agree upon a time line for R4 data collection events to reduce periodic pressures on staff time of partners and encourage common expectations regarding performance measurement tasking. By the team’s final briefing with the Partnership on June 17, the DP was discussing both the clarification of partner roles for the R4 reporting and the related timeline of activities.
- Continue discussion with BRAC concerning a formal commitment to take the lead role in performance monitoring. Initiate any identified necessary management actions (e.g. subgrant or separate agreement) to make better use of BRAC as a partner. Such discussions may benefit, at initial stages at least, from discussions among BRAC, the RGT, and TAF at the senior level, broader discussions among the full DP staff could follow after initial agreements have been reached.

- Draft uniform data collection instruments (DCIs) and data collection instructions receive input from NGOs, pretest and revise in preparation for next round of data collection This probably requires active technical participation by BRAC and/or a contractor
- Consider a format for qualitative “domain reporting” to be included with NGO semi-annual reports receive NGO input on the format, and provide short training to NGOs and selected DP staff on use of this reporting format Such reporting should be easy to incorporate into the semi-annual report format, yet useful for TAF use in performance monitoring Several options are available for a reporting format, but one approach would be for a “menu” of domains to be made available to all NGOs and for TAF to come to agreement with each organization concerning which domains are most appropriate for semi-annual reporting There might be a few critical performance indicators for which the NGO provides semi-annual data, but the core of the performance reporting would be qualitative and diagnostic with such components as
  - Outstanding achievements for this reporting period
  - Special challenges in the work environment,
  - Examples of best practice (if any) to share with other DP organizations and
  - Expected accomplishments for the year, including anticipated performance levels vis-a-vis critical indicators
- Once revised DCIs are in place, develop a plan for translating them, and associated instructions, into Bangla Two-way translation and field pretesting will be necessary to ensure validity of the translation

### **LONG TERM STEPS**

- Consider developing a PMP to guide data collection for any internal reporting needed by the Partnership
- Annually review status of the PMP for relevance, quality, and efficiency of data collection This need not be a large-investment, intense exercise once the performance measurement system is more routinized
- Include resource requirements for performance measurement TA and training in the DP’s annual resource allocation process
- Identify who the longer-term providers of technical assistance and training for performance measurement (e.g. BRAC or contractor) will be using knowledge gained from experience of the latter half of CY 1998

- Establish and support a permanent schedule for (a) technical assistance in data collection and analysis, and (b) training to partner and NGO staff in performance measurement
- Develop a short, simple evaluation plan for the DP, to maximize the usefulness of performance monitoring for discrete evaluations and to confirm common expectations in the DP regarding program/project evaluations Possible areas of exploration for evaluations include (a) Relationship of DP efforts to levels in marriage registrations and (b) Paths through which IR-level accomplishments, such as LEBs applying best practices or collective actions receiving positive government response, are translated to customer confidence at the SO level

**Annex I**

**TERMS OF REFERENCE  
CONSULTANCY TO IDENTIFY IMPROVED INDICATORS FOR THE DEMOCRACY  
PARTNERSHIP'S PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM**

**Introduction**

The Democracy Partnership is comprised of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID), The Asia Foundation (TAF), and the Bangladesh Rural Advancement Committee (BRAC) Formed in 1995 and focused on the democratic aspirations of the socially and economically disadvantaged (currently referred to as "customers"), the partnership's strategic objective is broadened participation in local decision making and more equitable justice especially for women. The partnership has aimed to achieve progress in five "intermediate results" (IR) areas it believes will contribute measurably to the achievement of this strategic objective over a five-year period. The core values of customer focus, teamwork, empowerment and accountability and managing for results underlie the Partnership's operating principles.

The three partners have joint decision-making in selecting and managing a portfolio of projects to improve local governance and rural justice through greater interaction between community associations and local elected bodies resulting in better advocacy of "customer" interests, enhanced performance and accountability of local elected bodies to better serve their constituents' needs, better election administration and voter education, greater awareness of legal rights and responsibilities, and improvements in the quality of informal/alternative dispute resolution by village mediation committees (shalish) and local elected bodies.

