USAID | LIBERIA
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2008-2010

30 September 2008

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Chemonics International Inc.

USAID/LIBERIA PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN 2008-2010

Chemonics International Inc.
1717 H Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006

Contract No: GS-23F-9800H

Order No: 669-M-00-08-00091-00

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

CONTENTS

Acronyms v

Executive Summary 1

I. Introduction 3
- A. Overview of USAID/Liberia Strategy 3
- B. PMP Preparation Process 5
- C. Challenges in Revamping the PMP 5
- D. Selecting Performance Indicators 7

II. Operationalizing the PMP 8
- A. Monitoring and Evaluation Team 8
- B. Program Support Contractor 10
- C. Database 10
- D. Implementing Partners' Contractual Responsibilities 11
- E. Reporting, Analyzing, and Integrating Results 11
- F. Ownership of Performance Management 11
- G. On Demand Reporting 12
- H. Mission Order Observations 12
- I. Future Data Quality Assessments 15
- J. Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Schedule 16

III. Strategic Objective 8: Education 19
- A. Results Framework 20
- B. Foreign Assistance Alignment 21
- C. Indicators at a Glance 22
- D. Summary Performance Data Table 24
- E. Performance Indicator Reference Sheets 30

IV. Strategic Objective 8: Health 61
- A. Results Framework 62
- B. Foreign Assistance Alignment 63
- C. Indicators at a Glance 66
- D. Summary Performance Data Table 69
- E. Performance Indicator Reference Sheets 79

V. Strategic Objective 9: Democratic Governance Enhanced 141
- A. Results Framework 142
- B. Foreign Assistance Alignment 143
- C. Indicators at a Glance 144
- D. Summary Performance Data Table 146
- E. Performance Indicator Reference Sheets 150

VI. Strategic Objective 10: Sustained Economic Growth for Poverty Reduction 168
A. Results Framework 169
B. Foreign Assistance Alignment 170
C. Indicators at a Glance 171
D. Summary Performance Data Table 173
E. Performance Indicator Reference Sheets 180

VII. Data Quality Assessments 198
A. Methodology and Recommendations 198
B. DQA Summary and Tracking Table 199
C. Data Quality Assessment Reports 207

Annexes

Annex A: Monitoring & Evaluation Schedule 260
Annex B. PMP Definition, Purpose, and Guiding Principles 267
Annex C: Data Quality Reporting Forms 270
Annex D: List of Persons Contacted 277

ACRONYMS

ACT	Artemisinin-based Combination Treatments
ADS	Automated Directives System
AMTSL	Active Management of the Third Stage of Labor
ANC	Antenatal Care
AR	Annual Report
BCC	Behavior Change Communication
CB	Capacity Building
CBD	Community Based Distributors
CC	Community Profile
CCC	Civilian Conservation Corps
CCI	Control of Corruption Index
CHW	Community Health Worker
COP	Chief of Party
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTO	Cognizant Technical Officer
DG	Democracy and Governance
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
DPT	Diptheria Pertusis Tetanus
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
EG	Economic Growth
EGRA	Early Grade Reading Assessment
FACTS	Foreign Assistance Coordination Tracking System
FDI	Foreign Direct Investment
FP/RH	Family Planning/Reproductive Health
FSN	Foreign Service National
FY	Fiscal Year
GAR	Gross Attendance Ratio
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEMAP	Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program
GIS	Geographical Information System
GOL	Government of Liberia
GPI	Gender Parity Index
HDI	Human Development Index
HMIS	Health Management Information Systems
IBRD	International Bank for Reconstruction and Development
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
IEC	Information Education Communication
IFC	International Finance Institution
IMF	International Monetary Fund

IMR	Infant Mortality Rate
IP	Implementing Partner
IPT	Intermittent Preventive Treatment
IR	Intermediate Result
IT	Information Technology
ITN	Insecticide Treated Nets
IYCF	Infant and Young Child Feeding
KAP	Knowledge, Attitudes, Practices
KM	Kilometer
LCIP	Liberia Community Infrastructure Program
LEAP	Liberia Energy Assistance Program
LIAP	Liberia Integrated Assistance Program
LISGIS	Liberia Institute for Statistics and Geo-Information Services
LRC	Learning Resource Center
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MCH	Maternal and Child Health
mCPR	Modern Contraceptive Prevalence Rate
MIS	Management Information System
MIS	Malaria Indicator Survey
MOE	Ministry of Education
MOF	Ministry of Finance
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
Mw	Mega Watts
MWE	Mega Watts Electricity
N/A	Non-Applicable
NAR	Net Attendance Ratio
NEC	National Elections Commission
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NMCP	National Malaria Control Program
OCAT	Organization Capacity Tool
OD	Organizational Development
OMI	Organizational Management Index
OPPR	Operational Plan Performance Report
ORT	Oral Rehydration Therapy
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PMTCT	Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission
PMP	Performance Management Plan
PTA	Parent-Teacher Association
RFP	Request for Proposal
SBA	Skilled Birth Attendant
SI	Strategic Information

SJSCC	Special Joint Stakeholders Collaborative Committee
SMC	School Management Committee
SO	Strategic Objective
STI	Sexually Transmitted Infection
TA	Technical Assistance
TAMIS	Technical and Administrative Management Information System
TBA	Traditional Birth Attendants
TBD	To Be Determined
UN	United Nations
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNDP	United Nationals Development Program
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government
VCT	Voluntary Counseling and Testing
VIP	Ventilated Improved Pit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This Performance Management Plan (PMP) was developed in response to a request from USAID/Liberia to Chemonics International, Inc. (Chemonics). The work was conducted in Liberia and the United States from July through September 2008. Two monitoring and evaluation specialists from Chemonics assisted the Mission Technical Teams to update their respective Results Frameworks and PMPs, and to assess the quality of data being collected for reporting to USAID/Washington.

Chemonics used a facilitative and collaborative approach that placed USAID's Technical Team members at the center of the process. At every step, efforts were made to involve USAID staff and partners in order to promote their "ownership" of the final product because, at the end of the day, the PMP must serve the needs of the Mission Technical Teams.

Two overarching considerations drove revisions of the PMP; namely the imperative to update and sharpen the focus on what USAID/Liberia is supposed to accomplish, while also bringing the Mission's revised PMP into alignment with the Foreign Assistance Transformational Diplomacy system for monitoring and reporting results.

One of the challenges faced in aligning the Mission PMP with the Foreign Assistance Framework (referred to as F) was the numerous F standard operational planning indictors reported in the Mission's FY 2007 Operational Plan (OP) Performance Report and FY 2008 Operational Plan. It was imperative to decide among the more than 155 F standard indicators in the current PMP the group of indicators that would be manageable and still meaningful in reporting performance results. While a few indicators were cut, there are still too many indicators in the revised PMP due mainly to the integration of F standard indicators. Linked to that challenge was the difficulty in trying to align two different planning frameworks, the USAID Results Framework being hierarchical and strategic with cause-effect linkages of expected results, and the F strategic framework being more descriptive of functional objectives, program areas and program elements and sub-elements. The approaches used to align the two frameworks differ from one program area to the other depending on the complexity of each program or technical area.

Revamping the Technical Teams' Results Frameworks with new intermediate or sub-intermediate results and corresponding indicators was also a challenge given the fact that a number of activities under these results or sub-results are still being designed.

The purpose of this PMP is to provide a plan for monitoring and evaluating the program results. It is a tool for planning, managing, and documenting how performance data is collected and used. This report contains an overview of the USAID/Liberia strategy, program activity and sub-activity results, and full documentation of the indicators used to track progress toward expected results.

This document was developed in accordance with current USAID guidelines and requirements. The plan:

- Summarizes the SO, IR, and sub-IR level results statements and updated indicators (see *Results Frameworks*);

- Provides a detailed description of the performance indicators that will be tracked, and specifies the source and method for the collection of required data (see *Performance Indicator Reference Sheets*); and

- Specifies the schedule and responsibility for the collection of required data, including baseline and target values (see *Summary Performance Data Tables*).

The plan also includes suggested measures to build the monitoring and evaluation skills of Mission and partner staff, automate the collection and storage of performance data, create a Mission-wide M&E team across sectors, and develop a comprehensive timetable of tasks required over the next two years to operationalize the PMP.

As a *living document*, the PMP provides a mechanism for continuous formative assessment and learning about the relative success of interventions rather than a plan set in stone that cannot be adjusted along the way. It serves as a tool for maintaining constant awareness about progress relative to the Results Framework so that operational constraints can be flagged early on and mid-course corrections in programming made as necessary. The indicators that were settled on, first and foremost, will ensure that monitoring information will be meaningful and demonstrate the relative effectiveness of targeted actions. The extensive participatory process was undertaken to develop a strong set of performance indicators, with consideration given not only to the qualities of meaningfulness and effectiveness (and related utility), but also to practicality and economy. To this end, the set of indicators were developed with the participation of the Technical Teams, including key personnel and monitoring and evaluation officers.

Six main deliverables were accomplished as part of the PMP updates and in accordance with the original Scope of Work and Workplan for this activity:

- Updated Results Frameworks and indicators for the four Mission Technical Teams;
- Alignment of Technical Team's Results Frameworks with the Foreign Assistance Framework;
- Updated performance indicator reference sheets and summary performance data tables for all the indicators included in the revised PMP;
- A comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Schedule;
- Data quality assessments for priority indicators included in previous PMP;
- Recommendations for revisions of the draft Mission Order document.

We describe below each of these deliverables and related accomplishments. The introduction section presents an overview of the USAID/Liberia strategy and the process followed in conducting this activity. The second section provides some suggestions for operationalizing the PMP. Sections three through seven present updated Technical Teams' Results Frameworks and alignment of these frameworks with the Foreign Assistance Framework; updated PMPs; performance indicator reference sheets and summary data tables; a comprehensive Monitoring and Evaluation Schedule; and data quality assessment reports. The Annex section contains a few tools used during the course of this activity, including a completed M&E schedule matrix.

I. INTRODUCTION

A. Overview of USAID/Liberia Strategy

Since 1979, chronic instability has plagued Liberia. With the exception of a two-year period from 1997 to 1999, Liberia was ravaged by armed conflict from 1989 to 2003. Root causes of armed conflict and instability in Liberia are inextricably linked to the country's history of poor governance. For most of Liberia's 130 years of relative stability, Liberia was a highly centralized unitary state. The control and flow of state resources and decision making were located in the nation's capital, Monrovia.

After decades of poor governance and conflict, a period of high hope and high expectations for recovery and development began with the inauguration of President Ellen Johnson-Sirleaf in January 2006. Liberia has made encouraging progress in beginning to recover from 14 years of civil war (1989-2003). But major challenges remain as central and local governments that collapsed require support to secure law and order, administer justice, provide basic services such as water, electricity and road maintenance, restore health and education systems, and generate employment.

The US is working to restore public confidence in political, social, economic and judicial institutions while addressing the regional disparity and bad governance that contributed to the conflict. Prolonged armed conflict has had a deleterious effect on every aspect of the lives of Liberians. Liberia emerged from the war with shattered administrative, economic, health, and education capacities due to the flight of qualified professionals and widespread damage to infrastructure. Formal economic activity and agricultural productivity was disrupted and devastated by the years of armed conflict and the subsequent flight of most businesses and human resources. The majority of the population, outside of limited areas of the capital city, has no access to electricity and sanitation.

Two sources of fragility jeopardize Liberia's progress: 1) political and social exclusion and 2) competition over resources. However, prospects for sustainable development are good because of the resiliency of the Liberian people, governance reforms, and the natural endowment of the country with tremendous agricultural potential and iron ore, rubber, timber, precious minerals, and potentially, offshore oil reserves and bauxite.

Building on the achievements of USAID activities and successful emergency and transition activities of the USAID Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), Office of Food for Peace (FFP), and the Office of Transition Initiatives, USAID's strategy for 2006 - 2009 sets two goals: 1) to avert and resolve conflict; and 2) to manage crises and promote stability, recovery, and democratic reform. The strategy consists of four strategic objectives:

- SO 7: Reinforce African Conflict Management Mitigation Capacity
  Program Components:
  Mitigate Conflict and Support Peace
  Support Populations at Risk

- SO 8: Increase access to Essential Services by National and Local Organizations
  Program Components:

Improve Equitable Access to Basic Education
Improve Child Survival, Health and Nutrition
Reduce Transmission and Impact of HIV/AIDS
Support Family Planning and Reproductive Health

- SO 9: Advance Inclusive Government
  Program Components:
  Strengthen Civil Society
  Improve Justice Sector
  Legislative Strengthening
  Strengthen Public Sector Executive Function

- SO 10: Restore and Improve Basic Economic Activity and Livelihoods
  Program Components:
  Protect and Increase the Assets and Livelihoods of the Poor
  Promote Sustainable Management of Natural Resources and Bio-Diversity Conservation
  Expand and Improve Access to Economic and Social Infrastructure (energy and power)

Between 2006 and 2008, USAID succeeded in its rehabilitation and stabilization efforts. Major activities were supported to reintegrate internally displaced people, ex-combatants and the general population affected by the war through job creation, reconstruction of roads, schools, and hospitals, reviving and initiating agricultural production, expanding access to schooling, training health, education and other government personnel, and delivering an integrated package of essential health services for child survival, maternal health, malaria and HIV/AIDS. USAID's democracy and governance program supports the justice system, human rights, and economic governance as well as strengthening the multi-party electoral system.

As the end of the current strategy period approaches (FY 2009), the Mission is making adjustments to its program and performance management system taking into account the progress to date and new directions anticipated for the next strategy period (FY 2010 – FY 2013). Having achieved the SO 7 objective of reinforcing the African conflict management mitigation capacity, it is no longer part of the Mission program. Similarly, under SO 9 the original "Strengthen Civil Society" and "Legislative Strengthening" components are/will be completed in early FY 2009, opening the way for new initiatives which have yet to be designed. Finally, SO 8 (Education and Health) and SO 10 (Economic Growth) are being significantly revamped to reflect progress to date and the shift already underway in the USAID program from rehabilitation and stabilization to transformational activities. This transformation will be fully developed in the new Country Strategy Plan for Liberia.

The USAID/Liberia strategy continues to address in a coherent manner the ongoing need to continue the recovery and rebuilding effort, the pressing need to introduce regulatory and economic reforms, and the urgent and complex requirement for capacity to plan and manage the implementation of these reforms.

B. PMP Preparation Process

Implementation of the Performance Management Plan (PMP) for USAID/Liberia was interrupted beginning in 2006 by the introduction of the Operational Plan system intended to provide a new comprehensive, interagency picture of how foreign assistance resources are used to support the foreign policy objectives and the Transformational Diplomacy goal. This initiative was accompanied by the year-long process of developing and introducing a new set of mandatory standard indicators for tracking financial obligations and performance results through the worldwide Foreign Assistance Coordination and Tracking System (FACTS) database. Although the Mission PMP of May 2006 was available, USAID/Liberia shifted its performance management attention to the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data and program information related to its projects in the context of the Operational Planning system.

This PMP update is the result of USAID/Liberia's desire to better track and analyze the results of the now-terminating rehabilitation and stabilization activities as well as its new development initiatives. It reflects the current situation in Liberia and the probable direction that USAID's development strategy will take going forward. However, it is recognized that a new PMP will be necessary in FY 2009 following approval of the new Country Strategy Plan (CSP). The evolving and continuing importance of Liberia to US national interests, as well as the successful implementation of USAID activities since 2006, has been taken into account in the revisions made to this PMP.

Recognizing the difficulties in developing a comprehensive and rigorous monitoring and evaluation system program that meets both the ADS requirements for a PMP and the evolving F monitoring standards, USAID/Liberia engaged Chemonics International to assist the Mission Technical Teams to update their PMPs and other related documents and conduct data quality assessments of their indicators. During July-August 2008, a two-person Chemonics team, through a series of PMP assessment meetings, worked with Technical Team leaders, Cognizant Technical Officers (CTOs), activity managers, and implementing partners to review performance monitoring issues such as data quality and sufficiency, quality, relevancy, and documentation of performance indicators, and availability of baseline and target values for performance indicators. The Chemonics team also reviewed the USAID/Liberia Strategy Statement 2006-2009, the PMP that was developed in 2006 for that strategy, the FY 2007 and FY 2008 Operational Plans of USAID/Liberia, and the FY 08 semi-annual portfolio review reports. Some activity PMPs prepared by implementing partners were also reviewed to learn the indicators they were using to report their results. For the four strategic areas of Mission involvement, one of them (democracy and governance) needed only updates and three (health, education, and economic growth) required significant changes to the Results Frameworks and indicators. The team also explored with interlocutors possible obstacles and/or potential problems in harmonizing the PMP indicators and F standard indicators, one of the deliverables of the consultancy, and recommended modifications or new indicators that would meet the requirements of both systems while increasing the capacity of the Mission to track the quantitative/qualitative progress of its program.

C. Challenges in Revamping the PMP

Two overarching considerations drove revisions of the PMP; namely the imperative to update and sharpen the focus on what USAID/Liberia is supposed to accomplish, while also bringing the Mission's revised PMP into alignment with the Foreign Assistance Transformational

Diplomacy system for monitoring and reporting results. The revised Results Frameworks and monitoring and evaluation system should prove useful to the Mission in the rational allocation of resources to the most effective programs and should permit more meaningful reporting of achievements in Liberia.

The particular challenge of both solidifying the Results Frameworks and then harmonizing those indicators with the F standard operational planning indictors was compounded when an analysis of the current PMP and the FY 2007 Performance Report and FY 2008 Operational Plan revealed that USAID/Liberia was reporting on some 155 different indicators. Clearly, it was imperative to decide upon a group of indicators that would be manageable and still meaningful in reporting performance results.

The development of proposed indicators, notably those for SO 10 (Economic Growth) and S08 (Education and Health), was carried out in the context of the performance indicators already in use by the four technical offices of USAID/Liberia. A small reduction in the overall number of indicators was accomplished simply by eliminating those indicators from the PMP that duplicated those that the Mission intended to report on in the FY 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report (OPPR). In cases of duplication or near-duplication, the F standard indicators were retained while the indicators in the original PMP were discarded. Indicators tracking activities that had been completed or in the process of being completed were also eliminated as well as those for which data could not be collected in the past. Despite this attempt to streamline and align PMP indicators with the new Foreign Assistance Framework, there are still too many indicators in the revised PMP mainly due to the new F standard indicators that have been integrated into the PMP, new or revised activities that require both standard F indicators and Mission custom indicators, and incorporation of indicators that reflect regional or USAID/Washington funded activities such as the African Global Competitivess Initiative and the Initiative to End Hunger in Africa.

For all sectors, Intermediate Results were examined for the coverage, balance and complementarities that they would provide to the framework. Finally, the redesign included technical reviews of potential results and indicators to examine their role in the overall analysis and reporting system.

In revising the Results Framework for SO 10 to accommodate planned new activities, the SO was changed to “Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction.” This change led to the creation of two new Intermediate Results: “market-based opportunities in the rural economy enhanced,” and “growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated.” These alterations helped to clarify and strengthen the logic of the economic growth development hypothesis.

A few months prior to the consultancy, the Health Technical Team had started to update its Results Framework to reflect new activities and the overall expansion of its program. As part of this updating process, the Health Team decided to have its own Results Framework, separate from the combined education and health Results Framework that was developed in 2006. New updates made on the revised Results Framework during our consultancy include changing the SO result from “Increased Access to Basic Health Services” to “Increased Use of Basic Health Services,” which was Intermediate Result 1 in the previous Results Framework. “Increased Access to Basic Health Services” became Intermediate Result 1. The previous Intermediate Result 2 “Improved infrastructure, health workforce and systems performance” was changed to “Increased Quality of Basic Health Services” and the third

Intermediate Result "Youth informed and networked on reproductive health" became "Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills."

Substantial changes were also made to the Education Results Framework (now also separate from the Health Results Framework) to better reflect the quality of education, an important component of the education program, and to incorporate results of a higher education activity under development. Hence, the SO changed from "Increased Access to Essential Social Services" to "Increased Access to Quality Education." Intermediate Result 1 "Improved capacity for delivery of social services (health, basic education, vocational education)" became "Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education"; Intermediate Result 2 changed from "Strengthened civil society participation and advocacy for better services" to "Increased capacity of higher education institutions and the Ministry of Education"; and Intermediate Result 3 slightly changed from "Improved enabling environment for social service delivery (policy, strategic planning, data access & use, governance)" to " Strengthened enabling environment for basic and higher education."

D. Selecting Performance Indicators

Several important criteria for determining performance indicators were chosen early on. These included both the USAID mandated criteria for all indicators (direct, objective, useful for management, practical, attributable to USAID, timely, and adequate) as well as particular indicator criteria suggested by the USAID/Liberia Strategy Statement 2006 - 2009:

- The indicators should measure the most important aspects of the program. This process involved analyzing what is already underway in the myriad activities already being funded by USAID/Liberia and reviewing what was originally intended in the strategy and potential new activities that will be added to the portfolio in the coming months.

- To the extent possible, the PMP should adopt F standard indicators, especially when selecting output indicators. This approach greatly facilitated harmonizing the PMP and the Operational Planning system although it made the PMP heavier with the integration of F standard indicators.

- A wide range of types of indicators has been chosen, including the results of surveys, some of which have yet to be designed, a mixture of qualitative and quantitative indicators, indicators already used by the GOL in the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, and the use of readily available international statistics and standard outcome and impact indicators, including USAID common indicators (called in this document custom outcome or impact indicators or performance management indicators). In some cases, a few output indicators were added to the standard F indicators to measure sub-intermediate or activity-level results.

Performance summary data tables for the revised strategic objectives being pursued by USAID/Liberia for FY 2008 – FY 2010 are presented. Individual Performance Data Reference Sheets for each indicator include definitions, data sources and collection methods, and baseline target information. These indicators have been selected to be consistent with each Strategic Objective, Intermediate Result as well as the Program Areas and Elements of

the foreign assistance framework. To the extent practicable, they are also as similar as possible to many existing performance indicators being reported in the Operational Plan Performance Report (OPPR). This is intended to minimize both the reporting burden on these Mission Technical Teams and adjustments to their data collection procedures.

II. OPERATIONALIZING THE PMP

A. Monitoring and Evaluation Team

Accurate, timely, and credible information on the USAID program is needed to enable Mission staff to manage programs effectively and to report on them objectively. One way to help meet these needs would be for USAID/Liberia to consider forming an internal monitoring and evaluation (M&E) team comprised of Liberian representatives from each technical office and chaired by a representative from the Program Office.

1. Team Organization and Management

The M&E team members would be chosen by the team leaders of the four technical offices responsible for implementing USAID's four program components. The team could be supported periodically with technical assistance from a monitoring and evaluation specialist consultant who would assist in establishing the team and provide periodic inputs as needed either remotely or during occasional visits to Monrovia. Alternatively, if the Mission should obtain the services of a program support contractor (see below), the contractor could provide similar assistance. The Mission should also consider recruiting a full time M&E specialist in lieu of or in addition to the M&E contractor. The main role of the M&E specialist would be to strengthen the M&E capacity of the Mission's Technical Teams and implementing partners, and ensure effective implementation of the PMP.

2. Objectives

The M&E team will place simultaneous emphasis on accountability, good management, and effective communication. The team will produce:

- Timely information to support decisions relevant to the USAID program management and that of its four components;
- Objective data on the performance of implementers to ensure accountability;
- Accurate information it can use to inform elements of the GOL and the public on USAID program goals and the degree of progress in meeting them;
- Data for use in preparing semi-annual portfolio review reports as well as mid-term reports and the Operational Plan Performance Report (OPPR) to USAID/W; and
- Consistent and timely information on cross-cutting themes such as gender, youth, anti-trafficking, HIV/AIDS, urbanization, decentralization, or others.

The Mission's M&E team will maintain needed objectivity and independence while being mindful of the importance of reliable data; clearly and easily defended methodologies for cross-checking and analyzing data; easily understood reporting formats; and unambiguous source information.

3. Roles and Responsibilities

Development of the Mission M&E team could commence with a series of Monitoring and Evaluation orientation workshops, conducted by outside consultant personnel or a program support contractor, intended to introduce the team to 1) principles of M&E; (2) indicators and targets to be used for monitoring; (3) baselines and benchmarks; (4) data sources and collection procedures; and (5) reporting formats and procedures. The USAID/Liberia M&E system could be expected to include provision for both quantitative and qualitative metrics and will permit the augmentation of factual reporting with narrative text, anecdotes, case examples, and photos.

Invitations to these workshops could be extended to implementing partners, who would be encouraged by the USAID M&E team to formally assign M&E responsibilities to one of the project staff.

4. Meeting and Reporting

To ensure a rapid start-up, the M&E team will meet weekly during the one-month start-up period and bi-weekly thereafter. M&E team members, individually or as a team, will be capable of producing regularly scheduled reports (quarterly and semi-annually) and, on occasion, PowerPoint presentations. This might include, for example, presentations of quarterly implementation reports or semi-annual portfolio reviews submitted by implementing partners for their respective Technical Teams or for a wider Mission audience. Recognizing the fact that USAID staff is extremely busy will require that monitoring information be presented in a lean format to facilitate decision-making.

Once M&E team members are comfortable with their respective agreed upon indicators, targets, data sources, and reporting formats, consideration will be given to the creation of a database(s) for data storage and management of program data or parts thereof. This would help to reduce the likelihood of error, facilitate the management of data, and shorten report production time. For further details on this subject, see Section C below.

5. M&E Capacity Building

The PMP cannot be effectively implemented if Technical Teams don't have basic skills in monitoring and evaluation. One of the roles of the M&E team, assuming the team has received some training in M&E, is to train other staff on key M&E concepts and methodologies. If the Mission has a full time M&E specialist and the M&E team has been established, it will be easier to mainstream M&E throughout the Mission. Implementing partners will also need occasional M&E refresher training, including training on new tools, indicators, and data collection methods, data quality assessments, updates or new reporting requirements, and database and M&E systems training. The M&E specialist can play a major role in strengthening the M&E capacity of partners and promoting good M&E practices within the Mission and amongst implementing partners. In the absence of a dedicated M&E

specialist, USAID can use an M&E consultant or contractor. (See Section B below for more details).

6. Flash Reporting and Follow-up

In rare cases, a matter may be so urgent that the M&E team will not wait for the scheduled monthly or quarterly report, but will need to report information to project managers for immediate attention. Monitoring data employed in such a manner may redirect project resources to help prevent having a problem spin out of control.

B. Program Support Contractor

Performance monitoring is a process that demands certain levels of human resources if it is to be an operational part of an organization's program and responsibilities. USAID/Liberia staff is stretched to the limits with program management responsibilities that exceed that of normal activity managers. The Mission should consider obtaining the services of a program support contractor to help improve the collection, analysis, and dissemination of data and program information related to Mission activities. One major area of responsibility to be covered by the contract could include implementation of and reporting on the PMP. To accomplish this, the contractor would take the lead in compiling, organizing and presenting information on the entire range of Mission activities. This might include management of various performance monitoring mechanisms, including the PMP. The contractor will also play a major role in strengthening the M&E capacity of Mission and Implementing Partner personnel.

The program support contractor could assist the Mission in tracking program results against targets established in the PMP. This might be done in three ways:

- Collecting and collating information presented by implementing partners (contractors, grantees, NGOs, etc.) in their periodic reports and updates. This might include the results of separately contracted special studies and other surveys that would be given to the program support contractor for analysis.

- Conducting special exercises to collect performance data not associated with a particular implementing partner or other source; and

- Collecting information used in PMP baselines and targets from other official sources such as the World Bank, other donors and Africa regional organizations. As a general rule, all performance reports (excluding financial data) could be made available to the contractor by implementing partners for this purpose.

The responsibility for performance management rests with the Technical Teams, but for each objective level indicator there could be points in the data management process where the program support contractor could play a supporting, initiating, facilitating, coordinating, or analytical role, as appropriate.

C. Database

A comprehensive database of all USAID/Liberia-supported activities and broad capacity-building and policy development programs would be exceedingly useful in helping the

Mission quickly pull together sometimes disparate activities into an effective performance management system. Although the Mission has not invested in establishing such a database, it is recommended that they consider doing so.

The Mission or a program support contractor, as suggested above, should be tasked to study all aspects of database development, including assessing a variety of options to meet the wide range of Mission information needs. This assessment should explore a range of platforms from the possible use of Microsoft Excel to a full-fledged database using Microsoft Access or a similar relational database program. Excel can be a powerful tool, as evidenced by its successful use in the Initiative to End Hunger in Africa, and offers the significant advantage of easy data export to more robust programs in later years.

User-unfriendly systems of reporting and analysis can also sideline the PMP system from playing its proper role in its on-going assessment of the progress in achieving Mission objectives. From the perspective of performance management, the user-unfriendliness that is sometimes reported for USAID project databases is a special problem. Awkward data entry will slow and harm the quality of the basic data in the system and undermine the credibility and utility of the system. However, the users' input interface and reporting capabilities in the basic architecture can be enhanced to avoid this.

In addition to focusing on developing an architecture that pulls together Mission activities, the study should also highlight that any resulting database is user-friendly regarding both the input process and the reporting capabilities. Furthermore, the uniform input protocols (essential when data is coming from multiple sources and multiple types of organizations and programs) must be flexible enough to accurately represent broad policy development and capacity-building programs.

D. Implementing Partner Contractual Responsibilities

USAID/Liberia should consider adopting language to be included in bilateral contracts and grants that specify the duties of the implementing partners to perform monitoring and evaluation functions, to adopt Mission performance indicators whenever possible, and especially to provide quality data in the formats specified by USAID. It is important that this language always be inserted in RFPs and RFA's so that bidders will adequately budget for their M&E responsibilities.

E. Reporting, Analyzing, and Integrating Results

At this point in USAID/Liberia's transition to a more typical development program, priority must be given to improving decision-making and planning by collecting and synthesizing data from multiple sources in a way that is minimally intrusive and time-consuming. While ensuring that comparable data is collected on a regular and timely basis, the Mission will want to be mindful of the Agency's desire to minimize data calls outside of the Operational Planning and Performance Reporting systems that are meant to serve all data reporting needs.

F. Ownership of Performance Management

Performance management is, as stated above, a shared responsibility that depends for its success upon the "ownership" of USAID activity managers, implementing partners, and

senior management. This is especially true for those partners (international agencies, NGOs, etc.) whose source of funding is from Washington, rather than the bilateral Mission, and who sometimes resist Mission attempts to include them in the PMP reporting process. Experience shows that the only way to successfully develop a performance monitoring and reporting system for a large program spanning so many operating units is to collaborate closely with those units. USAID/Liberia should continue this participatory approach and involve as many actors as possible along the way. Thus, the overall approach to PMP system development and execution is a combination of technical inputs by the Program and technical offices and frequent communication and discussion with implementing partners.

G. On Demand Reporting

Although performance monitoring is essentially a semi-annual and annual process within the framework of USAID's established results management approach, demands for performance information are constant and various in a high profile program such as Liberia's. The recommended database, enabled to track performance indicators in addition to activity inputs and outputs, will be the basis for contributing to other regular, on-going reporting exercises, and to the many ad-hoc taskings for performance analysis that are a constant element of the environment of high profile programs. To meet these needs, the addition of the PMP tracking capability, user friendly input interfaces (so that data is recent and accurate), and an agile reporting and analytical module will be essential.

H. Mission Order Observations

We have reviewed the Mission Order draft document and formulated some suggestions for improving this important M&E guidance document.

General Comments:

- Take into account the new Foreign Assistance Framework reporting requirements;
- Discuss PMP implementation (how data is acquired, analyzed, stored, and used).

Specific Comments:

Page 1: Definitions: Include definitions of standard F indicators and custom indicators. Clarify whether USAID "common indicators" will continue to be called so or whether they are now known as "Mission custom outcome or impact indicators" in the new Foreign Assistance Terminology.

Page 2: Still under definitions: Results Framework. Perhaps add that under the new Foreign Assistance Framework, USAID missions are encouraged to align their Results Frameworks with the new Foreign Assistance Framework. Aligned Results Frameworks should show how F objectives, program areas and elements, and corresponding indicators are aligned with the Mission's objectives and intermediate results and corresponding indicators.

Page 3: Another responsibility for the Program Office under monitoring would be: Ensure PMP implementation (make sure CTOs/Activity Managers have up-to date performance data for their programs and assist them in setting up systems for obtaining performance data).

Page 5: Technical Team annual budget planning; last paragraph: Technical Teams may also budget for other studies or assessments. These studies may include special surveys (that are not accounted for in implementing partners' budgets). Budgets for both baseline and follow-on surveys are required.

Other items to include in the budgets (unless covered in salaries and overhead expenses) include training of USAID staff, databases and other M&E equipment/software, and implementing partners' training and other capacity strengthening.

Page 6: Common indicators: Discuss F standard and custom indicators as well as Mission-specific custom indicators.

Page 7: Conducting Data Quality Assessments (DQAs): Perhaps add that although DQAs are done once every 3 years, data quality should be integrated into Technical Team's work to ensure the data reported is always of good quality. For example, systems and procedures must be put in place to informally check the quality of the data on a routine basis (through sites visits, portfolio reviews, data spot-checking/verification, etc).

Page 8: Portfolio reviews: It's stated that PRAs are conducted once a year, but the Liberia Mission does PRAs twice a year (every 6 months). Also, it's important to clarify which results are reviewed against targets (which indicators PRAs focus on) since there are now many indicators in the PMP, including F standard indicators. Will the Portfolio review focus exclusively on SO/IR results? Since there are so many F indicators, perhaps the portfolio review can focus on outcome/impact results and a few F results using a selected number of indicators?

Page 9: Planning for and conducting evaluations: It would be useful to provide guidance on when an external evaluation is recommended over an internal evaluation. What are the advantages/disadvantages of each?

Page 10: Designating indicators for the OP: At the bottom of the page, it's stated that "as part of the OP process, Technical Teams are required to select a sub-set of indicators and targets from the PMP, usually around 3, to submit with the OP). Please clarify. Perhaps this was done under the old reporting system. Is it still done this way under the new F OP reporting system?

Page 13: Calendar of Monitoring and Evaluation Responsibilities: Include language from the new F reporting requirements:

- Get data for the annual OP Performance Report
- Designate indicators and targets for the next Operational Report

Page 17: Indicator summary table: Perhaps use the table that's in the PMP toolkit (page 97). It has more information on performance indicators.

Page 19: Performance Indicator Reference Sheet: Clarify terminology - Strategic Objective/ Agency Common Indicator. Will these terms continue to be used with F alignment?

Page 20: Annual Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E calendar): Adapt the table based on the one used in the PMP toolkit (page 98-99).

Page 22: Show alignment of the Results Framework with Foreign Assistance Framework

Attachment 2: Data quality assessment checklists:

On page 2 of that attachment (instructions), it is stated "plan at least two hours to conduct the DQA visit." I would say "plan at least 30 minutes for each indicator data assessed."

These 2 checklists are a bit long. It's possible to summarize the questions and write an overall assessment of data quality for each indicator using a short DQA assessment report form.

On page 2 of Data Quality Assessment Checklist A - Representative Sampling: it's difficult for USAID staff or a third party conducting the DQA to guess the responses to some of the shaded questions (to be completed by USAID staff/third party before DQA) — e.g. "Are the people collecting the data qualified and properly supervised?." The IP or contractor implementing the survey is the most appropriate person to answer that question. The question "Are final numbers reported accurate?" would be hard to answer during the DQA session if it's a large scale survey. One must verify the entire data set to see if the numbers are correct. This can take a long time to do. Perhaps the analysis should be done before the DQA.

On page 4: Under precision, add a question on data disaggregation since disaggregation also tells you how data is precise or specific to allow for informed decision-making.

Same comments on DQA checklist B - Non-Representative Sampling.

Attachment 3: Guidelines and Report Formats for Site Visits:

On Page 2, other purposes of site visits: Add building capacity of implementing partner. Performance improvement should be the overarching goal of site visits. Therefore, sites visits should have some focus on capacity-building or formative supervision.

On Page 3- Report: The second paragraph states that Technical Teams may want to hold debriefing meetings following field trips. There should also be a discussion on how field visits findings/issues are discussed and resolved with partners. Is there a debriefing meeting with the IP at the conclusion of the site visit?

Attachment 7: Portfolio Review Assessments:

Page 7: E - Performance Assessment: I - g) Are PMP indicators, targets, baselines, etc. up to date? Are indicators still relevant? ADD: Is performance data being obtained for each indicator?

Page 8: F - Results for this year's reporting indicators. Double-check dates when the indicator memo is written. OP indicators are selected in November and I assume the indicator memo is written after the indicator selection process, not in January.

Page 9: Completion of the summary indicator tables supposes that annual performance data has been reported by IPs. In case of semi-annual PRAs, only partial performance data will be available so the data template should be designed accordingly. For example, ask for progress data as of April 2008.

Additional portfolio review questions can be found in the PMP toolkit (page 114-115).

I. Future Data Quality Assessments

Below are a few suggestions to consider for addressing data quality in the future:

- **Operational Plan Performance Report (OPPR) Data:** The ADS requires that any data used for annual reporting undergo a data quality assessment every 3 years. There are many indictors that will be used for the first time beginning in 2009 for which data quality assessments will be needed. Given the fact that the next strategy is expected to cover only three years, it is recommended the Mission plan DQAs for these indicators as early as 2009.

- **Mission Level Data (not used for the annual report**): It is also important to note that there is a significant amount of data used at the mission level for management decision making (e.g. to manage contracts). Over the course of the next year, Technical Teams should consider data quality issues for that data. If data quality concerns emerge, then this issue may need to be explored more fully for those indicators.

- **Options for Assessing Data:** There are a variety of options for conducting data quality assessments ranging from more informal explorations of specific data quality issues to a full blown, more comprehensive assessment. Each approach is appropriate in different contexts. The following summarizes a range of approaches for assessing data quality:

    - Complete the DQA worksheet for the indicator/data;
    - Work with partners to identify key issues/problems as well as the appropriate solution to address those problems. In this case, it would be advisable to write a brief memo for the files summarizing the issue and its resolution;
    - Incorporate data quality as part of the provision of technical assistance to set up M&E systems among beneficiaries;
    - Incorporate data quality issues into other assessments that occur as a part of the project (experts in the field often need to examine the available data for their analyses);
    - Hire an external consultant or team to conduct a data quality assessment, using a more comprehensive and systematic approach.

- **A strategic approach**: Remember that not all data are equal. It may be useful to establish priorities based on which data are most important. Highest priority indicators include ones that:

- Are used for reporting (these are covered in the formal DQAs conducted every 3 years);
- Measure a strategic approach;
- Measure progress in a major area of importance (e.g., program areas where 50% of the resources are allocated are higher priority than those that measure progress in more tangential areas).

J. Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Schedule

The matrix in Annex A presents the major tasks required to ensure that the PMP is used as a planning and management tool. It presents the major tasks required to obtain performance data at the different levels of the Results Framework, review and report performance information, assess data quality, and review and update the PMP, including designating indicators for the Operational Plan Performance Report.

Collecting Baseline and Target Data

There are still a number of indicators that don't have baseline data or targets. Those are mostly Mission outcome or impact indicators that are either new in the revised PMP or were in the previous PMP but for which data was never collected. Still others are suggested indicators for new activities now in the design stage that Technical Teams need to decide upon once new activities are authorized. A few Mission custom output indicators also need baseline data for the same reasons explained above. Some indicators may have baseline data, but lack target data, so targets for these indicators are required. We have indicated in the matrix the indicators that need baselines and targets. We have proposed setting baseline and targets in the first and second quarter of FY 09. Targets for all F indicators have to be set in the first quarter as part of the OP Performance Reporting. In the case of S08 (Education) and S10 (Economic Growth), some of the indicators need to be finalized before baseline and target information is collected.

Collecting SO and IR Level Performance Data

Most of the SO and IR level indicators are custom Mission outcome or impact indicators and will, in some cases, require conducting surveys to obtain data. We have scheduled surveys on outcome and impact indicators to be conducted in Quarter 1 or Quarter 2 of FY 2009 (baseline survey) and follow-on surveys a year or 2 later, depending on the periodicity of the proposed survey. A number of these surveys will be conducted by third party entities that normally collect this kind of data, so USAID will adjust its schedule for obtaining the data based on when these entities conduct the surveys. An example of such surveys is the Demographic and Health Survey.