The program is currently at its midway point and requires the services of a team of consultants to review the Democracy Partnership's performance monitoring system and existing indicators (both qualitative and quantitative), make recommendations for improving the indicators, and assist the Partnership in rewording its strategic objective statement.

**Problems**

I. The results framework including the performance monitoring system and current indicators was developed in September 1995 and revised in April 1997. Collection of quantitative results data is carried out by NGO subgrantees and qualitative data is obtained through rapid appraisals conducted by DP staff. 1997 was the first year that subgrantee NGOs were required to collect and submit actual results data. Many problems with this data were found and as a result data for some IR indicators could not be used.

The Partnership has identified the following problems with its performance monitoring indicators which need to be addressed:

- The understanding among Partnership staff, subgrantee headquarters staff and subgrantee field staff of the indicators' meaning, measurement criteria and methodology to be used varies greatly.

- For some subgrantees the data collection process is very time consuming, and decreases the time available to the subgrantees for implementing the projects
- Some data collected by the subgrantees is not used by the DP and some data we need is not collected
- It is not always clear which subgrantees should be supplying results data for which indicators. In other words, which programs devote a sufficient amount of time and resources to an area that they should be considered responsible for producing measurable results in that area.
- There is uncertainty about how to define and quantify target populations and how to adjust baseline and target figures in IRs when new subgrantees are added and where target populations change or expand after the program has begun.
- The rapid appraisals done by DP staff to obtain qualitative data do not always complement or provide a cross-check on the quantitative data collection system.
- Several IRs are not captured by SO-level indicators.

II The Mission has consolidated its two previous strategic objectives into one new SO by more or less combining the two previous SO statements into one. The Mission needs to express its consolidated strategic objective in a clearer manner as pointed out in a form of agreement reached during the recent R4

### **Tasks**

The consultants will review the Democracy Partnership's current results framework, the performance monitoring and evaluation system, and the indicators (both quantitative and qualitative) - understanding how the information feeds into the R4 exercise, how the system is used to monitor the performance of the Partnership itself and how the data is used to monitor subgrantee performance. Where appropriate lessons to date including best practices, innovative ideas, primary obstacles to implementation, ideas about replicability and the critical ingredients for achieving greatest impact will be identified and assessed against the current performance monitoring and evaluation system. The team will diagnose the variety of problems encountered when using the current set of indicators from the perspectives of both the Partnership as well as the NGOs. The team of consultants will then make recommendations to the Democracy Partnership about potential changes to the indicators. The exercise will culminate in a planned workshop with the Democracy Partnership staff to modify existing indicators to make them more effective and identify and operationalize new indicators where necessary. If time permits recommendations will be discussed on how to improve the overall monitoring system for gathering and analyzing results in a standardized, efficient, simple and useful fashion. Finally the exercise will result in recommendations for a restatement of the strategic objective.

### **Illustrative Activities**

Upon signing the contract the team of consultants will undertake the following activities during the contract period

*Performance Measurement for the Democracy Partnership*

- 1 Review project documents to get an overall understanding of the current results framework its core components its design process and its intended purpose
- 2 Interview Democracy Partnership staff about the overall strategic objective of the Partnership
- 3 Interview a sample of NGO subgrantees across all IRs about their Democracy Partnership projects to determine their organizations' goals and objectives, innovations best practices lessons learned obstacles in goals
- 4 Review performance monitoring system data, forms subgrantee reporting requirements computer database system, and latest R4 report to get an overview of the type of data collected and used (both quantitative and qualitative)
- 5 Interview Democracy Partnership staff and a sample of NGO subgrantees about the data collection approach and the quality of data produced (baseline, targets, actuals) Identify problems from both DP perspectives and NGO perspectives
- 6 Incorporating discoveries about the DP's and NGOs' overall objectives the strengths and weaknesses of the current performance monitoring system, problems associated with the indicators and data collection methods, and the lessons from the field, recommend changes or adjustments to current indicators (including wording, key definitions measurement criteria and methodology) and sketch out potential new indicators to replace existing ones which are not useful The indicators should if possible also capture some of the lessons and best practices identified
- 7 Provide some training to Partnership staff on how to identify and evaluate indicators for the R4 reporting process, and assist them in coming up with ideas for a reworded strategic objective statement
- 8 If time permits, make recommendations about the overall monitoring and evaluation system as it relates to monitoring performance of subgrantees, reporting for the R4 exercise collecting data across multiple NGOs using diverse approaches in a standardized fashion and ensuring meaningful data that is able to capture complex change processes with a small set of key indicators

- 9 Participate in a two day workshop with Democracy Partnership staff. Make formal presentations of the findings and recommendations, and work jointly with the Democracy Partnership to operationalize an improved set of indicators and if time permits establish new monitoring and evaluation system parameters for collecting, analyzing and reporting on data from the field
- 10 During the same two day workshop, assist the Partnership staff in identifying one or more options for a more clearly worded strategic objective
- 11 Prepare a final report of summarizing these various steps and documenting the final outputs of the workshop

### **Output**

The final output will be a document that summarizes the findings from each of the steps described above a final draft of a revised set of indicators. The newly revised set of indicators will be a simple universal tool that enables the effective and efficient monitoring of ongoing activities by multiple implementing agencies as well as consistent quality reporting to Washington, D C. It will be a tool that NGOs can easily administer as a required reporting instrument, allowing for efficient collection of data at low cost in time and resources and that is consistent with their own programming goals and objectives. The document should also include recommendations for a reworded strategic objective statement.

### **Time frame**

The consultancy will involve approximately a maximum of 20 person workdays of which 3 person workdays in the U S as required for preparatory work to review materials and documents. Remaining 15 person workdays in Bangladesh and 2 person workdays more days should that be required to finalize and submit the final report/product. The effective start and completion dates of the consultancy are May 26 through June 20 1998. The consultant from Management Systems International who will lead the team and be responsible for preparing the final report, will submit the final document/product to the Asia Foundation/Bangladesh no later than June 24, 1998.

### **Qualifications**

The composition of the team of consultants will ensure the following skill mix:

- 1 knowledge of and experience of USAID results frameworks and performance measurement systems
- 2 specialized expertise in designing and evaluating monitoring and evaluation frameworks including operationalizing indicators that allow for scientific empirical analysis of impact and results establishing sound and efficient data management systems and user-friendly feedback loops between data collection and analysis
- 3 local understanding of the Bangladesh cultural context recent developments in the area of governance, democratization, legal aid and mediation, and women's development issues

- 4 exposure to some of the subgrantee programs and basic understanding of some their distinctive programming approaches
- 5 field research experience and knowledge of the best practices, key ingredients of success and common obstacles in good governance programming
- 6 workshop facilitation skills

**Tentative Schedule of Workdays**

- Days 1-3 PREPARATORY REVIEW OF DOCUMENTS/MATERIALS AT MSI/USA
- Days 4-5 DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP STAFF BRIEFING CONSULTATIVE TEAM AND UNDERSTANDING THE SUBSTANTIVE PURPOSES OF THE DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM
- Days 6-7 DIAGNOSIS OF CURRENT PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM
- Days 8-9 PRELIMINARY REVIEW AND DRAFT MODIFICATION OF INDICATORS
- Days 10-11 TRAINING OF PARTNERSHIP STAFF IN IDENTIFICATION OF USEFUL INDICATORS, AND ASSIST THEM IN COMING UP WITH IDEAS FOR A REWORDED STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE STATEMENT IF TIME PERMITS PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATIONS FOR MODIFICATION OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM
- Days 12 WORKSHOP PREPARATION
- Days 13-14 WORKSHOP
- Days 15-16 REPORT WRITE-UP AND FINAL SUBMISSION