Collecting Activity-Level Data

This data relates to F standard and custom indicators reported annually; so the data has to be acquired during the first quarter from implementing partners (at least a month before the OP Performance Report is due). Mission CTOs and Activity Managers should make sure that partners regularly collect performance data, particularly OP indicator data, to avoid any

delays in compiling and submitting that data to USAID for the November OP Performance Report.

Conducting Evaluations and Specials Studies

Each Technical Team will schedule evaluations and special studies to be conducted annually. Those may include external or internal evaluations or special studies to better understand certain aspects of their programs, including identification of best practices. Timing for some of the evaluations scheduled in FY 2009 is included in Annex A.

Reviewing Performance Information

The main mechanisms for reviewing performance data are the semi-annual performance reviews (also called portfolio reviews). Performance reviews not only offer an opportunity to review progress on program implementation, but to also review the results of the projects to ensure annual targets have been met (for annual performance reviews) or are on track for being met (for mid-year performance reviews). Performance reviews take place in the first and third quarter of the year.

Reporting Performance Results

Performance Results on Standard F indicators are reported in the first quarter of the fiscal year (November 30th). Mission custom indicator data should also be reported during that time. Missions should encourage implementing partners to schedule their surveys for assessing project outcomes during the last quarter of the year so that survey results can also be reported to USAID as part of the annual reporting. Surveys done by third party partners are harder to schedule, but USAID should work with the third party entities implementing these surveys to have them done according to their normal schedule (e.g., every 3-5 years for DHS).

Assessing Data Quality

All indicator data (particularly F indicator data) should be assed at least once every 3 years. We have scheduled data quality assessments for all indicators whose quality hasn't been yet assessed for the fourth quarter of each fiscal year. We put the same date for data quality assessments in the performance indicator reference sheets, but it will be up to the Mission to determine which indicators are assessed each year depending on the importance of the indicator, the last time the indicator was assessed, the resources available to conduct the DQA, the availability of staff, and the availability of data to be assessed (especially for outcome and impact indicators which require surveys or special assessments).

Review and Update the PMP

A PMP is a living document and should be updated every year as new indicators might have to be added or some of the existing ones dropped. Ideally, the PMP should be updated after the annual portfolio review and designation of F indicators and targets to be included in the next FY OP. Hence, PMP updates are scheduled for the first quarter of each FY. The review

of the PMP also entails reviewing the indicator reference sheets and entering performance data (actual and target data).

Designate PMP Indicators for Operational Plan

This should be done during the OP Performance Reporting in the first quarter of each FY.

III. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 8: EDUCATION

See A. Results Framework on the following page.

A. Results Framework

US Foreign Assistance Objective: Investing in People
Program Area: Education
SO: Increased Access to Quality Education

Indicator 1: Primary school enrollment rates
Indicator 2: Primary school completion rates
Indicator 3: Primary school absentee rates
Indicator 4: Gender parity index
Indicator 5: Grade 6 literacy rates
Indicator 6: Higher education institutions' graduation rates

Intermediate Result 1: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education

1.1 Reading fluency among students in Grades 2, 3 and 4

1.2 Primary School retention rates

1.3. % of primary and lower secondary schools with trained staff in USG-assisted areas

1.4 # of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings

1.5. # of adult learners enrolled in USG-supported schools or equivalent non school-based settings

1.6. # of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance

1.7. # of administrators and officials trained

1.8. # of teachers/educators trained with USG support

1.9. # of host country individuals receiving USG-funded scholarships to attend higher education institutions 1 Number of classrooms renovated

1.10. # of host country individuals completing USG-funded exchange programs conducted through higher education programs

1.11. # of host country individuals trained as a result of USG investments involving higher education

Intermediate Result 2: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions

2.1 Public-private funds leveraged

2.2. Organizational Capacity Score of higher education institutions and the Ministry of Education

2.3. # of host-county institutions with increased management or institutional capacity as a result of USG investments involving higher education institutions

2.4 # of higher education partnerships between US and host country higher education institutions that address regional, national, and local development needs

2.5 # of USG-supported organizational improvements that support institutional capacity of host-country institutions

2.6. # of USG-supported higher education institutions' activities that address regional, national, and local development needs

2.7. # of institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance

Intermediate Result 3: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education

3.1 Education policy environment score

3.2 # of schools that have adopted girl friendly approaches

3.3. # of advocacy or planning events in which PTAs or other civil society organizations have participated

3.4. # of organizations using data/MIS for advocacy and policy development

3.5 # of laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines developed or modified to improve access to or quality of basic

3.6 # of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structures supported

3.7 # of USG-assisted host-country policy development and reform activities utilizing host-country higher education

B. Foreign Assistance Alignment

US Foreign Assistance Objective: Investing in People
Program Area: Education
Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education

Mission custom outcome indicators
Indicator 1: Primary school enrollment/attendance ratios
Indicator 2: Primary school completion rates
Indicator 3: Primary school absentee rates
Indicator 4: Gender parity index
Indicator 5: Grade 6 literacy rates
Indicator 6: Higher education institutions' graduation rates

Intermediate Result 1: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education

Mission Performance Management (Custom Outcome) indicators

1.1 Reading fluency among students in Grades 2, 3 and 4
1.2 Primary School retention rates
1.3 % of primary and lower secondary schools with trained staff in USG-assisted areas

F standard indicators for Program Element: Basic Education

1.4 # of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings
1.5 # of adult learners enrolled in USG-supported schools or equivalent non school-based settings
1.6 # of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance
1.7 # of administrators and officials trained
1.8 # of teachers/educators trained with USG support

F standard indicators for Program Element: Higher Education

1.9. # of host country individuals receiving USG-funded scholarships to attend higher education institutions
1.10. # of host country individuals completing USG-funded exchange programs conducted through higher education programs
1.11. # of host country individuals trained as a result of USG investments involving higher education

Intermediate Result 2: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions

Mission Performance Management (Custom Outcome) indicators

2.1. Public-private funds leveraged
2.2. Organizational Capacity Score of higher education institutions and the Ministry of Education

F standard indicators for Program Element: Higher Education

2.3. # of host-county institutions with increased management or institutional capacity as a result of USG investments involving higher education institutions
2.4 # of higher education partnerships between US and host country higher education institutions that address regional, national, and local development needs
2.5 # of USG-supported organizational improvements that support institutional capacity of host-country institutions
2.6. # of USG-supported higher education institutions' activities that address regional, national, and local development needs

F standard indicators for program element: program support/host country strategic information

2.7. # of institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance

Intermediate Result 3: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education

Mission Performance Management (Custom outcome/output) indicators

3.1 Education policy environment score
3.2 # of schools that have adopted girl friendly approaches
3.3. # of advocacy or planning events in which PTAs or other civil society organizations have participated
3.4. # of organizations using data/MIS for advocacy and policy development

F standard indicators for Program Element: Basic Education

3.5 # of laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines developed or modified to improve access to or quality of basic
3.6 # of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structures supported

F standard indicators for Program Element: Higher Education

3.7. # of USG-assisted host-country policy development and reform activities utilizing host-country higher education institutions

C. Indicators at a Glance

SO: Increased Access to Quality Education

Indicator 1: Primary school enrollment/attendance ratios
Indicator 2: Primary school completion rates
Indicator 3: Primary School absentee rates
Indicator 4: Gender parity index
Indicator 5: Grade 6 literacy rates
Indicator 6: Higher education institutions' graduation rates

Intermediate Result 1: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education

1.1. Reading fluency among students in Grades 2, 3 and 4
1.2. Primary School retention rates
1.3. Percentage of primary and lower secondary schools with trained staff in USG-assisted areas
1.4. Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings
1.5. Number of adult learners enrolled in USG-supported schools or equivalent non school-based settings
1.6. Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance
1.7. Number of administrators and officials trained
1.8. Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support
1.9. Number of host country individuals receiving USG-funded scholarships to attend higher education institutions
1.10. Number of host country individuals completing USG-funded exchange programs conducted through higher education programs
1.11. Number of host country individuals trained as a result of USG investments involving higher education

Intermediate Result 2: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions

2.1. Public-private funds leveraged
2.2. Organizational Capacity Score of higher education institutions and the Ministry of Education
2.3. Number of host-county institutions with increased management or institutional capacity as a result of USG investments involving higher education institutions
2.4. Number of higher education partnerships between US and host country higher education institutions that address regional, national, and local development needs
2.5. Number of USG-supported organizational improvements that support institutional capacity of host-country institutions
2.6. Number of USG-supported higher education institutions' activities that address regional, national, and local development needs
2.7. Number of institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance

Intermediate Result 3: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education

3.1. Education policy environment score
3.2. Number of schools that have adopted girl friendly approaches
3.3. Number of advocacy or planning events in which PTAs or other civil society organizations have participated
3.4. Number of organizations using data/MIS for advocacy and policy development
3.5. Number of laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines developed or modified to improve access to or quality of basic
3.6. Number of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structures supported
3.7. Number of USG-assisted host-country policy development and reform activities utilizing host-country higher education

D. Summary Performance Data Table

Summary Performance Data Table - Education												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA completed**
SO: Increased Access to Basic and Higher Education Services	1. Primary school enrollment/attendance ratios	PM[1]	Percent	Gender Urban/Rural	2007 (DHS)	**NAR[2]:** Total: 40.0 M: 41.4 F: 38.6 Urban: M: 60.8 F: 54.6 Rural M: 30.5 F: 27.1 **GAR[3]:** Total: 82.7 M: 86.3 F: 79.1 Urban M: 109 F: 102.7 Rural M: 73.6 F: 62.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2010
	2. Primary school completion rates	PM	Percent	Gender	2007 (UNESCO)	M: 54.2 F: 36.7	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2010
	3. Primary School absentee rates	PM	Percent	Gender	2007 (DHS)	Total: 27.3% M: 25.9% F: 28.7%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2010

[1] Performance Management Indicator
[2] Net Attendance Ratio
[3] Gross Attendance Ratio

Summary Performance Data Table - Education												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA completed**
	4. Gender parity index	PM	Ratio	Gender	2007 DHS	0.92 for NAR 0.93 for GAR	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2010
	5. Grade 6 literacy rates	PM	Percent	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	6. Higher education institutions' graduation rates	PM	Percent	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
IR1. Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education	1.1. Reading fluency among students in Grades 2, 3 and 4	PM	Percent	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.2. Primary School retention rates	PM	Percent	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.3. Proportion of primary and lower secondary schools with trained staff in USG-assisted areas	PM	Proportion	Rural/ Urban Training/certification level	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.4. Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings	F[4]	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 10,176 M: 5,429 F: 4,747	Total: 18,000 M: 9,000 F: 9,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	8/5/08
	1.5. Number of adult learners enrolled in USG-supported	F	Number		2007 OP	Total: 417 M: 127	Total 4,500 M:	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	8/5/08

[4] Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator

Summary Performance Data Table - Education												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA completed**
	schools or equivalent non school-based settings			Gender		F: 290	2,250 F:2,250					
	1.6. Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance	F	Number	None	2007 OP	76,330	22,500	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	8/5/08
	1.7. Number of administrators and officials trained	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 242 M: 225 F: 17	Total: 50 M: 40 F: 10	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	8/5/08
	1.8. Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 1831 M: 1640 F: 264	Total: 2230 M:1784 F: 446	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	8/5/08
	1.9. Number of host country individuals receiving USG-funded scholarships to attend higher education institutions	F	Number	Gender Sector Receiving institution	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.10. Number of host country individuals completing USG-funded exchange programs conducted through higher education programs	F	Number	Gender Sector Receiving institution	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.11. Number of host county individuals trained as a result of USG investments	F	Number	Gender Sector	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Education												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA completed**
	involving higher education											
IR2. Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions	2.1 Public-private funds leveraged	F	US Dollars	$ Source	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.2 Organizational Capacity Score of higher education institutions and the Ministry of Education	F	% score	Capacity Area	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.3. Number of host-county institutions with increased management or institutional capacity as a result of USG investments in higher education institutions	F	Number	Capacity Area	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.4 Number of higher education partnerships between US and host country higher education institutions	F	Number	Sector	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.5 Number of USG-supported organizational improvements that support institutional capacity of host-	F	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Education												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA completed**
	country institutions											
	2.6 Number of USG-supported higher education institutions' activities that address regional, national, and local development needs	F	Number	Higher education institution Sector	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.7 Number of institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance	F	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
IR 3: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education	3.1 Education policy environment score	PM	Number	Policy Environment. Components	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	3.2 Number of schools that have adopted girl friendly approaches	PM	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	3.3 Number of advocacy or planning events in which PTAs or other civil society organizations have actively participated	PM	Number	Type of event Type of organization	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	3.4 Number of organizations using	PM	Number	Type of	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/2008	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Education												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA completed**
	USG-supported data/MIS for advocacy and/or policy development			organization.								
	3.5 Number of laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines developed or modified to improve equitable access to or quality of basic education ,	F	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/08	By 9/2009
	3.6 Number of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structures supported	F	Number	None	2007 OP	178	35	TBD	TBD	TBD	By 11/2008	By 9/2009
	3.7. Number of USG-assisted host-country policy development and reform activities utilizing host-county higher education institutions	F	Number	Sector	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD		By 11/2008	By 9/2009

E. Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Primary School Enrollment/Attendance Ratios
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Net attendance Ratio (NAR): Percentage of the primary school age (6-11 years) population that is attending primary school. Gross Attendance Ratio (GAR): Percentage of primary school students, of any age, attending primary school Numerator: Number of primary school age students (6-11 years for NAR; any age for GAR) attending primary school x 100 Denominator: Total number of primary school age students (6-11 years for NAR, any age for GAR) in the surveyed population
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is used to monitor progress towards the goal of achieving universal primary education, identified in both the Millennium Development Goals and Liberia Poverty Reduction Strategy. The indicator measures both net and gross attendance ratios. It is important to measure both ratios because in some cases the GAR can be considerably higher than the NAR. In Liberia, the GAR is 80% and the NAR is 40%, indicating that there are many primary school students who are not of primary school age.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: This indicator will be primarily measured through the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS). DHS data could be compared with data from MOE Management Information System and UNESCO statistical database.
Data Source(s): Macro International/ Liberia Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services (LISGIS)
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International/LISGIS will send the DHS report to USAID as soon as it's finalized.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years. The last DHS was conducted in 2007; the next one is l kely to be conducted between 2010 and 2013.
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International database and public website; LISGIS data storage
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need to do a DQA since the DHS has rigorous data quality control procedures throughout its design and implementation. However, USAID could collaborate with Macro on the design of the survey to ensure the highest quality and representativeness of the data collected.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Liberia DHS 2007 provides baseline for this indicator (see "actual" below). Since this is a national level indicator to which other partners contribute, USAID will determine the targets in consultation with other partners.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		NAR: 40%; M: 41.4%; F: 38.6% GAR: 82.7%; M: 86.3%; F: 79.1%	
2008	TBD		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Primary school completion rate
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of the total number of students successfully completing (or graduating from) the last year of primary school in a given year to the total number of children of official graduation age Numerator: Number of students successfully completing (or graduating from) the last year of primary school x 100 Denominator: Total number of children of official graduation age
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: While being enrolled in primary school is important, it is even more important to complete Grade 6 of primary school, as that opens doors to secondary school and eventual continuation of higher education studies. The indicator also monitors students progression, human capital formation, and school system quality and efficiency
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Data will be collected from secondary data sources such as UNICEF, UNESCO, or the Liberia MOE Information System. Also, since secondary data sources aren't timely and/or reliable, USAID may work with Macro International to include this important indicator in the next Liberia DHS survey. DHS currently collects data on educational attainment within the general population (age 6-65).
Data Source(s): UNICEF; UNESCO; Liberia MOE; Macro International/LISGIS (potentially in the future)
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners will consult the publicly available data from UNICEF, UNESCO and MOE and report it to USAID.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years or as soon as available
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: UNICEF and UNESCO databases and public websites, MOE MIS
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): MOE primary school completion rate data may not meet the 5 criteria for good quality data, especially validity and reliability. Most of the UNESCO data also comes from the MOE and is often incomplete.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Implementing partners will need to work with the MOE to address any data limitations for this indicator. Also, using the DHS to collect data for this indicator might be the best option.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: A rigorous methodology for assessing secondary data (MOE, UNESCO data) will need to be established. To be used, this data needs to meet the five USAID criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: UNESCO 2006 data for this indicator was 63.4%. Since this is a national level indicator, targets will be determined in consultation with other partners. See tentative target setting dates in the performance indicator summary table.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		Total: 63.4% (UNESCO, 2006) M: 69.3 %; F: 57.5%	
2008	TBD		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Primary school absentee rates
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of children 6-14 years attending primary school who were absent all days of the week preceding the interview. Numerator: Number of children 6-14 years attending primary school who were absent all days of the week preceding the interview x 100 Denominator: Total number of children 6-14 years attending primary school the week preceding the interview
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Tracking absentee rates is important as all those who enroll or attend primary school might not go to school every day. Consistency in attending school is linked to academic success and is a measure of both access and quality of education. Knowing the factors that cause students not to attend all days of schooling is also important for school administrators to address these problems.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Data will be collected through the DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International will send the DHS report to USAID as soon as it is finalized.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years. The last DHS was conducted in 2007; the next one is likely to be conducted between 2010 and 2013.
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International database and public website; LISGIS data storage
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need to do a DQA since the DHS has rigorous data quality checks throughout its design and implementation. However, USAID could collaborate with Macro on the design of the next survey to ensure the highest quality and representativeness of the data collected.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The last DHS estimated the primary school absentee rate at 27.3% (see “actual” below). USAID will establish targets for this indicator in consultation with other partners
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		27. 3% (Male: 25.9%; Female: 28.7%)	
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Gender Parity Index
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The Gender Parity Index (GPI) for primary school is the ratio of the number of female students enrolled in primary school to the number of students males enrolled. Both net and gross ratio should be calculated since there are many students beyond the primary school age enrolled in primary education in Liberia. See definition of net and gross enrollment rates under indicator 1. GPI under 1 usually suggests a gender disparity in enrollment. The ratio is obtained by diving the number of girls enrolled (Net or Gross) by the number of boys enrolled (Net or Gross)
Unit of Measure: Ratio
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Measuring Gender Parity is important in order to provide equal educational opportunities to both boys and girls. Female education is also an important determinant of economic development.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Data will be collected through the DHS. The GPI will be computed by comparing the number of female students enrolled in primary education with the number of males enrolled.
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International will send the DHS report to USAID as soon as it is finalized.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years. The last DHS was conducted in 2007; the next one is l kely to be conducted between 2010 and 2013.
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International database and public website; LISGIS database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need to do a DQA since the DHS has rigorous data quality checks throughout its design and implementation. However, USAID could collaborate with Macro during the design of the survey to ensure the highest quality and representativeness of the survey.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Liberia DHS 2007 provides baseline for this indicator (see “actual” below). Since this is a national level indicator to which other partners contribute, USAID will determine the target in consultation with these other partners
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		0.92 for NAR 0.93 for GAR	
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Grade 6 Literacy Rate
Geographic Focus: National and USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percent of primary school students enrolled in grade 6 of primary school who can read and write fluently as determined by a level-appropriate literacy assessment test. Elements of literacy may include a good understanding of simple statements on everyday life. The definition of literacy sometimes extends to basic arithmetic and other life skills. Numerator: Number of primary school students enrolled in grade 6 of primary school who can read and write fluently x 100 Denominator: Total number of primary school students enrolled in grade 6
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: The ability to read and write is an important asset, allowing individuals increased opportunities in life. Literacy at grade 6 is an important indicator of the ability of the students who cannot continue their education beyond that the 6th grade to increase their socio-economic opportunities. Literacy is often seen as a proxy measure of social progress and economic achievement
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Currently, the DHS only tracks literacy rates among the population age 15-49. USAID may consider using a contractor to conduct a special survey on literacy rate among 6th grade students. USAID may also consider working with Macro International to include the grade 6th literacy rate measurement in the next Liberia DHS
Data Source(s): Implementing Partners; USG-assisted schools
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners will submit the literacy survey report to USAID
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files, USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess the data according to the 5 criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline will be established after the administration of the first grade 6th literacy survey. Once the baseline is obtained, USAID will establish targets for this indicator in consultation with other education partners and stakeholders.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Higher Education Graduation Rates
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of students enrolled in the last academic year of higher education institutions who received their degree at the end of the academic year preceding the survey. Higher education institutions are accredited universities or institutes; both public and private. Numerator: Number of students enrolled in the last academic year of higher education who received their degree x 100 Denominator: Total number of students enrolled in the last academic year of higher education
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the increased capacity of higher education institutions to provide access to high quality education. This is an important outcome indicator for higher education institutions' investments as more and qualified students have a positive impact at the socio-economic level of Liberia
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Review of higher education institutions' graduation records and MOE MIS data
Data Source(s): Higher education institutions; implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners of higher education activities will get the data from universities and institutes or from the MOE and will send the data to USAID CTO/Activity Manager
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database/files; USAID database/files; MOE/Higher Education institutions databases/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: Since it's possible to collect this data annually, an initial data quality assessment could be scheduled in September 2009, a year after the data has been collected
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess the quality of the data against the 5 USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline will be established as soon as USAID begins its higher education activities (tentatively by November 2008). At that time, targets will also be established in consultation with other education partners and stakeholders
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Primary and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Reading fluency among students in Grades 2, 3, and 4
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of primary school students in grades 2, 3, and 4 enrolled in USG-supported schools who can read fluently as determined by the Early Grade Reading Assessment Test (EGRA). Numerator: Number of primary school students enrolled in grades 2, 3, and 4 of USG-supported schools who can read fluently x 100 Denominator: Total Number of primary school students enrolled in grades 2, 3, and 4 of USG-supported schools
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: It is important to monitor reading fluency among early graders as high reading proficiency is linked to success in other disciplines.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: EGRA will be administered to students in grades 2, 3, and 4
Data Source(s): Schools participating in EGRA test, implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners will submit the EGRA test results in their annual reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess the quality of the data according to the 5 criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Preliminary baseline data and 2009 target can be established based on existing student test records and other secondary data sources. The final baseline will be established with the first EGRA test administration. Once the final baseline is obtained, targets for subsequent years will be established in a more objective manner. We proposed setting the baseline and target for this indicator by November 2008.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Primary and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Primary school retention rates
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted facilities
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The survival rate of primary school students by cohort. Grade by grade, the completion of one grade and transition (or promotion) to the next grade. Numerator: Number of students enrolled in each grade cohort of primary school promoted to the next grade x 100 Denominator: Total number of students enrolled in that grade cohort
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility:
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Review of school records of student retention/promotion
Data Source(s): USG-assisted primary schools, implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files, USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of the data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Preliminary baseline data and 2009 target can be established based on student records and other existing secondary data sources. We propose setting the baseline and target for this indicator by November 2008. Baseline and targets could be adjusted after the first data is collected by the designated implementing partners.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator (performance indicator): Percentage of primary and lower secondary schools with trained staff in USAID-assisted areas.
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Trained teachers include teachers holding MOE certification. Trained staff includes administrators qualified by the MOE (MOE to determine administrator qualification; staff will not include non-teaching or administrative staff). Numerator: Number of USG-assisted schools with trained staff x100 Denominator: Total number of USG-assisted schools
Unit of Measure: Proportion
Disaggregated by: Certification level and school level (primary or lower secondary)
Justification & Management Utility: Trained teachers are required for the delivery of quality education. This indicator makes the assumption that training will improve the teachers' and administrators' ability to teach effectively and to manage school facilities better.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Review of MOE and school records of trained staff
Data Source(s): Implementing partners, MOE, USG-assisted schools
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/ Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: MOE database and/or files, school files, IP database and/or files, USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): TBD
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess the quality of the data according to the 5 data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline and target for this indicator can be established based on current IP and USAID records of number of teachers and school administrator trained.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator (performance indicator and common indicator): Number of learners enrolled in USAID-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of individuals formally enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings for the purpose of acquiring academic basic education skills or knowledge. This may include individuals receiving USG- supported educational radio and/or TV programs. However, this indicator is intended to capture direct rather than indirect beneficiaries.
Unit of Measure: Number of learners
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This is a measure of access to education at the levels most in need. Counting the number of learners provides an overall sense of scope. However, the depth and duration of USG supported interventions varies. This is a limited indicator, meant to help 'tell the story' by counting the annual, overall number of direct beneficiaries of USG basic education programs.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners collect and maintain information on enrollments from schools records
Data Source(s): School Administrators; USAID implementing partners; USG partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: USAID implementing partners through quarterly reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: School administrator files, IP databases/files, MOE database/files, and USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 5, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review data quality against the five data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is an F indicator. The baseline for the indicator is the last value reported to USAID as part of the OP Performance Report. The target is the 08 OP target value.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		Total: 10,176 M: 5,429; F: 4,747	
2008	Total: 18,000 M: 9,000; F: 9,000		

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of adult learners enrolled in USG-supported schools or equivalent non-school based settings
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of individuals formally enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings for the purpose of acquiring academic basic education skills or knowledge. This may include individuals receiving USG-supported educational radio and/or TV programs. However, this indicator is intended to capture direct rather than indirect beneficiaries.
Unit of Measure: Number of adult learners
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Counting the number of learners provides an overall sense of scope. However, the depth and duration of USG supported interventions varies. This is a limited indicator, meant to help 'tell the story' by counting the annual, overall number of direct beneficiaries of USG basic education programs.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners collect and maintain information on enrollments from schools records
Data Source(s): Schools and Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 5, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess the data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is an F indicator. The baseline for the indicator is the last value reported to USAID as part of the OP Performance Report. The target is the 08 OP target value.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		Total: 417 M: 127; F: 290	
2008	Total: 4,500 M: 2,250; F: 2,250		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The number of teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance (funded in whole or in part by USG). This may represent a range of final 'products', including materials that are designed and then printed and published, or documents that are purchased and distributed. For the purposes of this indicator, however, the same material should only be counted once, in its final stage of USG support. Teaching and learning materials may include textbooks, student workbooks, supplementary reading books, educational tapes and CDs, and reference material in hard or electronic copies for use in preschool, primary, secondary, adult education, and/or teacher training classes. L brary books or materials, and support materials for educational radio, cassette, CD or TV broadcasts should be counted. Small materials and supplies (e.g. pencils, small materials produced as hand-outs in training, etc.), even if paid for by USG funds should not to be counted.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Learning materials, including an adequate amount of materials per student, is critical to supporting educational quality. This measure provides an overall sense of the scope of products resulting from investments in this area.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners collect and maintain records on textbooks and other teaching materials provided.
Data Source(s): Schools and implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 5, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): There may be some misinterpretation of the definition of this indicator. Partners may count draft materials distributed (instead of final materials) or count twice materials purchased and distributed.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: To avoid mis-counting or double counting, it's important to clearly explain to partners reporting in this indicator how the indicator is defined and calculated.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess the quality of the data against the 5 criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is an F indicator. The baseline for the indicator is the last value reported to USAID as part of the OP Performance Report. The target is the 08 OP target value.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		76,330	
2008	22,500		

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of individuals who have successfully completed a pre- or in-service training program to teach in schools or equivalent non-school-based settings (pre-primary; primary; lower-secondary; upper-secondary; adult literacy), with USG support (e.g. scholarships or a training program funded in whole or in part by USG). Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Training should be at least three working days (24 hours) in duration (based on the ADS standard for in-country training). Note also that an individual trainee, even if he/she is trained in more than one area or instance of training that year, should be counted only once. People trained under Fulbright or in sectors other than education who will be/are teaching in pre-primary, primary, lower-secondary, upper-secondary, adult literacy should be counted here.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Training teachers and/or educators supports individual and institutional capacity building in countries. This indicator provides an overall sense of scope by giving a count of the total number of teachers/educators trained. However, because the depth of USAID supporting interventions varies (e.g. this includes both short term and long term training), this is a limited indicator, meant to help 'tell the story'.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners use training attendance sheets to collect information on teachers/administrators trained
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 8, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess quality of data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is an F indicator. The baseline for the indicator is the last value reported to USAID as part of the OP Performance Report. The target is the 08 OP target value
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		Total: 1,831 M: 1640; F: 264	
2008	Total: 2,230 M: 1,787; F: 446		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of administrators and officials trained
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of education officials (public or private) or administrators of education programs, funds or institutions who receive training in aspects of their current positions, including areas such as finance, management (e.g., logistics, monitoring, personnel use, and support), governance (e.g., legislation, communication, enforcement) or infrastructure (e.g. building, supplies). Successful completion requires that trainees meet the completion requirements of the structured training program as defined by the program offered. Training should be at least three working days (24 hours) in duration (based on the ADS standard for in-country training). Note also that an individual trainee, even if he/she is trained in more than one area or instance of training that year, should be counted only once.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: USG training supports capacity building for host country education administrators and officials – and their institutions. Counting the number of trainees provides an overall sense of scope. However, this is a limited indicator, meant to help 'tell the story' by giving an overall sense of the number of administrators/officials affected by USAID-supported efforts.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners collect information on number of administrators and officials trained via training attendance sheets and maintain those records.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 5, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A-
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Data quality will be assessed against the five criteria for good quality data
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is an F indicator. The baseline is the last value reported in the OP performance report. The target is the 2008 target value in the FY OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		Total: 242 M: 225; F: 17	
2008	Total: 50 M: 40; F: 264		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of host-country individuals receiving USG-funded scholarships to attend higher education institutions
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of host-country individuals receiving scholarships through USG-funded partnerships, scholarship programs, or exchange programs (such as Fulbright and other fellowship programs) to attend higher education institutions (US/host country/ third-country). Higher education institutions include research institutes, teacher-training colleges and institutes, universities, community colleges, and post-secondary professional skills colleges.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Sex, sector, receiving institution (US/host-country/third-country)
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure the number of individuals with access to higher education as a result of USG funding.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners maintain records of individuals receiving scholarships
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing Partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new higher education activity. The baseline and targets will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of host-country individuals completing USG-funded exchange programs conducted through higher education programs
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of host-country individuals completing exchange programs conducted through higher education institutions (US/host-country/third-country). Exchange programs include long- and short-term degree and certificate programs, visitor and cultural exchanges, and study tours. Higher education institutions include research institutes, teacher-training colleges and institutes, universities, community colleges, and post-secondary professional skills colleges.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Sex, sector, receiving institution (US/host-country/third-country
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure the number of individuals completing USG-funded exchange programs.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners maintain records of individuals benefiting from exchange
Data Source(s): Implementing partners and TraiNet for USAID participants
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing Partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): TBD
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new higher education activity. The baseline and targets will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of host-country individuals trained as a result of USG investments involving higher education institutions
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of host-country individuals trained as a result of USG investments involving higher education institutions (US/host-country/third-country). Individuals trained include all individuals participating in activities meant to enhance their knowledge or skills. (Activities might include courses, explicit formal or informal training, research, or coaching and mentoring.) USG investments involving higher education institutions include but are not limited to research and training programs, scholarships, exchanges and partnerships. Higher education institutions include research institutes, teacher-training colleges and institutes, universities, community colleges, and post-secondary professional skills colleges.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Sex; location of higher education institution; type of higher education institution; sector
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure USG efforts towards human capacity building that utilizes higher education institutions.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners maintain records of host-country individuals trained
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing Partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): -
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: -
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new higher education activity. The baseline and targets will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions
Name of Indicator: Public-Private funds leveraged
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted higher education institutions; MOE
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Amount of funds leveraged through public-private partnerships. Public education institutions may form partnerships with local communities, NGOs, or the business sector.
Unit of Measure: US Dollars
Disaggregated by: Partnership types
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the ability of the education system to mobilize resources as a result of activities designed to strengthen the system. It also measures the extent to which the public and private sector work together to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of education initiatives.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will keep records of any public-private funds that have been leveraged through public-private partnerships
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions
Name of Indicator: Organizational Capacity Score of higher education institutions and MOE
Geographic Focus: USG-supported higher education institutions, USG-supported MOE departments
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Organizational capacity refers to the ability of the MOE and key higher education institutions to effectively perform organizational management functions such as leadership and governance, strategic planning and administration, financial management, human resource management, communications, and service delivery. The organizational management capacity score is obtained by assessing each component of the organizational management capacity index, assigning a score to each component, and adding the scores for all the components to obtain a single score.
Unit of Measure: Score
Disaggregated by: Organizational management components, higher education institution, MOE (as a whole or by department)
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the capacity of the MOE and key higher education institutions to implement education programs by assessing organizational management and systems areas that are key to effective management and implementation of education programs.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing Partners will adapt existing organizational management capacity assessment tools/indices such as the Organizational Capacity Tool (OCAT) or the Management Capacity Index and use the adapted tool/index to assess the organizational management capacity of MOE and higher education institutions.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' assessment reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts. A baseline survey will be conducted to assess the current organizational management capacity of higher education institutions and the MOE
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions
Name of Indicator: Number of host-country institutions with increased management or institutional capacity as a result of USG investments involving higher education information institutions
Geographic Focus: USG-supported higher education institutions
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Increased management or institutional capacity includes improved administration, financial management, human resources, strategic planning and service delivery. Higher education institutions include research institutes, teacher-training colleges and institutes, universities, community colleges, and post-secondary professional skills colleges.
Unit of Measure: Number of institutions
Disaggregated by: Non-profit, government, and private sector
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure the number of host-country institutions with increased management and institutional capacity as a result of USG investments involving higher education institutions.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: This indicator will be assessed using an adapted OCAT or Organizational Management Index (OMI) tool (see indicator reference sheet above). Implementing partners will then keep records of host-country institutions that have increased their management of institutional capacity.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts. A baseline survey will be conducted to assess the current management or institutional capacity of host-country institutions.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions
Name of Indicator: Number of higher education partnerships between US and host country higher education institutions that address regional, national, and local development needs
Geographic Focus: USG-supported higher education institutions
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Higher education institutions include research institutes, teacher-training colleges and institutes, universities, community colleges, and post-secondary professional skills colleges. Activities include requests from regional, national, and local organizations (public and private), and concrete active efforts by higher education to apply research and technology, policy and institutional development, community service, and technical assistance to defined development needs.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Sector
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure institutional relationships between US and host-country higher education institutions as channels of effective development assistance and public diplomacy.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of higher education partnerships that have been formed.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new F indicator related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions
Name of Indicator: Number of USG-supported organizational improvements that support institutional capacity of host-country institutions
Geographic Focus: USG-supported higher education institutions
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): An organizational improvement is a change in structures, systems, resources or policies that improves the performance of the institution. This includes, but is not limited to, changes in human resources (improved faculty skills, improved capacities of staff and administrators); management and administration (financial management, service delivery, fundraising, outreach, institutional linkages to the private sector, personnel policies); research capacity and methods; and academic programs (quality relevant degree programs, curricula, pedagogy). Higher education institutions include research institutes, teacher-training colleges and institutes, universities, community colleges, and post-secondary professional skills colleges.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure the number of key organizational improvements that strengthen the institutional capacity of host-country higher education institutions.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of activities related to organizational improvements of supported higher education institutions.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new F indicator related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality c Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions
Name of Indicator: Number of USG-supported higher education institutions' activities that address regional, national, and local government needs
Geographic Focus: USG-supported higher education institutions
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Activities include concrete active efforts by higher education institutions to conduct or apply research and technology, policy analysis, institutional development, training, community service, or technical assistance in order to address development needs. Higher education institutions include research institutes, teacher-training colleges and institutes, universities, community colleges, and post-secondary professional skills colleges.
Unit of Measure: Number of institutions
Disaggregated by: Foreign assistance framework objective; sector; higher education institution (host country or U.S.)
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure the extent to which higher education institutions contribute to development
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of USG-supported higher education activities that address regional, national, and local development needs
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new F indicator related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Basic Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education Institutions
Name of Indicator: Number if institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: USG-supported higher education institutions**;** MOE
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Institutions refer to host country organizations such as a Ministry, government office, sub-national government unit, NGO, school, hospital, or research organization. Management information systems are data bases, usually computerized, that allow the organization to store, analyze, report, and use information.
Unit of Measure: Number of institutions
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator captures the direct support provided by operating units to host country institutions.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of institutions with improved MIS. A special survey may be conducted to measure such improvements
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new F indicator related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Education Policy Environment Score
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The Education Policy Environment is made up of several elements including policies, plans, resources, organizational management, legal and regulatory arrangements, research, monitoring and evaluation, and education program components. The policy environment score is a measure of all these components using a policy environment index.
Unit of Measure: Score
Disaggregated by: By policy environment component
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure the extent to which the education policy environment is favorable to education services, a pre-requisite to any improvements in that sector.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Policy environment survey. The policy environment index has been applied in a number of countries and could be adapted to the Liberia context and used to measure improvements in the education enabling environment. The survey consists of interviewing knowledgeable people in country about the strengths and weaknesses of the education policy environment. The survey will be conducted by the implementing partner(s) reporting on this indicator with assistance from a consultant, if needed.
Data Source(s): Data will be collected from a sample of experts in the education field; results will be aggregated and analyzed by the designated implementing partner(s).
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partner survey report
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 2 years from time of baseline assessment
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This indicator is related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline will be established the first time the survey is implemented (at the beginning of the activity). The implementing partner(s), in consultation with USAID and other partners involved in enhancing the policy environment for education, will set targets once the baseline is established.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of schools that have adopted girl friendly approaches
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of schools that promote gender equality in enrollment by promoting and adopting girl-friendly approaches and processes such as restrooms for girls, curricula and textbooks, learning materials that are gender sensitive, and provision of hygiene and sanitation kits for girls.
Unit of Measure: Number of schools
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: In order to encourage more girls to enroll in school and achieve gender parity in enrollments, schools need to create a favorable learning environment for girls. This indicator monitors the number of schools that have adopted gender-sensitive approaches to achieve gender balance.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of girl-friendly approaches or processes that have been implemented by schools
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new education activity under development. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of advocacy or planning events in which PTAs or other civil society organizations have actively participated.
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted PTAs and civil society organizations
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): This indicator monitors advocacy activities (rallies, campaigns, policy dialogue meetings) in which PTAs or other civil society organizations have actively participated to influence policy or planning decisions. It also measures actual policy development or planning activities in which PTAs or other civil society organizations have participated. Participation may include organizing or attending the events, making a presentation during the event, serving on a policy panel or committee, participating in outreach activities, etc.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Type of events, type of organizations participating
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is a proxy measure of degree of participation of PTAs and civil society organizations in the advocacy and policy development process designed to improve the policy environment for education. It is also a proxy measure for increased capacity of PTAs and similar structures to engage in advocacy and policy dialogue, and planning.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of PTA or other civil society organizations actively involved in advocacy, policy development, and/or planning
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new education activity under development. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of organizations using USG-supported education data/MIS for advocacy, planning, and/or policy development
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted organizations/institutions
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of organizations/institutions receiving USG-assistance related to data collection, analysis, and storage, including establishment or strengthening of MIS that have used data for advocacy, planning, and/or policy development.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the use of data that was generated through USG-supported activities. Use of data is an important outcome of any data collection and analysis efforts. Policy, planning, and program improvements are all based on use of accurate and relevant data.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of organizations using education data/MIS
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to an activity under development by the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of laws, policies, regulations, or guidelines developed or modified to improve equitable access to and quality of basic education
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted basic education institutions
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): This indicator captures information on quantifiable systems and policy level activities. Examples of actions that may be counted include the development or modification of laws, policies, regulations or guidelines in areas such as school finance, assessment, teacher recruitment and selection, etc. To be counted, actions must have, as their ultimate purpose, improving equitable access to or the quality of education services.
Unit of Measure: Number of laws, policies, regulations or guidelines
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is a quantitative complement to the qualitative narrative indicator on policy/systems level support activities.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of laws, policies, regulation or guidelines developed or modified
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator related to a potential new higher education activity of the Education Team. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structure supported
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted schools
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Count of PTA, School Management Committee (SMC), or other similar governance bodies for an individual school (or equivalent non-school setting) supported by USG to organize, meet regularly, participate more fully in education activities, contribute to school governance, or in any other way be more supportive of the school or non-school equivalent education setting. USG support includes, but is not limited to, direct financial support (grants) and training in skills related to serving on a PTA, SMC, or equivalent governance body.
Unit of Measure: Number of PTAs or Number of SMC or other school governance bodies
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Support for PTA or other school governance structures are an important way to promote capacity building at the grassroots, local level. Such structures promote opportunities for democracy in action as well as improved local ownership, accountability, and educational quality. This is a limited indicator that it only provides an overall sense of scope of the number structures affected by USG-supported efforts.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of PTAs, SMC, or other similar bodies
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 5, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): There is a minimal risk of under or over reporting of number of PTAs or similar structures supported since the indicator definition doesn't specify what constitutes "support."
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Specify the types of support provided to PTAs, SMCs or other similar school governance structures and disseminate the revised definition to all implementing partners reporting on this indicator.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is an F indicator partners have been reporting on. The baseline is the value reported in FY 2007 as part of the OP Performance Report. The target is the FY 2008 target established in April 2008.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		178	
2008	35		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Education
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Access to Quality Education
Name of Intermediate Result: Strengthened Enabling Environment for Basic and Higher Education Capacity of the MOE and Higher Education
Name of Indicator: Number of USG-assisted host country policy development and reform activities utilizing host-county higher education institutions
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted higher education institutions
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Policy development and reform activities include but are not limited to policy analyses, policy dialogues, policy designs, policy research, and legislative testimony, regardless of sector. Higher education institutions include research institutes, teacher-training colleges and institutes, universities, community colleges, and post-secondary professional skills colleges.
Unit of Measure: Number of activities
Disaggregated by: Sector
Justification & Management Utility: Used to measure the ability of host-country higher education institutions to engage in policy development and reform activities to contribute to development
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners keep records of host country policy development and reform activities utilizing host-county higher education institutions.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Assess data according to the five criteria for good quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new F indicator related to a new education activity under development. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity starts.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

IV. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 8: HEALTH

See A. Results Framework on the following page.