**5/07/98 DOC ID FILENAME msi-sow ind**

**Annex II**

**SCHEDULE FOR CONSULTANTS - (6/8/98)**

**Dr James Fremming, Dr Steven Rood, Dr Zarina Rahman Khan, Dr Habibur Rahman**

Jim Fremming and Steve Rood will stay at

Hotel Sheraton  
1, Minto Road  
Dhaka - 1000  
Tel 880-2-863391-9 861191  
Fax 880-2-832915

Emergency phone numbers

TAF office phone 886941, 886942, 884504  
Karen Casper 883673 (home) and Nilan Fernando 883047 (home)

**Sunday, May 31**

3 40 p m Jim Fremming arrives on British Airways flight (BA-145)  
evening Consultants' time

**Monday, June 1**

9 00 - 12 noon Discussions with TAF and USAID  
12 30 - 1 30 p m Lunch  
12 50 p m Steve Rood arrives on Thai Airways flight (TG-322)  
3 00 - 4 30 p m Welcome tea with all Partnership staff (see attached distribution list) to review  
itinerary, at TAF office  
evening Consultants' time

**Tuesday, June 2**

- 8 00 - 9 30 a m Get acquainted breakfast meeting among consultants at Sheraton James Fremming Steven Rood, Zarina Rahman Khan, Habibur Rahman
- 10 00 - 12 30 p m Briefing on the Democracy Partnership at TAF office with all BRAC TAF and USAID Partnership staff
- 12 30 - 1 30 p m Lunch for consultants and all Partnership staff at TAF office
- 1 30 - 4 30 p m Preliminary diagnostic of indicators and systems problems through group and individual meetings with BRAC and USAID staff Consultants will decide where to have meetings

**Wednesday, June 3**

- 8 45 a m Jim Fremming and Steve Rood leave Sheraton for airport to take them to Jessore Will be joined at airport by Zarina, Habibur, Nawshad Ahmed (TAF), and Rezaul Haque (USAID) Field trip to 3 NGOs (Banchte Shekha, Uttaran, and International Voluntary Services) operating in all 5 intermediate results areas
- See attached for detailed itinerary

- 10 20 a m Flight departs for Jessore

**Thursday, June 4**

In the field BSathkira and Bagerhat Districts

**Friday, June 5**

- 12 00 noon Return to Dhaka
- 3 00 p m Rescheduled diagnostic meeting with TAF

**Saturday, June 6**

- Roundtable meetings at TAF office for consultants with all sub-grantees in each intermediate result (IR) area
- 9 30 a m - 12 00 noon IR 1 Advocacy

*Performance Measurement for the Democracy Partnership*

12 30 p m - 1 30 p m Lunch at TAF office for consultants

1 30 a m - 4 00 p m IR 3 LEBs

4 00 p m Consultants' time

**Sunday, June 7**

More roundtable meetings for consultants at TAF office with sub-grantees

9 00 a m - 11 00 a m IR 2 Elections

11 00 a m - 1 00 p m IR 4 Legal Awareness

1 00 p m - 2 00 p m Lunch at TAF office for consultants

2 00 p m - 4 00 p m IR 5 Alternative Dispute Resolution

4 00 p m Consultants' time

**Monday, June 8**

9 00 a m - 12 30 a m Assessment of DP systems and workshop preparation by consultants only

12 30 p m - 1 30 p m Lunch for consultants at TAF office

2 00 p m - 4 30 p m Pre-briefing on the workshop for Partnership staff at TAF office

4 30 p m Consultants' time

**Tuesday, June 9**

- 8 30 a m - 4 00 p m      Workshop preparation
- 4 30 p m                      Consultants leave for BRAC Training Center in Rajendrapur

**Wednesday, June 10**

- 7 45 a m                      Partnership staff meet at TAF office to go to BRAC Training Center in Rajendrapur    Group will travel together in rented vans
- 8 00 a m                      Partnership staff leave for Rajendrapur
- 9 15 a m - 9 45 a m        Arrive and check in to rooms
- 10 00 a m - 12 30 noon    Morning session
- 12 30 p m - 1 30 p m      Lunch
- 2 00 p m - 6 00 p m        Afternoon session
- 6 00 p m - 7 30 p m        Free time
- 7 30 p m - 8 30 p m        Dinner

**Thursday, June 11**

- 7 30 a m - 8 30 a m        Breakfast
- 9 00 a m - 12 00 noon     Morning session
- 12 30 p m - 1 30 p m      Lunch
- 1 30 p m - 3 30 p m        Afternoon session
- 4 00 p m                      Leave Rajendrapur for Dhaka

**Friday, June 12**

Consultants' day

**Saturday, June 13**

Consultants day

- 7 00 p m                      Closing dinner at Karen Casper's residence for all Partnership staff and representatives from sub-grantee organizations

**Sunday, June 14**

8 30 a m - 10 30 a m      Consultants debrief Partnership staff before Steve Rood leaves

11 30 a m                      Steve Rood leaves for airport

1 55 p m                        Steve leaves for Bangkok on Thai Airways flight (TG-321)

**Monday, June 15**

Consultants day

**Tuesday, June 16**

Consultants' day

**Wednesday, June 17**

2 00 - 4 00 p m              Final consultants' debriefing for Partnership staff at TAF office

5 30 p m                        Jim Fremming leaves for airport

8 30 p m                        Jim leaves for London on British Airways flight

### **Annex III**

## **DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT WORKSHOP BRAC Training Center (Rajendrapur, Bangladesh) 10-11 June 1998**

### **Wednesday, 10 June 1998**

- 9 15 Arrival of Participants
- 10 00 Opening Plenary
- Introduction of Participants
  - Consultant Inputs
    - General Issues
    - Qualities of Good Indicators
    - Points about the ACustomer Surveys/Qualitative Indicators
  - Open Discussion of Strategic Objective Level
  - Suggested New Wording
  - S O Indicators Discussion
- 1 00 Lunch
- 2 00 Work Groups on Intermediate Results Indicators
- Orientation of Work Groups
  - Breakout Groups by Intermediate Results
  - One group each IR 1, IR 2, IR 3, IR 4, IR 5
    - Each composed of TAF/USAID/BRAC and Implementing NGOs
- 4 00 *Tea Break*
- 5 00 Plenary Session
- Reporting by Groups
  - Questions of Clarification only
- 6 00 Session Ends
- 8 00 Dinner

### **Thursday, 11 June**

- 7 30 to 8 30 Breakfast
- 9 00 Plenary Discussion of Workshop Outputs
- Consultant Team Processing of Day One Results
  - Plenary Responses
- 10 30 *Tea Break*
- 12 30 Lunch
- 1 20 Breakout Groups
- Orientation of Two Groups

**Democracy Partnership  
(TAF/USAID/BRAC)**

- Monitoring Plan
- Data Management
- Expectations/Visions of Partnership

**Implementing NGOs**

- Sharing Best Practices
- Expectations/Visions of Partnership

2 30 Plenary Session

- Reporting by Breakout Groups
- Identifying Critical Actions

3 30 End

## **ANNEX IV - PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT WORKSHOP FLIPCHART NOTES**

### **OBJECTIVES**

Identify Best Practices for Measuring and Reporting Democracy Partnership Results

Assess Current Indicators & Performance Measurement Practices

Consider Options for Improving Democracy Partnership Performance Measure

Consider Alternatives to Current Strategic Objective

Share Expectations/Visions of the Democracy Partnership with Implementing NGOs

Identify Next Steps for the Democracy Partnership to Improve Managing for Results

### **PRINCIPLES OF DEMOCRACY PARTNERSHIP**

- Customer Focus
- Collaboration
- Empowerment
- Management

#### Characteristics

- Cooperation
- Consensus
- Complementarity
- Sharing
  - Resources
  - Risks
  - Accountability