A. Results Framework

Foreign Assistance Objective: Investing in People
Program Area: Health
SO: Increased Use of Basic Health Services

Indicator 1: DPT 3/P3 Coverage
Indicator 2: Modern Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (mCPR)
Indicator 3: Proportion of pregnant women who have received two or more doses of IPTp during their pregnancy in the last 2 years
Indicator 4: Proportion of pregnant women who slept under a mosquito net the previous night
Indicator 5: Proportion of children under 5 years with fever in the last two weeks receiving treatment with ACT within 24 hours of onset of fever
Indicator 6: Percentage of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA)
Indicator 7: Percentage of households with access to an improved source of drinking water
Indicator 8: Percentage of young women and men age 15-24 who used a condom the last time they had high risk sexual intercourse

Intermediate Result 1
Increased Access to Basic Health Services

1.1. % of antenatal care visits by skilled providers

1.2. Proportion of households with at least one mosquito net

1.3. # of children under 12 months of age who received DPT3/P3

1.4. # of children under 5 years of age who received Vitamin A supplementation

1.5. # of child pneumonia cases treated with ant biotics by trained facility or community health workers in USG-supported programs

1.6. # of newborns receiving new born care

1.7. # of cases of child diarrhea treated in USG-assisted programs

1.8. # of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance

1.9. # of women receiving active management of the third stage of labor (AMSTL) through USG-supported programs

1.10. # of USG-assisted service delivery points providing FP counseling services

1.11. # of people that have seen or heard a specific USG-supported FP/RH message

1.12. Total # of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care, including TB/HIV

1.13 # of targeted condom service outlets

1.14. # of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence

1.15. # of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence and/or being faithful

1.16. # of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through other behavioral change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful

1.17. # of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support

1.18. # of Artemisinin-based Combination Treatments (ACTs) purchased or distributed

1.19. # of houses sprayed with insecticide with USG support

1.20. # of people in target areas with access to improved drinking water supply as a result of USG assistance

1.21. # of people in target areas with access to improved hygiene and sanitation as a result of USG assistance

1.22. # of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs

1.23. # of OVC served by OVC programs

1.24. # of health facilities rehabilitated from USG support

1.25. # of improvements to policies, regulations or guidelines to increase access to services

Intermediate Result 2
Increased Quality of Basic Health Services

2.1. % of USG-assisted clinic facilities meeting accreditation criteria and receiving at least one star on the accreditation

2.2. # of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA) in USG-assisted facilities

2.3. # of Antenatal Care (ANC) visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities

2.4. # of individuals who received counseling and testing for HI and received their test results

2.5. # of pregnant women who received HIV counseling and testing for PMTCT and received their test results

2.6. # of improvements to policies, regulations or guidelines to increase the quality of services

2.7. # of health workers trained in malaria treatment or prevention using USG funds

2.8 # of people trained in maternal/newborn health through USG-supported programs

2.9. # of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported programs

2.10. # of people trained in FP/RH with USG assistance

2.11. # of individuals trained in HIV/AIDS counseling and testing according to national and/or international standards

2.12. # of individuals trained in HIV-related institutional capacity building

2.13. # of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through abstinence

2.14. # of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through abstinence and/or being faithful

2.15. # of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through other behavior change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful

2.16 # of local organizations provided with technical assistance for HIV-related institutional capacity building

2.17. # of institutions with improved MIS, as a result of USG-assistance

2.18. # of people trained in strategic information (includes M&E, surveillance, and/or HMIS)

Intermediate Result 3
Increased Youth health knowledge and skills

3.1. % of young women and young men age 15-24 with comprehensive knowledge about AIDS

3.2. % of young women and men aged 15-24 with knowledge of HIV prevention methods

.3.3. % of young women and young men age 15-24 who know a source for condoms

3.4. % age at first birth among youth

3.5. # of youth who have seen or heard FP/RH/HIV-related messages in the last few months

3.6. # of youth who have received malaria-related messages through community health workers

3.7. # of heath services or information delivery points meeting youth-friendly criteria

3.8. # of policies or guidelines developed to promote youth's access to services

3.9. # of youth peer/counselors trained

3.10. # of youth trained in life skills related to health knowledge, behavior, and services

B. Foreign Assistance Alignment

Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services (Program Area: Health)

USAID/Liberia Health Custom Outcome Indicators

Percentage of children under 12 months of age who are vaccinated with DPT3/P3
Percentage of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA)
Modern Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (mCPR)
proportion of pregnant women who have received two or more doses of IPTp during their pregnancy in the last two years
Proportion of pregnant women who slept under a mosquito net the previous night
Proportion of children under 5 years with fever in the last two weeks receiving treatment with ACT within 24 hours of onset of fever
Percentage of young women and men age 15-24 who used a condom the last time they had high risk sexual intercourse
Percentage of households with access to an improved source of drinking water

Program Elements	Intermediate Result 1: Increased access to basic health services	Intermediate Result 2: Increased quality of basic health services	Intermediate Result 3: Increased youth health knowledge and skills
HIV/AIDS	Number of OVCs served by OVC programs (Standard - S)	Number of people who received counseling and testing for HIV and received their test results (S)	Percentage of young men and women age 15-24 with comprehensive knowledge about HIV/AIDS (C)
		Number of pregnant women who received HIV counseling and testing for PMTCT and received their test results (S)	Percentage of young men and women age 15-24 with knowledge of HIV prevention methods (C)
			Percentage of young men and women age 15-24 who know at least one source for condoms (C)
FP/RH	Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance (S)	Percentage of USG-assisted clinic facilities meeting accreditation criteria and receiving at least one star on the accreditation (C)	Percentage age at first birth among youth 15-24 years of age (C)
MCH	Percentage of antenatal care (ANC) visits by skilled providers (C)	Percentage of USG-assisted clinic facilities meeting accreditation criteria and receiving at least one star on the accreditation (C)	
	Number of children receiving DPT3/P3 (S)	Number of deliveries with a SBA (S)	
	Number of children receiving Vitamin A supplementation in USF-assisted facilities (S)	Number of Antenatal Care (ANC) visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities (S)	
	Number of cases of child diarrhea treated in USG-assisted facilities (S)	Number of improvements to policies, guidelines, or regulations related to access to/quality of services (S)	
	Number of newborns receiving new born care (S)	Number of women receiving active management of the third stage of labor (AMSTL) (S)	
MALARIA	Proportion of households with at least one ITN (C)	Percentage of USG-assisted clinic facilities meeting accreditation criteria and receiving at least one star on the accreditation (C)	
Water & Sanitation	Number of people in target areas with access to improved water supply as a result of USG assistance (S)		
	Number of people in target areas with access to sanitation facilities as a result of USG assistance (S)		

Additional indicators by Intermediate Result and Program Element

Program Elements	Intermediate Result 1: Increased access to basic health services	Intermediate Result 2: Increased quality of basic health services	Intermediate Result 3: Increased youth health knowledge and skills
HIV/AIDS	Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence (S)	Number of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through abstinence and/or being faithful (S)	Number of youth who have seen or heard one or more HIV-related messages in the last two weeks (C)
	Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence and/or being faithful (S)	Number of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through other behavior change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful (S)	
	Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through other behavioral change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful (S)	Number of individuals trained in HIV-related institutional capacity building (S)	
	Number of service outlets providing counseling and testing according to national and international standards (S)	Number of local organizations provided with technical assistance for HIV-related institutional capacity building (S)	
	Total number of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care, including TB/HIV (S)		
	Number of targeted condom service outlets (S)	Number of people trained in strategic information (includes M&E, surveillance, and/or HMIS) (S)	
FP/RH	Number of USG-assisted service delivery points providing FP counseling services (S)	Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG assistance (S)	Number of youth who have seen or heard one or more FP/RH messages in the last two weeks (C)
	Number of people that have seen or heard a specific USG-supported FP/RH message (S)	Number of improvements to policies, regulations, or guidelines related to quality of services (S)	
	Number of health facilities rehabilitated from USG support (S)		
	Number of improvements to policies, and regulations related to access to services (S)		
MCH	Number of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs (S)	Number of people trained in maternal/newborn health through USG-supported programs (S)	
	Number of health facilities rehabilitated from USG support (S)	Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs (S)	
	Number of improvements to laws, policies, and regulations related to access to services (S)	Number of improvements to laws, policies, and regulations related to quality of services (S)	
MALARIA	Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support (S)	Number of health workers trained in malaria treatment or prevention using USG funds (S)	Number of youth who have received malaria-related messages through community health workers (C)
	Number of Artemisinin-based Combination Treatments (ACTs) purchased or distributed (S)	Number of community health workers (CHW) trained in malaria treatment or prevention using USG funds	
	Number of houses sprayed with insecticide with USG support (S)		

Program Elements	Intermediate Result 1: Increased access to basic health services	Intermediate Result 2: Increased quality of basic health services	Intermediate Result 3: Increased youth health knowledge and skills
Program Support/Learning & Other cross-cutting indicators		Number of institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG assistance (S)	Number of heath services or information delivery points meeting youth-friendly criteria (C)
			Number of policies or guidelines developed to promote youth's access to services(C)
			Number of youth peer/counselors trained (C)
			Number of youth trained in life skills related to health knowledge, behavior, and services (C)

C. Indicators at a Glance

SO: Increased Use of Basic Health Services

Indicator 1: DPT 3/P3 Coverage[5]
Indicator 2: Modern Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (mCPR)
Indicator 3: Proportion of pregnant women who have received two or more doses of IPTp during their last pregnancy in the last two years
Indicator 4: Proportion of pregnant women who slept under a mosquito net the previous night
Indicator 5: Proportion of children under 5 years with fever in the last two weeks receiving treatment with ACT within 24 hours of onset of fever
Indicator 6: Percentage of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA)
Indicator 7: Percentage of households with access to an improved source of drinking water
Indicator 8: Percentage of young women and men age 15-24 who used a condom the last time they had high risk sexual intercourse

IR1. Increased Access to Basic Health Services

1.1. Percentage of antenatal care (ANC) visits by skilled providers
1.2. Proportion of households with at least one ITN
1.3. Number of children under 12 months of age receiving DPT3/P3 (see footnote)
1.4. Number of children under 5 years of age receiving Vitamin A supplementation
1.5. Number of child pneumonia cases treated with antibiotics by trained facility or community health workers in USG-supported programs
1.6. Number of newborns receiving essential new born care
17. Number of cases of child diarrhea treated in USAID-assisted programs
1.8. Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance
1.9. Number of women receiving active management of the third stage of labor (AMSTL) through USG-supported programs
1.10. Number of USG-assisted service delivery points providing FP counseling services
1.11. Number of people that have seen or heard a specific USG-supported FP/RH message
1.12. Total number of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care, including TB/HIV
1.13. Number of targeted condom service outlets
1.14. Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence
1.15. Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence and/or being faithful
1.16. Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through other behavioral change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful
1.17. Number of pregnant women who have received two or more doses of IPTp during their last pregnancy in the last two years
1.18. Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support
1.18. Number of Artemisinin-based Combination Treatments (ACTs) purchased or distributed
1.19. Number of houses sprayed with insecticide with USG support

[5] Liberia has started to provide Pentavalent vaccine to children. Since Pentavalent contains both DPT3 and 2 other vaccines (Hib and hepatitis B), DPT 3 coverage will be monitored via Pentavalent coverage.

1.20. Number of people in target areas with access to improved drinking water supply as a result of USG assistance
1.21. Number of people in target areas with access to improved hygiene and sanitation as a result of USG assistance
1.22. Number of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs
1.23. Number of OVC served by OVC programs
1.24. Number of health facilities rehabilitated from USG support
1.25. Number of improvements to policies, regulations or guidelines to increase access to services

IR2. Increased Quality of Basic Health Services

2.1. Percentage of USG-assisted clinic facilities meeting accreditation criteria and receiving at least one star on the accreditation
2.2. Number of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA) in USG-assisted facilities
2.3. Number of Antenatal Care (ANC) visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities
2.4. Number of individuals who received counseling and testing for HIV and received their test results
2.5. Number of pregnant women who received HIV counseling and testing for PMTCT and received their test results
2.6. Number of improvements to policies, regulations or guidelines to increase the quality of services
2.7. Number of health workers trained in malaria treatment or prevention using USG funds
2.8. Number of people trained in maternal/newborn health through USG-supported programs
2.9. Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs
2.10. Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG assistance
2.11. Number of individuals trained in HIV/AIDS counseling and testing according to national and/or international standards
2.12. Number of individuals trained in HIV-related institutional capacity building
2.13. Number of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through abstinence
2.14. Number of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through abstinence and/or being faithful
2.15. Number of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through other behavior change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful
2.16. Number of local organizations provided with technical assistance for HIV-related institutional capacity building
2.17. Number of institutions with improved MIS, as a result of USG-assistance
2.18. Number of people trained in strategic information (includes M&E, surveillance, and/or HMIS)

IR3. Increased youth health knowledge and skills

3.1. Percentage of young women and young men age 15-24 with comprehensive knowledge about AIDS

3.2. Percentage of young women and men aged 15-24 with knowledge of HIV prevention methods
3.3. Percentage of young women and young men age 15-24 who know a source for condoms
3.4. Age at first birth among youth
3.5. Number of youth who have seen or heard FP/RH/HIV-related messages in the last few months
3.6. Number of youth who have received malaria-related messages through community health workers
3.7. Number of heath services or information delivery points meeting youth-friendly criteria
3.8. Number of policies or guidelines developed to promote youth's access to services
3.9. Number of youth peer/counselors trained
3.10. Number of youth trained in life skills related to health knowledge, behavior, and services

D. Summary Performance Data Table

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
SO: Increased Use of Basic Health Services	1. DPT3/P3 Coverage [6]	PM[7]	Percentage	Gender	2007 DHS	Total: 50.3 (M: 49.0 F: 51.6)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	2. Modern Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (mCPR)	PM	Percentage	Type of method	2007 DHS	11.7 (any modern method)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	3. Proportion of pregnant women who have received two or more doses of IPTp during their last pregnancy in the last two years	PMI[8]	Proportion	None	2005 MIS	4.31%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	4. Proportion of pregnant women who slept under a mosquito net the previous night	PMI	Proportion	None	2005 MIS	31%	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	5. Proportion of children under 5 years with fever in the last two weeks receiving treatment with ACT within 24 hours of onset of fever	PMI	Proportion	Age	2005 MIS 2007 DHS	3.2% (MIS) 8.9% (DHS)	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	6. Percentage of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA)	PM	Percentage	Rural/ urban	2007 DHS	Total: 46.3 Urban: 78.3 Rural: 32.3	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010

[6] Liberia has started to provide Pentavalent vaccine to children. Since Pentavalent contains both DPT3 and 2 other vaccines (Hib and hepatitis B), DPT 3 coverage will be monitored via Pentavalent coverage.
[7] Performance Management Indicator
[8] Presidential Malaria Initiative Indicator

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	7. Percentage of households with access to an improved source of drinking water	PM	Percentage	Type of source Rural/ Urban	2007 DHS	Total: 65.2 Urban: 81.5 Rural: 65.2	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	8. Percentage of young women and men 15-24 years old who used a condom the last time they had high risk sexual intercourse	PM	Percentage	Gender	2007 DHS	Female: 14% Male: 26%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
IR8.1. Increased Access to Basic Health services	1.1. Percentage of antenatal care (ANC) visits by skilled providers	PM	Percentage	Type of provider Age urban/ rural	2007 DHS	Total: 79	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	1.2. Proportion of households with at least one ITN	PMI	Percentage	Urban/ rural	2007 DHS	Total: 30.4	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	1.3. Number of children less than 12 months of age who receiving DPT3/P3 from USG-supported programs	PM	Number	None	2007 OP	13,040	13,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	1.4. Number of children under 5 years of age receiving Vitamin A supplementation	F[9]	Number	None	2007 OP	11,665	12,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.5. Number of child pneumonia cases treated with ant biotics by trained facility or community health workers in USG-	F	Number	None	2007 OP	18,246	17,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009

[9] Standard Foreign Assistance Indicators

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	supported programs											
	1.6. Number of newborns receiving essential new born care	F	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.7. Number of cases of child diarrhea treated in USAID-assisted programs	F	Number	None	2007 OP	15,136	14,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.8. Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance	F	Number	None	2007 OP	4,277	5,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.9. Number of women receiving active management of the third stage of labor (AMSTL) through USG-supported programs	F	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.10. Number of USG-assisted service delivery points providing FP counseling and services	F	Number	T Type of delivery point	2007 OP	TBD	1	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.11. Number of people that have seen or heard a specific USG-supported FP/RH message	F	Number	None	2007 OP	54,772	60,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.12. Total number of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care, including TB/HIV	F	Number	Type of outlets/facilities	2007 OP	TBD	3	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.13. Number of targeted condom service outlets	F	Number	ypes of outlets/facilities)	2007 OP	78	80	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	1.14. Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 247,085 M:109,485 F: 137,600	Total: 306,800 M: 136,800 F: 170,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.15. Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence and/or being faithful	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 247,085 M:109,485 F: 137,600	Total: 306,800 M: 136,800 F: 170,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.16. Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through other behavioral change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 247,085 M:109,485 F: 137,600	Total: 306,800 M: 136,800 F: 170,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.17. Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support	F	Number	None	2007 OP	6,108	150,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	Done 8/8/08
	1.18. Number of Artemisinin-based Combination Treatments (ACTs) purchased or distributed	F	Number	None	2007 OP	156,636	200,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	Done: 8/8/08
	1.19. Number of houses sprayed with insecticide with USG support	F	Number	None	2007 OP	699	25,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.20. Number of people in target areas with	F	Number	Type of source	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	access to improved drinking water supply as a result of USG assistance										by 11/08	
	1.21. Number of people in target areas with access to improved hygiene and sanitation as a result of USG assistance	F	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.22. Number of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs	F	Number	None	2007 OP	33,488	62,730	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	1.23. Number of OVC served by OVC programs	F	Number	Gender Type of service	2007 OP	Total: 74 M: 45 F: 29	70 M: 40 F:30	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 92009
	1.24. Number of health facilities rehabilitated from USG support	F	Number	By types of facilities	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 92009
	1.25. Number of improvements to policies, regulations or guidelines to increase access to services	F	Number	None	2007 OP	TBD	1	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	: By 9/2009
IR8.2. Increased Quality of Basic Health Services	2.1. Percentage of USG-assisted clinics meeting accreditation criteria and receiving at least one star on the accreditation	F	Percentage	Rural/ Urban	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.2. Number of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA) in USG-assisted facilities	F	Number	None	2007 OP	2095	1600	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	2.3. Number of Antenatal Care (ANC) visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities	F	Number	None	2007 OP	30,712	22,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.4. Number of individuals who received counseling and testing for HIV and received their test results	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 3,304 M: 945 F: 2359	Total : 3,650 M: 2100 F: 1550	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.5. Number of pregnant women who received HIV counseling and testing for PMTCT and received their test results	F	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.6. Number of service outlets providing counseling and testing according to national and international standards	F	Number	Type of delivery point	2007 OP	26	27	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.7 Number of improvements to policies, regulations or guidelines to increase the quality of services	F	Number	None	2007 OP	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.8 Number of health workers trained in malaria treatment or prevention using USG funds	F	Number	Gender Type of health worker	2007 OP	Total: 674 M: 274 F: 400	800	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.9 Number of people trained in maternal/newborn health	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 801 M:264 F: 537	Total: 1950 M: 350	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	through USG-supported programs						F: 1600					
	2.10. Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 801 M: 264 F: 537	Total: 2200 M: 590 F: 1610	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.11. Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG assistance	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	Total: 174 M: 64 F:174	200	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.12. Number of individuals trained in HIV/AIDS counseling and testing according to national and/or international standards	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	88	40	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.13. Number of individuals trained in HIV-related institutional capacity building	F	Number	Gender	2008	TBD	2	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.14. Number of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through abstinence	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	2,188	1,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.15. Number of individuals trained to promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through abstinence and/or being faithful	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	2,188	1,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.16. Number of individuals trained to	F	Number	Gender	2007 OP	2,188	1,000	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	promote HIV/AIDS prevention programs through other behavior change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful										11/08	
	2.17. Number of local organizations provided with technical assistance for HIV-related institutional capacity building	F	Number	Type of organiz-ation	2007 OP	12	2	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.18. Number of institutions with improved MIS, as a result of USG-assistance	F	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	2.19. Number of people trained in strategic information (includes M&E, surveillance, and/or HMIS)	F	Number	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set new target by 11/08	By 9/2009
IR8.3. Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills	3.1. Percentage of young women and young men age 15-24 with comprehensive knowledge about AIDS	PM	Percentage	Gender	2007 DHS	M: 27.2 F: 20.5	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	3.2. Percentage of young women and men aged 15-24 with knowledge of HIV prevention methods	PM	Percentage	Gender Type of knowledge	2007 DHS	M: 61.9 F: 51.0	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	3.3. Percentage of young women and young men age 15-24 who know a source for condom	PM	Percentage	Gender	2007 DHS	M: 65.3 F: 56.4	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	3.4. Age at first birth among youth	PM	Percentage	None	2007 DHS	**Among Age 15-19** Fist birth at age 15: 8.7% **Among Age 20-24** First birth at age 15: 5.9% age 18: 33.4% age 20: 55%	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set target by 11/08	By 9/2010
	3.5. Number of youth who have seen or heard FP/RH/HIV-related messages in the last few months	PM	Number	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	3.6. Number of youth who have received malaria-related messages through community health workers	PM	Number	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	3.7. Number of heath services or information delivery points meeting youth-friendly criteria	PM	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009

Summary Performance Data Table - Health												
SO/IR: Results Statement	**Indicators**	**Indicator Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disaggre-gation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	3.8. Number of policies or guidelines developed to promote youth's access to services	Custom[10]	Number	None	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	3.9. Number of youth peer/counselors trained	Custom	Number	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009
	3.10. Number of youth trained in life skills related to health knowledge, behavior, and services	Custom	Number	Gender	2008	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	TBD	Set baseline and target by 11/08	By 9/2009

[10] Custom F indicator

E. Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

SO 8: Health

Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services

Name of Intermediate Result: N/A

Name of Indicator: DPT3/P3 coverage

Geographic Focus: National

Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Percentage of children 12-23 months old who received three doses of DPT vaccine by 12 months; Numerator: Number of children 12-23 months of age who received 3 doses of DPT by 12 months x 100 Denominator: Number of children 12-23 months of age surveyed.

Liberia has started to provide Pentavalent vaccine to children. Since Pentavalent contains both DPT3 and two other vaccines (Hib and Hepatitis B), DPT3 coverage will be monitored via Pentavalent coverage

Unit of Measure: Percentage

Disaggregated by: Residence (urban/rural), gender

Justification & Management Utility: DPT3 coverage is a good proxy indicator of childhood immunization coverage. It measures the effectiveness of routine health service delivery by indicating the ability of the health system to deliver a series of vaccinations and continuity of use of immunization services by caretakers

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: Data will be collected through the Demographic and Health Survey (DHS). The most recent DHS survey was conducted in 2007, providing baseline data for this indicator. DHS data will be supplemented by UNICEF and WHO data, although this data is based on national statistics, which are often incomplete and unreliable.

Data Source(s): Macro International and L beria Institute of Statistics and Geo-Information Services (LISGIS)

Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and LISGIS will submit the DHS report to USAID once the survey is completed and data analyzed and published.

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years**.** The next DHS will likely be conducted between 2010 and 2013.

Budget Mechanism: TBD

Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager

Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing Partner (IP) Chief of Party/Representative, Macro International/LISGIS survey directors

Location of Data Storage: LISGIS/Macro DHS and IP's survey database and/or files, USAID database and/or files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: By September 2010

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): This indicator cannot account for the timeliness of each dose of DPT or the interval between doses. It can be used to validate DPT3 coverage data gained from routine immunization and surveillance activities, such as that reported by the Liberia Government for DPT3 coverage.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need to conduct a DQA on this indicator since the DHS has built-in data quality control procedures. However, USAID could still collaborate with Macro International in the design of the next survey to ensure it yields high quality data

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline is from the 2007 Liberia DHS report. USAID, in consultation with IPs and other stakeholders involved in child immunization will develop targets for future years based on this baseline and other historical data trends. We suggest setting targets for this indicator by November 2008.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		Total: 50.3% (M: 49.0%, F: 51.6%)	
2008	TBD		

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Modern Contraceptive Prevalence Rate (mCPR)
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of currently married women age 15-49 who are currently using a modern method of contraception. Modern methods of contraception include pills, IUDs, injectables, female sterilization, and male condoms. Numerator: Number of currently married women age 15-49 who are currently using a modern method of contraception x 100 Denominator: Total number of currently married women age 15-49
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Age, type of method
Justification & Management Utility: The level of current use of modern contraceptive methods is the most widely used and valuable measure of the success of family planning programs. Furthermore, it can be used to estimate the reduction in fertility attributable to contraception.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International and Liberia Institutes of Statistics and Geo-Information Services (LISGIS)
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International will send the DHS report to USAID once published.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Ever 3-5 years; the next DHS will likely be conducted between 2010 and 2013
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Survey directors of Macro International/LISGIS, Implementing Partner COP/ Representative
Location of Data Storage: LISGIS/Macro International databases and websites, USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need to conduct a DQA on this indicator since the DHS has built-in data quality control procedures. However, USAID could still collaborate with Macro International in the design of the next survey to ensure it yields high quality data
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator in 2007 Liberia DHS survey report was 11.4% .. USAID, in consultation with implementing partners and other stakeholders involved in child immunization will develop targets for future years based on this baseline data and other historical trends. We suggest setting targets for this indicator by November 2008.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		11.4%	
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health

Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Health Services

Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services

Name of Indicator: Proportion of pregnant women who have received two or more doses of IPTs during their last pregnancy in the last two years

Geographic Focus: National

Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Proportion of woman 15-49 with a live birth in the two years preceding the survey who received two doses of intermittent preventive treatment (IPT) using sulladoxine-pyrimethamine (FS/Fansidar) in the second and third trimesters of their pregnancy

Numerator: Number of women 15-49 who received 2 or more doses of IPTs using FS/Fansidar during their second and third trimester of pregnancy within the last two years

Denominator: Total number of pregnant woman surveyed

Unit of Measure: Proportion

Disaggregated by: Residence **(**Rural/Urban), county

Justification & Management Utility: Since pregnant women are more susceptible to malaria infection, it's important they receive two doses of IPTs in the second and third trimester of their pregnancy in order to reduce the risk of malaria infection. This indicator is a good measure of prophylactic use of anti-malaria drugs by women during pregnancy; particularly how well pregnant women are protecting themselves against infection.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: Malaria Indicator Survey (MIS)

Data Source(s): Macro International/LGIS, National Malaria Control Program (NMCP)

Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International, NMCP will send the survey report to USAID or USAID Implementing Partner who will forward the report to USAID

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-4 years

Budget Mechanism: TBD

Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager

Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: MIS survey directors, Implementing Partner COP/Agency Representative

Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS database and public websites, NMCP database/files, IP database/files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need to conduct a DQA on this indicator since the MIS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. However, USAID could collaborate with Macro International and NMCP in future survey design to ensure these surveys yield the highest quality data possible.

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator in the 2005 MIS report was 4.31%. USAID, in consultation with IPs and other stakeholders involved in malaria control will establish targets based on this baseline data and other historical data trends. We recommend setting targets for this indicator by November 2008.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2005		4.31%	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2009

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Proportion of pregnant women who slept under a mosquito net the previous night
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Ratio of pregnant women who slept under well covered insecticide treated bed nets during the night before the interview. Numerator: Number of pregnant women who slept under well covered insecticide treated bed nets in the night before the interview Denominator: Total number of pregnant women living in the communities
Unit of Measure: Proportion/ratio
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Pregnant women are the most vulnerable group for malaria infection and illness. Malaria-attributed morbidity and mortality among pregnant women is high. This indicator provides the magnitude of pregnant women who are protected from mosquito bites by sleeping under well covered insecticide treated mosquito nets.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Malaria Indicators Survey (MIS); ANC records of health facilities
Data Source(s): Macro International, NMCP, ANC services statistics
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: If the MIS survey is used, the MIS survey director will send the survey report to USAID. Otherwise, implementing partners will send service statistics reports to USAID.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: every 3-4 yrs for MIS, annually for service statistics
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010 for MIS; September 2009 for ANC service statistics
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Service statistics are often incomplete and unreliable
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: If relying on ANC services statistics for this indicator, a rigorous DQA should be conducted in October 2009. There is no need for conducting a DQA if relying on MIS because this survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with the IP implementing the survey in the design of future surveys is recommended, however, to ensure these surveys yield high quality data.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the indicator value reported in the 2005 MIS Survey (see "actual" below). USAID will set targets for this indicator in consultation with other partners and stakeholders involved in malaria treatment and prevention
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2005		31% (Source: 2005 MIS)	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2009

SO 8: Health

Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services

Name of Intermediate Result: N/A

Name of Indicator: Proportion of children under 5 years with fever in the last two weeks receiving treatment with ACT within 24 hours of onset of fever

Geographic Focus: National

Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Children under 5 years with fever in the last two weeks receiving treatment with ACT within 24 hours of onset of fever.
Numerator: Number of children under 5 years with fever in the last two weeks receiving treatment with ACT within 24 hours of onset of fever
Denominator: Number of children under 5 years in the communities

Unit of Measure: Proportion

Disaggregated by: None

Justification & Management Utility: The prevalence and incidence rates of malaria among children under 5 years of age are high in Liberia. Malaria-attributed morbidity and mortality in this specific age group is high. They are the most vulnerable population segment. The prompt and efficient treatment of under-5 children with fever will reduce their deaths.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: DHS, MIS

Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS, NMCP for Malaria indicator survey (MIS)

Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Compiled survey analysis reports and facility records reviews

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: DHS every 3-5 years**,** MIS every 3-4 yrs

Budget Mechanism: TBD

Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager

Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative

Location of Data Storage: IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA if relying on DHS or MIS because these surveys have built-in data quality control procedures. However, USAID collaboration with the IP implementing the DHS or MIS survey during the survey design process is recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest quality data.

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator is the actual number reported by the 2007 DHS. Alternatively, the MIS 2005 data could also be used as the alternative baseline (see below).

Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		2007 DHS: 8.9% 2005 MIS : 3.2%	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Percentage of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA)
Geographic Focus: National/USG-assisted facilities
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of live births with a skilled health professional providing assistance during delivery. A skilled health professional can be a doctor, a nurse/midwife, or a physician's assistant. Numerator: Number of deliveries with a skilled health professional providing assistance during delivery x 100 Denominator: Total number of deliveries
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Type of SBA
Justification & Management Utility: In addition to place of birth, assistance during childbirth is an important variable that influences the birth outcome and the health of the mother of the infant.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS, Implementing Partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and/or Implementing Partners will send the DHS report to USAID, once finalized and published
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: 3-5 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, Chief of Party/IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS databases, websites, and files, IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA because the DHS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline data for this indicator is the most recent data reported by the 2007 DHS report. Since this is a national level indicator, USAD will collaborate with other stakeholders involved in Maternal and Child Health to establish national-level targets for 2009 and beyond.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		46%	
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health services
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Percentage of households with an improved source of drinking water
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of the household population who use any of the following types of water supply for drinking: piped water, public tap/standpipe, tube well or borehole, protected well, protected spring. Improved water sources do not include vendor-provided water, bottled water, tanker trucks, or unprotected wells and springs Numerator: Number of households population who use any of the following types of water supply for drinking x100 Denominator: Total number of households population surveyed
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Type of improved source, residence (urban/rural)
Justification & Management Utility: The indicator monitors access to improved water sources on the assumption that improved water sources are more likely to provide safe water. Unsafe water is the direct cause of many diseases in developing countries. This is also a Millennium Development Goal all countries have to track.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and/or Implementing Partners will send the DHS report to USAID, once finalized and published
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, Implementing Partner/IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS databases, websites, and files; IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA because the DHS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline data for this indicator is the most recent data reported by the 2007 DHS report (see below). Since this is a national level indicator, USAID will collaborate with other stakeholders involved in Water Supply and Sanitation to establish national-level targets for 2009 and beyond.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		Total: 65.3% (Urban: 81.8%; Rural: 55.9%)	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Percentage of young women and men age 15-24 who used a condom the last time they had high risk sexual intercourse
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Numerator: Number of women and men age 15-24 reporting having sexual intercourse with more than one partner during the last 12 months and using a condom during the intercourse x 100 Denominator: Total number of women and men age 15-24 reporting having sexual intercourse with more than one partner during the last 12 months
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Consistent use of condoms in non-regular sexual partnerships substantially reduces the risk of sexual HIV transmission. This is particularly important for young people, who often experience the highest rate of HIV infection.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and/or Implementing Partners will send the DHS report to USAID, once finalized and published
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, Implementing Partner/IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS databases, websites, and files; IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA because the DHS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline data for this indicator is the most recent data reported by the 2007 DHS Report (see below). Since this is a national level indicator, USAID will collaborate with other stakeholders involved in HIV prevention to establish national-level targets for 2009 and beyond.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		M: 26%; F: 14%	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Health Services
Name of Indicator: Percentage of women receiving antenatal care (ANC) by skilled providers
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of pregnant women age 15-49 receiving antenatal (or prenatal) care from a skilled provider for the most recent birth Numerator: Number of women age 15-49 receiving antenatal (or prenatal) care from a skilled provider x 100 Denominator: Total number of pregnant women age 15-49 who received antenatal care visits
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Residence, country, and type of skilled provider
Justification & Management Utility: The major objective of prenatal care is to identify and treat problems during pregnancy such as anemia and infections. It's during prenatal care visits that screening for complications and advice on a range of issues, including place of delivery and referral of mothers with complications, occur. This indicator is important for monitoring proper screening and counseling of pregnant women by skilled health providers.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and/or Implementing Partners will send the DHS report to USAID, once finalized and published
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, Implementing Partner/IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS databases, websites, and files; IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA because the DHS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline data for this indicator is the most recent data reported by the 2007 DHS (see below). Since this is a national level indicator, USAID will collaborate with other stakeholders involved in Water Supply and Sanitation to establish national-level targets for 2009 and beyond.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		79.3%	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Percentage of households with at least one mosquito net
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of households with at least one mosquito net (treated or untreated) Number of households with at least one mosquito net (treated or untreated) x 100 Total number of households surveyed
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Rural/urban, county
Justification & Management Utility: Ownership of a mosquito net is an important indicator to track since a mosquito net prevents malaria infection, if used properly. However, this indicator measures only coverage of mosquito nets among the population, it doesn't measure proper use of mosquito nets.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS, Malaria Indicator Survey (MIS)
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS, National Malaria Control Program (NMCP)
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International, NMCP will send the survey report to USAID or USAID Implementing Partner who will forward the report to USAID
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years for DHS, every 3-4 years for MIS
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, NMCP director, Implementing Partner COP/Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): TBD
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA because the DHS and MIS surveys have built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International and NMCP in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator is the actual number reported by the 2007 DHS. Alternatively, the MIS 2006 data could also be used as the alternative baseline (see below). Since this is a national level indicator, USAID will set targets in consultation with other partners and stakeholders involved in Malaria control and prevention.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		30.4% (2007 DHS) 18% (2005 MIS)	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of children less than 12 months old who received DPT3 in a given year from USG supported programs.
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of children less than 12 months old who received DPT3 in a given year from USG supported programs. Liberia has started to provide Pentavalent vaccine to children. Since Pentavalent contains both DPT3 and 2 other vaccines (Hib and Hepatitis B), DPT3 coverage will be monitored via Pentavalent coverage
Unit of Measure: Number of children
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: DPT3 coverage can be used as a proxy for full immunization coverage in countries with established immunization programs. Child immunization is one of the most cost-effective program interventions to reduce under-five mortality.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records; service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Data quality will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		13,040	
2008	13,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of children under 5 years of age who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of children under 5 years of age who received Vitamin A from USG-supported programs
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Vitamin A supplementation reduces risk of under-five mortality by about one-fourth among the millions of children deficient in this micronutrient
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records; service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		11,665	
2008	12,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of cases of child pneumonia treated with ant biotics by trained facility or community health workers in USG-supported programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of cases of child pneumonia treated with antibiotics by trained facility or community health workers in USAID supported programs.
Unit of Measure: Number of treated cases
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Pneumonia is the leading cause of preventable mortality among infants and young children; this indicator provides a measure of the number of children with pneumonia symptoms receiving required treatment.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records; service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		18,246	
2008	17,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of newborns receiving essential newborn care through USG-supported programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of newborn infants who receive essential newborn care (clean cord care, drying and wrapping, immediate breastfeeding) from trained facility, outreach or community health workers through USG-supported programs.
Unit of Measure: Number of newborns
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Basic essential care for all newborns is a cornerstone component of USAID programs aimed at reducing the newborn component of infant mortality
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records; service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of the data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline and target for this indicator will be determined once related activities begin.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008	TBD		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of cases of child diarrhea treated in USAID-assisted programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of cases of child diarrhea treated through USG-supported programs with: a) oral rehydration therapy (ORT), b) zinc supplements
Unit of Measure: Number of treated cases
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Diarrheal illness is a major cause of preventable mortality among infants and young children; this indicator provides a measure of the number of children with diarrheal illness receiving required treatment
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records, service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		15,136	
2008	14,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of counseling visits for FP/RH as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of visits that include counseling on FP/RH. Can include clinic visits as well as contacts with CBD agents.
Unit of Measure: Number of visits
Disaggregated by: 5-year age group, post-partum women. For this indicator, the post-partum period is defined as up to one year after the birth.
Justification & Management Utility: FP/RH health counseling visits are important to monitor as they contribute to increasing women knowledge of FP/RH services and products. More visits are associated with increased demand for and use of FP/RH services.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records; service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		4,277	
2008	5,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of women giving birth who received Active Management of the Third Stage of Labor (AMSTL) through USG-supported programs.
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of women giving birth who received Active Management of the Third Stage of Labor (AMSTL) through USG-supported programs
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: AMSTL is a key component of USAID programs aimed at preventing and managing post-partum hemorrhage, a major cause of maternal mortality.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records, service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator whose baseline and target will be determined once related activities begin.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008	TBD		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of USG-assisted service delivery points providing FP counseling or services
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of service delivery points (excluding door-to-door Community-Based Distributors (CBD) providing FP counseling or services, disaggregated, as appropriate, by type of service: vertical FP/RH; HIV, incl. Prevention of Mother to Child Transmission (PMTCT); pre-natal/post-natal or other MCH; sites offering long-acting and permanent methods (IUD, implants, voluntary sterilization)
Unit of Measure: Number of service delivery points
Disaggregated by: Type of service: vertical FP/RH; HIV, incl. PMTCT; pre-natal/post-natal or other MCH; sites offering long-acting and permanent methods (IUD, implants, voluntary sterilization)
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator assumes that more service delivery points for FP/RH counseling and services will lead to greater demand for and use of FP services and products.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records, service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the 5 USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		76	
2008	80		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people that have seen or heard a specific USG-supported FP/RH message
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Size of target population that has seen or heard a specific FP/RH message
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator assumes that greater exposure to FP/RH messages will lead to increased knowledge of FP services and greater demand for and use of FP services and products.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Head of Implementing Partner's Agency
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files, database; USAID files, database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		54,552	
2008	60,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Total number of service outlets providing HIV-related palliative care, including TB/HIV.
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted facilities
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): A service outlet refers to the lowest level of service. For example, with regard to clinical activities, the lowest level for which data exists should be a service outlet such as a hospital, clinic, or mobile unit. Palliative care services include A) clinical/medical, B) psychological, C) spiritual, and/or D) support care services. *Measurement note:* One difficulty with this indicator is that while facility-based or community-based service outlets in fixed locations are relatively straight-forward to measure, community-based or home-based outreach activities are too difficult to define as service outlets and are not captured in this indicator. It is recommended that at country level, programs monitor which sites provide each of the key interventions: medical, psychological, spiritual, and social. (For further guidance on this indicator, please see F indicator Guidance)
Unit of Measure: Number of service outlets
Disaggregated by: Rural/Urban, type of facilities/outlets
Justification & Management Utility: Palliative care is patient and family-centered care. It optimizes the quality of life of adults and children living with HIV through the active anticipation, prevention, and treatment of pain, symptoms and suffering from the onset of HIV diagnosis through death. Palliative care includes and goes beyond the medical management of infectious, neurological, or oncological complications of HIV/AIDS to comprehensively address symptoms and suffering throughout the continuum of illness.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records, service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		No data reported	
2008	3		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of targeted condom service outlets
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Targeted condom service outlet refers to fixed distribution points or mobile units with fixed schedules providing condoms for free or for sale.
Unit of Measure: Number of service outlets
Disaggregated by: Type of facility/outlet
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator provides a tangible measure of the potential reach of condom distribution to a given community as an important part of a comprehensive prevention message.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, Implementing Partner's Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files, database; USAID files, database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		80	
2008	78		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Community outreach is defined as any effort to affect change that might include peer education, classroom, small group, and/or one-on-one information, education, communication (IEC) or behavior change communication (BCC) to promote abstinence. Abstinence-promoting messages include: 1) Importance of abstinence in reducing the prevention of HIV transmission among unmarried individuals; 2) Decision of unmarried individuals to delay sexual activity until marriage; 3) Development of skills in unmarried individuals for practicing abstinence; and 4) Adoption of social and community norms that support delaying sex until marriage and that denounce forced sexual activity among unmarried individuals.
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the number of individuals who attended community outreach activities focused on abstinence. In any prevention campaign, the more individuals who receive the message, the higher number who may make the behavioral changes involved.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, Implementing Partner's Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files, database; USAID files, database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		208, 085 (M:109, 485; F: 137, 600)	
2008	306, 800 (M: 136,800; F: 170,000)		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV/AIDS prevention through abstinence and/or being faithful
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Community outreach is defined as any effort to affect change that might include peer education, classroom, small group, and/or one-on-one information, education, communication (IEC) or behavior change communication (BCC) to promote abstinence and/or being faithful. *(See F indicator Guidance for examples of abstinence and being faithful messages)*
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the number of individuals who attended community outreach activities focused on abstinence and/or being faithful. In any prevention campaign, the more individuals who receive the message, the higher number who may make the behavioral changes involved.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, Implementing Partner's Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files, database; USAID files, database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: October 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: TBD
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		208, 085 (M:109, 485; F: 137, 600)	
2008	306, 800 (M: 136,800; F: 170,000)		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals reached through community outreach that promotes HIV prevention through other behavioral change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The number of individuals who attended community outreach activities focused on HIV prevention through the targeting of behaviors that increase risk for HIV transmission. Community outreach is defined as any effort to affect change that might include peer education, classroom, small group, and/or one-on-one information, education, communication (IEC) or behavior change communication (BCC) to promote behavioral change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful. Other behavior change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful includes the targeting of behaviors that increase risk for HIV transmission such as engaging in casual sexual encounters, engaging in sex in exchange for money or favors, having sex with an HIV-positive partner or one whose status is unknown, using drugs or abusing alcohol in the context of sexual interactions, and using intravenous drugs. (For more details on the definition of this indicator, please see 2008 F Investing in People Indicator Guidance)
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is based on the rationale that in any prevention campaign, the more individuals who receive the message, the higher the number who may make the behavioral changes involved.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner database/files, USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		247,085 (M: 109,485; F: 137, 600)	
2008	306, 800 (M; 136,600; F: 170,000)		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of insecticide treated nets (ITNs) distributed in country that were purchased or subsidized with USG support.
Unit of Measure: Number of ITNs
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the number of ITNs distributed – one of the two high impact malaria prevention interventions — that were directly attributable to USG support.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files/ database, USAID files/database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		6,108	
2008	150,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increase Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of treatments with artemisinin-based combination drugs purchased and distributed to malaria patients through USG support.
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of artemisinin-based combination treatments (ACTs) purchased and distributed through USG-support.
Unit of Measure: Number of ACTs
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility:
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/ Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files/ database, USAID files/ database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 7, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		156,636	
2008	200,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of houses sprayed with IRS with USG support
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of occupied houses in the indoor residual spraying (IRS) program target area sprayed with a residual insecticide for malaria prevention with USG direct support.
Unit of Measure: Number of houses
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is used to measure the number of houses reached with one of the two high impact prevention interventions for malaria attributable to USG support.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files, USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		699	
2008	50,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people in target areas with access to improved drinking water supply as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of people in target areas with access to improved drinking water technologies, including household water connection, public standpipe, borehole, protected dug well, protected spring, rainwater collection, and bottled water (if a secondary source is also improved). It does NOT include unprotected wells, unprotected springs, rivers or ponds, vendor-provided water, and tanker trucks.
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Urban/Rural
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator accurately measures delivery of a basic human service, using definitions that are completely consistent with internationally endorsed WHO/UNICEF indicators.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/ Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party/ IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files/database, USAID files/database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator whose baseline and target will be determined once activities related to the indicator begin.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008	TBD		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people in target areas with access to improved sanitation facilities as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of people in target areas with access to technologies more likely to ensure privacy and hygienic use, i.e., connection to a public sewer, connection to a septic system, pour-flush latrine, simple pit latrine, and ventilated improved pit (VIP) latrine. This does NOT include public or shared latrines, open pit latrines, and bucket latrines.
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Rural/Urban
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator accurately measures delivery of a basic human service, using definitions that are completely consistent with internationally endorsed WHO/UNICEF indicators.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/ Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party/ IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files/database, USAID files/database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator whose baseline and target will be determined once activities related to the indicator begin.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of children reached by USG-supported nutrition programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of children reached by programs that promote good infant and young child feeding and/or growth promotion programs
Unit of Measure: Number of children
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is based on evidence that promotion of good infant and young child feeding (IYCF) practices are essential in preventing malnutrition and improving child survival.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files/ database, USAID files/database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		62,730	
2008	33,488		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of OVC served by OVC programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of orphans and vulnerable children (OVC) under 18 years of age reached by OVC programs. It does NOT include non-OVC family members. (For more details on the definition of this indicator, please see 2008 F Investing in People Indicator Guidance)
Unit of Measure: Number of OVC
Disaggregated by: Sex, primary direct support, supplementary direct support
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the extent to which OVC are being served. This indicator will measure OVC who are receiving: access to education; economic support; targeted food and nutrition support; legal aid; medical, psychological, or emotional care; and/or other social and material support. Institutional responses would also be included.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/ Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party/ IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner database/files, USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		74 (M: 45; F: 29)	
2008	70 (M: 40; F:30)		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2009

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of health facilities rehabilitated
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of health facilities that have been rehabilitated, including cosmetic upgrades such as whitewashing walls, structural improvements, and mending broken furniture. (For more details on the definition of this indicator, please see 2008 F Investing in People Indicator Handbook)
Unit of Measure: Number of facilities
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is based on evidence that health facilities in flagrant disrepair are frequently unsafe and inadequate for providing health care.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/ Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files/database, USAID files/ database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator whose baseline and target will be determined once activities related to the indicator begin.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Access to Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of improvements to policies, regulations or guidelines related to improving access to services drafted with USG support
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of policy documents drafted with USG support that result in improved access to and use of health services. *Measurement note*: More is not necessarily better than fewer; the importance is on creating an improved policy environment. This could be achieved with one policy change or with several. Policies will be reported under the program element where they belong.
Unit of Measure: Number of policies or guidelines
Disaggregated by: Policy improvements informed by National Health Accounts/Other USG input. Policies should also be disaggregated and reported by program element; specifically MCH, Malaria, and FP/RH
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is based on evidence that a supportive policy environment is important to the long-term sustainability of programs and for use and access of services.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/ Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party/ IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner files/ database, USAID files,/database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline and targets for this indicator will be determined once specific activities to affect the indicator begin.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Percentage of USG-assisted facilities meeting facility accreditation criteria and obtaining at least one star on the accreditation
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of health facilities assessed against the national health facility accreditation criteria that receive at least one star in meeting the accreditation criteria Numerator: Number of health facilities that meet accreditation criteria and receive at last one star x 100 Denominator: Total number of health facilities assessed
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator provides a progress check on the health facilities in the drive to improve quality of service.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility accreditation survey
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: The designated implementing partner will send the facility accreditation report to USAID
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator which currently doesn't have baseline data. The baseline will be established once the first health facility accreditation survey is conducted. A preliminary target for 2009 will be established in November 2008 by the designated implementing partner in consultation with USAID Health Team.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of deliveries with a skilled birth attendant (SBA) in USG assisted programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Skilled birth attendant (SBA) includes: medically trained doctor, nurse, or midwife. It does NOT include traditional birth attendants (TBA).
Unit of Measure: Number of deliveries
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Attendance at birth by a medically trained professional provides the opportunity to administer life-saving preventive and curative care at the time of greatest vulnerability for the mother and the newborn.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records; service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files; implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		2,095	
2008	1,600		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of antenatal care visits by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of antenatal care (ANC) visits provided by skilled providers from USG-assisted facilities. Skilled provider includes: medically trained doctor, nurse, or midwife. It does NOT include traditional birth attendants (TBA).
Unit of Measure: Number of ANC visits
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is based on evidence that ANC visits are required to provide preventive and curative care to promote healthy birth outcomes.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records, service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files; implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		30,712	
2008	22,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals who received counseling and testing for HIV and received their test results
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): This indicator requires a minimum of counseling, testing, and the provision of test results. Partners should not double count individuals seen multiple times within a program. An individual may count in separate program areas, such as an OVC who may be served separately by an OVC program, ART facility, and prevention program. However, double counting of individuals within a program area is to be avoided among USG funded partners to the extent possible. (See further guidance on this indicator in the F Indicator Guidance)
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator provides a count of those individuals who have received counseling and testing during the current reporting period, and as a result are now aware of their HIV status. The goal is to track the number of individuals who received their test results; however, not all programs are set up to adequately distinguish between those who are tested and those who receive results. All programs should work towards being able to track individuals through pre-test counseling, testing, post-test counseling, provision of results, and subsequent interventions.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Data collected through health facility records (cards/registers) of people receiving counseling and testing
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files; implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		3,304 (M: 945; F: 2,359)	
2008		3,650(M: 2,100, F: 1,150)	
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of pregnant women who received counseling and testing for PMTCT and received their test results
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The total number of pregnant women who received both HIV counseling and testing including the provision of test results at PMTCT service outlets. Count only those pregnant women who received, at minimum, HIV counseling and testing and received results during the specified reporting period (6 months for semi-annual report; 12 months for annual report).
Unit of Measure: Number of pregnant wormen
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator reflects the main goal of PMTCT which is to increase the number of pregnant women who know their HIV status
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Health facility records, service statistics
Data Source(s): Health facilities
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Health facility database/files, implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new F indicator for an upcoming activity. The baseline and target will be determined once the activity begins.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of service outlets providing counseling and testing according to national and international standards
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): A service outlet refers to the lowest level of service. For example, with regard to clinical activities, the lowest level for which data exists should be a service outlet such as a health center, hospital, clinic, stand alone Voluntary Counseling and Resting (VCT) center, or mobile unit. Counseling and testing includes activities in which both HIV counseling and testing are provided for those who seek to know their status (as in traditional VCT) or as indicated in other contexts (e.g. STI clinics, diagnostic testing, etc.). This indicator excludes service outlets that provide counseling and testing in the context of preventing mother-to-child transmission. Count only outlets which provide both HIV counseling and testing, except those involved in PMTCT.
Unit of Measure: Number of outlets
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator provides a gross count of the number of locations which provide basic counseling and testing for HIV. It provides a rough sense of the change in the capacity within a country to provide counseling and testing services. If there is a plan to expand the number of service outlets, this measure will track the progress of meeting that goal.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing Partners' project records (service outlets' assessment checklists)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		26	
2008	27		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of improvements to policies, regulations, or guidelines drafted related to improving the quality of services, with USG support
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Policies are important for the sustainability of programs and for use and access of services. More changes are not necessarily better than fewer. What is important is that a supportive policy environment exists. This could be the result of a single policy change. This indicator can be used within or across health elements. If used within an element, it must be measured for and relate specifically to that element. There are 3 program elements that have this indicator: FP/RH, MCH, and Malaria
Unit of Measure: Number of policies, regulations, or guidelines
Disaggregated by: Policy improvements informed by National Health Accounts/Other USG input. Policies should also be disaggregated by program elements and reported under each relevant program element.
Justification & Management Utility: Policies are important for the sustainability of programs and for use and access of services
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing Partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: October 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: There is no baseline for this indicator since implementing partners haven't been reporting on this indicator. The baseline will be established with the first partners' reports on this indicator. Targets will be set in November 2008 as part of the OP Performance Report.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people trained in malarial treatment or prevention with USG funds
Geographic Focus: USG-assisted areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of people (medical personnel, health workers, community workers, etc.) trained in malaria treatment or prevention
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator will be used to quantify one of the inputs of USG support for building local capacity for delivering malaria services.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 8, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		674 (M: 274; F: 400)	
2008	800		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people trained in maternal/newborn health through USG-supported programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of people (health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, non-health personnel) trained in maternal and/or newborn health and nutrition care through USG-supported programs
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Development of human capacity through training is a major component of USG-supported health area programs in this element.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		801 (M: 264; F: 537)	
2008	1,950 (M:350; F: 1,600)		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported health area programs
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of people (health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, non-health personnel) trained in child health care and child nutrition through USG-supported programs
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Development of human capacity through training is a major component of USG-supported health area programs in this element
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		801 (M: 264; F: 537)	
2008	2,200 (M: 590, F: 1,650)		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of health workers trained in the provision of PMTCT services according to national and international standards
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. A training session must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. A PMTCT training curriculum must contain at least one of the PMTCT core elements: PMTCT-related counseling and testing, ARV prophylaxis, infant feeding counseling, and family planning counseling or referral. Each USG agency and USG-funded partner counts the number of individuals trained in PMTCT by USG staff (HQ or field-based) or USG-funded partners during the specified reporting period (6 months for semi-annual report; 12 months for annual report). Only participants who complete the full training course should be counted. If a training course covers more than one PMTCT topic, for example ARV prophylaxis and infant feeding, individuals should only be counted once for that training course. (For additional information on this indicator, see F Indicator Guidance)
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Sex, type of training
Justification & Management Utility: The intent of the indicator is to measure progress toward a cadre of professionals trained in PMTCT service delivery according to national or international standards.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		17	
2008	4		

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people trained in FP/RH with USG funds
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of people (health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, non-health personnel) trained in FP/RH (including training in service delivery, communication, policy and systems, research, etc.). Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. A training session must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Sex, type of training
Justification & Management Utility: Increasing the quality and quantity of trained workers in FP/RH will increase the quality of services.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		Total: 590 (M: 64; F: 110)	
2008	Total: 120 (M: 80; F: 120)		

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people trained in counseling and testing according to national and international standards
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. A training session must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. *Measurement notes*: Each USG agency and USG-funded partner counts the number of individuals trained in prevention by USG staff (HQ or field-based) or USG-funded partners during the specified reporting period (6 months for semi-annual report; 12 months for annual report). Only participants who complete the full training course should be counted. If a training course covers more than one counseling or testing topic, individuals should only be counted once for that training course. If a training course is conducted in more than one session/training event, only individuals who complete the full course should be counted. (For additional information on this indicator, see F Indicator Guidance)
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Sex, type of training
Justification & Management Utility:
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training logs/attendance forms/sheets)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		88	
2008	40		

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals trained in HIV-related institutional capacity building
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. Count all individuals trained, from local organizations or otherwise, during the reporting period. A training session must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. HIV institutional capacity building training includes strategic planning, registration, financial management, human resources management, network development, commodities, equipment, and logistics management, and infrastructure development. Only participants who complete the full training course should be counted. If a training course covers more than one institutional capacity building topic, individuals should only be counted once for the training course. For further guidance on the definition of this indicator, please see F 2008 Investing in People Indicator Guidance
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the number of individuals trained in institutional capacity building. As more and more individuals are trained in the different capacity building domains, more individuals can be reached with HIV/AIDS services. In conjunction with other HIV training indicators, this indicator.gives a picture of the reach of capacity building programs.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		No data reported	
2008	2		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals trained to promote HIV prevention programs through abstinence
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. Count all individuals trained, from local organizations or otherwise, during the reporting period. A training session must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. Remember that this includes only abstinence programs. If the program is targeting sexually active young adults with condom social marketing, it will not count in the abstinence category. Each USG agency and USG-funded partner counts the number of individuals trained in prevention through abstinence only by USG staff (HQ or field-based) or USG-funded partners during the specified reporting period (6 months for semi-annual report; 12 months for annual report). Only participants who complete the full training course should be counted. (For further guidance on the definition of this indicator, please see F 2008 Investing in People Indicator Guidance).
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is a measure of peer or health care educators who have been trained in the delivery of prevention messages to the target audience. It measures the number of newly trained or retrained individuals who are able to deliver HIV prevention messages with primary focus on abstinence.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		2,188	
2008	1,000		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals trained to promote HIV prevention programs through abstinence and/or being faithful
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. Count all individuals trained, from local organizations or otherwise, during the reporting period. A training session must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. Remember that this includes either abstinence programs or Be Faithful programs or those which have a combination of these approaches as their primary message. If the program is targeting sexually active young adults with condom social marketing, it will not count in the abstinence and Be Faithful category. Each USG agency and USG-funded partner counts the number of individuals trained in prevention through abstinence and/or being faithful during the specified reporting period (6 months for semi-annual report; 12 months for annual report). Only participants who complete the full training course should be counted. (For further guidance on the definition of this indicator, please see F 2008 Investing in People Indicator Guidance).
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is a measure of peer or health care educators who have been trained in the delivery of prevention messages to the target audience. It measures the number of newly trained or retrained individuals who are able to deliver HIV prevention messages with primary focus on abstinence and/or being faithful.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds with the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY8 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		2,188	
2008	1,000		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals trained to promote HIV prevention programs through other behavioral change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. A training session must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. Other behavior change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful includes targeting those behaviors that increase risk for HIV transmission such as engaging in casual sexual encounters, engaging in sex in exchange for money or favors, having sex with an HIV-positive partner or one whose status is unknown, using drugs or abusing alcohol in the context of sexual interactions, and using intravenous drugs. *Measurement Note:* Each USG agency and USG-funded partner counts the number of individuals trained in prevention through other behavioral change beyond abstinence and/or being faithful by USG staff (HQ or field-based) or USG-funded partners during the specified reporting period (6 months for semi-annual report; 12 months for annual report). Only participants who complete the full training course should be counted. For further guidance on the definition of this indicator, please see F 2008 Investing in People Indicator Guidance.
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is a measure of peer or health care educators who have been trained in the delivery of prevention messages to the target audience. It measures the number of newly trained or retrained individuals who are able to deliver comprehensive HIV prevention messages.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the performance data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		2,188	
2008	1,000		
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of local organizations provided with technical assistance in HIV-related institutional capacity building
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): A local organization is defined as any entity whose headquarters is in a country or region served by the Emergency Plan. As such, the majority of the entity's staff (senior, mid-level, support) is comprised of host country and/or regional nationals. "Local organizations" refers to both governmental and non-governmental (NGOs, FBOs, and community-based) organizations. Technical assistance (TA) is defined as the identification of the need for and delivery of practical program and technical support. TA is intended to assist local organizations in building capacity to design, implement and evaluate HIV prevention, care and treatment programs. *Measurement Note:* HIV institutional capacity building includes strategic planning, registration, financial management, human resources management, network development, commodities, equipment, and logistics management, and infrastructure development. Only participants who complete the full training course should be counted. If a training course covers more than one institutional capacity building topic, individuals should only be counted once for the training course. For further guidance on the definition of this indicator, please see F 2008 Investing in People Indicator Guidance.
Unit of Measure: Number of local organizations
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the degree to which organizations receive technical assistance in support of institutional capacity development, a priority area of The Emergency Plan.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (technical assistance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator corresponds to the data reported in the 2007 Mission OP Performance Report (see "actual" data below). The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		12	
2008	2		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of institutions with improved HMIS as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Institutions refer to host country organizations such as a Ministry, government office, sub-national government unit, NGO, school, hospital and research organization. Management information systems are data bases, usually computerized, that allow the organization to store, analyze, report and use information
Unit of Measure: Number of institutions
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator captures the direct support provided by operating units to host country institutions
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Special survey conducted by implementing partners
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The target for 2008 is the data included in the Mission's FY 08 OP.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008	20		
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Quality of Basic Health Services
Name of Indicator: Number of people trained in strategic information (includes M&E, surveillance, and/or HMIS)
Geographic Focus: USG target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. A training session must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants. Only participants who complete the full training course should be counted. If a training course is conducted in several sessions or covers more than one SI topic, for example M&E and surveillance, individuals should only be counted once for that training course. If a training spans more than 1 programmatic area with separate and specific objectives and curricula for each program (for instance OVC and SI), individuals trained may count in each program area. Individuals trained in training courses co-funded by more than one USG agency / USG-funded partner should only be counted once within the specified reporting period. (See further guidance in F Investing in People Indicator Guidance)
Unit of Measure: Number of people
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: The intent of the indicator is to measure progress toward creating a cadre of professionals trained in the collection, analysis, dissemination, and use of strategic information for HIV/AIDS programming.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (training logs/attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Chief of Party, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners' database/files; USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new indicator and the baseline and targets will be established once activities related to this indicator begin.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Percentage of young women and young men with comprehensive knowledge about HIV/AIDS
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of young women and men age 15-24 with comprehensive knowledge about HIV/AIDS, including: knowing that consistent use of condoms during sexual intercourse and having just one uninfected faithful partner can reduce the chance of getting the AIDS virus; knowing that a healthy looking person can have the AIDS virus; and rejecting the two most common local misconceptions about AIDS transmission or prevention which are — AIDS can be transmitted by mosquito bites and a person can be infected by sharing food with a person who has AIDS. Numerator: Number of young men and women age 15-24 with comprehensive knowledge about AIDS x 100 Denominator: Total Number of young men and women age 15-24 surveyed
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator reflects the success of national information, education, and communication program and other efforts in promoting knowledge of valid HIV-prevention methods and reducing misconceptions about the disease.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and/or Implementing Partners will send the DHS report to USAID, once finalized and published.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, Implementing Partner/IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS databases, websites, and files, IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA on this indicator because the DHS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline data for this indicator is the most recent data reported in the 2007 DHS survey report (see data below). Since this is a national level indicator, USAID will collaborate with other stakeholders involved in HIV prevention programs to establish national-level targets for 2009 and beyond.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		M: 27.2% F: 19.4%	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Percentage of young women and young men with knowledge of HIV/AIDS prevention methods
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of young women and men age 15-24 who, in response to prompted questions, say that people can reduce their AIDS virus by using condoms every time they have sexual intercourse, by having one sex partner who is not infected and has no other partners, and by abstaining from sexual intercourse. Numerator: Number of young men and women age 15-24 with knowledge about HIV prevention x 100 Denominator: Total Number of young men and women age 15-24 surveyed
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex, type of HIV prevention knowledge
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator reflects the success of national information, education, and communication program and other efforts in promoting knowledge of valid HIV-prevention methods.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and/or Implementing Partners will send the DHS report to USAID, once finalized and published.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, Implementing Partner/IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS databases, websites, and files, IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA on this indicator because the DHS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline data for this indicator is the most recent data reported in the 2007 DHS survey report (see data below). Since this is a national level indicator, USAID will collaborate with other stakeholders involved in HIV prevention programs to establish national-level targets for 2009 and beyond.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		M: 63% F: 51%	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Percentage of young women and young men who know a source for condoms
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of young women and young men age 15-24 who know a source for condoms. A source for condoms is any place where young people can get the condoms either by purchasing them or accessing them free of charge (can be a public or private health facility, shop, pharmacy, etc). Friends, family members, and home are not considered sources for condoms. Numerator: Number of young women and young men age 15-24 who know a source for condoms x 100 Denominator: Total number of young women and young men age 15-24 interviewed
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: Condom use among young adults plays an important role in the prevention of transmission of HIV and other STIs, as well as prevention of unwanted pregnancies. This indicator is useful for assessing knowledge of places where young people can obtain condoms, which is a pre-requisite for using them.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and/or Implementing Partners will send the DHS report to USAID, once finalized and published.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, Implementing Partner/IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS databases, websites, and files, IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA on this indicator because the DHS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline data for this indicator is the most recent data reported in the 2007 DHS survey report (see data below). Since this is a national level indicator, USAID will collaborate with other stakeholders involved in HIV prevention programs to establish national-level targets for 2009 and beyond.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		M: 52.3%; F: 48.9%	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Percentage age at first birth among youth age 15-19
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Percentage of young women age 15-24 who gave birth by age 15, 18, 20, 22, and 24. Numerator: Number of young women age 15-24 who gave birth at either age 15, 18, 20, 22, or 24 x 100 Denominator: Total number of young women age 15-24 surveyed
Unit of Measure: Percentage
Disaggregated by: Age group and exact age of first birth
Justification & Management Utility: The age at which childbearing commences is an important determinant of the overall level of fertility as well as the health and welfare of the mother and child. Postponement of age due to an increase in age at marriage may contribute to fertility decline.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: DHS
Data Source(s): Macro International/LISGIS
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Macro International and/or Implementing Partners will send the DHS report to USAID, once finalized and published.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Every 3-5 years
Budget Mechanism: TBD
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: DHS survey director, Implementing Partner/IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Macro International/LISGIS databases, websites, and files, IP database and/or files; USAID database and/or files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2010
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: There is no need for conducting a DQA on this indicator because the DHS survey has built-in data quality control procedures. USAID collaboration with Macro International in the design of future surveys is, however, recommended to ensure the survey yields the highest data quality possible
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline data for this indicator is the most recent data reported in the 2007 DHS survey report (see data below). Since this is a national level indicator, USAID will collaborate with other stakeholders involved in HIV prevention programs to establish national-level targets for 2009 and beyond.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007		**Between age 15-19:** Birth at age 15: 2.8% **Between age 20-24** - Birth at age 15: 5.9% - Birth at age 18: 33.4% - Birth at age 20: 55.4%	
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Number of youth who have seen or heard FP/RH/HIV-related messages in the last few months
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Size of the targeted youth population that has seen or heard a FP/HIV-related message. Since messages received via radio or television are hard to monitor, implementing partners will primarily track messages received or heard from community health workers during information campaigns/events targeting youth.
Unit of Measure: Number of youth
Disaggregated by: Age
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator monitors the extent to which IEC messages reach young people, a first step to increasing their knowledge about FP/RH and HIV/AIDS
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (event attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner database/files, USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new custom indicator whose baseline will be determined once designated partners start reporting on the indicator. The 2009 target will be determined based on criteria agreed upon by the implementing partners and USAID Health Team (amount of funding, size and reach of interventions, etc).
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Number of youth who have received malaria-related messages through community health workers
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Size of the targeted youth population that has seen or heard a FP/HIV-related message. Since messages received via radio or television are hard to monitor, implementing partners will track primarily messages received or heard from community health workers during information campaigns/events targeting youth.
Unit of Measure: Number of youth
Disaggregated by: Age
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator monitors the extent to which IEC messages reach young people, a first step to increasing their knowledge about and protection against malaria infection.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records (e.g. event attendance forms)
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner database/files, USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new custom indicator whose baseline will be determined once designated partners start reporting on the indicator. The 2009 target will be determined based on criteria agreed upon by the implementing partners and USAID Health Team (amount of funding, size and reach of interventions, etc).
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Number of health service or information delivery points meeting youth friendly criteria
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of health service or information delivery points meeting youth friendly criteria. Youth friendly criteria may include flexible service hours for youth, non-age discrimination, product appeal, service delivery outlets (e.g. condom outlets) specific for youth or in proximity with places youth congregate, etc.
Unit of Measure: Number of health services or information delivery points
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator monitors the extent to which health services of information provided to young people are delivered in a way that promotes or facilitates ease of access by youth. For example, young people may have difficulty accessing condoms or other contraceptive methods because of their age or because shops or other facilities providing services and information are closed after school hours.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner database/files, USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new custom indicator whose baseline will be determined once designated partners start reporting on the indicator. The 2009 target will be determined based on criteria agreed upon by the implementing partners and USAID Health Team (amount of funding, size and reach of interventions, etc).
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Number of policies or guidelines developed to promote youth access to services
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of policies or guidelines developed to promote youth access to services. Include in this indicator policies that have been developed or adapted/revised, but are in their final form of development or revision. Policies may include actual policy text, degrees, laws, national or sub-national plans, and/or policy guidelines.
Unit of Measure: Number of policies or guidelines
Disaggregated by: None
Justification & Management Utility: Policies are important for the sustainability of programs and for use and access of services
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner database/files, USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new custom indicator whose baseline will be determined once designated partners start reporting on the indicator. The 2009 target will be determined based on criteria agreed upon by the implementing partners and USAID (amount of funding, size and reach of interventions, etc).
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

SO 8: Health
Name of Strategic Objective: Increased Use of Basic Health Services
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased Youth Health Knowledge and Skills
Name of Indicator: Number of youth peers/counselors trained
Geographic Focus: USG-target areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of youth peers/counselors trained. This is a custom indicator linked to the other F training indicators in this PMP. Therefore, the F definition for training should be followed here: Training refers to new training or retraining of individuals and assumes that training is conducted according to national or international standards when these exist. A training must have specific learning objectives, a course outline or curriculum, and expected knowledge, skills and/or competencies to be gained by participants.
Unit of Measure: Number of youth peers/counselors
Disaggregated by: Sex, training subject
Justification & Management Utility: High quality peer education, training, and counseling depend on the skills and quality of the trainers, counselor, and peer educators.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners' project records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners' reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly and Annually
Budget Mechanism: None
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Designated CTO/Activity Manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: COP, IP Agency Representative
Location of Data Storage: Implementing Partner database/files, USAID database/files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2009
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: The quality of data will be assessed against the five USAID data quality standards.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new custom indicator whose baseline will be determined once designated partners start reporting on the indicator. The 2009 target will be determined based on criteria agreed upon by the implementing partners and USAID Health Team (amount of funding, size and reach of interventions, etc).
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007			
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 29, 2008

V. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 9: DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE ENHANCED

See A. Results Framework on the following page.

A. RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Democracy and Governance

Goal: Democratic governance enhanced
Indicators:
- Control of Corruption Index
- Government Effectiveness Index
- Public perception of the state of rule of law, corruption, and governance effectiveness

R 9.1 Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
- # of government officials receiving USG supported anti-corruption training
- # of USG supported anti-corruption measures implemented

Sub-R 9.1.1 Executive Branch management capacity enhanced

- Public disclosure of financial statements of selected SOEs
- Timber taxes, mineral fees, and other fees fully invoiced by selected SOEs and fully received by MOF
- Procurement in compliance with L berian Procurement law
- Ministry and agency annual spending does not exceed appropriated levels
- Program-based budgeting implemented by sector and institution
- % of GOL assets being managed in accordance with GSA policies
- # of Executive Branch personnel trained with USG assistance
- # of Executive Office operations supported with USG assistance

Sub-R 9.1.2 Legislative Branch oversight capacity enhanced

- # of national executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance
- # of national legislators and national legislative staff attending USG sponsored training or educational events
- # of USG assisted civil society organizations that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees
- # of civil society organizations receiving USG assisted training in advocacy
- # of public forums resulting from USG assistance in which national legislators and members of the public interact

R 9.2 Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation

- # of legal aid groups and law clinics assisted by USG
- # of courts operating in areas of low income populations with USG assistance
- # of justice sector personnel that received USG training
- # of legal institutions and associations supported by USG
- # of people visiting USG supported legal service centers

R 9.4 Political processes strengthened

- NEC actions to promote voter education, political party liaison, and election law reforms
- # of elections officials utilizing new skills and knowledge
- # political parties with permanent offices in at least eight counties (IRI)
- # of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance to articulate platform and policy agendas effectively (IRI)
- # of USG-assisted political parties implementing programs to increase number of candidates and members who are women, youth or from marginalized groups (IRI)
- # of organizations receiving USG support to promote development of and compliance with political finance regulations and legislation (IRI)
- # of individuals who receive USG-assisted political party training (IRI)

B. FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ALIGNMENT

US Foreign Assistance Objective: Governing Justly and Democratically

SO: Democratic Governance Enhanced

Ind 1: Control of Corruption Index; Ind. 2: Government Effectiveness Index; Ind 3.Public perception of the state of rule of law, corruption, and government effectiveness

Good Governance

R 9.1 Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities

Rule of Law and Human Rights

R 9.2 Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation

Political Competition and Consensus Building

R 9.4 Political processes strengthened

GJD 2.2 Public Sector Executive Function

Sub-IR 9.1.1 *Executive Branch management capacity enhanced*

- Public disclosure of financial statements for selected SOEs
- Timber taxes, mineral fees and other fees fully invoiced by SOE and fully received by MOF
- Procurement in compliance with L berian Procurement law
- Ministry and agency annual spending does not exceed appropriated levels
- Program-based budgeting implemented by sector and institution
- % of GOL assets being managed in accordance with GSA policies
- # of Executive Branch personnel trained with USG assistance
- # of Executive Office operations supported with USG assistance
- # of government officials receiving USG supported anti-corruption training
- # of USG supported anti-corruption measures implemented

GJD 2.1 Legislative Function and Process

Sub-IR 9.1.*2 Legislative Branch oversight capacity enhanced*

- # of national executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance
- # of national legislators and national legislative staff attending USG sponsored training or educational events
- # of civil society organizations receiving US assisted training in advocacy
- # of public forums resulting from USG assistance in which national legislators and members of the public interact
- # of USG assisted civil society organizations that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees

GJD 1.3 Justice System

- # of courts operating in areas of low income populations with USG assistance
- # of justice sector personnel that received USG training
- # of legal aid groups and law clinics assisted by USG
- # of legal institutions and associations supported by USG
- # of people visiting USG supported legal service centers

GJD 3.2 Elections and Political Processes

- # NEC actions to promote voter education, political party liaison, and election law reforms
- # of elections officials utilizing new skills and knowledge

GJD 3.3 Political Parties

- # political parties with permanent offices in at least eight counties
- # of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance to articulate platform and policy agendas effectively (IRI)
- # of organizations receiving USG support to promote development of and compliance with political finance regulations and legislation (IRI)
- # of USG-assisted political parties implementing programs to increase the number of candidates and members who are women, youth or from marginalized groups (IRI)
- # of individuals who receive USG-assisted political party training (IRI)

C. Indicators at a Glance

Goal: Democratic governance enhanced
Indicators:
1. Control of Corruption Index
2. Government Effectiveness Index
3. Public perception of the state of rule of law, corruption and governance effectiveness

Intermediate Result 1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected private sector entities
Indicators:
1.1 Public disclosure of financial statements for selected SOEs
1.2 Timber taxes, mineral fees and other fees fully invoiced by selected SOEs and fully received by MOF
1.3 Procurement in compliance with Liberian Procurement law
1.4 Ministry and agency annual spending does not exceed appropriated levels
1.5 Program-based budgeting implemented by sector and institution
1.6 Percent of GOL assets being managed in accordance with GSA policies
1.7 Number of Executive Branch personnel trained with USG assistance
1.8 Number of Executive Office operations supported with USG assistance
1.9 Number of national executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance
1.10 Number of national legislators and national legislative staff attending USG sponsored training and educational events
1.11 Number of civil society organizations receiving USG assisted training in advocacy
1.12 Number of public forums resulting from USG assistance in which national legislators and members of the public interact
1.13 Number of USG assisted civil society organizations that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees
1.14 Number of government officials receiving USG supported anti-corruption training
1.15 Number of USG supported anti-corruption measures implemented

Result 2: Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Indicators:
2.1 Number of legal aid groups and law clinics assisted by USG
2.2 Number of courts operating in areas of low income populations with USG assistance
2.3 Number of justice sector personnel that received USG training
2.4 Number of legal institutions and associations supported by USG
2.5 Number of people visiting USG supported legal service centers

Result 3: Political processes strengthened (legislature, elections, political parties, legal reform)
Indicators:
3.1 Number of NEC actions to promote voter education, political party liaison, and election law reforms
3.2 Number of elections officials utilizing new skills and knowledge
3.3 Number of political parties with permanent offices in at least eight counties
3.4 Number of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance to articulate platform and policy agendas effectively

3.5 Number of organizations receiving USG support to promote development of and compliance with political finance regulations and legislation

3.6 Number of USG-assisted political parties implementing programs to increase the number of candidates and members who are women, youth or from marginalized groups

3.7 Number of individuals who receive USG-assisted political party training

D. Summary Performance Data Table

Summary Performance Data Table - Democracy and Governance													
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregated**	**Source**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
***Goal*:** Democratic governance enhanced	Control of Corruption Index	PM	Index	N/A	Transparency International	2004						6/09	5/27/06
	Government Effectiveness Index	PM	Index	N/A	World Bank	2004						6/09	5/27/06
	Public perception of the state of rule of law, corruption, and governance effectiveness	PM	Percent	Issue	Survey	TBD, 6/09						Initial survey, 6/09	2010
Result1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities	Public disclosure of financial statements of selected SOEs	PM	Number	n/a	GMAP – Segura, IBI	2006	TBD	100		100	100		8/6/08
	Timber taxes, mineral fees and other fees fully invoiced by SOE and fully received by MOF	PM	Percent or US $	n/a	GMAP – Segura, IBI	2006	TBD	100 invoiced, 100 collected		100 invoiced, 100 collected	100 invoiced, 100 collected	10/08	8/6/08
	Procurement in compliance with Liberian Procurement Law	PM	Percent	Ministry, agency, type	GMAP – Segura, IBI	2006	TBD					10/08	8/6/08
	Ministry and agency annual spending does not exceed appropriated levels	PM	Percent	Ministry, agency	GMAP – Segura, IBI	2006	TBD	100		100	100	10/08	8/6/08
	Program-based budgeting adopted by sector and institution	PM	Number	Sector, ministry, agency	GMAP – IBI	2006	TBD					10/08	8/6/08