**"GOOD INDICATORS"**

Fit needs of collectors and other users

Are products of collaboration in planning, collecting and interpreting performance information

Are continuously managed through use of a performance monitoring plan

Are viewed as critical elements in program planning

Are minimum number necessary to describe results

Meet criteria for technical quality

Direct

Objective

Unidimensional

Quantitative where it fits

Disaggregated where useful

Available/efficient

Practical

Meaningful

Educative

## **GENERAL ISSUES**

### Overall context

- It could be worse
- Difficulties in collecting data
- We're not confident in data quality
- Performance monitoring system & overall management need improvement

### Partner needs

- TAF better balance of R4 reporting & internal data needs
- USAID continue to re-examine indicators, build up confidence of Democracy Partnership in data quality, reformulate results framework as needed
- BRAC clarify role

### Data collection

- Relevance, directness
- Definitions
- Coverage of groups/communities
- Adequately capturing accomplishments
- Sampling procedures
- Techniques for collecting data

## **GENERAL SUGGESTIONS**

Assess/Affirm role of performance measures in what Democracy Partnership does given opening principles

Clarify what changes (to indict , to framework) are needed now vs later

Consider capturing cross - IR results (e g , justice advocacy)

Use qualitative/narrative reporting to "show off" special results

Apply training & T A to strengthen performance measures and reporting

5a Specify roles & resources necessary for performance measures

Look for opportunities to reduce total number of indicators for R4

Institutionalize indicator diagnosis, esp through a performance monitoring plan

Look at what performance data tell us about program effectiveness, approaches, etc Look at implications for implementing NGO reports

Consider inter-dependence of the performance measures process and dynamics of the partnership itself

## **CUSTOMER SURVEYS**

“Qualitative Indicators

Strategic Objective

Confidence in ability to influence local decisions”

“Confidence in access to equitable justice”

Intermediate Result

“Confidence in ability of associations to advocate their interest”

“Confidence in Electoral Process” [in target communities]

“Satisfaction with performance of LEBs”

[“BIGUF members sense of empowerment vis-a-vis employers”]

Appropriate for

- Mission’s overall goal
- strategic objective
- Intermediate results

Objectives of appraisal are mixed

Who does

- Outside contractor (e g BUP)
- Democracy Partnership

How select respondents

- Probability sample
- Convenience sample of
  - ★ Individuals
  - ★ Or, in Group

Pair of I capture general sentiments

How ask indicator question

- Current
- Anchored, e g concrete situation

Anchor levels in behavior

Very Low

Low

Medium

High

Very High

**WORK GROUP PROCESS**

Facilitator reads "Issues Considerations" flipchart

- Preliminary discussion
- When a point needs recording, write it on a VIPP card (yellow)

Facilitator Reads "Suggestions" flipchart

- General discussion of proposed indicators
- Output [Template]
  - 1) Four Indicators [Priority]
  - 2) Proposals for system/process/organization for collection

Note During the discussion there may arise

Questions to address to the plenary [White]

Comments on the S O level wording or indicators [Green]

Comments on the General Issues outlined in the morning [Blue]

- When a point needs recording write it on a VIPP card

By 4 00 Tea break, group should be almost done

- Try to reach consensus by 4 00
- After Tea break prepare for 7 to 10 minute presentation

**ADVANTAGES TO COLLAPSING IR'S**

- ★ Reducing overlap improves focus
- ★ Refines who they advocate to
- ★ Activities to improve
- ★ Responsiveness of LEBs could be at all levels
- ★ So include both supply & demand in one IR

**ADVANTAGES TO COLLAPSING IR'S**

- Not as good for I-NGOs without groups
- Hard to get both demand & supply [depends on model]
- Any Reduction in IR may through some activities into question

Improving Accountability Recognize Weakness & Strengthen - Public Office

Democracy is a Process [not outcome]

## **BALANCING REPORTING**

### **INTERNAL – EXTERNAL REPORTING ISSUES**

- Int INGO 6 months and 12 months reports
- “Seasonal” pressure of R4
- Get real meaning B’hind numbers
- External request are onerous