Summary Performance Data Table - Democracy and Governance													
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregated**	**Source**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	Percent of GOL assets being managed in accordance with GSA policies	PM	Percent	Ministry, agency	GMAP – IBI	2008	TBD					10/08	2009
	Number of Executive Branch personnel trained with USG assistance	F	Number	Ministry, agency, gender	GMAP – IBI, Segura	2006	TBD					10/08	2009
	Number of Executive Office operations supported with USG assistance	F	Number	n/a	GMAP – IBI, Segura	TBD	TBD					10/08	2009
	Number of national executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance	F	Number	n/a	CEPPS – NDI	TBD	0	15		Ends	Ends		8/6/08
	Number of national legislators and national legislative staff attending USG sponsored training or educational events	F	Number	Gender	CEPPS - NDI, IFES, IRI	2006	0	150		Ends	Ends		8/7/08 8/8/08 8/8/08
	Number of civil society organizations receiving USG assisted training in advocacy	F	Number	n/a	CEPPS – NDI, IFES	2006	0	15		Ends	Ends		8/7/08 8/8/08
	Number of public forums resulting from USG assistance in which national legislators and members of the public interact	F	Number	n/a	CEPPS – NDI, & IFES	2006	0	60		Ends	Ends		8/7/08 8/8/08

Summary Performance Data Table - Democracy and Governance													
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregated**	**Source**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	Number of USG assisted civil society organizations that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees	F	Number	n/a	CEPPS - NDI	2006	0	20		Ends	Ends		8/7/08 8/8/08
	Number of government officials receiving USG supported anti-corruption training	F	Number	Ministry, agency	GMAP- IBI	TBD	0					10/08	2009
	Number of USG supported anti-corruption measures implemented	F	Number	Ministry, agency	GMAP - IBI	TBD	0					10/08	2009
Result 2: Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation	Number of courts operating in areas of low income populations with USG assistance	F	Number	n/a	Support for a Human Rights Culture in L beria	2006	0	4		?	Ends		8/7/08
	Number of justice sector personnel that received USG training	F	Number	Gender, type	Support for a Human Rights Culture in L beria	2006	0	60		?	Ends		8/7/08
	Number of legal aid groups and law clinics assisted by USG	F	Number	n/a	Support for a Human Rights Culture in L beria	2006	0	6		?	Ends		8/7/08
	Number of legal institutions and associations supported by USG	F	Number	n/a	Support for a Human Rights Culture in L beria	2006	0	6		?	Ends		8/7/08
	Number of people visiting USG supported legal service centers	F	Number	Gender	Support for a Human Rights Culture in L beria	2006	0	150		?	Ends		8/7/08

Summary Performance Data Table - Democracy and Governance													
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregated**	**Source**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
Result 3: Political processes strengthened	NEC actions to promote voter education, political party liaison, and election law reforms	PM	Number	n/a	CEPPS - IFES	2006	0	?		Ends	Ends		8/8/08
	Number of elections officials utilizing new skills and knowledge	C	Number	n/a	CEPPS – IFES	2006	0	?		Ends	Ends		8/8/08
	Number of political parties with permanent offices in at least eight counties	C	Number	n/a	CEPPS – IRI	2006	0	3		Ends	Ends		8/8/08
	Number of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance to articulate platform and policy agendas effectively	F	Number	Parties, groups	CEPPS – IRI, NDI	2006	0	19 NDI only		Ends	Ends		8/8/08
	Number of organizations receiving USG support to promote development of and compliance with political finance regulations and legislation	F	Number	n/a	CEPPS - IRI	2006	0	?		Ends			8/8/08
	Number of USG-assisted political parties implementing programs to increase the number of candidates and members who are women, you and from marginalized groups	F	Number	n/a	CEPPS - IRI	2006	0	3		Ends			8/8/08
	Number of individuals who receive USG-assisted political party training	F	Number	Gender	CEPPS - IRI	2006	837 493 M 334 F	1,533 738 M 795 F		Ends			8/8/08

PM = Performance Management Indicator; F = Foreign Assistance Standard Indicator; C = Custom Indicator

E. Performance Indicators Reference Sheets

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Control of Corruption Index
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes, in its years of publication
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): CCI measures the exercise of public power for private gain, including both petty and grand corruption and state capture
Unit of Measure: Country percentile ranking
Disaggregated by: N/A
Justification & Management Utility: It is the most comprehensive democratic governance dataset available; combining subjective and objective data. Pulls from many sources; broad coverage and five periods of time-series data; used by MCC; margins of error clearly explained to increase accuracy and confidence.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Indicator aggregates data from independent sources; indicator scores (point estimates) are expressed as relative percentile rankings
Data Source(s): Kaufmann & Kraay, World Bank Institute
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Available on the Internet
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Biennial
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: N/A
Location of Data Storage: USAID official files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: May 25, 2006
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Complexity of dataset makes disaggregation difficult; it is based primarily on subjective data; aggregate change is incremental. Since the score is a country percentile ranking, Liberia's score depends not only on its own progress in anti-corruption, but also the progress of other countries ranked above and below it.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: No action can be taken, as this is a World Bank index. The third SO indicator, related to perceptions, will help to confirm CCI scores.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Periodic review of the methodology used and the data limitations identified.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	**Target**	**Actual**	**Notes**
2004		21.1	
2006			
2008			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Government Effectiveness Index
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes, in its years of publication
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: This index measures the competence of the bureaucracy and the quality of public service delivery.
Unit of Measure: Country percentile ranking
Disaggregated by: N/A
Justification & Management Utility: It is the most comprehensive democratic governance dataset available; combines subjective and objective data - pulls from many sources; broad coverage and five periods of time-series data; used by MCC; margins of error clearly explained to increase accuracy and confidence.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: This indicator aggregates data from independent sources; indicator scores (point estimates) are expressed as relative percentile rankings.
Data Source(s): Kaufmann & Kraay, World Bank Institute
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: World Bank Institute or USAID/Washington
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Biennial
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: N/A
Location of Data Storage: USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: May 25, 2006
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Complexity of dataset makes disaggregation difficult; the index is based primarily on subjective data; aggregate change is incremental. Since this is a country percentile ranking, Liberia's score depends not only on its own progress in government effectiveness, but also on the actions of other countries ranking near it (above or below) on the scale.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: No actions are possible as this is a World Bank source; however, use of the perceptions rating (3rd SO indicator) will help to confirm whether scores found in the GEI are consistent.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2004		1%	
2006			
2008			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Public perception of the state of rule of law, corruption, and legislative effectiveness
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Public perception means perception of people throughout Liberia on democracy, governance, corruption, economic reform, and social conflict.
Unit of Measure: Opinion survey
Disaggregated by: Age, gender, county, and other demographic characteristics to be determined
Justification & Management Utility: Public perceptions are of critical importance to discover whether people recognize, understand and are satisfied with progress on democratic reform. This is a proxy indicator for the SO result, based on the assumptions that people will only perceive that changes have occurred if they see evidence of them.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: A national sample survey will be designed (perhaps through IFES) in consultation with USAID, the Embassy and other development partners, to measure broad attitudes towards various aspects of democracy in L beria. A Liberian survey research organization will be trained to carry out the survey**.**
Data Source(s): Survey of a sample of citizens
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Reports from the implementing partner to be determined
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Upon completion of survey, in early 2009 and again in 2011.
Budget Mechanism: Built into IFES agreement.
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partner files should include the survey instrument and interview results
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: DQA will occur during development of the survey instrument and identification/training of the survey firm.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None identified to date.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: USAID will do spot checks of whether interview results reported to USAID are consistent with background documents/survey results. In addition, USAID, the implementing partner, Embassy staff ,and other development partners, in debriefing on the survey, will discuss potential data problems and how these can best be dealt with in the future. Any resulting follow-up actions will be carried out by the implementing partner.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	**Target**	**Actual**	**Notes**
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009	Final		
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008			

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
Name of Indicator: Public disclosure of financial information for selected SOEs
Geographic Focus: National, policy-level
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The State-owned enterprises included are the National Port Authority (NPA), Roberts International Airport (RIA), Liberia Petroleum Refining Corporation (LPRC) and the Forestry Development Authority (FDA). Public disclosure means making available to the public financial information about the company operations including payments, rates and fees, revenues generated, budgets and expenditures. Public disclosure should be timely – information should be made public as soon as the data have been approved by GOL authorities
Unit of Measure: Degree of public disclosure (i.e. proportion of key financial documents publicly disclosed to all key financial documents of these companies). See below on data collection method.
Disaggregated by: SOE, type of financial information
Justification & Management Utility: Making available to the public information about financial status and activity (revenues and expenditures, for example) of state-owned companies is a critical step for increasing transparency, for reducing opportunities for illegal or unethical transactions, and for ensuring that profits are made available for public use. A phased disclosure over the next couple of years is likely.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: CFOs for these companies, sponsored by USAID under GEMAP, will provide quarterly reporting that will include progress on achievement of targets for disclosure that are specified in the scopes of work of the CFOs.
Data Source(s): The assisted SOEs, through the USAID- supported CFOs. Other donors involved in GEMAP will also be sources of information. In addition, evidence of public disclosure will be through the newspaper articles through which disclosure will be made.
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly reports from GEMAP consultants
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Budget Mechanism: GEMAP project
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GEMAP consultants
Location of Data Storage: USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done as soon as targets are established.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None known
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of consultant files, discussions with consultants over progress and issues they have encountered, comparison of consultant information with newspaper articles and other independent sources where disclosure is to be made (e.g. government website).
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
Name of Indicator: Timber taxes, mineral fees and other fees and dividends charged/received by selected SOEs received by the MOF.
Geographic Focus: National, policy-level
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Taxes and fees and dividends collected by the SOEs identified that are transferred to the Ministry of Finance for general government use.
Unit of Measure: US dollars
Disaggregated by: SOE
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the amount of revenues collected by the selected state-owned-enterprises that are not required for the company's own overhead. If companies are successful in reducing their overhead, both by improved management of costs and by reduced leakage of funds for illegal or unethical uses, the amount available to the Ministry of Finance for use in the general budget will increase. Thus this indicator DIRECTLY measures increased revenues and INDIRECTLY measures reduction in leakages.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Disclosures of SOEs.
Data Source(s): SOEs and/or MOF, with information from USAID's GEMAP consultants
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly GEMAP reports.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Information is expected to be available every quarter, but at least annually
Budget Mechanism: GEMAP contract
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GEMAP consultants
Location of Data Storage: USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): GEMAP consultants will have access to all critical financial information of the assisted SOEs; however, some level of fraudulent reporting may still be poss ble. Accountability will be based upon the increase in revenues. How you prevent fraud is a difficult, far-reaching question, and it will take time to put internal controls in, but the GEMAP team will be working with the government to institute internal controls over the next couple of years, which should reduce opportunities for fraud.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: See above.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Annual review with GEMAP consultants of progress on institution of internal controls, review of financial figures, and discussions with the MOF and other donors involved in the GEMAP process.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline information will be provided by GEMAP consultants. Targets will be established as part of the SOWs of the GEMAP team.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced.
Name of Intermediate Result: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
Name of Indicator: Procurement in compliance with Liberian Procurement law.
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Procurements refer to those made by the USAID-assisted SOEs
Unit of Measure: Degree of compliance = the number of procurement documents approved by GEMAP CFOs for the assisted SOEs, as a proportion of the number of procurement documents submitted. If documents are submitted several times before the CFOs are willing to approve, each submission will be counted.
Disaggregated by: SOE
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is intended to measure whether procurements are made on a competitive basis, thus reducing the opportunities for over-pricing and misuse of funds. When procurements are made on a competitive basis, in line with the standards established in Liberian procurement law, SOE costs and overhead should be reduced and quality of items procured should be increased.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: There is now an annual audit by an international accounting firm, to be made at the end of each year, which will examine the extent to which procurements are in compliance with the law. These audit results will be made public. USAID will also receive regular reporting on progress by the CFOs at GEMAP.
Data Source(s): Annual audit results as described above, and GEMAP consultants reports on procurements
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: GEMAP consultant quarterly reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Interim reports quarterly, audit report annually at beginning of calendar year.
Budget Mechanism: GEMAP contracts
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GEMAP consultants
Location of Data Storage: USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: May 26, 2006 and FY 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None anticipated at this time.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Periodic reviews of progress with GEMAP consultants, review of the procedures they use to ensure compliance, review of annual audits, and discussions with other donors involved in GEMAP.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: To be determined as soon as SOWs for GEMAP consultants have been finalized
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced.
Name of Intermediate Result: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
Name of Indicator: Percentage of government budget spent according to appropriated levels
Geographic Focus: National, policy-level
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Indicator measures the extent to which the executive branch expends the national budget at the levels and in the categories authorized by the legislature, examining both total and disaggregated spending levels by institution and economic category.
Unit of Measure: Annual budget expended per appropriation as a percentage of total budget expenditures. To clarify: Any amount expended that is at or below the appropriated amount for that category will appear in the numerator.
Disaggregated by: Institution, wages, goods and services and capital expenditure
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures the extent to which the executive branch is complying with the budget authority of the legislature, and informs about progress on accountability in the use of public resources – i.e., if the budget is being spent in accordance with the budget categories that were approved by the legislature, it means that these budget resources are not being used for other, non-transparent and non-disclosed expenditures.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Collected from implementing partner (GEMAP) from MOF and Bureau of Budget
Data Source(s): BoB and MOF
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly GEMAP reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual, within one month after expenditure information has been determined.
Budget Mechanism: GEMAP contracts
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: IRBE (GEMAP consultant)
Location of Data Storage: USAID files, MOF files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done as soon as SOW for GEMAP consultants, including baseline and target information, is in place.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): There is no current reliable method for collecting actual spending data
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Installation of IFMIs in conjunction with World Bank will provide a means of collecting actual spending data. These are expected to be in place by (Year? Month?)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: This will consist of discussions with GEMAP consultants, other donors and MOF; review of budget and expenditure documents, and GEMAP consultant reports.
OTHER NOTES
Other Notes:
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline will use the 2007 budget year; however, these figures are not very reliable because of the data limitation noted above.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance

Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic Governance Enhanced

Name of Intermediate Result: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities

Name of Indicator: Program-based budgeting adopted by sector and institution

Geographic Focus: National, policy-level

Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Program-based budgeting means budgeting based on aggregation of the individual budgets for each program and/or department. Development of program budgets requires tracking the flow of funds for each element of each program or department. This process will vary depending upon the government sector or institution and nature of its work.

Unit of Measure: Milestone measures (see SOW for GEMAP consultants)

Disaggregated by: Sector and institution

Justification & Management Utility: Government sectoral ministries and institutions are developing budgets based on individual budgets being developed by each division and department. Most have no accounting, no financial statements, etc. Those who do have financial statements are not computerized. Without concise program budgets, the opportunities for leakage are very high. Use of accurate budgets as a way of controlling spending will result in less misuse of funds and, as a result, more revenues available for legitimate governance purposes.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: GEMAP team will provide information to USAID

Data Source(s): Ministry of Finance, Bureau of Budget

Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly GEMAP reports, annual review of publicly-disclosed budget and expenditures

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually, along with quarterly progress reports

Budget Mechanism: GEMAP contracts

Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer

Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: GEMAP consultants

Location of Data Storage: USAID files, MOF

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: FY 2008

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): This process is essentially starting from scratch, as there has been no serious effort at budgeting or control of expenditures based on needs of the various programs in the past. Data – including baseline data – are not reliable or are nonexistent at the moment. However, the accuracy of budgetary data is improving annually.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: GEMAP consultants are providing technical assistance for precisely this purpose.

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: As with other GEMAP-related indicators, data quality will be continuously assessed through review of reports and budget/expenditure data, discussions with GEMAP team, SOE officials, MOF officials and other donors involved in the GEMAP process.

OTHER NOTES

Other Notes:

Notes on Baselines/Targets: To be determined during PMP update in FY 2008

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Name of Indicator: Number of legal personnel trained
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: Legal personnel are defined as law school students who are trained with USAID funds to serve in victim abuse centers, trained and mentored by lawyers; or to join the judiciary, either as prosecutors or as public defenders.
Unit of Measure: Number per year
Disaggregated by: Type of training (for victims abuse centers or for judiciary); and by gender
Justification & Management Utility: This is a common indicator and is not very useful as an IR performance measure.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will keep records of people trained and report them to USAID.
Data Source(s): Implementing partner records
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly reports of implementing partners.
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner project director
Location of Data Storage: Numerical records in USAID files, back-up documentation in implementing partner files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done using procedures described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None noted
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None noted
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of implementing agencies records, spot-check with selected training classes. Photos of classes are helpful to document numbers trained.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Name of Indicator: Number of people trained to address conflict
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas.
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: People trained include all of those people who are serving through informal justice centers (e.g. community peace councils and peace committees – these sometimes include traditional leaders as well) who receive training as a result of USAID-supported activity.
Unit of Measure: Number per year
Disaggregated by: Sex, age cohort (i.e. youth vs. older person, with youth age 18-35) and ethnicity
Justification & Management Utility: This is a common indicator and has little value as an IR performance measure
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners who provide or sponsor the training will report to USAID
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly reports of implementing partners
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner project directors
Location of Data Storage: USAID (cumulative and disaggregated numbers), implementing partner (detailed records)
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done following procedures descr bed below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Spot check a sample of implementing partner training records (approx 10 percent of trainees) with justice centers. Ask justice centers how many were trained in past year; interview a small sample of trainees.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Name of Indicator: Number of women and men who participated in gender based violence prevention programs
Geographic Focus: Communities/Areas receiving USAID support for gender-based violence prevention.
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: All men and women who participated – i.e. completed an entire program of training or support – in gender-based violence prevention should be counted. Those who began a program but failed to complete it should not be counted.
Unit of Measure: Number per year
Disaggregated by: Sex
Justification & Management Utility: This is a common indicator and has little value as an IR-level performance measure
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing agency will keep record of programs implemented and number of people who completed the program and will report on this to USAID.
Data Source(s): Implementing partner
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly reports of implementing partner
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner project director
Location of Data Storage: Quarterly reports at USAID, detailed files of program participation in implementing partner files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be dated as soon as USAID has discussed the record-keeping process with the implementing partner and approved the method that the partner will use to track data.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of files spot-checked by site visits to selected programs
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: This is a new activity, so baseline is zero
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline	0	
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Name of Indicator: Increased citizen knowledge of their legal rights and responsibilities and options available to them to seek justice.
Geographic Focus: Montserrado County, Lofa, Grand Gedeh, Nimba and Bong
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? No
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): "Citizens" means Liberian youth and adults resident in the targeted counties. Knowledge of their legal rights and responsibilities includes knowledge about basic human rights, citizenship, and civil and criminal offenses related to land laws, rape law, inheritance law, domestic relations, and labor rights. By "knowledge of the options available to them to seek justice" we mean that people are aware of the choices available to help resolve disputes, such as traditional mechanisms, youth mechanisms, neighbors, peace committees, peace councils, legal aid clinics, victims abuse centers, as well as the courts system.
Unit of Measure: Survey
Disaggregated by: Gender, age (youth vs. older adults)
Justification & Management Utility: For citizens to take advantage of the resources available to them to support their rights to justice, they first need to have an understanding of what these rights are, as well as what protections are available to them under the law. This indicator measures whether citizens have a good enough understanding of their rights to take the protective actions available to them. Further, if people perceive the availability of alternatives, they are likely to use them. This is direct indicator of access.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: The national survey used for SO9 indicator 3 will contain questions that will provide the needed information for this indicator.
Data Source(s): Implementing organization for national survey cited in SO 9 indicator 3.
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Report from implementing organization
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Early 2007 and again in late 2008.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing organization.
Location of Data Storage: Cumulative and disaggregated numbers in USAID project files, questionnaires and other back-up documentation in implementing partner files.
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be undertaken in the course of developing the questionnaire.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): See discussion under SO9 indicator 3.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations. See reference sheet for SO9 indicator 3.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: See reference sheet for SO9 indicator 3.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic governance enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Political Processes Strengthened
Name of Indicator: NEC actions to promote voter education, political party liaison, and election law reforms.
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: NEC is the National Electoral Commission. NEC's ability to take the steps necessary to prepare for future elections is an indicator of its improved capacity. Some of the key actions it has identified in its five-year action plan are increasing voter information about elections and their importance, including increasing voter registration; increasing cooperation between the NEC and political parties through the Inter-Party Consultative Committee; and undertaking electoral reforms.
Unit of Measure: Number of actions taken
Disaggregated by: Category (i.e. voter education, political party liaison, election law reform)
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is a proxy for improved institutional capacity. NEC needs to improve its ability to serve effectively its goal of managing free and fair elections and impartially adjudicating election results. It has developed an action plan of steps it will take in over the next years to increase its capacity and prepare for local elections. These action plans are the basis for this indicator.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: The implementing partner will agree with USAID on key actions to be tracked annually, based upon the NEC's own plans, in the three areas identified. The implementing partner will retain documentation of each action taken, and report to USAID.
Data Source(s): Implementing partner
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner
Location of Data Storage: USAID and implementing partner files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done before end FY2008.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None identified to date.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: USAID will review the NEC actions taken as reported by the implementing partner, and will review supporting documentation for verification.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic processes enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Political processes strengthened
Name of Indicator: Political parties with permanent offices at the county level in at least 8 counties.
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: Political party refers to any of the legitimate political parties that have a national or regional presence in Liberia. Permanent offices are offices that are staffed and have regular office hours every week – not just prior to elections.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Party
Justification & Management Utility: Democratic political processes require active political parties that are able to define and articulate the needs of their constituencies and to develop specific agendas to address them, so that voters will have real choices – in terms of issues and answers, and not just personalities – in their voting. Having permanent offices at the county level, where local constituents can meet with party members, and where the party can identify citizen concerns, is an indirect measure of enhanced political party activity and representation at the local level.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partner collects this information and reports to USAID.
Data Source(s): Implementing partner
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: At least twice annually in April and October.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner COP
Location of Data Storage: USAID for cumulative records, partners for backup documentation
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 8, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): An office address doesn't necessarily mean the office will be staffed and open to the public regularly.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None. Activity is terminating in early FY 2009
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008	6		

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic processes enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Political processes strengthened
Name of Indicator: Number of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance to articulate platform and policy agendas effectively
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: The number of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance that are able to articulate platform and policy agendas effectively. This means they are consistent in their articulation of policy platforms, and/or media, government officials, other political parties, other political groupings, and/or citizens recognize and attribute platforms or elements of platforms to the political parties and political groupings that are articulating them.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: N/A
Justification & Management Utility: If a political party or political grouping effectively articulates a platform and a policy agenda, it indicates an orientation toward issue-based development of the political party/grouping/candidacy and toward party professionalism, as well as a step towards open competition of ideas. If more than one significant party, grouping or independent candidate effectively articulates a platform or agenda, it can indicate a step toward greater competition of ideas, underpinning the development or reinforcement of a competitive, democratic political system. Lastly, if parties, groupings, and/or independent candidates make their policy platform and agenda known, citizens can hold them accountable to those platforms, improving the prospects for effective representation and accountability.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners collect this information and report to USAID.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: At least twice annually in April and October
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner COP
Location of Data Storage: USAID for cumulative records, partners for backup documentation
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 8, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None revealed because indicator is direct measure of assistance provided by partner which is monitored by activity manager.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None planned. Activity is terminating in early FY 2009
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic processes enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Political processes strengthened
Name of Indicator: Number of organizations receiving USG support to promote development of and compliance with political finance regulations and legislation
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: Organization means any civil society organization, election administration body or political party. - support includes funding, technical assistance, or training - 'promote political finance' can mean any activity designed to strengthen, reform, assess, or encourage implementation and compliance with political party regulations and legislation.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: N/A
Justification & Management Utility: This is an input measure that captures USG efforts to improve political finance regulations. Unregulated political finance can undermine political competition.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners collect this information and report to USAID.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: At least twice annually in April and October
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner COP
Location of Data Storage: USAID for cumulative records, partners for backup documentation
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 8, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None revealed because indicator is direct measure of assistance provided by partner which is monitored by activity manager.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None planned. Activity is terminating in early FY 2009
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic processes enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Political processes strengthened
Name of Indicator: Number of USG-assisted political parties implementing programs to increase the number of candidates and members who are women, youth or from marginalized groups
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: Programs must be active and credible efforts, and make use of financial or human resources to reach out and increase numbers
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: N/A
Justification & Management Utility: This is one measure of the extent to which political parties are seeking to incorporate women, youth and marginalized communities and increase their own representativeness and inclusiveness.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners collect this information and report to USAID.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: At least twice annually in April and October
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner COP
Location of Data Storage: USAID for cumulative records, partners for backup documentation
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 8, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None revealed because indicator is direct measure of assistance provided by partner which is monitored by activity manager.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None planned. Activity is terminating in early FY 2009
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	**Target**	**Actual**	**Notes**
2007	Baseline		
2008			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008			

SO 9: Democracy & Governance
Name of Strategic Objective: Democratic processes enhanced
Name of Intermediate Result: Political processes strengthened
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals who receive USG-assisted political party training
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: Number of political party representatives, political grouping representatives, and independent candidates who received USG-supported training in political party strengthening (e.g., campaign techniques, membership development, constituency outreach, platform design, communication skills, transparency, fundraising, campaign finance, etc.). Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Gender
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator is one measure of the support the USG provides to political parties and groupings in improving their effectiveness and becoming more internally democratic.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners collect this information and report to USAID.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: At least twice annually in April and October
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: DG officer
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner COP
Location of Data Storage: USAID for cumulative records, partners for backup documentation
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August 8, 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None revealed because indicator is direct measure of assistance provided by partner which is monitored by activity manager.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None planned. Activity is terminating in early FY 2009
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES			
Year	**Target**	**Actual**	**Notes**
2007	Baseline		
2008			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008			

VI. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE 10: SUSTAINED ECONOMIC GROWTH FOR POVERTY REDUCTION

See A. Results Framework on the following page.

A. Results Framework

Economic Growth Results Framework

Goal: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
***Indicators*:**
- Percent of beneficiary economic units with increased income (survey result)
- Ratio of agricultural imports to agricultural exports
- Percent growth of private sector GDP in real terms
- Reduced vulnerability of rural population to food insecurity

IR 1: Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased
Indicators:
-- # policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management
-- # hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance
-- % of revenue generated from diamonds, timber, oil, gold, cotton transparently

Sub-IR: Legal and policy framework for community forestry established for sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity conservation in forest lands.
-- Strengthened FDA and assisting agency capacity to carry out community forestry programs
-- # of people receiving USG supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation

Sub-IR: : Land tenure and property rights systems for forest lands developed
-- # Sustainable pilot market opportunities developed
-- Model for community LTPR in community forestry lands developed

Sub-IR: Community forest management provides improved biodiversity conservation and livelihoods
-- State control over Sapo National Park restored

IR 2: Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased
Indicators:
-- # people with increased access **to** modern energy services as a result of USG assistance
-- # Kms of transportation infrastructure constructed or repaired through USG assistance

Sub-IR: Re-commercialization of LEC
Indicators:
-- Total public sector and private dollars leveraged by USG for energy infrastructure projects
-- # newly illuminated street lights
-- % reduction in utility commercial

Sub-IR: Community infrastructure and essential services strengthened

Indicators:
-- # people receiving USG supported training in transportation technical fields
-- # people receiving USG supported training in transportation management systems
-- # local contractors' capacity to develop infrastructure as a result of USG support

Sub-IR: Other infrastructure

IR 3: Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased
Indicators:
--Volume of agricultural production (% growth) disaggregated by food and non-food crops
-- % increase in food crop yields by adopting new techniques and technologies
-- # additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

Sub-IR: Capacity of MOA to advance economic growth strengthened
Indicators:
-- # of institutions/organizations undergoing capacity/competency assessments as a result of USG assistance
-- # of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural enabling environment training
-- # of policy reforms presented for legislation/decree as a result of USG assistance

Sub-IR: Value chains restored and community participation in supply and value chains increased
Indicators:
-- # new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance
-- # of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training
-- # of firms receiving USG supported assistance to improve their management practices

IR 4: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated.
Indicators:
-- # of the 11 core commercial laws prepared with USG assistance/passed/ approved
- Access to financial services for micro, small and medium sized economic units increased
-- # of firms demonstrating more competitive business practices
-- Percentage change in sales for assisted enterprises

Sub-IR: Private sector productivity improved
Indicators:
-- # of firms receiving USG supported assistance to invest in improved technologies
-- # of SMEs that successfully accessed bank loans or private equity as a result of USG assistance
-- # of institutions and organizations undertaking capacity/competency strengthening as a result of USG assistance

Sub-IR: Employment/skills development for unemployed youth expanded
Indicators:
-- # vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance
-- # persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs
-- # people gaining employment or more remunerative employment as a result of participation in USG-funded workforce development programs
-- # of youth trained in management and entrepreneurial skills through USAID-assisted programs

B. Foreign Assistance Alignment

US Foreign Assistance Objective: Economic Growth

SO: Sustained Economic Growth for Poverty Reduction

Ind 1. Percent of beneficiary economic units with increased income (survey result); Ind 2. Ratio of agricultural imports to agricultural exports; Ind 3. Percent growth of private sector GDP in real terms; Ind 4. Reduced vulnerability of rural population to food insecurity

Environment

IR 1: Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased

EG 8.1 Natural Resources and Biodiversity

-- # policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management
-- # hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance
-- % of revenue generated from diamonds, timber, oil, gold, cotton transparently
-- Strengthened FDA and assisting agency capacity to carry out community forestry programs
-- # of people receiving USG supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity
-- # Sustainable pilot market opportunities developed
-- Model for community LTPR in community forestry lands developed
-- State control over Sapo National Park restored

EG 7.4 Inclusive Economic Law and Property Rights

Infrastructure

IR 2: Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased

EG 4.1 - Modern Energy Service

-- # people with increased access to modern energy services as a result of USG assistance
-- Total public sector and private dollars leveraged by USG for energy and infrastructure projects
-- # newly illuminated street lights
-- % reduction in utility commercial losses

EG 4.3 - Transport Services

-- # Kms of transportation infrastructure constructed or repaired through USG assistance
-- # people receiving USG supported training in transportation technical fields
-- # people receiving USG supported training in transportation management systems
-- # local contractors' capacity to develop infrastructure as a result of USG support

OTHER INFRASTRUCTURE

Agriculture

IR 3: Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased

EG 5.1 Agriculture Enabling Environment

-- # of institutions/organizations undergoing capacity/competency assessments as a result of USG assistance
-- # of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural enabling environment training
-- # of policy reforms presented for legislation/decree as a result of USG assistance

EG 5.2 Agricultural Sector Productivity

-- # new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance
-- # of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training
-- # of firms receiving USG supported assistance to improve their management practices
-- Volume of agricultural production (% growth) disaggregated by food and non-food crops
-- % increase in food crop yields by adopting new techniques and technologies
-- # additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance

Private Sector Competitiveness

IR 4: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated

EG 6.1 Business Enabling Environment

-- # of the 11 core commercial laws prepared with USG assistance/passed/ approved
-- Access to financial services for micro, small and medium sized economic units increased
-- # of firms demonstrating more competitive business practices
-- % change in sales of assisted enterprises

EG 6.2 Private Sector Productivity

-- # of firms receiving USG supported assistance to invest in improved technologies
-- # of SMEs that successfully accessed bank loans or private equity as a result of USG assistance
-- # of institutions and organizations undertaking capacity/competency strengthening as a result of USG assistance

EG 6.3 Workforce Development

-- # vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance
-- # persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs
-- # people gaining employment or more remunerative employment as a result of participation in USG-funded workforce development programs
-- # of youth trained in management and entrepreneurial skills through USAID-assisted programs

C. Indicators at a Glance

Goal: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Indicators:
1. Percent of beneficiary economic units with increased income (survey result)
2. Ratio of agricultural imports to agricultural exports
3. Percent growth of private sector GDP in real terms
4. Reduced vulnerability of rural population to food insecurity

Intermediate Result 1: Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased
Indicators:
1.1 Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management
1.2 Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance
1.3 Percentage of revenue generated from diamonds, timber, oil, gold, cotton transparently accounted for in the national budget
1.4 Strengthened FDA and assisting agency capacity to carry out community forestry programs
1.5 Number of people receiving USG supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity
1.6 Number of sustainable pilot market opportunities developed
1.7 Model for community LTPR in community forestry lands developed
1.8 State control over Sapo National Park restored

Intermediate Result 2: Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased
Indicators:
2.1 Number of people with increased access to modern energy services as a result of USG assistance
2.2 Number of kms of transportation infrastructure constructed or repaired through USG assistance
2.3 Total public sector and private dollars leveraged by USG for energy
2.4 Number newly illuminated street lights
2.5 Percent reduction in utility commercial losses
2.6 Number of people receiving USG supported training in transportation technical fields
2.7 Number of people receiving USG supported training in transportation management systems
2.8 Number of local contractors with capacity to develop infrastructure as a result of USG support
2.9 Other Infrastructure Indicators

Intermediate Result 3: Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased
Indicators:
3.1 Volume of agricultural production (% growth) disaggregated by food and non-food crops
3.2 Percentage increase in food crop yields by adopting new techniques and technologies

3.3 Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
3.4 Number of [MOA] institutions/organizations undergoing capacity/competency assessments as a result of USG assistance
3.5 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short term agricultural enabling environment training
3.6 Number of policy reforms presented for legislative/decree as a result of USG assistance
3.7 Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance
3.8 Number of individuals who have received USG supported short term agricultural sector productivity training
3.9 Number of firms receiving USG supported assistance to improve their management practices

Intermediate Result 4: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated
Indicators:
4.1 Number of the 11 core commercial laws prepared with USG assistance passed/approved
4.2 Access to financial services for micro, small and medium sized economic units increased
4.3 Number of firms demonstrating more competitive business practices
4.4 Percentage change in sales for assisted enterprises
4.5 Number of firms receiving USG supported assistance to invest in improved technologies
4.6 Number of SMEs that successfully accessed bank loans or private equity as a result of USG assistance
4.7 Number of institutions and organizations undertaking capacity/competency strengthening as a result of USG assistance
4.8 Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance
4.9 Number of persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs
4.10 Number of people gaining employment or more remunerative employment as a result of participation in USG-funded workforce development programs
4.11 Number of youth trained in management and entrepreneurial skills through USAID-assisted programs

D. Summary Performance Data Table

Summary Performance Data Table - Economic Growth												
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
Goal: *Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction*	Percent of beneficiary economic units with increased income (survey results)	PM	Percent	County	2009	TBD					2009	
	Ratio of agricultural imports to agricultural exports	PM	Ratio	Rice, cassava	2009	TBD					2009	
	Percent growth of private sector GDP in real terms	PM	Percent	N/A	2009	TBD					2009	2010
	Reduced vulnerability of rural population to food insecurity	PM	Number	County	2009	TBD					2009	2010
Result 1: Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased	Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management	F	Number									
	Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance	F	Number									

Summary Performance Data Table - Economic Growth												
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	Percent of revenue generated from diamonds, timber, oil, gold, cotton transparently	F	Number									
Sub-Result: Legal and policy framework for community forestry established for sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity conservation in forest lands	Strengthened FDA and assisting agency to carry out community forestry programs	PM										
	Number of people receiving USG supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity	F	Number	Gender, County								
Sub-Result: Land tenure and property rights systems for forest lands developed	Number of sustainable pilot market opportunities developed	PM	Number									
	Model for community LTPR in community forestry lands developed	PM										
Sub-Result: Community forest management provides improved biodiversity conservation and livelihoods	Number of people with increased benefits derived from sustainable natural resources management and conservation as a result of USG assistance	F	Number	Gender								

Summary Performance Data Table - Economic Growth												
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance	F	Number	County								
	Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance	F										
	State authority over Sapo National Park re-established	F										
Result 2 : Equitable/sustainable access to infrastructure for national development increased	Number of people with increased access to modern energy services as a result of USG assistance											
	Number of kms of transportation infrastructure constructed or repaired through USG assistance											
Sub-Result: Re-commercialization of LEC	Total public and private dollars leveraged by USG for energy infrastructure projects	F										
	Number of newly illuminated street lights	PM										
	Percent reduction in utility commercial losses	PM										

Summary Performance Data Table - Economic Growth												
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
Sub-Result: Community infrastructure and essential services strengthened	Number of people receiving USG supported training in transportation technical fields	F										
	Number of people receiving USG supported training in transportation management systems	F										
	Number of local contractors able to deliver $1 million road construction or maintenance services per annum, as a result of USG support	C										
Result 3: Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased	Volume of agricultural production (%) disaggregated by food and non-food crops											
	Percentage increase in food crop yields by adopting new techniques and technologies	F										
	Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	F										
Sub-Result: Capacity of MOA to advance economic growth strengthened	Number of institutions/organizations undergoing capacity/competency assessments as a result of USG assistance	F										

Summary Performance Data Table - Economic Growth												
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural enabling environment training	F										
	Number of policy reforms presented for legislation/decree as a result of USG assistance	F										
***Sub-Result*:** Value chains restored and community participation in supply and value chains increased	Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance	F										
	Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training	F										
	Number of firms receiving USG supported assistance to improve their management practices	F										
Result 3: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated	Number of the 11 core commercial laws prepared with USG assistance/passed/ approved	F										

Summary Performance Data Table - Economic Growth												
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	Access to financial services for micro, small and medium sized economic unites increased	PM										
	Number of firms demonstrating more competitive business practices	PM										
	Percentage change in sales for assisted enterprises	PM										
***Sub-Result*:** Private sector productivity improved	Number of firms receiving USG supported assistance to invest in improved technologies	F										
	Number of SMEs that successfully accessed bank loans or private equity as a result of USG assistance	F										
	Number of institutions and organizations undertaking capacity/competency strengthening as a result of USG assistance	F										
Sub-Result: Employment and skills development for unemployed youth expanded	Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance	F										
	Number of persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs	F		gender, youth, skill area								

Summary Performance Data Table - Economic Growth												
Goal/Results	**Indicators**	**Type**	**Unit of Measure**	**Disag-gregation**	**Baseline Year**	**Baseline Value**	**2008 Target**	**2008 Actual**	**2009 Target**	**2010 Target**	**Baseline & Target Established**	**DQA Completed**
	# people gaining employment or better employment as a result of participation in USG-funded workforce development programs	F										
	# of youth trained in management and entrepreneurial skills through USAID-assisted programs	C		gender, type of business								

PM = Performance Management Indicator
F = Foreign Assistance Standard Indicator
C = Custom Indicator

E. Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Fulltime jobs in excess of two weeks created
Geographic Focus:
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The population with jobs to be counted in this indicator consists of people benefiting from USAID-supported programs. Full time means working continuously for a minimum of two weeks. We have purposely not established a daily or weekly minimum number of hours worked, recognizing that for some types of employment, especially in the informal sector, work hours may vary greatly from day to day.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Youth, cohort, sex
Justification & Management Utility: This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. However, USAID and its partners are concerned about creation of sustainable employment, not temporary employment (of short duration such as the two-week period in this common indicator). This indicator is not the best measure of creation of long-term employment, nor does it count individuals who got jobs indirectly as a result of USAID-financed activity in their area.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will track the number of people employed through their activities and will report this information in quarterly and semi-annual progress reports.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners, who will obtain the information from their own field monitoring and from their local partners.
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Through quarterly and semi-annual reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: At least semi-annually, in April and October of each year.
Budget Mechanism: No special budget mechanism requirement.
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be undertaken using procedures cited below
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): USAID is interested in creating sustainable, long-term employment. This indicator does not signal whether the employment counted is either long term or sustainable.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Other indicators will be used to “triangulate” with this one, to help ensure the validity of this indicator as a measure of livelihoods improvement.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: USAID will review implementing partners’ headquarters records of people employed, compare them with a sampling of field-based employment records held by local partners of the implementing partners, spot check through field visits to employment sites.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Number of farmers adopting improved practices through USAID support
Geographic Focus: USAID assisted areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of farmers consists of farmers participating in USAID-supported activities. Since different implementing partners will be working with different crops and will be teaching different practices (according to the crop), in each case the USAID activity manager will agree with the CTO as to what level of improved practice the farmer must accept in order to be counted.
Unit of Measure: Number
Disaggregated by: Product and gender
Justification & Management Utility: This is an indirect measure – and a proxy – for improved economic activity and livelihood. The assumption that links the indicator to the SO is that farmers who adopt improved practices will increase their production, and consequently achieve higher incomes. Worldwide experience shows that there is a close correlation between adoption of improved agricultural practices and increased incomes. Of course, other assumptions must also be made, such as access to markets to sell the agricultural product.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Partners will collect this information directly, based on their work with farmers and farmer associations in the targeted communities.
Data Source(s): Direct observation by partners, records from producer associations
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Partner quarterly reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Preferably every quarter, but at least once annually in July.
Budget Mechanism: NA
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture project manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, USAID files, producer association records
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done during USAID review with partners of the appropriate level of acceptance of improved practices, through discussions, review of files, and followed up site visits.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Reliance on partners and producer associations to provide an accurate account of how many farmers in the community have adopted a minimum number of improved practices could lead to some subjective judgments. However, this is the most cost-efficient way of providing up-to-date information to USAID and therefore is useful for results management.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: USAID will spot-check the information provided by its partners during site visits, and through discussions about how they measured results with producer association representatives.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Same as above – checks of partner files backed up by visits to a sample of sites. Photographs should be used wherever possible.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A
Name of Indicator: Km. of physical infrastructure renovated or reconstructed (roads, irrigation systems, communications lines, etc)
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas.
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Kilometers of transportation and power and water-delivery infrastructure completed through USAID-assisted projects annually.
Unit of Measure: Km per year
Disaggregated by: Type of infrastructure, county
Justification & Management Utility: Poor roads, lack of irrigation and power delivery are major constraints to increased production and marketing of agricultural and rural enterprise products, as well as being constraints to access to the services needed to provide economic opportunities (e.g. education, financial services). This indicator measures whether this constraint to livelihoods improvements is being reduced. It is such a critical factor for economic growth in remote, impoverished areas that it merits inclusion at the SO level.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will record km. of infrastructure in the course of normal project oversight/management.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners and their local partners.
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly and semi-annual reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: At least semi-annually, in October and April.
Budget Mechanism: N/A.
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture project manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: FY 2008 to be finalized using technique described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The measure does not indicate whether maintenance of existing infrastructure is adequate, so even with new infrastructure coming on line, if the existing infrastructure is inadequate, the return on the new investment may be limited. Further, the indicator does not tell what percentage of the total infrastructure in the region is represented by this new construction, so one cannot assess the significance of these improvements in improving access and economic opportunities.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Monitor whether maintenance of existing infrastructure remains adequate. If inadequate maintenance of existing infrastructure threatens to severely reduce the value of new construction investments, USAID and its partners should consider whether investing in maintenance of existing infrastructure is needed, or whether some other remedial action can be taken.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Review of headquarters records of km of infrastructure completed, comparison with selected field office/partner records, site visits to observe a sampling of completed infrastructure, observation of before and after photos maintained by the partners.
OTHER NOTES
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth

Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction

Name of Intermediate Result: Improved access to livelihoods support services in targeted areas.

Name of Indicator: Percent of change in the total value and number of micro-finance loans dispersed in USAID-financed activities.

Geographic Focus: Areas with USAID-supported micro-finance loan programs

Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator contains two measures. The first is the percent change in value of loans disbursed. The numerator is the value (in US dollars) of micro-finance loans disbursed in the current year; the denominator is the value of micro-finance loans disbursed in the previous year. Thus the resulting percentage will be the change from one year to the next. Similarly, the second measure is the percent change in the NUMBER of micro-finance loans disbursed. The numerator is the number of micro-finance loans disbursed in the current year. The denominator is the number of micro-finance loans disbursed in the previous year. It does not matter how many times a loan is turned over to a given individual. This measure is only concerned about the TOTAL value, and total number, of loans, NOT the total number of people who received loans.

Unit of Measure: Percent change in value, and percent change in number from previous year.

Disaggregated by: Gender, age group

Justification & Management Utility: An increase in value and number of loans signifies an increase in business growth and profits. The assumption is that an increase in the volume of microfinance loans, both in value and in numbers, indicates that access to funds for enterprise development has increased.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: Implementing partners are making the loans and have total loan information.

Data Source(s): Implementing partners.

Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly reports

Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: At least semi-annually, with one reporting period in July.

Budget Mechanism: N/A

Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager

Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners

Location of Data Storage: Partner files, USAID files

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done in near future following procedures described below.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The indicator does not tell us how many loans are being repaid, or if they are actually successful; however, since this is a measure of access rather than of use, this is not a major problem. There may be data problems resulting from inadequate accounting and reporting procedures.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: USAID financial analyst will review partner accounting/reporting procedures to ensure that opportunities for data misuse are minimized.

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: USAID program manager and financial analyst will review partner files to ensure that they track with partner reporting to USAID. They will supplement this with a site visits to location where loans are provided; check records kept on site and compare with those maintained by the partner; and follow up with interviews with a small number of individuals who have received loans.

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Improved access to livelihoods support services in targeted areas
Name of Indicator: No. of clients of USAID-supported micro-enterprise development programs
Geographic Focus: Locations of USAID-supported programs
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Total number of clients receiving services from USAID-supported micro-enterprise development programs. Services may include, among other things, technical support in production techniques, quality control and marketing, micro-enterprise loans, support for development of producer associations or similar groups. Clients may be involved in agro-processing, community forestry, small-scale mining, or other small businesses supported by USAID. "Clients" are any of the people receiving services. If assistance is provided for producer or marketing associations, all members of the association are considered as clients. The indicator measures number of clients during the current year.
Unit of Measure: Annual number
Disaggregated by: Sex, activity, youth, county
Justification & Management Utility: This is a direct measure of access to livelihoods support services, since all of USAID's micro-enterprise development programs provide livelihood support services.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Partners will collect information on number of clients served.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual numbers provided in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, local partner files on site, and USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done in near future, using methods descr bed below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Local partners may not maintain accurate records on site, and may not maintain records disaggregated in the ways the USAID desires.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Implementing partners are respons ble for ensuring that local partners maintain records on-site of sufficient quality so that they provide accurate information on the indicators. Implementing partners may need to train local partners to ensure that this is the case.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: USAID program manager will review partner files to ensure they track with partner reporting to USAID. He will supplement this with site visits to selected locations where business-support services are provided; check records kept on site and compare with those maintained by the partner; and follow up with interviews with a small number of individuals who have received services.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Improved access to livelihoods support services in targeted areas
Name of Indicator: Number of people trained in livelihoods skills
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of people trained each year, through USAID funding, in any subject related to improving their livelihoods. This may include agriculture, small business, agricultural processing, small-scale mining, community forestry, among others.
Unit of Measure: Number trained annually
Disaggregated by: Subject matter, gender, youth cohort (Liberian definition of youth). Note that number of people trained in agriculture is a common indicator, so disaggregation of people trained in agriculture will be important.
Justification & Management Utility: The other indicators under this IR measure the kinds of support services provided and the extent of their provision, as well as civil society advocacy to improve access. However, people's access to support services also depends on whether they have the skills and training to use these services effectively. This indicator measures the number of people trained – a proxy for the number of people whose skills are improved to use the services available to them effectively. It also feeds into a common indicator (training in agriculture).
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: USAID partners will keep records of the people they train
Data Source(s): Partner training records
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Data should be submitted quarterly, with annual data in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agricultural program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partners files will have detailed records, USAID files will have summary records
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: This can be undertaken FY 2009, using procedures below
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Partner records may be inadequate.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Program manager will ensure partners know they are responsible for maintaining accurate records of training, both in their headquarters and at the training sites.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Program manager will compare figures provided in quarterly reports with those shown in partner's files; and through a limited number of site visits will compare partner records at headquarters with training records maintained at the training sites. Program manager may also interview a few of the people who received training, selected at random, as a final check.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased access to livelihoods support services in targeted areas.
Name of Indicator: Number of actions taken by producer associations and other civil society groups to improve the policy environment for economic activity and livelihoods
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): "Actions taken" means any substantive interaction with local government officials to advocate for changes that helps stimulate economic activity. Such as group meetings with officials, seminars or workshops involving community members and government officials, one-on-one meetings, or formal communications. Government officials may include executive and legislative branch representatives. Types of actions might include lobbying for infrastructure improvement (e.g. road improvement or market), having a procedure changed (e.g. reduction in the time needed to get business licenses), inputs into a policy change, or protecting the rights (e.g. land rights, mining rights) of individuals in the community, among other things. "Producer associations and other civil society groups" include any community groups they serve.
Unit of Measure: Number per year
Disaggregated by: Type of organization, type of actions (e.g. finance, marketing, production issues)
Justification & Management Utility: Indicator measures whether people feel empowered to demand improvement in services, policies, etc. Part of access to services is that people have opportunity to influence how/where those services are provided. A small-business-friendly policy environment is an aspect of "access".
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will require the local groups with whom they work to keep records of their interactions with government on issues affecting the business environment, meetings with government, they should keep a record of the date, persons who met, subject matters discussed, and conclusions-if there were any. Implementing partners will collect this information from their local partners regularly.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly reports from partners
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual results in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: USAID files, implementing partner files, site records of local groups
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be undertaken in near future using methods described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): "Actions taken" is somewhat subjective, and will require judgment by local groups and by implementing partners as to what kinds of interactions should be counted.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Kinds of actions that qualify will be determined in a year or so, after gaining experience collecting this information from local groups
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: Site visits by agriculture program manager
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased adoption of sustainable natural resource management practices in targeted communities
Name of Indicator: # hectares under USAID supported managed natural resource production systems
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas.
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): This indicator applies only to community forestry, including mixed cropping with the intent of sustainable forest management. It does not include to other natural resources, such as mining. Sustainable natural resource management practices are defined as the practices promoted for community forestry by USAID implementing partners. The extent communities effectively adopt such practices is subjective, so implementing partners will agree with USAID in advance as to the level of adoption required for hectares to be counted.
Unit of Measure: Hectares per year
Disaggregated: N/A
Justification & Management Utility: This is a Standard indicator that directly measures the IR.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Farmers in many cases do not have an accurate idea of the hectares they farm. Consequently, implementing partners will have to estimate the hectares under natural resource management. The assumption here is that implementing partners are sufficiently technically skilled to estimate the amount of land under NRM management with a reasonable level of accuracy.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners, based on on-the-ground estimates.
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partners quarterly reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual numbers reported in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: FY 2008.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Two limitations: (1) need to estimate hectarage as actuals cannot be measured; and (2) how to measure partial adoption of improved practices.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: For the first limitation, USAID will have to rely on partner estimates of hectarage under management, but will supplement partner estimates with USAID program manager's own estimates during spot checks. For the second limitation, USAID will accept some level of partial adoption of the preferred practices – in each case where there are questions, partner will discuss with USAID agriculture program manager, USAID officer will make a decision, and implementing partner will record discussion and decision in files, with copy to USAID.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: USAID program manager will combine a review of partner files with a sample of site visits to observe first hand the area under NRM, and to review the records maintained by the local partner to ensure consistency with those maintained by implementing partner and USAID.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2010

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased adoption of sustainable natural resource management practices in targeted communities
Name of Indicator: # of actions taken by NRM based organizations to improve the policy environment
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas.
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition: NRM-based organizations are CSOs who support use of agricultural and small business practices that will sustain the natural resource base, and receive USAID assistance. "Actions taken" means any substantive interaction with local or central government officials to advocate for changes that will help stimulate improved natural resource management (NRM). Such interactions may be group meetings with officials, seminars or workshops involving community members and government officials, one-on-one meetings, or formal communications such as letters. Government officials may include executive and legislative branch representatives. Types of actions: lobbying for local infrastructure or legal decisions that will not have a deleterious effect on NRM, changing procedures, making inputs into a policy change, or protecting individual rights in NRM.
Unit of Measure: Annual number
Disaggregated by: Type of action, subject matter
Justification & Management Utility: The previous indicator measure capacity of NRM organizations. This one measures their level of activism in promoting conditions that encourage NRM. It does not measure their success in influencing change. However, an increase in the number of actions is a good measure of increased activism – a step towards greater influence.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will require the local groups with whom they work to keep records of their interactions with government on issues affecting the business environment. If they hold meetings with government, they should keep a record of the date, persons who met, subject matters discussed, and conclusions-if there were any. Also formal documents, such as letters, or newspaper articles, or similar reports
Data Source(s): Local NRM organization records, as reported to implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partner quarterly reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual reporting in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: NRM organization offices, implementing partner files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be completed using procedures described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): There may be difficulties in defining "actions" to be counted. Also, there is the poss bility that local NRM organizations will not keep adequate records.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: USAID implementing partner will ensure that local partners maintain records of sufficient quality. After a year of implementation, it should become clearer whether there are problems defining "actions taken" and USAID will be able to refine the definition as needed.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: USAID program manager will combine a review of partner files with a sample of site visits, and to review the records maintained by the local partner to ensure consistency with those maintained by implementing partner and USAID.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased adoption of sustainable natural resource management practices in targeted communities
Name of Indicator: Number of forest-product users and miners who adopt sustainable natural resource management practices.
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): This is intended to measure the number of small-scale forest product users (e.g. community forestry) and small-scale miners – not large forest or mining concessions – who adopt sustainable NRM practices. Sustainable NRM practices are those recommended by USAID's implementing partners in the sector. The extent to which adoption of NRM practices should be counted (since, in some cases, individuals may adopt some but not all of the recommended practices) will be subject to agreement between the USAID program manager and the implementing partner, and decisions will be recorded in the files. This is an annual measure (number using NRM practices each year)
Unit of Measure: Number per year.
Disaggregated by: Forest products vs. mining, gender, youth cohort
Justification & Management Utility: This is a people-level indicator, and is important from the standpoint of ensuring an inclusive approach. In addition, it is a good way of verifying information from 10.2.1, in light of the problems in estimating hectares.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will gather this data directly from local groups with whom they work.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Partner quarterly reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual numbers reported in July
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner records and USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be undertaken using procedures described below
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The extent to which an individual has adopted NRM practices is somewhat subjective.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: See discussion of "definition" above, where the process is described.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: USAID program manager will combine a review of partner files with a limited number of site visits, at which he will review local partner records on the individuals using NRM, and including some visits with individuals listed.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Access to energy expanded
Name of Indicator: # people with increased access to modern energy services as a result of USAID assistance
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): People with increased access to energy services are defined as the people who connect to electric services in the pilot urban and rural communities in which USAID-assisted activity will provide appropriate power sources, with community involvement, using renewable or hybrid energy sources. Many people will receive access to power INDIRECTLY through USAID assistance for policy reform and capacity improvements in the Liberian Electricity Corporation, but these indirect beneficiaries will NOT be counted in this indicator because of the difficulty in measuring them.
Unit of Measure: Number served annually
Disaggregated by: Type of female head of household, business vs. residential (type of use)
Justification & Management Utility: This is a common indicator that has only limited value as a strategic-level measure, except that it is one measure of effectiveness of the pilot programs.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will maintain comprehensive records on the pilot communities.
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Implementing partner quarterly reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partner
Location of Data Storage: Both partner files and USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: Conducted in FY 2008
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None identified as yet.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased access to employment and economic opportunities of youth in targeted communities
Name of Indicator: No. of youth trained in management and entrepreneurial skills through USAID-assisted programs
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Youth 18-35 years by Liberia definition. This indicator counts the number of youth trained in the current year. "Management and entrepreneurial skills" means business management training, and should be distinguished from vocational/technical training (in the next indicator). This indicator looks at the number trained to set up their own business, as opposed to learning a technical skill or craft, which is covered in the next indicator. Only those who successfully complete the entire training course in the current year are counted.
Unit of Measure: Annual number
Disaggregated by: Gender, skill area, county
Justification & Management Utility: Youth is a key population group that, as a result of past conflicts and of intergenerational issues, has been largely excluded from opportunities to improve their livelihoods. There is high unemployment among youth, and lack of skills for productive employment exacerbates the problem. This indicator is meant to be a direct measure of how successful USAID is in addressing youth skills and livelihoods opportunities – an important factor in reducing fragility.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Implementing partners will maintain training records
Data Source(s): Implementing partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual reporting in July
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partner files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: To be done following procedures noted below
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Variation in quality of trainers and trainees may affect quality of training; however, this indicator does not examine quality directly. The assumption is that youth will not complete the entire course if they do not find it useful.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will consist of review of partner files, comparison with files on students made at the training site – including certificates of passing or final examination results and the l ke – to confirm site records accurately reflected in partner files and in USAID reports.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Increased access to employment and economic opportunities for youth in targeted counties
Name of Indicator: Number of youth completing USAID-assisted vocational and apprenticeship programs based on market need
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): "Vocational / technical" training consists of technical skills needed to perform a specialized task (e.g. carpentry, masonry, electrical work, plumbing, and the l ke) as opposed to business management skills. "Market need for skills" means the training is related to demand driven activities (where market demand is strong) such as logging, construction, mining, rubber, cash crop farming and general agricultural activities.
Unit of Measure: Annual number.
Disaggregated by: Program, gender
Justification & Management Utility: Youth is a key population group that, as a result of past conflicts and of intergenerational issues, has been largely excluded from opportunities to improve their livelihoods. There is high unemployment among youth, and lack of skills for productive employment exacerbates the problem. This indicator is meant to be a direct measure of how successful USAID is in addressing youth skills and livelihoods opportunities – an important factor in reducing fragility.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Partners will collect training data from training sites
Data Source(s): Training records of partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual reporting in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, training files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: See procedures described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Quality of training may vary. "Market need" may be perceived differently by different people.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Training quality will be considered adequate if students pass national trade tests in applicable areas, e.g. blacksmithing, masonry and carpentry. USAID need to inform and agree with partners as to what technical skills can be considered "demand driven".
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will consist of review of partner files, comparison with files on students made at the training site – including certificates of passing or final examination results and the l ke – to confirm site records accurately reflected in partner files and in USAID reports.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: August 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated
Name of Indicator: No. of youth accessing financial assistance to engage in small businesses and self employment through USAID-funded programs
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Financial assistance can take the form of grants, micro-finance, or in-kind support (e.g. equipment and supplies). Youth are individuals aged 18 to 35. This indicator measures the number of youth who receive assistance in the current year.
Unit of Measure: Annual number
Disaggregated by: Gender, type of business, type of assistance, county
Justification & Management Utility: The previous indicators measured training, but for young people who do not go to work for another employer, they need resources besides training if they are to establish their own businesses. This indicator measures the level of access to financing that young people need to engage in economic activity on their own.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: This indicator relies on the disaggregated data from IR 10.1.2, as well as from any other partners who may be providing assistance to young entrepreneurs in a form other than small loans.
Data Source(s): Disaggregated data from IR indicator 10.1.2
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: See 10.1.2
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual reporting in July
Budget Mechanism: NA
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Implementing partners, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: This indicator will not require a separate DQA
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): See discussion under
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: See discussion under
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: NA
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2007	BB Baseline		
2008			
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated
Name of Indicator: Number of 11 core commercial laws prepared with USG assistance passed/approved
Geographic Focus: National
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The 11 core commercial laws relate to legal categories not individual statutes. They correspond to the following: company law, contract law and enforcement, real property, mortgage law, secured transactions law, bankruptcy law, competition policy, commercial dispute resolution, foreign direct investment, corporate governance, and international trade law.
Unit of Measure: Number of core laws prepared
Disaggregated by: Category
Justification & Management Utility: This represents a comprehensive set of business climate areas. Demonstrating improvement in them indicates systemic changes to enable private sector growth.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Partner
Data Source(s): Implementing partner
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual reporting in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, training files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: See procedures described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Quality of training may vary. “Market need” may be perceived differently by different people.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Training quality will be considered adequate if students pass national trade tests in applicable areas, e.g. blacksmithing, masonry and carpentry. USAID need to inform and agree with partners as to what technical skills can be considered “demand driven”.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will consist of review of partner files, comparison with files on students made at the training site – including certificates of passing or final examination results and the l ke – to confirm site records accurately reflected in partner files and in USAID reports.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2009	Baseline		TBD during project design
2010			
2011			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated
Name of Indicator: Number of firms receiving USG supported assistance to invest in improved technologies
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of firms that receive USG assistance to invest in improved technologies.
Unit of Measure: Number of firms
Disaggregated by: Sex of firm owner, rural/urban
Justification & Management Utility: Firms improve their productivity, and in turn their competitiveness, by accessing capital and increasing investment in productive assets.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Partners will collect training data from their client contacts
Data Source(s): Records of partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual reporting in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, training files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: See procedures described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Quality of training may vary. “Market need” may be perceived differently by different people.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Training quality will be considered adequate if students pass national trade tests in applicable areas, e.g. blacksmithing, masonry and carpentry. USAID need to inform and agree with partners as to what technical skills can be considered “demand driven”.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will consist of review of partner files, comparison with files on students made at the training site – including certificates of passing or final examination results and the l ke – to confirm site records accurately reflected in partner files and in USAID reports.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2009	Baseline		TBD during project design
2010			
2011			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated
Name of Indicator: Number of institutions and organizations undertaking capacity/competency strengthening as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of institutions undertaking capacity/competency strengthening in one or more of the six areas of institutional/organizational competency: governance (e.g. board, mission/goal/constituency, leadership, legal status); management practices (e.g., organizational structure, information management, administration procedures, personnel, planning, program development, program reporting); human resources (e.g., human resources development, staff roles, work organization, diversity issues, supervisory practices, salary and benefits); financial resources (e.g. accounting, budgeting, financial/inventory controls, financial reporting); service delivery (e.g., sectoral expertise, constituency, impact assessment); external relations (e.g., constituency relations, collaboration, public relations, local resources, media).
Unit of Measure: Number of assessments presented
Disaggregated by: N/A
Justification & Management Utility: Measures advanced stages of institutional/organizational capacity strengthening. This indicator is easily aggregated upward.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Partners
Data Source(s): Records of partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual reporting in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, training files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: See procedures described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Quality of training may vary. “Market need” may be perceived differently by different people.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Training quality will be considered adequate if students pass national trade tests in applicable areas, e.g. blacksmithing, masonry and carpentry. USAID need to inform and agree with partners as to what technical skills can be considered “demand driven”.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will consist of review of partner files, comparison with files on students made at the training site – including certificates of passing or final examination results and the l ke – to confirm site records accurately reflected in partner files and in USAID reports.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2009	Baseline		TBD during project design
2010			
2011			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

SO 10: Economic Growth
Name of Strategic Objective: Sustained economic growth for poverty reduction
Name of Intermediate Result: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated
Name of Indicator: Number of SMEs that successfully accessed bank loans or private equity as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: USAID project areas
Is This an Annual Report Indicator? Yes
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of small and medium enterprises who are receiving assistance from USG supported sources to obtain bank loans or private equity.
Unit of Measure: Number of SMEs
Disaggregated by: Sex of firm owner, urban/rural
Justification & Management Utility: Firms improve their productivity, and in turn their competitiveness, by accessing capital and increasing investment in productive assets.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: Partners
Data Source(s): Records of partners
Method of Data Acquisition by USAID: Quarterly partner reports
Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly, with annual reporting in July.
Budget Mechanism: N/A
Individual(s) Responsible at USAID: Agriculture program manager
Individual(s) Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: Implementing partners
Location of Data Storage: Partner files, training files, USAID files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: See procedures described below.
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Quality of training may vary. “Market need” may be perceived differently by different people.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Training quality will be considered adequate if students pass national trade tests in applicable areas, e.g. blacksmithing, masonry and carpentry. USAID need to inform and agree with partners as to what technical skills can be considered “demand driven”.
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will consist of review of partner files, comparison with files on students made at the training site – including certificates of passing or final examination results and the l ke – to confirm site records accurately reflected in partner files and in USAID reports.
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES

Year	Target	Actual	Notes
2008	Baseline		TBD during project design
2009			
2010			

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 10, 2008

VII. Data Quality Assessments

A. METHODOLOGY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This section presents the results of Data Quality Assessments or DQAs undertaken in collaboration with the Mission. The DQAs were carried out between July 30 and August 15, 2008. The objective of this activity was to complete DQAs for the Mission's performance indicators, many of which correspond to those under the Mission's Performance Management Plan (PMP), and represent new assessment requirements for the current annual Operational Plan Performance Report. The DQA team, composed of two Chemonics consultants and Technical Team staff, combined limited field visits, document reviews, and key informant interviews and data systems analysis to complete the assessments. Specific indicator results are reported on DQA forms tailored to the complexity of the indicator. DQA forms used for these assessments are found in Annex C.

The consultants' Statement of Work called for them to provide mentoring to Mission staff so that the Mission itself could carry out DQAs work in the future. The mentoring took the form of a series of meetings with Technical Teams and implementing partners during which data quality concepts and assessment methodologies were presented. The mentoring also involved joint consultant/Mission staff visits to implementing partners' offices to discuss data issues and examine written and electronic data sets. In some instances, the consultants also provided examples of data quality issues from their experiences in other countries. The extent of the mentoring activity varied by Technical Team because some key staff members were unavailable or available only for short periods of time.

With a multitude of indicators needing data quality assessments, priorities had to be established to determine the most important indicators on which to focus DQAs. As a result of this prioritization, Technical Teams with support from consultants decided not to do DQAs on:

- Indicators that had low targets and low values reported in 2008;
- Indicators that had been dropped from the revised PMP the consultants helped develop;
- Indicators whose data sources were activities that had closed or were in the process of closing down;
- Indicators measuring results of activities funded primarily by USAID/Washington. DQAs on these indicators are initiated by the project CTO in Washington, working with the prime implementing partner of these projects;
- Indicators for which there was no data because data had not been collected under the previous PMP.

An exercise of this magnitude, conducted within a relatively short timeframe, inevitably will contain gaps. The intent was to provide Technical Teams a set of templates and a solid start toward completing or improving the DQAs provided

herein, particularly for the numerous OP indicators. A Technical Team should submit an indicator for approval only when it is satisfied that the assessment is complete. Upon approval, concerned CTOs should maintain active files that substantiate and update the DQA report forms.

Next steps are outlined both in the DQA worksheets under "General Notes or Comments" and in the Data Quality Assessment Status and Tracking Table, which summarizes remaining actions. It will be important for Technical Teams to review these actions and ensure that any remaining issues are addressed. It is highly recommended that the Program Office set up a schedule for the teams to address these issues.

B. DQA SUMMARY AND TRACKING TABLE

Indicator	Status	Note/Next Action
Strategic Objective 8: Education: Increased Access to Basic Education Services		
Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non-school based settings	Completed	
Number of adult learners enrolled in USG-supported schools or equivalent non school-based settings	Completed	
Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance	ALPP- Completed	
Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance	LTTP- Completed	
Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance	Alfalit Youth Literacy No formal DQA conducted	Project ending soon, but may be extended. Met with the staff and discussed ways of strengthening their M&E system
Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance	Vision in Action DQA not conducted	Project closing down
Number of administrators and officials trained	ALPP - Completed	
Number of administrators and officials trained	LTTP - Completed	
Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support	ALPP - Completed	
Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support	LTTP - Completed	
Number of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structures supported	ALPP - Completed	
Number of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structures supported	LTTP - Completed	
Number of learners completing the primary cycle in USAID-supported programs including the Accelerated Learning programs	ALPP - Completed	

Indicator	Status	Note/Next Action
Number of monitoring plans	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/low numbers reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of people trained in other strategic information management	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/low number reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of institutions that have used USG-assisted MIS system information to inform administrative and management decisions	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/ low number reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of baselines and feasibilities studies	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/low number reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of institutions with improved management information systems as a result of USG-assistance	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/low number reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of evaluations	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/low number reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of people trained in monitoring and evaluation	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/low number reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of sector assessments	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/low number reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of special studies	Not done	Not a priority indicator for DQA (low target/low number reported); Indicator dropped in revised PMP
Number of teacher training institutes rehabilitated with USG support	N/A	Indicator dropped, activity ended
Number of classrooms constructed or rehabilitated with USG support	N/A	Indicator dropped, activity ended
Proportion of communities in which local committees supported by USAID participate in service delivery	N/A	No data on this indicator; Indicator revised in the new PMP; conduct DQA by September 2009
Enabling environment score card	N/A	No data on this indicator; Indicator revised in the new PMP; conduct DQA by September 2009
Proportion of primary and secondary schools with trained staff in USAID-assisted areas	N/A	No data on this indicator; conduct DQA by September 2009
Index score for financial and organizational management capacity	N/A	No data on this indicator; Indicator revised in the new PMP; conduct DQA by September 2009
Strategic Objective 8: Health: Increased Access to Basic Health Services		
DPT3 Coverage	Initial DQA completed by Health Team Leader	Conduct DQA by September 2009 with new implementing partner
Vitamin Supplementation	Initial DQA completed by Health Team Leader	Conduct DQA by September 2009 with new implementing partner

Indicator	Status	Note/Next Action
Couple Years of Protection	Initial DQA completed by Health Team Leader	Conduct DQA by September 2009 with new implementing partner
Number of ITNs distributed that were purchased or subsidized with USG support	N/A	Met with Mentor Initiative; Mentor doesn't distribute ITNs
Number of houses sprayed with insecticide with USG support	N/A	Met with Mentor Initiative; Mentor doesn't have indoor spraying activities
Number of people trained in Malaria treatment or prevention	Completed	
Number of artemisinin-based combination treatments (ACTs) purchased and distributed through USG support	Completed	
Number of institutions that have used USG-assisted MIS system information to inform administrative and management decision	N/A	Indicator dropped in revised PMP. Met with BASICS and DELIVER Projects; no DQA conducted since these are still new projects; discussed ways of strengthening their M&E systems including data quality With BASICS, discussed their role in ensuring data quality generated by the MOH health facilities
Number of institutions with improved management information systems	TBD	Met with DELIVER and BASICS Projects; no DQA conducted since these are still new projects; discussed ways of strengthening their M&E systems; including data quality With BASICS, discussed their role in ensuring data quality generated by the MOH health facilities For both projects, conduct DQA on this indicator by September 2009
All the other health indicators	TBD	DQAs not done; major implementing partners closing down, but most of the current F indicators were retained for the revised PMP New and comprehensive project being designed; DQAs should be conducted by September 2009
Previous F indicators dropped in the revised PMP: a) Number of individuals trained in blood safety b) Number of service outlets carrying out blood safety activities c) Total Number of health workers trained to deliver ART services, according to national and international standards d) Number of institutions that have used USG-assisted MIS system information to inform administrative and management decision e) Number of people trained in Monitoring and Evaluation f) Number of people trained in other strategic information management	DQAs not done on these indicators since they were dropped in the revised PMP	

Indicator	Status	Note/Next Action
Strategic Objective 9: Democratic governance enhanced		
Control of Corruption Index	Initial conducted 5/26/06	None. Transparency International Index methodology accepted by USAID
Government Effectiveness Index	Initial conducted 5/26/06	None. World Bank index methodologies accepted by USAID
Public perception of the state of rule of law, corruption, and governance effectiveness	TBD	Pending survey design during FY 2009
Sovereign rating of Liberia	TBD	Pending determination by D&G team to use this indicator
Intermediate Result 9.1 Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities		
Public disclosure of financial statements of selected SOEs	Initial DQA – IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009
Timber taxes, mineral fees and other fees fully invoiced by selected SOEs and fully received by the MOF	Initial DQA – IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009
Procurement in compliance with Liberian Procurement Law	Initial DQA – IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009
Ministry and agency annual spending does not exceed appropriated levels	Initial DQA – IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009
Program-based budgeting adopted by sector and institution	Initial DQA – IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009
Percent of GOL assets being managed in accordance with GSA policies	Not done	Suggested new indicator. If adopted, DQA proposed in 2010
Number of national executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance	Completed – NDI	No further action. CEPPS terminating
Number of national legislators and legislative staff attending USG sponsored training or educational events	Completed – NDI/IFES/IRI	No further action. CEPPS terminating
Number of public forums resulting from USG assistance in which national legislators and members of the public interact	Completed - NDI	No further action. CEPPS terminating
Number of USG assisted civil society organizations that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees	Completed - NDI	No further action. CEPPS terminating
Number of civil society organizations receiving USG assisted training in advocacy.	Completed – NDI/IFES	No further action. CEPPS terminating
Number of Executive Branch personnel trained with USG assistance	Initial DQA – IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009
Number of Executive Office operations supported with USG assistance	Initial DQA – IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009
Number of government officials receiving USG supported anti-corruption training	Initial DQA IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009
Number of USG supported anti-corruption measures implemented	Initial DQA – IBI/Segura	Complete DQA in early 2010 following approval of revised activity PMP in 2009

Indicator	Status	Note/Next Action
Intermediate Result 9.2 Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation		
Number of cases resolved at USAID sponsored justice centers	N/A	Not USAID indicator Justice Sector Support Program
Number of legal personnel trained (disaggregated by category, sex and age cohort)	N/A	Never used. Replaced by standard F indicator 9.2.7 below
Number of people trained to address conflict disaggregated by sex, agree cohort and ethnicity	N/A	Indicator from IR 3 (civil society) which Mission no longer implements
Number of women and men who participated in gender based violence prevention programs	N/A	Indicator from IR 3 (civil society) which Mission no longer implements
Citizen knowledge of their rights and responsibilities and options available to them to seek justice	N/A	Survey never conducted. Indicator to be dropped. Citizen knowledge to be incorporated into SO level survey
Number of courts operating in areas of low income populations with USG assistance	Completed - ABA	Update in FY 2010
Number of justice sector personnel that received USG training	Completed - ABA	Update in FY 2010
Number of legal aid groups and law clinics assisted by USG	Completed - ABA	Update in FY 2010
Number of legal institutions and associations supported by USG	Completed - ABA	Update in FY 2010
Number of people visiting USG supported legal service centers	Completed - ABA	Update in FY 2010
Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management	N/A	Not USAID indicator Justice Sector Support Program
Ratio of new case filings to case dispositions in courts assisted by USG in the area of case management	N/A	Not USAID indicator Justice Sector Support Program
Number of indigent criminal defendants represented by Public Defenders supported by the USG	N/A	Not USAID indicator Justice Sector Support Program
Intermediate Result 9.4 Political processes strengthened (legislature, elections, political parties, legal reform)		
Legislative capacity to represent constituencies and provide oversight of executive branch operations and lawmaking	N/A	Drop as indicator. NDI funds reprogrammed for other activities
NEC actions to promote voter education, political party liaison, and election law reforms	Completed - IFES	No further action. CEPPS terminating
Political parties with permanent offices in at least eight counties	Completed - IRI	No further action. Activity terminating
Number of elections officials utilizing new skills and knowledge	Completed - IFES	No further action. Activity terminating
Number of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance to articulate platform and policy agendas effectively	Completed – IRI/NDI	No further action. Activity terminating

Indicator	Status	Note/Next Action
Number of organizations receiving USG support to promote development of and compliance with political finance regulations and legislation	Completed - IRI	No further action. Activity terminating
Number of USG-assisted political parties implementing programs to increase the number of candidates and members who are women, youth or from marginalized groups	Completed - IRI	No further action. Activity terminating
Number of individuals who receive USG-assisted political party training	Completed - IRI	No further action. Activity terminating
Number of political parties with functioning formal operations	Not done.	Custom indicator dropped from PMP and OPPR
Strategic Objective 10: Sustainable economic growth for poverty reduction		
Percent of project participants who report that their lifestyle has improved annually (proxy for income)	Not done. Survey never designed.	Indicator dropped from PMP and OPPR
Number of full-time jobs in excess of two weeks created disaggregated by sex as a result of USAID supported activity	See IR 2 below	
Number of farmers adopting improved practices in USAID-assisted areas	Not done. Indicator never used by Mission	Indicator dropped from PMP and OPPR
Km of physical infrastructure renovated or reconstructed	See IR 2 below	
Number of facilities rehabilitated/ reconstructed in partnership with communities	Not done. Indicator never used by Mission	Indicator dropped from PMP and OPPR
Percent of beneficiary economic units with increased income (survey result)	N/A	EG team considering as new SO indicator
Ratio of agricultural imports to agricultural exports	N/A	EG team considering as new SO indicator
Percent growth of private sector GDP in real terms	N/A	EG team considering as new SO indicator
Reduced vulnerability of rural population to food insecurity	N/A	EG team considering as new SO indicator
Intermediate Result 10.1 Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased		
Number of people with increased benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and conservation as a result of USG assistance	Completed - CI	Update in 2009 when CI terminates and ARD begins reporting performance results
Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance	Completed - CI	Update in 2009 when CI terminates and ARD begins reporting performance results
Number of people receiving USG supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation	Completed – CI only	Update in 2009 when CI terminates and ARD begins reporting performance results
Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management	Completed – CI only	Update in 2009 when CI terminates and ARD begins reporting performance results

Indicator	Status	Note/Next Action
Actions taken by NRM-based organizations to improve the policy environment	N/A	Dropped as indicator for PMP and OPPR
Strengthened FDA and assisting agency capacity to carry out community forestry programs	Deferred - ARD	Conduct in 2009 when ARD begins reporting performance results
Number of sustainable pilot market opportunities developed	Deferred - ARD	Conduct in 2009 when ARD begins reporting performance results
Model for community LTPR in community forestry lands developed	Deferred - ARD	Conduct in 2009 when ARD begins reporting performance results
Actions taken by NRM-based organizations to improve the policy environment	Not done	Dropped as indicator for PMP and OPPR
Number of forest products users and miners who adopt sustainable natural resource management practices	Not done	Dropped as indicator for PMP and OPPR
Capacity of NRM-based organizations (scores on a capacity assessment tool that includes technology transfer)	Not done	Dropped as indicator for PMP and OPPR
Percentage of revenue generated from diamonds/timber/oil/gold/cotton transparently	Not done	Dropped as indicator for PMP and OPPR
Intermediate Result 10.2 Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased		
Number of people with increased access to modern energy services as a result of USG assistance	Completed - IRG	No further action. Activity terminating
Total public sector and private dollars leveraged by USG for energy infrastructure projects	Completed - IRG	No further action. Activity terminating
Number of newly illuminated street lights	Completed - IRG	No further action. Activity terminating
Percent reduction in utility commercial loss	Completed - IRG	No further action. Activity terminating
Number of Kms of transportation infrastructure constructed or repaired through USG assistance	Completed - DAI	Revisit in 2010 to consolidate with poss ble new infrastructure project
Number of people receiving USG supported training in transportation technical fields	N/A	EG team to consider new IR indicator
Number of people receiving USG supported training in transportation management systems	N/A	EG team to consider new IR indicator
Number of local contractors capacity as a result of USG support	N/A	EG team to consider new IR indicator
Intermediate Result 10.3 Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased		
Volume of agricultural production (% growth) disaggregated by food and non-food crops	N/A	EG team to consider as new IR indicator
Percent increase in food crop yields by adopting new techniques and technologies	N/A	EG team to consider as new IR indicator

Indicator	Status	Note/Next Action
Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	N/A	EG team to consider as new IR indicator
Number of new technologies or management practices made available for transfer as a result of USG assistance	N/A	EG team to consider as new IR indicator - value chain activity
Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training	N/A	EG team to consider as new IR indicator – value chain activity
Number of firms receiving USG supported assistance to improve their management practices	N/A	EG team to consider as new IR indicator – value chain activity
Number of firms who have received USG support short-term agricultural enabling environment training	N/A	EG team to consider as new IR indicator – value chain activity
Number of institutions/organizations undergoing capacity/competency assessments as a result of USG assistance	Deferred - ARD	Conduct DQA in 2009 after ARD begins performance reporting
Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural enabling environment training	Deferred - ARD	Conduct DQA in 2009 after ARD begins performance reporting
Number of policy reforms presented for legislation/decree as a result of USG assistance	Deferred - ARD	Conduct DQA in 2009 after ARD begins performance reporting
Intermediate Result 10.4 Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated		
Number of firms receiving USG-supported assistance to invest in improved technologies	N/A	Proposed indicator for new activity
Number of 11 core commercial laws prepared with USG assistance passed/approved	N/A	Proposed indicator for new activity
Number of SMEs that successfully accessed bank loans or private equity as a result of USG assistance	N/A	Proposed indicator for new activity
Number of institutions and organizations undertaking capacity/competency strengthening as a result of USG assistance	N/A	Proposed indicator for new activity
Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance	Completed – CARE/DAI/CI	Update 2010
Number of persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs	Completed – CARE/DAI	Update 2010
Number of people gaining employment or more remunerative employment as a result of participation in USG-funded workforce development programs	Completed – CARE/DAI	Update 2010
Number of youth trained in management and entrepreneurial skills through USAID-assisted programs	Completed – CARE/DAI	Update 2010
Number of youth completing USAID-supported vocational and apprenticeship programs based on market need	Not done	Indicator dropped from PMP and OPPR

C. DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT REPORTS

I. Education

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non school based settings
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/5/08
Data Source(s): Accelerated Learning Program Plus (ALP Plus)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan reports? ___X___ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: The data collected by ALP Plus on this indicator meets the five criteria for good quality data. The data is valid and free from measurement and transcription errors. The data is also representative of the program and the result being measured. Data collection forms to capture student enrollments are well designed, standardized across all ALP Plus schools, and include student enrollment forms, student profiles and data summary/aggregation and reporting forms. The M&E officers at the county-level (called Learning Resource Center (LRC) M&E Officers), as well as the M&E Officer at the central project office in Monrovia, are well trained (they all have bachelor degrees). Schools administrators are also well oriented on the use of student enrollment forms. Data is cross-checked for accuracy throughout the data collection process. The first level of data verification is the school where enrollment data is collected and records maintained by school administrators. The LRC M&E Officer assigned to each school visits the school at least twice a semester to collect data on school enrollment. During that process, s/he reviews the school enrollment records and, with the school administrators, resolves any discrepancies found in the data. After verifying the accuracy of the data, s/he enters the data into a county-level project database and sends the electronic file and hard copy forms to the Central Office M&E Officer in Monrovia who also checks the data before entering it into a national level project database. The database itself has data quality control and cleaning features that allow to spot check data values that are out of range. Electronic data entries are also checked against hard copy forms. In addition, the M&E Officer at the central office occasionally visits schools to verify the data. Data collection procedures (indicator definition, student enrollment forms, student profiles) are used consistently and uniformly across all ALP schools, which makes the data collected reliable. The data collection procedures are well documented in the project PMP and data collectors have been trained in these procedures. Data precision is achieved by disaggregating it by sex, age, level of completion, and geographic location (urban/rural) and checking missing values through the database. The precision of forms also minimizes the size of error. Data is timely because there are no delays in transmitting the data from the county level to the central project office and USAID always gets its reports on time. Data is also updated regularly and protected from loss or damage through frequent back ups. Finally, data is protected against any deliberate manipulation by using a database that's password-protected with limited access by staff, by visiting schools and verifying the data (doing a head count of students and comparing the data on student enrollment forms with individual student profiles).
Additional Comments and Recommendations: As mentioned above, the data on "number of learners enrolled" meets the five data quality standards. I would only recommend strengthening data entry and verification procedures at the central office level by having one person enter the data and another verify accuracy of data as it is being entered. I would also recommend more data verification site visits by both the central office M&E officer and LRC M&E officers, although that may require additional resources (more M&E officers, more vehicles to travel to the sites).
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of adult learners enrolled in USG-supported primary schools or equivalent non school based settings
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/5/08
Data Source(s): Accelerated Learning Program Plus
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ **yes** _____ **no**
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This indicator is similar to the above, so the data quality assessment is also the same as above. The data collected by ALP Plus on this indicator also meets the five criteria for good quality data. The data is valid and free from measurement and transcription errors. The data is also representative of the program and the result being measured. Data collection forms to capture student enrollments are well designed, standardized across all ALP Plus schools, and include student enrollment forms, student profiles and data summary/aggregation and reporting forms. The M&E officers at the county-level (called Learning Resource Center (LRC) M&E Officers), as well as the M&E Officer at the central project office in Monrovia, are well trained (they all have bachelor degrees). Schools administrators are also well oriented on the use of student enrollment forms. Data is cross-checked for accuracy throughout the data collection process. The first level of data verification is the school where enrollment data is collected and records maintained by school administrators. The LRC M&E Officer assigned to each school visits the school at least twice a semester to collect the data on school enrollment. During that process, s/he reviews the school enrollment records and with the school administrators resolve any discrepancies found in the data. After verifying the accuracy of the data, s/he enters the data into a county-level project database and sends the electronic file and hard copy forms to the Central Office M&E Officer in Monrovia who also checks the data before entering it into a national level project database. The database itself has data quality control and cleaning features that allow to spot check data values that are out of range. Electronic data entries are also checked against hard copy forms. In addition, the M&E Officer at the central office occasionally visits schools to verify the data. Data collection procedures (indicator definition, student enrollment forms, student profiles) are used consistently and uniformly across all ALP schools, which makes the data collected reliable. The data collection procedures are well documented in the project PMP. Data precision is achieved by disaggregating it by sex, age, level of completion, and geographic location (urban/rural) and checking missing values through the database. The precision of forms also minimizes the size of error. Data is timely because there are no delays in transmitting the data from the county level to the central project office and USAID always gets its reports on time. Data is also updated regularly and protected from loss or damage through frequent back ups. Finally, data is protected against any deliberate manipulation by using a database that's password-protected with limited access by staff, by visiting schools and verifying the data (doing a head count of students and comparing the data on student enrollment forms with individual student profiles).
Additional Comments and Recommendations: As mentioned above, the data on "number of adult learners enrolled" meets the five data quality standards. I would only recommend strengthening data entry and verification procedures at the central office level by having one person enter the data and another verify accuracy of data as it is being entered. I would also recommend more data verification sites visits by both the central office M&E officer and LRC M&E officers although that may require additional resources (more M&E officers, more vehicles to travel to the sites).
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of learners completing the primary cycle in USAID-supported programs including Accelerated Learning Program
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/5/08
Data Source(s): Accelerated Learning Program Plus
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? _____ yes _____X_ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: Data for this indicator meets the five criteria for good quality data. Data collection and verification follow the same process as for the two indicators above. Data is collected and compiled by school administrators using a student promotion form, which they fill out at the end of each school year. Information recorded on the form includes number of students promoted, number of students retained (failed) and number of drop outs. The LRC M&E Officer assigned to each school collects the data at the end of the school year. During that process, s/he reviews the school enrollment records and with the school administrators resolve any discrepancies or inconsistencies found in the data. After verifying the accuracy of the data, s/he enters the data into a county-level project database and sends the electronic file and hard copy forms to the Central Office M&E Officer in Monrovia who also checks the data before entering it into a national level project database. The database itself has data quality control and cleaning features that allow to spot check data values that are out of range. Electronic data entries are also checked against hard copy forms. In addition, the M&E Officer at the central office occasionally visits schools to verify the data. Data collection procedures (indicator definition, student enrollment forms, student profiles) are used consistently and uniformly across all ALP schools, which makes the data collected reliable. The data collection procedures are well documented in the project PMP and data collectors have been trained in these procedures. Data precision is achieved by disaggregating it by sex, age, level of completion, and geographic location (urban/rural) and checking missing values through the database. The precision of forms also minimizes the size of error. Data is timely because there are no delays in transmitting the data from the county level to the central project office and USAID always gets its reports on time. Data is also updated regularly and protected from loss or damage through frequent back ups. Finally, data is protected against any deliberate manipulation by using a database that's password-protected with limited access by staff, by visiting schools and verifying the data (cross-checking of student enrollment form with the student promotion forms at the beginning of each school year).
Additional Comments and Recommendations: As mentioned above, the data on "number of learners completing the primary cycle" meets the five data quality standards. I would only recommend strengthening data entry and verification procedures at the central office level by having one person enter the data and another verify accuracy of data as it is being entered. I would also recommend more data verification sites visits by both the central office M&E officer and LRC M&E officers although that may require additional resources (more M&E officers, more vehicles to travel to the sites).
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X_____ Date_____** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element:: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of teachers/educators trained with USG support
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/5/08
Data Source(s): Accelerated Learning Program Plus
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ **yes** _____ **no**
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: Data on this indicator is valid and free from errors and fully represents the result being measured. It is collected by the LRC M&E officers using a standardized teacher training attendance form. All the teachers participating in the training have to fill out and sign the form. Each teacher must also fill out a teacher profile the first time they attend a training. The profile is entered in the ALP Plus database and plays an important role in cross-checking the data provided by teachers on teacher's training forms. At the end of each training, the LRC M&E officers cross-check the names of training participants with the list of teachers who have received stipends for the training, then enter this information into the county-level database. An electronic and hard copy of the teachers' training attendance form with a summary form showing the total number of training participants is then sent to the central office M&E Officer. If there are any inconsistencies in the data, the later asks the LRC M&E officers to investigate and resolve the inconsistencies before the data is entered into the national level project database. The database itself has data quality control and cleaning features that allow to spot check data values that are out of range. Electronic data entries are also checked against hard copy forms. All the teachers have unique identification numbers in the database, which permits checking for teachers who have been trained in the same subject during the same reporting period and therefore avoid double-counting. Data is also reliable in the sense that data collection procedures (indicator definition, training attendance forms) are consistent and stable over time. The data collection procedures are well documented in the project PMP and data collectors have been trained in these procedures. Data precision is achieved by disaggregating it by sex, and level and type of training provided and by checking missing values through the database. The precision of forms also minimizes the size of error. Data is timely because there are no delays in transmitting the data from the county level to the central project office and USAID always gets its reports on time. Data is updated regularly and protected from loss or damage through frequent back ups. Finally, data is protected against any deliberate manipulation by using a database that's password-protected with limited access by staff, by visiting schools and verifying the data (headcount of teachers participating in the training and cross-checking that information with participant profiles and the list of participants receiving perdiem).
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Data on "number of teachers and educators trained" meets the five USAID data quality standards. I would only recommend strengthening data entry and verification procedures at the central office level by having one person enter the data and another verify accuracy of data as it is being entered. I would also recommend more data verification site visits by both the central office M&E officer and LRC M&E officers, although that may require additional resources (more M&E officers, more vehicles to travel to the sites).
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Basic Education
Indicator: Number of administrators and officials trained with USG support
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/5/08
Data Source(s): Accelerated Learning Program Plus
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ **yes** _____ **no**
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: Data on this indicator is valid and free from errors and fully represents the result being measured. It is collected by the LRC M&E officers using a standardized teacher training attendance form. All the teachers participating in the training have to fill out and sign the form. Each teacher must also fill out a teacher profile the first time they attend a training. The profile is entered in the ALP Plus database and plays an important role in cross-checking the data provided by teachers on teacher's training forms. At the end of each training, the LRC M&E officers cross-check the names of training participants with the list of teachers who have received stipends for the training, then enter this information into the county-level database. An electronic and hard copy of the teachers' training attendance form with a summary form showing the total number of training participants is then sent to the central office M&E Officer. If there are any inconsistencies in the data, the later asks the LRC M&E officers to investigate and resolve the inconsistencies before the data is entered into the national level project database. The database itself has data quality control and cleaning features that allow to spot check data values that are out of range. Electronic data entries are also checked against hard copy forms. All the teachers have unique identification numbers in the database, which permits checking for teachers who have been trained in the same subject during the same reporting period and therefore avoid double-counting. Data is also reliable in the sense that data collection procedures (indicator definition, training attendance forms) are consistent and stable over time. The data collection procedures are well documented in the project PMP and data collectors have been trained in these procedures. Data precision is achieved by disaggregating it by sex, level, and type of training provided and by checking missing values through the database. The precision of forms also minimizes the size of error. Data is timely because there are no delays in transmitting the data from the county level to the central project office and USAID always gets its reports on time. Data is updated regularly and protected from loss or damage through frequent back ups. Finally, data is protected against any deliberate manipulation by using a database that's password-protected with limited access by staff, by visiting training sites, and verifying the data (headcount of administrators and teachers participating in the training and cross-checking that information with training participants profiles and the list of participants receiving perdiem).
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Data on "number of administrators and officials trained" meets the five data quality standards. I would only recommend strengthening data entry and verification procedures at the central office level by having one person enter the data and another verify accuracy of data as it is being entered. I would also recommend more data verification site visits by both the central office M&E officer and LRC M&E officers, although that may require additional resources (more M&E officers, more vehicles to travel to the sites).
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Basic Education
Indicator: Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/5/08
Data Source(s): Accelerated Learning Program Plus
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? __X___ **yes** _____ **no**
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: Data on this indicator is valid and free from errors and fully represents the result being measured. It is collected using a form each school has to sign upon receipt of textbooks and other learning materials. These materials are in the form of teaching kits containing a variety of supplies adapted to each class level. The schools keep a copy of the material distr bution form and the LRC M&E Officer keeps another form, which is entered into an Excel spreadsheet and sent to the central office M&E specialist for entry into a national-level project Excel spreadsheet. Information on teaching kits distr buted is also kept by the finance officer at the central office, which allows for cross-checking the accuracy of the data on this indicator. Data on this indicator is also reliable in the sense that data collection procedures (material distribution form) is standardized and used consistently across all ALP Plus schools. The use of this form is straightforward and the risk for error in data calculation is very minimal. There are no delays in transmitting the data from the county level to the central project office and reports on this data are always sent to USAID on time. Data is updated regularly and protected from loss or damage through frequent back ups. Finally, data is protected against any deliberate manipulation by using a database that's password-protected with limited access by staff and by cross-checking the number of materials distr buted with the financial data kept at the Project Central Office.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: The data on "number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance" meets the five data quality standards.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structures supported
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/5/08
Data Source(s): Accelerated Learning Program Plus
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: Currently, only PTAs are counted in this indicator as there are no other similar governance structures supported. Data on the number of PTAs is collected via school profiles (each school has a school profile). Each school's profile specifies whether or not the school has a PTA and if so, the names of members of the PTA. This information is then compiled by the LRC. M&E officer who sends it to the M&E officer at the central office for entry into an Excel Spreadsheet. The LRC M&E Officer also collects information on support provided to PTAs and similarly sends that information to the Central level M&E Officer for entry into the Excel Spreadsheet. The type of support provided to PTAs is mostly in the form of training of PTA members, but the project has just started a competitive small grants program to provide other types of support to the PTAs. It was unclear to the project staff interviewed whether they should count these grants as a type of support provided to PTAs. We clarified that they should include in their count the PTAs that have received small grants. Data on this indicator is reliable in the sense that data collection procedures are consistent across all the LPP Plus schools. The only problem that needs to be addressed is the definition of the type of support provided to PTAs that needs to be counted to calculate this indicator. Data meets the other criteria of precision, timeliness and integrity as the same procedures used to ensure data quality on the other indicators, are also applied on this indicator.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: As indicated above, the data on "number of PTAs supported" meets the five data quality standards. I would only recommend making sure the PTAs receiving small grants are counted in the total of PTAs supported. It would also be great to design a form to track the number of PTAs supported. The set of forms we reviewed did not include such a form. Information on that form could be disaggregated to include the type of support each PTA has received.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of teachers and educators trained
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/7/08
Data Source(s): Liberia Teacher Training Project (LTTP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: Data on this indicator is valid and free from errors and fully represents the result being measured. A teacher/educator training attendance form is used to collect data on this indicator. The form was designed by LTTP staff in collaboration with its partners who conduct training of teachers and oversee the proper completion of these forms by training participants. In addition to the participant attendance form, each teacher/educator who participates in a training for the first time has to fill out a teacher registration form which collects more information on teachers' level of education, their affiliation, their area of specialization (discipline taught in school), etc. There is an M&E focal point person at each LTTP partner organization that makes sure everyone on the training team uses these forms correctly. These M&E focal points have basic training in M&E (one partner has a well trained M&E officer) and the LTTP central M&E officer is also well trained in M&E. Once the forms have been properly filled out and cross-checked for accuracy, the M&E focal point sends the forms to the LPPP M&E Officer who enters the information in a database. If the M&E Officer detects any inconsistencies in the data, he asks the M&E focal person who collected the data to resolve these inconsistencies before the data is entered into the database. The database has data validation and cleaning features, allowing to spot check any major data entry errors. We also found the data reliable, consistently collected over time, and disaggregated by sex as the indicator recommends. The project has a set of guidance procedures to collect and report on the data, but it doesn't have a formal PMP that underpins and systematizes these procedures. Data is always timely as the attendance forms are submitted as soon as the training ends and the database is updated, and there is frequent back up of the data. Data is also protected against any manipulation since only a few people have access to the database via a protected password. Right now, however, there is no data entry, processing, cleaning, and aggregation guide and only one person (the LTTP M&E officer) is in charge of both entering, verifying and aggregating the data, which increases the risk for error.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Overall, the data for this indicator meets the five data quality standards. We only recommended having in place a data processing and cleaning guide to further minimize the potential for errors. We also recommended having the data entry and aggregation process cross-checked by another person to further verify accuracy of the data. We further recommended drafting a formal PMP since it is the foundation for the project M&E system.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of administrators and officials trained
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/7/08
Data Source(s): Liberia Teacher Training Project (LTTP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ **yes** _____ **no**
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This indicator is similar to the previous one "Number of teachers and educators trained," so the same assessment applies here: Data on this indicator is valid and free from errors and fully represents the result being measured. A teacher/educator training attendance form is used to collect data on this indicator. The form was designed by LTTP staff in collaboration with its partners who conduct training of teachers and oversee the proper completion of these forms by training participants. In addition to the participant attendance form, each teacher/educator who participates in a training for the first time has to fill out a teacher registration form which collects more information on teachers' level of education, affiliation, area of specialization (discipline taught in school), etc. There is an M&E focal point person at each LTTP partner organization that makes sure everyone on the training team uses these forms correctly. These M&E focal points have basic training in M&E (one partner has a well trained M&E officer) and the LTTP central M&E officer is also well trained in M&E. Once the forms have been properly filled out and cross-checked for accuracy, the M&E focal point sends the forms to LPPP M&E Officer who enters the information in a database. If the M&E Officer detects any inconsistencies in the data, he asks the M&E focal person who collected the data to resolve these inconsistencies before the data is entered into the database. The database has data validation and cleaning features, allowing to spot check any major data entry errors. The data was found to be reliable, consistently collected over time, and disaggregated by sex as the indicator recommends. The project has a set of guidance procedures to collect and report the data, but it doesn't have a formal PMP that underpins and systematizes these procedures. Data is always timely as the attendance forms are submitted as soon as the training ends and the database is updated and there is frequent back-up of the data. Data is also protected against any manipulation since only a few people have access to the database via a protected password. Right now, however, there is no data entry, processing, cleaning, and aggregation guide and only one person (the LTTP M&E officer) is in charge of both entering, verifying and aggregating the data, which increases the risk for error.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Overall, the data for this indicator meets the five data quality standards. We only recommended having in place a data processing and cleaning guide to further minimize the potential for errors. We also recommended having the data entry and aggregation process cross-checked by another person to further verify accuracy of the data. We further recommended drafting a formal PMP as the foundation for the project M&E system.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided with USG assistance
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/7/08
Data Source(s): Liberia Teacher Training Project (LTTP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: LTTP developed the National Teacher Standards, which were still in draft form when the DQA was conducted. There were four standards developed and disseminated for review, but they had not yet been finalized. They had, however, been counted and reported to USAID. The definition of the indicator above specifies that only materials in their final form should be counted. We recommended to the project to carefully review the definition of this indicator and do a proper count in future reports. Apart from the misinterpretation of the definition of this indicator, LTTP has a standard data collection form to monitor textbooks and other teaching and learning materials provided. Data is collected by the LTTP M&E officer and stored in the database descr bed earlier. There are no problems with timeliness, precision, and integrity of the data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Our recommendation was to carefully read the definition of this indicator and do a proper count in the future.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Services Provided by National and Local Organizations
Program Element/Sub-element:: Basic Education
Indicator: Number of parent-teacher associations or similar school governance structures supported
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/7/08
Data Source(s): Liberia Teacher Training Project (LTTP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: A form is used by LTTP partner focal points to collect data on PTAs that have received support. This form is regularly sent to the LTTP M&E officer who cross-checks the data before entering it into the database. IRC, an LTTP project partner has provided training to some of the more advanced PTAs, but this data was not included in the final count of PTAs supported that was reported in the last report submitted to USAID. We recommended including training of PTAs, as well as any other types of support PTAs receive, in the total count. We also recommended to the LTTP staff to carefully read the definition of this indicator to make sure they understand how data is collected and disseminated and explain this definition to their partners. We did not find any issues with data integrity or timeliness.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Our recommendation was to include the IRC training as another type of support to PTAs and better understand and disseminate the definition of this indicator to LTTP partners.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

II. Health

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Basic Health Services (Previous SO)
Program Element/Sub-element: Health/Malaria
Indicator: Number of people trained in Malaria treatment or prevention with USG funds
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/7/08
Data Source(s): Mentor Initiative
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: The data collected on "number of people trained in malaria treatment or prevention" is valid as it clearly represents the result being measured. Validity is also reflected in the standard procedures established to collect the data. Data on this indicator is captured through a training attendance form that each participant in the training has to fill out and sign. Trainers are usually health clinicians experienced in malaria treatment and prevention and trained in the use of training attendance forms so they can explain to participants how to properly fill out these forms. Participants have to take a test before and after the training so that improvements in their knowledge can be measured. After each training, the trainer ensures that the training form has been clearly and correctly filled out by participants, as well as that participants have been consistently present in the training and have signed the form. The trainer keeps a copy of the form and sends the original to MENTOR. He also sends a copy of pre-test and post-test results. After verifying the accuracy of the data, MENTOR data manager enters the data into an Excel and Access Database. The Acess database has unique identification features allowing to spot check people who have received more than one training in one subject within the same reporting period so that double-counting of people trained can be avoided. It also gives program managers critical information they need to ensure fairness in training (such as avoiding that the same people have access to training opportunities). The Excel database on the other hand has stronger data manipulation and analysis capabilities. Both databases have data validation and cleaning procedures, allowing detection of certain types of errors or values that are out of range. Electronic data entries are also checked against hard copy entries and verified by a data supervisor before reports are produced. Data on this indicator is reliable as the same data collection procedures (standardized training attendance form, pre- and post test, trainee roster) are used consistently over time. The precision of the form and the disaggregation of data (by sex and type of training) increase the precision of the data. Data is timely as there are no delays in transmitting the attendance forms to MENTOR data manager or submitting the required reports to USAID. Finally, data is protected against any manipulation by using a database only accessed by a few people. Data is protected against loss or damage though frequent back-ups, using en external drive.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: This indicator meets the five USAID standards for good quality data. The only recommendation I made was to design a PMP or at least have all the data collection procedures and forms described and documented in a single reference document and to disseminate that document to all data collectors and managers.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____ **Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO Result: Increased Access to Essential Basic Health Services (Previous SO)
Program Element/Sub-element: Health/Malaria
Indicator: Number of Artemisinin-Based Combination Treatments (ACTs) purchased and distributed
Reviewer(s): Alphonse Bigirimana
Date Reviewed: 8/7/08
Data Source(s): Mentor Initiative
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan report? ___X___ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: The data collected on "number of ACTs purchased or distributed" is valid as it clearly represents the result being measured. Validity of the data is also reflected in the rigorous system put in place by MENTOR to accurately monitor the quantity of ACTs purchased and distributed. All ACTs are procured internationally based on the needs expressed by health facilities or agencies served by MENTOR. MENTOR has designed several standardized forms to capture the number of ACTs purchased and distr buted. After a drug supplier has been identified, a standard drug purchase order is filled and sent to the supplier in the UK. Received drugs are kept in a warehouse and monitored using standard drug storage and stock inventory control procedures. The stock inventory forms specify the quantity of drugs procured and the drug specifications. ACTs are then distributed to health agencies or facilities according to the needs of each agency/facility and their readiness to administer the drugs and monitor the use of these drugs. The needs (drug quantity and specifications) of health facilities are indicated on a drug requisition form submitted to MENTOR. After a thorough analysis of health facilities' drug requests, drugs are supplied to the facilities and records of distribution established. A Warehouse Release Form specifying the type and quantity of drugs to be released is prepared as well as a stock card showing the quantity of drugs issued, the balance on stock, and destination where the drugs are sent. A waybill form is also completed to accompany distribution of the released drugs. It shows the origin and destination of the drugs, the shipper, the carrier, and the drug commodity and delivery details. A copy of the waybill is retained by the warehouse and the agency or health facility receiving the drugs returns a signed copy of the waybill upon receipt of the drugs. There are many ways to verify the accuracy of the data (data on all the forms has to match). Data is also entered into an Excel database which has data validation features. Electronic data is cross-checked against data on the various forms to ensure accuracy. Data is reliable because the forms used to monitor purchases, inventory, and distributions are used consistently and uniformly by well trained staff supervised by an M&E officer/data manager. The precision of the forms increase precision of the data. Only 3-4 people (data managers) have limited access to the database via a protected password, so the risks of manipulation of the data are minimal. Data is also protected through weekly back-ups.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: This indicator meets the five USAID standards for good quality data. The only recommendation I made was to design a PMP or at least have all the data collection procedures and forms described and documented in a single reference document and disseminate that document to all data collectors and managers.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X_____ Date_____** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X_____ Date_____** **Comments:**

III. Democracy and Governance

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Public disclosure of financial statements for selected SOEs
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009, which will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP) **:** Timber taxes, mineral fees and other fees fully invoiced by SOE and fully received by MOF
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009, which will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Procurement in compliance with Liberian Procurement Law
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009, which will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Ministry and agency annual spending does not exceed appropriated levels
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009, which will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP) **:** Program-based budgeting implemented by sector and institution
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009, which will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of Executive Branch personnel trained with USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009, which will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP) **:** Number of Executive Branch operations supported with USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009 that will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP) **:** Number of USG supported anti-corruption measures implemented
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009 that will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities.
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Percent of GOL assets being managed in accordance with GSA policies
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 6, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GMAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: All of the GMAP indictors that appeared in the original May 2006 PMP were never reported against to Washington, hence there isn't a basis for conducting a full DQA. However, the reviewer did discuss indicator definitions with each partner and suggested the indicators used in this PMP. IBI is revising its activity PMP in October 2009 that will include changes to the indicator definitions, baselines and targets. As this process moves forward, it is essential that Segura indicators be cross-checked with those proposed by IBI and that both partners use agreed upon indicator definitions as well as methods and sources of data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Full DQA should be conducted following the OPPR for 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.2 : Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Justice System
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of legal aid groups and law clinics assisted by USG
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Support for Human Rights Culture in Liberia
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/ 2009 Operational Plan Performance Reports? _X__ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: The ABA defines "legal aid" groups as NGOs or other private or private/state mixed entities existing to provide legal advice to citizens. The term "law clinics" means programs established by the bar and law schools where students, under close supervision, give legal advice to citizens. This includes two legal advice centers, FIND, the L berian Bar association, and JPC. See further details related to this indicator described in "Number of people visiting USG supported legal service centers serving low income and marginalized communities."
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Overall, the data for this indicator meets the five data quality standards. It is important to bear in mind that all the indicators being used by the ABA in USAID's Support for a Culture of Human Rights in Liberia project are simple outputs and reflect what is by any measure a clearly focused initiative with modest targets. This assessment reflects those realities. It is recommended that at least one outcome indicator be developed for this project in the event that the "perception survey" indicator at the Goal level never materializes. In addition, while a PMP for the project, with baseline data as of September 2006 was submitted to USAID, greater use could be made of that PMP for the purpose of managing the project.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.2 : Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Justice System
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of courts operating in areas of low income populations with USG assistance.
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Support for Human Rights Culture in Liberia
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/ 2009 Operational Plan Performance Reports? _X__ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This simple F standard output indicator refers to the two courts that the ABA is assisting or plans to assist: the Circuit Court and the Magistrates Court in Buchanan, Liberia. As of this assessment, the project is already working with the Magistrates Court, but will expand its work to include the Circuit Court. An assessment was recently completed that clarifies the functions of the second court, proposes a plan for its development over time, and suggests the training and material assistance (furniture, stationary, etc.) that will be provided by the ABA project to close the resource gap. The term "areas of low income populations" should be those where 60% of the population has an income in the lowest quintile of the country as a whole. In reality, this is meaningless because so much of the population falls within this definition of low income. The location of these courts would easily meet these criteria, negating the need to undertake any income surveys to confirm this fact. There are no issues about the DQA criteria associated with this indicator.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Overall, the data for this indicator meets the five data quality standards. It is important to bear in mind that all the indicators being used by the ABA in USAID's Support for a Culture of Human Rights in Liberia project are simple outputs and reflect what is by any measure a clearly focused initiative with modest targets. This assessment reflects those realities. It is recommended that at least one outcome indicator be developed for this project in the event that the "perception survey" indicator at the goal level never materializes. In addition, while a PMP for the project, with baseline data as of September 2006 was submitted to USAID, greater use could be made of that PMP for the purpose of managing the project.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.2 : Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Justice System
Indicator: (PMP) **:** Number of justice sector personnel that received USG training
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Support for Human Rights Culture in Liberia
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/ 2009 Operational Plan Performance Reports? _X__ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This is a simple and easily collected number that ABA staff compiles from attendance rosters used at each training event presented by the project. The original sign-in sheets, which include participant names, addresses, gender, and occupation, are stored in loose leaf binders in the ABA office at the Louis Arthur Grimes School of Law in Monrovia, where the reviewer examined them. In addition, the following details about the workshops are also collected: date, location, nature of the presentation, and facilitator. The definition of "justice sector personnel" the ABA team is using refers to judges, magistrates, prosecutors, public defenders, and 'others' — namely clerks, bailiffs, marshals, probation officers, stenographers and typists. Training refers to all training or educational events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. Data from the sign-in sheet are then collated and entered into an EXCEL spreadsheet by the Chief of Party who maintains them in electronic format on his personal laptop. His personal review of the rosters and data entry serves as a form of quality control. The collated data is reported to USAID quarterly. A copy of the training materials is maintained in electronic format on the COP's laptop.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Overall, the data for this indicator meets the five data quality standards. It is important to bear in mind that all the indicators being used by the ABA in USAID's Support for a Culture of Human Rights in Liberia project are simple outputs and reflect what is by any measure a clearly focused initiative with modest targets. This assessment reflects those realities. It is recommended that at least one outcome indicator be developed for this project in the event that the "perception survey" indicator at the goal level never materializes. In addition, while a PMP for the project, with baseline data as of September 2006 was submitted to USAID, greater use could be made of that PMP for the purpose of managing the project.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.2 : Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Justice System
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of people visiting USG supported legal service centers serving low income and marginalized communities
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Support for Human Rights Culture in Liberia
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/2009 Operational Plan Performance Reports? _X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: There are currently two legal aid clinics being assisted by the Rule of Law Initiative. One is in Monrovia at the School of Law and the other is the Buchanan Legal Aid Center in Buchanan, Liberia. Legal services to clients are tallied by collecting data on each person who seeks assistance at either center. Intake staff ensures that client information is completed on the confidential form. It includes the name, address, mobile/e-mail contact, map to home, employer, occupation, salary, age (guardian's name, if a minor), nationality, and details of how the client heard about services. Hard copies of all client forms are maintained in filing cabinets at the centers, which was confirmed visually in Monrovia. Legal staff completes the case information, which is collated and includes the nature of the case, staff person to whom the case is assigned, type of service provided, number of hours spent on matter, outcome of case, client satisfaction and the date the case is closed. The Supervising Attorney/Buchanan Program Manager verifies that the files are complete and the case may be closed. Hardcopies of all case information is maintained in filing cabinets. This information is collated from client intake forms and monthly reports submitted by attorneys and lawyers. This information, which is tallied and verified by the Country Director and the Buchanan Program Manager, is then incorporated into an EXCEL spreadsheet. This document then becomes the source of aggregated data, which are reported to USAID on a quarterly basis.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Overall, the data for this indicator meets the five data quality standards. It is important to bear in mind that all the indicators being used by the ABA in USAID's Support for a Culture of Human Rights in Liberia project are simple outputs and reflect what is by any measure a clearly focused initiative with modest targets. This assessment reflects those realities. It is recommended that at least one outcome indicator be developed for this project in the event that the "perception survey" indicator at the goal level never materializes. In addition, while a PMP for the project, with baseline data as of September 2006 was submitted to USAID, greater use could be made of that PMP for the purpose of managing the project.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.2 : Increased access to justice and conflict prevention and mitigation
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Justice System
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of legal institutions and associations supported by USG
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Support for Human Rights Culture in Liberia
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008/ 2009 Operational Plan Performance Reports? _X__ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: A straightforward, easily collected F output indicator that includes both governmental and non-governmental institutions and associations that focus on administering and improving the legal system. Institutions currently being assisted, include the Louis Arthur Grimes School of Law at the University of Liberia in Monrovia, the L beria Bar Association, the Ministry of Justice, FIND and JPC. Assistance to these institutions is compiled in a dossier of assistance for each institution that includes sub-grants, procurement details for any material assistance, and full documentation of communications regarding these matters. Quarterly reports submitted to USAID by the ABA regularly refer to project assistance provided to these institutions and associations.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Overall, the data for this indicator meets the five data quality standards. It is important to bear in mind that all the indicators being used by the ABA in USAID's Support for a Culture of Human Rights in Liberia project are simple outputs and reflect what is by any measure a clearly focused initiative with modest targets. This assessment reflects those realities. It is recommended that at least one outcome indicator be developed for this project in the event that the "perception survey" indicator at the goal level never materializes. In addition, while a PMP for the project, with baseline data as of September 2006 was submitted to USAID, greater use could be made of that PMP for the purpose of managing the project.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result: Political processes strengthened (legislation, elections, political parties, legal reform)
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): GJD 3.3 – Political Parties
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of political parties with permanent offices in at least eight counties
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 8, 2008
Data Source(s): The International Republican Institute, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? ___X_ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This indicator consists of a simple, precise and easily verifiable number. The IRI staff works closely with each of the parties in implementing Party Action Plans, which are developed by each party at the end of IRI provided training. During the implementation of those plans, IRI personnel visit party offices and work collaboratively with party staff. They are able to verify that party offices are open and fund raising activities are conducted, two criteria that parties agree to during IRI workshops. Mentorship reports of field visits to county political party offices by IRI staff, which were reviewed, provide periodic confirmation that the offices are open in at least eight counties. An important cross-check is provided by the Summary of Comprehensive Review of Political Parties issued annually by the National Elections Commission.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result: Political processes strengthened (legislation, elections, political parties, legal reform)
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): GJD 3.3 – Political Parties
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of political parties and political groupings receiving USG assistance to articulate platform and policy agendas effectively
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 8, 2008
Data Source(s): The International Republican Institute, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Reports? ___X___ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This Indicator currently includes four political parties and four "groupings," the latter includes the Coalition of Political Party Women in Liberia (a cross-party group), the Women's Legislative Caucus, the National Youth Party/Federation of Liberian Youths, and the Inter-Party Consultative Committee. As implementing partner dispensing the USG assistance, the IRI obviously controls both the type and amount of assistance that produces this output result. Regarding the issue of whether or not these recipients are articulating "platform and policy agendas effectively," it is not clear what criteria IRI is using to make these determinations. They look to the views of IRI staff reports of their work with these organizations, gather press reports and look to IPCC, COPWIL and WLC as sources. This information is also cross-checked by the implementing partner with data reported in the National Elections Commission annual Summary of Comprehensive Review of Political Parties issued on October 30.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result: Political processes strengthened (legislation, elections, political parties, legal reform)
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): GJD 3.3 – Political Parties
Indicator: (PMP) **:** Number of organizations receiving USG support to promote development of and compliance with political finance regulations and legislation
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 8, 2008
Data Source(s): The International Republican Institute, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? ___X_ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: There are currently 17 political parties recognized by the National Elections Commission. Of these, IRI recognizes six so-called target "partner political parties" and works fully with them. Others receive partial, targeted assistance. IRI provides two day training programs, including practical work with all 17 recognized parties. Since they work so closely with their six partner parties, IRI is well-informed about the actions these groups are taking, their public funding and policy inputs for legislation. In addition to IRI's first-hand knowledge of the compliance of these parties with political finance regulations and legislation, their compliance is cross-checked against the NEC's Campaign Finance Status of Parties Report issued annually on October 30. This annual report of the NEC is based on periodic NEC staff visits to the political parties who, among other things, are on the lookout for "brief case parties." For parties to obtain NEC certification, Liberia's 1986 Electoral Reform Law requires them to maintain a bank account balance of at least $10,000 and to issue an annual report on its activities. Significantly, the NEC actively enforces the reform law, including seeking legal remedies when required. For example, of the 31 parties registered before the 2005 elections, seven were taken to court for decertification due to inactivity and another 10 are awaiting court decisions on NEC decertification requests.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result: Political processes strengthened (legislation, elections, political parties, legal reform)
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): GJD 3.3 – Political Parties
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of USG-assisted political parties implementing programs to increase the number of candidates and members who are women, youth and from marginalized groups
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 8, 2008
Data Source(s): The International Republican Institute, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? ___X_ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This standard F output indicator is simple in that the IRI chooses the political parties, works with them to develop programs to increase the number of candidates and members from these groups, and then helps these parties to finance and implement their respective programs. The numbers involved here are very small: the 2008 target is only three, although IRI is likely to report that they are actually working with six. In addition, in reaching their targets for this indicator, IRI believes that the political parties need only meet one of the criteria, candidates or members. More importantly, in practice they interpret the indicator to mean "women, youth *of* marginalized groups" rather than "women, youth, *and* marginalized group members." Since IRI works so closely with these parties, they get detailed information about their activities, especially about the implementation of their programs.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: There are no evident DQA problems with this indicator, except to note that NDI reports that it sets its targets by calendar year, which could pose a reporting problem for USAID when it reports results by the fiscal year. It is recommended that the CTO review this issue with all CEPPS partners to determine if this is a problem within the CEPPS consortium and between CEPPS and USAID. This should be done by November 2008 in preparation for the 2008 OPPR. Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result: Political processes strengthened (legislation, elections, political parties, legal reform)
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): GJD 3.3 – Political Parties
Indicator: (PMP) **:** Number of individuals who receive USG-assisted political party training
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 8, 2008
Data Source(s): The International Republican Institute, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? ___X_ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This straight-forward F standard output indicator is valid for measuring improved effectiveness of political parties if one assumes that training per se leads to improved performance. It is well-documented world-wide that USAID training of personnel has had a significant and lasting impact on development projects. All of the training events conducted by IRI as part of its contribution to CEPPS are short term workshops. At each event, IR produces an attendance sign-up sheet that requires participants to report their names, titles and organizations. These data are being appropriately disaggregated and reported by gender. They are then tallied and forwarded to IRI/Washington for incorporation into the regular CEPPS reporting to USAID. While transmission errors are possible in compiling and transmitting the data, any errors that might occur would be of little consequence.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: There are no evident DQA problems with this indicator, except to note that NDI reports that it sets its targets by calendar year, which could pose a reporting problem for USAID when it reports results by the fiscal year. It is recommended that the CTO review this issue with all CEPPS partners to determine if this is a problem within the CEPPS consortium and between CEPPS and USAID. This should be done by November 2008 in preparation for the 2008 OPPR. It is worth noting that significant numbers of people have been trained by IRI under this program: an estimated 1,533 in calendar 2008, 825 in 2007 and 837 in 2006. Thus, It would be beneficial if the outputs reported by this indicator were to be supplemented by a basic evaluation of the “skills and knowledge” acquired by participants during their training and, possibly, the degree to which the participants used their newly acquired skills and knowledge in their respective organizations. It is unclear if the final evaluation of the training component of the CEPPS planned for early FY 2009 includes this level of training evaluation. Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.4: Political processes strengthened
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Elections and Political Processes
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of elections officials utilizing new skills and knowledge
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) IFES, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X_ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This custom indicator is ill-defined or undefined and subject to a wide variety of data quality pitfalls. IFES reports that "elections officials" refers to magistrates, assistant magistrates, commissioners, and officers of the NEC. It refers to "new" skills and knowledge, but no baseline study of old skills and knowledge was conducted before IFES provided training and technical assistance. Thus, we cannot determine what their skill levels and knowledge were before IFES began assistance. No working definition is available as to what constitutes "utilization." That could mean both talking about an issue, solving a problem involving the issue, or both. Finally, while the IFES staff does work closely with NEC personnel, it does not have access to them all the time and its access to other election officials outside of the NEC is infrequent. It is recommended that this indicator not be used for the 2008 OPPR.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.4: Political processes strengthened
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Elections and Political Processes
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of NEC actions to promote voter education, political party liaison, and election law reforms
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) IFES, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? _X_ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This custom output indicator captures specific actions the NEC takes in the implementation of the National Elections Commission Strategic Plan (2006-2011), which was developed jointly by IFES and the NEC in April 2006. A major part (pp. 13-23) of this multi-year document consists of a detailed Action Plan for the NEC to implement in order to reach its strategic objectives. For each Program and Strategic Objective, the plan suggests specific outputs and their estimated costs. IFES and the NEC jointly prepare the IFES annual work plan that sets out specific actions that IFES will take to assist the NEC. Thus, the term "actions" used in this indicator refers to specific steps NEC takes to implement its update Work Plan. NEC works closely on a daily basis with NEC staff in executing the updated NEC action plan and, therefore, is constantly aware of the actions taken. Given that this indicator, in effect, measures the success of IFES in helping the NEC implement the Action Plan it is certainly valid and sufficiently precise. A more thorough assessment of the success of the project itself would appear warranted, but that is something clearly beyond the scope of this DQA.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: There are no evident DQA problems with this indicator, except to note that NDI reports that it sets its targets by calendar year, which could pose a reporting problem for USAID when it reports results by the fiscal year. It is recommended that the CTO review this issue with all CEPPS partners to determine if this is a problem within the CEPPS consortium and between CEPPS and USAID. This should be done by November 2008 in preparation for the 2008 OPPR. Since the CEPPS project is terminating, no additional action regarding data quality is recommended. However, it is recommended that the forthcoming CEPPS evaluation include an examination of the specific NEC actions to promote voter education, political party liaison, and election law reform. It would be beneficial to gain a better understanding of NEC effectiveness in these areas.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of public forums resulting from USG assistance in which national legislators and members of the public interact
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) National Democratic Institute and IFES, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Repot? __X__ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: Although IFES does not frequently sponsor such fora, their support to the Special Joint Stakeholders Collaborative Committee (SJSCC) is important. The Committee looks at the legality of political boundaries and their impact on national budgets for elections. This data is easily available to IFES for reporting purposes because the meetings are sponsored by IFES. In the case of IRI, public forums refer to town hall meetings and radio programming, but a variety of sources are tapped for data, including partner reports, NDI observation of partner activities, and interviews with partners. Townhall meetings and outreach activities exclude public hearings, but does include the outreach activities some legislators have begun to conduct through constituent offices. All of these, of course, are sponsored by the USG, which ensures that NDI staff is present. Data on radio programming refers to radio programs developed and presented by partners under NDI sponsorship This is an F standard output indicator that is easily tracked by NDI.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: There are no evident DQA problems with this indicator, except to note that NDI reports that it sets its targets by calendar year, which could pose a reporting problem for USAID when it reports results by the fiscal year. It is recommended that the CTO review this issue with all CEPPS partners to determine if this is a problem within the CEPPS consortium and between CEPPS and USAID. This should be done by November 2008 in preparation for the 2008 OPPR. Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of USG assisted civil society organizations that participate in legislative proceedings and/or engage in advocacy with national legislature and its committees
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) National Democratic Institute, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Repot? __X__ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: According to the F standard definition, to be counted CSOs need to actively participate in, or engage with, the legislature; for example, attend and contribute to committee meetings, send policy briefs, send comments on proposed legislation, provide research, etc. The CSOs being monitored for this indicator are those which NDI has chosen to assist and with whom they have entered into partnership. Consequently, NDI captures data for this indicator from partner reports, observation of partner activities, and interviews with partners concerning CSO/NDI designed and funded activities. It is also important to keep in mind that the number of these organizations targeted by NDI in calendar 2008 is only three.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: There are no evident DQA problems with this indicator, except to note that NDI reports that it sets its targets by calendar year, which could pose a reporting problem for USAID when it reports results by the fiscal year. It is recommended that the CTO review this issue with all CEPPS partners to determine if this is a problem within the CEPPS consortium and between CEPPS and USAID. This should be done by November 2008 in preparation for the 2008 OPPR. Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of national executive oversight actions taken by legislature receiving USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) National Democratic Institute, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Repot? __X__ yes ____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This only appears to be a somewhat complicated indicator due to its somewhat broad definition and the data sources being used. NDI defines oversight actions to include legislative committee investigations, public hearings, formal question and answer sessions, and written interrogations regarding an executive branch program, decision, or action. Data for this F standard output indicator, which is compiled monthly but reported quarterly, is culled from committee records and NDI observations. It is important to keep in mind that the number of these "executive oversight actions" is small in number — reflecting the fact that the legislature is just beginning to function like a normal legislature — so it is understandable that the NDI target for all of 2008 is only 30. Neither the committees nor their staffs have the capacity to hold hearings without outside support. In addition, two senior NDI program assistants attend committee hearings and record their observations on a form for this purpose. Upon examination, it is evident that the information being recorded is basic. Moreover, most of the "public hearings" that are held are sponsored by NDI, usually in response to a request for NDI sponsorship. Also, not all formal hearings are public. Data is disaggregated by type of hearing and reported quarterly to NDI headquarters in Washington, which is then reported in the consolidated CEPPS report to USAID.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: There are no evident DQA problems with this indicator, except to note that NDI reports that it sets its targets by calendar year, which could pose a reporting problem for USAID when it reports results by the fiscal year. It is recommended that the CTO review this issue with all CEPPS partners to determine if this is a problem within the CEPPS consortium and between CEPPS and USAID. This should be done by November 2008 in preparation for the 2008 OPPR. Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 9.1: Transparent and accountable management of public resources by selected public sector entities
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Public Sector Executive Function
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of national legislators and national legislative staff attending USG sponsored training or educational events
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International and D&G program assistant
Date Reviewed: August 7, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) National Democratic Institute and IFES, Consortium on Elections and Political Parties Strengthening (CEPPS)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Repot? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: In this indicator, NDI uses the terms "training and educational events" to refer to any workshops, seminars, conferences, and coaching sessions of any duration, in-country or abroad. At formal training events, both NDI and IFES use attendance sheets to record the name, title, organization, and gender of each participant. This record serves two purposes for NDI: to track the numbers of people trained, and for accounting purposes. The numbers collected are aggregated by caucus and committee. A sample of the hard copies of these attendance sheets — which both organizations maintain in project file cabinets — were reviewed during the assessment. In the case of NDI, this data is entered into an EXCEL spreadsheet, whereas IFES scans them and attaches them to their monthly reports to headquarters in Washington. The risk of data transmission errors in general seems minimal, in most cases. On a quarterly basis, NDI submits data to its headquarters in Washington where it is combined with information from other partners and reported to USAID in a consolidated CEPPS report. Data being collected by both partners is appropriately disaggregated by gender. There are no issues related to timeliness, validity or precision. There is some risk, however, in that the data collected by NDI regarding the inclusion of persons who are coached is not sufficiently systematized.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: There are no evident DQA problems with this indicator, except to note that NDI reports that it sets its targets by calendar year, which could pose a reporting problem for USAID when it reports results by the fiscal year. It is recommended that the CTO review this issue with all CEPPS partners to determine if this is a problem within the CEPPS consortium and between CEPPS and USAID. This should be done by November 2008 in preparation for the 2008 OPPR. Since the CEPPS project is terminating no additional action regarding data quality is recommended.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