### **INTERNAL - EXTERNAL REPORTING RESPONSES**

- Focus R4 indicators for R4 only
- Free UP internal reporting
- Use contractor(s) for R4 data collection/analysis
- Change format, content & use of 6 months reporting
- Capture I-NGO best practices and results in narrative
  - B practices
  - Anecdotes
  - Case studies
- Spread R4 tasks across year
- Got to make it easy for I-NGO’s

## **PROPOSED DATA COLLECTION PROCESS/SYSTEM (FROM GROUP DISCUSSIONS)**

- IR-1 - Organization capacity-building (I-NGOs/Associations)  
(Advocacy) - Uniform guideline (Bangla Version)  
- Orientation/training to data collectors  
(Basically Endorsing the Present Structure/Technical Support)
- IR-2 - Survey (DP & NGOs)  
(Election) - Data collection/statistical analysis (external organization)  
(Based on a blend of qualitative & quantitative ind )
- IR-3 - Identification of best practices (DP & I-NGOs)  
(LEBs) - How to use new set of IRS/Indicators  
(With checklist of Dev Initiatives (VGA card/pics)
- IR-4 - Follow-up plan for monitoring (by whom?)  
(Legal) - Evaluation form (with definitions of key terms e.g participation etc ) (By whom?) (Process)  
(New Ideas)
- IR-5 - I-NGO reporting (of records)  
(ADR) To DP  
- Survey in target areas (DP)

## **GENERAL ISSUES (DATA COLLECTION)**

- ★ Relevance/directness
- ★ Definitions
- ★ Coverage of groups/communities  
(control area) (non-intervening area)
- ★ Capturing accomplishments
- ★ Sampling procedures  
(Probability/convenience/?)
- ★ Techniques for data collection

## **OTHER CONSIDERATIONS**

- Disproportionate burden (on I-NGOs?)
- Complementarity  
(Between quantitative/qualitative/NGO reports)  
(Through periodic coordination)
- Output vs impact  
(NGOs) (Quantitative/qualitative)
- Experimentation  
(BRAC's 'participatory' approach)
- Uniformity  
(Checklist/Questionnaire Designing)
- ★ Not addressed in group discussions
- Not addressed in group discussions

## **IMPLEMENTING NGOs**

### **Expectations/Visions for Democracy Partnership**

Focal points for I-NGO's accountability

Long term rel with DP & I-NGO

Participation of DP members in Some of the program/s of I-NGOs

Periodical bi-annual meeting between DP & I-NGO

Exposure visit to I-NGO - I-NGO cross visit

Finding best practices in country/abroad (budget provision)

Assist in linking with similar organizations in the Raelene

Uniform reporting guide line

Please reduce reporting

Flexible grant contract

DP should issue intent letter at least 2 months before starting project

Sustainability of the project

Joint efforts for changes at policy level

Resource allocation for legal aid & assistance to the disadvantaged

Technical assistance for data collection & compilation (impact assessment)

**IR 1 INDICATORS**

Quantitative

Number of collective action initiatives that lead to policy change

Number of advocacy initiatives by Partnership-supported groups (via NGOs)

Number of associations (i.e., peoples' organizations) advocating customer interests in target communities

Qualitative

Customer confidence in the ability of associations and Partnership-supported groups to advocate their interests in target communities (Need to clarify definitions: collective action Partnership-supported groups, association)

**SYSTEMS/PROCESS/ORGANIZATION OF COLLECTION**

Capacity building: political process, lobbying, administrative structure  
IR-wise sharing and collective efforts: law revision, policy change

Capacity building: INGOs

Capacity building: associations

Time gap in filing case versus result

Feed-in criteria: Cite the last successful collective action initiative

Previous Review

**IR 1 INDICATORS**

Quantitative

Number of collective action initiatives that lead to policy change

Number of advocacy initiatives by Partnership-supported groups (via NGOs)

Number of associations (i.e., peoples' organizations) advocating customer interests in target communities

Qualitative

Customer confidence in the ability of associations and Partnership-supported groups to advocate their interests in target communities (Need to clarify definitions: collective action, Partnership-supported groups, association)

**SYSTEMS/PROCESS/ORGANIZATION OF COLLECTION**

Capacity building: political process, lobbying, administrative structure  
IR-wise sharing and collective efforts: law revision, policy change

Capacity building: INGOs

Capacity building: associations

Time gap in filing case versus result

Feed-in criteria: Cite the last successful collective action initiative

## **IR 2 QUALITY OF ELECTIONS ENHANCED**

### **Issues/Considerations**

Adequacy of indicator to capture level of achievement in IR area in terms of words used

–What constitutes customer confidence – to be able to cast a vote or able to cast vote according to own choice?

–What elements of electoral process to be considered in measuring customer confidence in it? Higher voter turnout?

–Fair election administration

–Violence/intimidation free vote-casting environment

–Reduction of election expenditure of candidates

Lack of complementarity of qualitative and quantitative indicators

### **Data collection format and methodology**

–Lack of uniformity of data collection tool of I-NGOs in same IR

–Low technical skill levels of actual data collectors (grassroots program implementers of I-NGO activities)

–Data collection activity not integrated with I-NGOs programs

## **IR 2 INDICATOR SUGGESTIONS**

### **I For new indicators/re-wording current ones**

- 1 Percentage casting vote according to own choice
- 2 Reduced numbers of reporting of unfair actions of election administration
- 3 Reduced incidence of violence/intimidation in vote casting
- 4 Reduced election expenditure of candidates

### **II Content/understanding of indicators**

- 1 Vote cast free of influence
- 2 Election administrators abiding by rules or procedures
- 3 Adherence to right to vote by all
- 4 Greater voter confidence in capability of candidates

### **III Systems/process/organization of data collection**

- 1 Uniform data collection tool for same indicator for all I-NGOs
- 2 Skill orientation of actual (grassroots) data collectors as part of own implementation training
- 3 Overall monitoring policy for ensuring complementarity between qualitative quantitative and I-NGO reports
- 4 Performance and impact evaluation for contract renewal

**Previous Page Blank**

**INDICATORS IR 2**

- 1 Percent of customers confident in the electoral process in target areas (#)

**System/process/organization of data collection**

- 1 Survey (design to be worked out with DP and I-NGOs), data collection and statistical analysis (done from outside)

*Considerations and issues*

- How to combine quantitative and qualitative indicators
- Survey design is key
- Opportunity to use an outside contractor

**IR 3 COMPETENCE OF LEBs TO IDENTIFY AND MEET CUSTOMER NEEDS**

**Considerations/issues**

- Who defines customer needs
  - DP list?
  - Customers?
- What is the list of 'best practices'?
- How characterize LEB
  - Any one practice
- Characterize LEB vs customer evaluation of LEB

### **IR 3 SUGGESTIONS**

#### **For new or re-worded indicators**

(Note Drop increased")

- 1 Keep # of LEBs using best practices'
- 2 Retain customer satisfaction"
- 3 Drop #2 Number of women

#### **For content/understanding**

- 1 Develop list of "best practices" but continually modify
- 2 using' define
- 3 Clarify question wording and procedure

#### **For system/process/organization for data collection**

- 1 For each U P , I-NGOs submit a 1-page checklist with comment
- 2 Consider outside organization to do "probability sample'

**IR 3 INDICATORS**

- 1 Number of LEBs in target areas using best practices
- 2 Percent of customers who consider that women LEB members participate in development initiatives

**System/process/organization of collection**

- 1 Through joint identification of a list of (growing) best practices by DP and INGOs Best practices will be identified by INGOs from the LEBs in their project areas
- 2 Present respondent with a list of development initiatives (e.g. VGD card, Project Implementation Committee, etc.) DP will contract out the survey