IV. Economic Growth

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.1: Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Natural Resources and Biodiversity
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of policies, laws, agreements or regulations promoting sustainable natural resource management
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 14, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) – Conservation International (CI)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: The CCC is an activity that provides economic alternatives to six communities (in Grand Gedeh and Sinoe counties) surrounding Sapo National Park that currently support illegal mining of gold inside the Park. Conservation International uses this basic F standard output indicator to refer to the number of written Community Incentive Agreements concluded between CI, Action Aid (development partner of CI), the community, and the Forestry Development Authority. An example of one of these agreements was reviewed during the assessment. The agreements, which vary in duration, govern the conservation activities and development projects implemented that promote sustainable natural resource management. Data on the implementation of these agreements is collected from sub-grantee reports, trip reports and Community Development Committee records. No issues surfaced during the assessment regarding the DQA criteria. This is a simple compilation of the number of agreements.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because CCC is terminating in 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.1: Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Natural Resources and Biodiversity
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of hectares under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 14, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), Conservation International (CI)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: In reporting against this indicator, Conservation International uses the official size of the Sapo National Park, which is 180,000 hectares. Although there are no issues pertaining to integrity, precision, timeliness, or reliability, a serious question is raised about its validity. At best this must be viewed as a very indirect indicator because the CCC interventions are implemented with the communities *outside* of the Park and to date there is little apparent evidence that these activities with the communities have yet to reduce the number of intruders or the amount of mining activities within the Park. Indeed, CI reported that they really don't monitor or measure how access to the Park is diminished.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: The Mission should reconsider the use of this indicator for inclusion in its Operational Planning Performance Report for 2008. No further action is warranted because CCC is terminating in 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.1: Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Natural Resources and Biodiversity
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of people receiving USG supported training in natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 14, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC), Conservation International (CI)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: In 2008 and 2009, Conservation International plans to train 300 persons each year. A review of documents in the training files confirmed that the number of trainees is disaggregated by gender. Information is collected for each training event offered by CI or Action Aid by employing daily sign-up sheets. Data on training and other outputs is collated and reported to CI offices in Washington for incorporation into the annual reports issued at the end of the fiscal year under the Cooperative Agreement between CI and USAID. No issues regarding data quality were discovered.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because CCC is terminating in 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.1: Adoption of sustainable Natural Resource Management policies and practices increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Natural Resources and Biodiversity
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of people with increased benefits derived from sustainable natural resources management and conservation as a result of USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 14, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This indicator refers to the total population of the six communities with which CI and Action Aid are collaborating. The target for 2008 is 3,200 and 6,000 in 2009. Baseline population data is collected during a Community Profile (CP) analysis. The assessment included an examination of the original hand-written standard form that was employed for Keh's Town in Grand Gedeh county as part of its CP in December 2007. This and other data related to the project are maintained in an overall CI Liberia data base. There appear to be adequate controls over the access to this automated system. No data quality issues were revealed during the review.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because CCC is terminating in 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Modern Energy Service
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of people with increased access to modern energy services as a result of USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Energy Assistance Program (LEAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This is a standard F outcome indicator that seeks to ascertain the increment of population with new or improved service connections or receiving modern fuels or improved cooking/lighting devices. It is considered the fundamental outcome of the EPP and LEAP activities and indicates how extensive the system expansion has been. It is important to note that the USAID contr bution in the electricity sector is not for generation but for transmission and distribution. It is defined broadly to include not just residential customers but public lighting and business lighting. The baseline used was the 2005 UN Military population census that concluded that Monrovia had a population of 850,000. The census also disaggregated the population by city neighborhoods. Thus, one can correlate the number of citizens gaining increased access by simply observing the availability of electricity in particular neighborhoods. This is a cross-check of contractor completion reports and the billing records of LEC. The reviewer discerned no significant data quality issues, except to note the obvious imprecision resulting from the fact that the calculation doesn't take into account people who have left or entered the city since the 2005 census. It is near certain that EPP/LEAP are significantly undercounting beneficiaries because it is widely believed that the population of Monrovia today exceeds 1 million people. The LEAP calculation of beneficiaries using this method will be cross-checked when the results are out for the 2008-2009 population census.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because LEAP is terminating in early 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Modern Energy Service
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Total public sector and private dollars leveraged by USG for energy infrastructure projects
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Energy Assistance Program (LEAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This standard F outcome indicator captures the amount of dollars that are mobilized from the public (including MDBs and other donors) and private sectors as a result of USG assistance programs, including equity investments, lending (DCAs), and partnerships (GDAs). It indicates the funding leveraged as a result of USG assistance that collectively was invested in the sector to improve operations and access. Data for this indicator is readily available because the activity is counting what other donors (IBRD, Norway, etc.) agreed to contribute in the December 2006 memorandum of understanding with the GOL. Donors pledged to contribute a total of $25 million, including $2.9 million from the U.S. Since USAID is providing the technical inputs on the transmission and distr bution aspects, the USAID partner is well-placed to know and verify what other donors are contr buting in the way of energy generation. Norway is providing $8 million under the MOU. This is a simple indicator for which no data quality issues were raised.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because LEAP is terminating in early 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Modern Energy Service
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of newly illuminated street lights
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Energy Assistance Program (LEAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This is a relatively simple custom outcome indicator that captures both the generation of electricity but also its transmission to neighborhoods. The data for streetlights installed are collected from completed construction contract sign-off sheets. They are not counted as "illuminated" until the generator is technically dedicated. There is no place for personal bias to impact the data. This data is collected following a simple method of transcribing numbers from contract completion reports. Data from contractual records are checked against streetlight circuit numbers, for which the GOL is billed. No data quality problems were determined. Integrity is assured by the fact that construction contract completion records are signed by the contractor, LEC, and a third party. It is a method that so far has shown no problems in the data from year to year. Indeed, the method employed to detect duplicate data is to compare the streetlight circuits that are billed to the GOL. Since no problems have been observed the reviewer agrees with IRG that an independent review of the results would not be necessary.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because LEAP is terminating in early 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Modern Energy Service
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Percent reduction in utility commercial losses
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Energy Assistance Program (LEAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity:
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because LEAP is terminating in early 2009.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Equitable or sustainable access to infrastructure for community or national development increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Transport Services
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of kms of transportation infrastructure constructed or repaired through USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Community Infrastructure Program (LCIP II),
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: Transport infrastructure is defined as roads and bridges (including national roads and feeder roads). Road rehabilitation includes drainage repair, bridge reconstruction, emergency repairs, resurfacing and/or pot hole filling. Data consists of the total length of roads repaired/rehabilitated (including lengths) as part of small scale community infrastructure and road rehabilitation by private contractors. Data is collected from implementing partner milestone and monthly reports and from private sector contractor reports against their construction schedules. The LCIP program development staff and engineers review the IP reports and enter data into the grants and subcontracts section of TAMIS. As is the case with some other LCIP indicators, there could be a bias in reporting higher percentages of completion rates by IPs and by the A & E teams in order to justify agreement targets and additional milestone funds; however, field visits, spot checks, and interviews with the IPs and beneficiaries are extensive and frequent enough to confirm the accuracy of the reported data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because LCIP will be redesigned in 2009 in accordance with a project evaluation conducted in 2008.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Agricultural Sector Productivity
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity training
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Integrated Assistance Program (LIAP), CARE; Liberia Community Infrastructure Program
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This standard F output indicator measures the number of people to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through formal or informal means. In-country and off-shore training are included. Knowledge or skills gained through technical assistance activities are included. If the activity provided training to trainers, and if the reporting unit can make a credible estimate of follow-on training provided by those trainers, this estimate should be included. Individuals attending more than one training are counted as many times as they attend training.
Additional Comments and Recommendations:
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Agricultural Sector Productivity
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG intervention
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Integrated Assistance Program (LIAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity:
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because LCIP will be redesigned in 2009 in accordance with a project evaluation conducted in 2008.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Agricultural Sector Productivity
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Integrated Assistance Program (LIAP), Civilian Conservation Corps, Food for Peace, Liberia Community Infrastructure Program (LCIP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This indicator poses particular difficulty for the Mission in that there are four separate projects that can/should contribute data. Unfortunately, each activity employs a different definition of vulnerable households and counts "benefiting directly from USG assistance" in very different ways. This already confusing situation is likely to be compounded in the years ahead as a new agricultural production project is added to the EG portfolio. Therefore, it is highly recommended that EG team CTOs and activity managers work with the partners providing employment data for the 2008 OPPR to reach agreement on a common indicator definition so that accurate data can be collected and collated into a single meaningful result.
Additional Comments and Recommendations:
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Market-based opportunities in the rural economy increased
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Agricultural Sector Productivity
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Integrated Assistance Program (LIAP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This standard F outcome indicator tracks successful adoption of technologies and management practices to improve agricultural productivity. Improved technologies and/or management practices include management practices, tenure arrangements, and administrative systems such as water user associations, etc. These data are collected by community organizers and extension agents. They probably have a fairly high degree of accuracy, although some individuals may have incentives to overstate the number of hectares.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: For purposes of program management, some type of follow-up would be appropriate for determining whether the newly adopted technologies and practices are sustained.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Mission Director or delegate approval: X** **Date** **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Workforce Development
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of persons completing USG-funded workforce development programs
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Community Infrastructure Program (LCIP)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This standard F output indicator refers to farmers, laborers, interns, apprentices, master craftsmen and women who have finished or who are at the end of the program, including all of the people who participated, whether they "passed" the test or got the certificate. Workforce development includes any activity that provides employment, training (formal and informal), or on-the-job opportunities for participants. It does not include casual labor on construction sites. Data, which is appropriately disaggregated by program type, gender, and age, is collected as each implementing partner provides milestone or monthly reports. Examples of those reports, which are stored in binders at the LCIP offices, were examined by the reviewer. The LCIP staff is aware of the risks for implementing partner bias in reporting higher numbers to justify grant agreement targets and additional milestone funds, for the possibility that participants may begin to participate in the activity after the official start date, and that some IPs do not take reporting to LCIP II seriously. These risks are being mitigated by a robust M&E, program and engineering staff that undertakes regular field visits, spot checks data and interviews both the IPs and beneficiaries to verify the accuracy of reported data.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because LCIP will be redesigned in 2009 in accordance with a project evaluation conducted in 2008.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
SO/IR Result 10.2: Growth of competitive private enterprises accelerated
Program Element/Sub-element: (OP): Workforce Development
Indicator: (PMP)**:** Number of people gaining employment or more remunerative employment as a result of USG-funded workforce development programs
Reviewer(s): James H. Purcell, Chemonics International
Date Reviewed: August 4, 2008
Data Source(s): (Activity Title) Liberia Community Infrastructure Program (LCIP II)
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Operational Plan Performance Report? __X__ yes _____ no
Assessment Against DQA Criteria: Validity, Reliability, Timeliness, Precision, Integrity: This standard F outcome indicator defines gaining employment to mean that before the activity the person was jobless or had a lower salary or position in the same or similar organization. More remunerative employment means that after the activity the person has a better paying job or the possibility of advancing to a better paying job. Better employment is based on the participant's perception of whether the employment is better, even if it is better because it is closer to home, has better pay, a better schedule, etc. Increased employment and the improvement of employment quality (e.g., income, stability, working conditions) are the primary goals of the Workforce Development Program Element. This indicator is critical for identifying the contribution of improved workforce development to employment and economic growth. Data is collected by Implementing Partners through a capacity building workshop within 90 days after the training ends. The M&E team of LCIP numerators adjusts the sample population to make sure that the participants are not double counted. The key question being asked is "As a result of the LCIP activity, did you get a better job or a job?" Data is stored in the partner's TAMIS database and in the implementing partner milestone and monthly reports in Monrovia. There are also data quality questions regarding this indicator, which appears to significantly under-report improved employment status, due to the way the surveys are conducted. The CTO and LCIP staff should attempt to improve this process if they intend to continue to use it in the OPPR.
Additional Comments and Recommendations: No further action is warranted because LCIP will be redesigned in 2009 in accordance with a project evaluation conducted in 2008.
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X**_____**Date**_____ **Comments:**

ANNEX A: MONITORING & EVALUATION SCHEDULE

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TASKS	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010				FY2011				Notes
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
S08: EDUCATION																	
FINALIZE INDICATORS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION					X												
COLLECT BASELINE DATA																	
Collect baseline data for S0 Indicator 5 and 6					X												
Collect baseline data for IR 1.1 and IR 1.3 indicators					X												
COLLECT TARGET DATA																	
Collect target data for all indicators (Standard and custom)					X												
COLLECT SO-LEVEL PERFORMANCE DATA																	
Conduct Surveys for all SO indicators (baseline and follow-on surveys)						X			X				X				
COLLECT IR-LEVEL PERFORMANCE DATA																	
Conduct surveys for IR1.1, IR1.2, IR1.3, IR 2.1, IR 2.2, and IR 3.1 (baseline and follow-on surveys)						X							X				
COLLECT ACTIVITY-LEVEL DATA																	
Collect data on all F standard indicators and Mission output custom indicators					X				X				X				
CONDUCT EVALUATIONS & SPECIAL STUDIES																	
Mid-Term Evaluation of the ALPP Program				X	X												
Mid-Term Evaluation of LTTP						X											

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TASKS	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010				FY2011				Notes
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Evaluation of the Alfalit Adult and Youth Literacy Program								X									
Outcome and Impact Evaluation of the Africa Education Initiative (funded by USAID/ Washington)					X	X	X										
REVIEW PERFORMANCE INFORMATION																	
Conduct portfolio reviews					X		X		X		X		X		X		
REPORT PERFORMANCE RESULTS																	
Report on all F standard indicators and Mission custom output indicators					X				X				X				
Report on all Mission custom outcome (IR) indicators									X				X				
Report on Mission Custom SO (outcome and impact) indicators													X				
ASSESS DATA QUALITY																	
Assess data quality for all F standard and Mission custom output indicators								X				X				X	
Assess data quality for all Mission custom outcome (IR) indicators								X				X				X	
Assess data quality for all Mission custom SO indicators												X				X	
REVIEW & UPDATE THE PMP																	
Update PMP annually					X				X				X				
DESIGNATE PMP INDICATORS FOR OPERATIONAL PLAN					X				X				X				

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TASKS	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010				FY2011				Notes
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
S08: HEALTH																	
COLLECT BASELINE DATA																	
Collect baseline data for S0 Indicator 4					X												
Collect baseline data for IR 2.1 indicator					X												
COLLECT TARGET DATA																	
Collect target data for all indicators (Standard and custom)					X												
COLLECT SO-LEVEL PERFORMANCE DATA																	
Conduct DHS Survey for all SO indicators 1, 2, 6, 7, 8 (DHS)												X					
Conduct MIS surveys for SO indicators 3, 4, 5								X									
COLLECT IR-LEVEL PERFORMANCE DATA																	
Conduct special survey for IR2.1						X							X				
Conduct DHS survey for IR 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, and 3.4						X							X				
COLLECT ACTIVITY-LEVEL DATA																	
Collect data on all F standard indicators and Mission output custom indicators					X				X				X				
CONDUCT EVALUATIONS & SPECIAL STUDIES																	
REVIEW PERFORMANCE INFORMATION																	
Conduct portfolio reviews					X		X		X		X		X		X		
REPORT PERFORMANCE RESULTS																	
Report on all F standard indicators and Mission custom output indicators				X				X				X					

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TASKS	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010				FY2011				Notes
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Report on all Mission custom outcome (IR) indicators								X				X					
Report on Mission Custom SO (outcome and impact) indicators												X					
ASSESS DATA QUALITY																	
Assess data quality for all F standard and Mission custom output indicators							X				X				X		
Assess data quality for all Mission custom outcome (IR) indicators							X				X				X		
Assess data quality for all Mission custom SO indicators											X				X		
REVIEW & UPDATE THE PMP																	
Update PMP annually					X				X				X				
DESIGNATE PMP INDICATORS FOR OPERATIONAL PLAN					X				X				X				
S0 9: DEMOCRACY AND GOVERNANCE																	
COLLECT BASELINE DATA					X												
Design and conduct S09 Indicator public perception survey						X											
Conduct public perception survey					X				X				X				
COLLECT TARGET DATA																	
All indicators (standard and custom)					X												
COLLECT SO-LEVEL PERFORMANCE DATA																	
Conduct annual public perception survey									X				X				
COLLECT IR-LEVEL PERFORMANCE DATA					X				X				X				

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TASKS	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010				FY2011				Notes
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
COLLECT ACTIVITY-LEVEL DATA																	
Collect data on all F standard indicators and Mission output custom indicators					X				X				X				
CONDUCT EVALUATIONS & SPECIAL STUDIES																	
To be determined																	
REVIEW PERFORMANCE INFORMATION																	
Conduct portfolio reviews					X		X		X		X		X		X		
REPORT PERFORMANCE RESULTS																	
Report on all F standard indicators and Mission custom output indicators					X				X				X				
Report on all Mission custom outcome (IR) indicators					X				X				X				
Report on Mission Custom SO (outcome and impact) indicators					X				X				X				
ASSESS DATA QUALITY																	
Assess data quality for all F standard and Mission custom output indicators								X				X				X	
Assess data quality for all Mission custom outcome (IR) indicators								X								X	
Assess data quality for all Mission custom SO indicators												X				X	
REVIEW & UPDATE THE PMP																	
Update PMP annually following portfolio review					X				X				X				
DESIGNATE PMP INDICATORS FOR OPERATIONAL PLAN					X				X				X				

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TASKS	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010				FY2011				Notes
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
S0 10: ECONOMIC GROWTH																	
INDICATORS FOR NEW EG PROJECTS																	
Finalize indicators for agriculture and private enterprise projects					X												
Establish indicators for infrastructure project						X											
COLLECT BASELINE DATA					X												
SO level income survey						X				X				X			
SO level indicator macro data					X				X				X				
COLLECT TARGET DATA																	
All indicators (standard and custom)					X	X											
COLLECT SO-LEVEL PERFORMANCE DATA																	
Conduct annual income survey									X				X				
SO level indicator macro data						X				X				X			
COLLECT IR-LEVEL PERFORMANCE DATA					X				X				X				
COLLECT ACTIVITY-LEVEL DATA																	
Collect data on all F standard indicators and Mission output custom indicators					X				X				X				
CONDUCT EVALUATIONS & SPECIAL STUDIES																	
To be determined																	
REVIEW PERFORMANCE INFORMATION																	
Conduct portfolio reviews					X		X		X		X		X		X		
REPORT PERFORMANCE RESULTS																	
Report on all F standard indicators and Mission custom output indicators					X				X				X				

PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT TASKS	FY 2008				FY 2009				FY 2010				FY2011				Notes
	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q1	Q2	Q3	Q4	
Report on all Mission custom outcome (IR) indicators					X				X				X				
Report on Mission Custom SO (outcome and impact) indicators					X				X				X				
ASSESS DATA QUALITY																	
Assess data quality for all F standard and Mission custom output indicators								X				X				X	
Assess data quality for all Mission custom outcome (IR) indicators								X								X	
Assess data quality for all Mission custom SO indicators												X				X	
REVIEW & UPDATE THE PMP					X				X				X				
DESIGNATE PMP INDICATORS FOR OPERATIONAL PLAN					X				X				X				

ANNEX B: PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN — DEFINITION, PURPOSE, AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES

1. What is a PMP?

A Performance Management Plan (PMP) is a performance management tool used by an Operating Unit and Technical Teams to help plan and manage the process of assessing and reporting progress towards achieving a Strategic Objective. It is a critical tool for *planning, managing, and documenting* how performance data is collected and used. A PMP serves to:

- Define specific performance indicators for each SO and IR, determine baselines, and set targets;
- Plan and manage the Annual Report data collection process to meet quality standards;
- Incorporate relevant data collection requirements into activities and obligation agreements;
- Plan potential related evaluative work to supplement Annual Report indicator data;
- Estimate costs related to data collection and plan how these will be financed;
- Communicate expectations to partner institutions responsible for producing the outputs intended to cause measurable changes in performance.

A PMP contributes to the effectiveness of the performance monitoring system by assuring that comparable data will be collected on a regular and timely basis. Using the PMP to sufficiently document indicator definitions, sources, and methods of data collection increases the likelihood that you will collect comparable data over time - even when key personnel change. PMPs also support reliable data collection by documenting the frequency and schedule of data collection and assigning responsibilities.

2. Guiding Principles for Effective PMPs

- **The PMP is the foundation for a sound performance management system.** A good PMP is a useful tool for management and organizational learning - it provides intelligence for decision-makers, and thus serves as a constant desk reference to guide the assessment of results. A good PMP is updated annually to ensure maximum use for decision-making. The PMP is NOT something developed only to satisfy Washington and then left to collect dust.

- **An effective monitoring system yields performance information that helps "tell your story" better.** Your ability to communicate the achievement of development results and share lessons learned is dependent on your ability to collect useful performance information.

- **Performance indicators are the basis of the PMP.** Effective performance monitoring starts with indicators that are direct, objective, practical, and adequate (see details in box 1 below). Indicators are useful for timely management decisions and credibly reflect the actual performance of USAID-sponsored activities.

- **Performance monitoring is based on access to and use of data that is of reasonable quality given the reality of the situation**. Your team's management decisions should be based on data that is reasonably valid, reliable, and timely (see details on data quality in box 2 below). Good performance monitoring systems include regular data quality assessments.

- **A good PMP helps the Technical Team focus on what's important.** The PMP provides the conceptual framework around which the Technical Team prioritizes and carries out its work. A PMP helps clearly assign accountability for results. It also outlines the mechanisms through which these results are shared both internally with employees and externally with partners and other stakeholders.

- **Effective leadership makes for a smoother process.** Every Technical Team member is responsible for the success of the SO. However, teams who work in Operating Units where the leaders of the unit (e.g., mission directors, Technical Team leaders, program officers) agree on the importance of a sound performance management system, and demonstrate its value by using it, will generally be more enthusiastic about participating in the process and using the information that results from it. Effective leadership also means creating a learning environment for results reporting that is seen by the staff as positive, not punitive.

- **Involving Customers, Partners and Stakeholders is key to a successful PMP:** Your customers, stakeholders, and partners will play an important role in performance management.
  - Include them in PMP design, data collecting, interpretation, and sharing information and experience;
  - Communicate Results Framework indicators to implementing partners and explain how their performance data feeds into the goals and objectives of the Operating Unit;
  - Encourage implementing partners to use common definitions and descriptors of performance indicators;
  - Consider the special information needs of partners. Wherever feasible, integrate your performance monitoring and evaluation activities with similar processes of your partners;
  - Help partners develop their own performance monitoring and evaluation capacity;
  - Consider the financial and technical assistance resources needed to ensure stakeholder participation in performance monitoring and evaluation.

Box 1: Characteristics of Good Performance Indicators (ADS203.3.4.2)

Good performance indicators generally exhibit the following characteristics:

- **Direct:** An indicator should closely track the result it is intended to measure. When direct indicators cannot be used because of costs or other factors, a reasonable proxy indicator may be used.
- **Objective:** Objective indicators are operationally precise and uni-dimensional. They should be unambiguous about what is being measured and what data are being collected.
- **Useful for Management:** Indicators should be useful for management purposes at relevant levels of decision making.
- **Practical:** An indicator is practical if data can be obtained in a timely way and at reasonable cost.
- **Attributable to USAID:** Performance indicators should measure change that is clearly and reasonably attributable, at least in part, to the efforts of USAID. That is, indicators should credibly reflect the actual *performance* of the Strategic Plan.
- **Timely:** Performance data should be available when they are needed to make decisions.
- **Adequate:** Taken as a group, a performance indicator and its companion indicators should be the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the given results is sufficiently captured.

Box 2: ADS Requirements for Data Quality (ADS 203.3.5.1)

Performance data should be as complete, accurate, and consistent as management needs and resources permit. To be useful in managing for results and credible for reporting, performance data should meet reasonable standards of validity, integrity, precision, reliability, timeliness.

- **Validity.** Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result. While proxy data may be used, the Operating Unit should consider how well the data measure the intended result. Another key issue is whether data reflect a bias such as interviewer bias, unrepresentative sampling, or transcription bias.
- **Integrity.** Data that are collected, analyzed, and reported should have established mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that they are intentionally manipulated for political or personal reasons. Data integrity is at greatest risk of being compromised during collection and analysis.
- **Precision.** Data should be sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels. One key issue is whether data are at an appropriate level of detail to influence related management decisions. A second key issue is what margin of error (the amount of variation normally expected from a given data collection process) is acceptable given the management decisions likely to be affected. In all cases, the margin of error should be less than the intended change; if the margin of error is 10 percent and the data show a change of five percent, the Operating Unit will have difficulty determining whether the change was due to the USAID activity or due to variation in the data collection process. Operating Units should be aware that improving the precision of data usually increases the cost of collection and analysis.
- **Reliability.** Data should reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods from over time. The key issue is whether analysts and managers would come to the same conclusions if the data collection and analysis process were repeated. Operating Units should be confident that progress toward performance targets reflects real changes rather than variations in data collection methods. When data collection and analysis methods change, the PMP should be updated.
- **Timeliness.** Data should be timely enough to influence management decision-making at the appropriate levels. One key issue is whether the data are available frequently enough to influence the appropriate level of management decisions. A second key issue is whether data are current enough when they are available.

ANNEX C: DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT FORMS

Below are data quality assessment forms used to assess the data generated by USAID/Liberia programs. The first data quality assessment form is the standard USAID data quality assessment checklist. This form was used as an interview guide to gather information on implementing partners' indicator data quality. The second form is a summary form we adapted from the first form and used to summarize the key findings and recommendations arising from data quality assessments on specific indicators. This summary form should be kept on file by USAID Program Office and Technical Teams for future reference.

A. USAID Data Quality Assessment Checklist

Refer to this checklist when the Technical Team conducts both initial and periodic data quality assessments. The full list does not have to be completed—the Technical Team may wish to identify the most critical data quality issues for formal or informal assessment.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet
Name of Strategic Objective:
Name of Intermediate Result (if applicable):
Name of Performance indicator:
Data source(s):
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
Year or period for which the data are being reported:
Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? _____YES _____NO
Date(s) of assessment:
Location(s) of assessment:
Assessment team members:
For Office Use Only Technical Team leader approval: X Date Mission director or delegate approval: X_____Date_____ Copies to: Comments

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
Face Validity	**Yes**	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			
➢ Were samples representative?	❑	❑	
➢ Were the questions in the survey/ questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	❑	❑	
➢ If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	❑	❑	
➢ Were response rates sufficiently large?	❑	❑	
➢ Has non-response rate been followed up?	❑	❑	
Non Sampling Error			
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	❑	❑	
➢ Were there incentives for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	❑	❑	
➢ Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	❑	❑	
➢ Are enumerators well trained? How were they trained? Were they insiders or outsiders? Was there any quality control in the selection process?	❑	❑	
➢ Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)	❑	❑	
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:	❑	❑	
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?	❑	❑	
➢ Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	❑	❑	
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			
➢ Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	❑	❑	
➢ Did all units of the population have an equal	❑	❑	

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
chance of being selected for the sample?			
➢ Is the sampling frame (i.e., the list of units in the target population) up to date? Comprehensive? Mutually exclusive (for geographic frames)	❑	❑	
➢ Is the sample of adequate size?	❑	❑	
➢ Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Consistency			
➢ Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	❑	❑	
➢ Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location? If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?	❑	❑	
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	❑	❑	
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	❑	❑	
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	❑	❑	
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	❑	❑	
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	❑	❑	
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

4. PRECISION—Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	❑	❑	
➢ Is the margin of error is acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)	❑	❑	
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

5. INTEGRITY—Are data are free of manipulation?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	❑	❑	
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	❑	❑	
➢ Has there been independent review?	❑	❑	
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the cred bility of the data?	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

For indicators for which no recent relevant data are available
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?
What concrete actions are now being undertaken to collect and report this data as soon as possible?
On what date will data be reported?

B. Summary data quality assessment report template

***Directions**: Use the following worksheet to complete an assessment of the indicator against the five data quality criteria outlined in the ADS. Be sure to understand the "chain of data collection" from its source to the point at which it is submitted to USAID and note this process in this worksheet (under "General Notes and Comments") . For a more detailed discussion of each criterion as well as examples, refer to the attached sheet entitled "Data Quality Criteria." (See Box # 2 in Annex B). Once the review is complete, ensure that any documentation related to data quality is maintained in the CTO and/or Mission M&E system files for future reference.*

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet	
SO/IR Result:	
IR:	
Indicator:	
Reviewer(s):	
Date Reviewed:	
Data Source(s):	
Is or will the Indicator be reported in the 2008 Annual/Performance Reports? yes no	**Is the indicator an Operational Plan Indicator? yes no**
Program Element/Sub-element:	
Criterion	**Definitions and prompts *(complements ADS and other, including attached, guidance*)**
1. Validity	Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are: • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Data Bias: Are there any measurement errors that could bias the data? Both sampling and non-sampling errors are areas where bias should be examined (see attached discussion for further explanation).
2. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time, location, and data source? *Note: This criterion requires the reviewer to ensure that the indicator definition is operationally precise (i.e. it clearly defines the exact data to be collected) and to verify that the data are, in fact, collected according to that standard definition consistently over time.*
3. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?

4. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels? For survey based data, has the margin of error been reported along with the data and have targets been set for and acceptable margin of error.
5. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription? *Note: This criterion requires the reviewer to verify 1) what mechanisms are in place to reduce the possibility of manipulation or transcription error and 2) those mechanisms are actually used/implemented.*
6. General Comments and Recommendations:	
For Office Use Only **Technical Team Leader approval: X** **Date** **Mission Director or delegate approval: X_____Date_____** **Comments:**	

ANNEX D: LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

US Government

USAID Mission

Brian Aaron, Contracting Officer
Sharon Pauling, Program Officer
S. Modupe Broderick, Project Development Officer
Phakatip (Quan) Chungbhivat, Assistant Program Officer
McDonald Homer, Team Leader, Economic Growth Office
Joe-Hoover Gbadyu, Economic Growth Office
William Massaquoi, Agricultural Officer
Marwu Zaza, EG Program Assistant
John Stamm, Team Leader Democracy & Governance
Louise J. Fahnbullah, D&G Program Assistant
Beverly A. Busa, Mission Controller
Margaret Sancho-Morris, Education Officer/Team Leader
Jacob A. L. Tarlowoh, Education Program Management Specialist/Youth Advisor
George I Brown, Basic Education Advisor
Francis K. Gray, Training Specialist
Miriam D. White, Education Program Management Assistant
Chris McDermott, Health Development Officer/Team Leader
James Tanu Duworko, Health Management Specialist
Kassahum A. Belay, Malaria Advisor
Kaa Williams, Malaria Assistant
Augustine Mulbah, Program Assistant

USAID/Washington

Brinton E. Bohling, Senior Advisor, Trade & Investment Programs
Bahiru Duguma, Agricultural Development Officer
Nils M. Mueller, Program Officer, Office of Democracy and Governance

U.S. Embassy Monrovia

Kristen Grauer, Political Officer

USAID-funded Activities and Partners

Support for a Human Rights Culture in Liberia

Anthony Valcke, ABA Chief of Party
Margaret S. Snoeren, ABA Manager, Legal Aid Clinic

Liberia Energy Assistance Program
Emergency Power Program for Liberia (EPP)

Frederick “Rick”Whitaker, IRG Chief of Party
Keith A. Marsland, IRG Deputy Chief of Party

PAE-HSC, Justice Sector Support Program Liberia

Michael W. McDonald, In-Country Program Manager
Marti Troy, Public Defense Advisor

Technical Assistance to the Ministry of Forestry (TAMOA)
Quan Dinh, ARD Chief of Party

Ministry of Agriculture
Reginald Farnoh, Director

Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC)
Jessica Donovan, CI Director of Programs, Liberia Program
Princetta Varmah, M&E Officer

International Institute of Tropical Agriculture (IITA)
MacArthur M. Pay-Bayee, Program Manager, Sustainable Tree Crop Program

Land Rights and Community Forestry Program (LRCFP)
Ian Deshmukh, ARD Chief of Party
Abubacar Conneh, ARD Training/M&E Coordinator

Liberia Community Infrastructure Program (LCIP)
Heather Robertson, DAI Acting Chief of Party
Isaac G. F. Gorvego, DAI Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist

Liberia Electoral Process Strengthening and Good Governance
Almami I. Cyllah, IFES Country Director
Barrie T. Zinnah, IFES Deputy Director, Finance and Administration
Senesee G. Freeman, IFES Senior Program Officer

Liberia Elections and Political Party Strengthening
Yomi Jacobs, IRI Resident Program Officer
Mahamed Boakai, IRI Program Officer

Liberia Strengthening Legislative Capacity and Legislative Constituent Relations
Alexander Chavarria, NDI Resident Director
Thomas Du, NDI Senior Program Officer

Liberia Integrated Assistance Program (LIAP)
Olun Kanitatu, CRS Head of Programs
Mwikali Kioko, CRS Monitoring and Evaluation Coordinator
Chris Seubert, Africare Country Representative

Governance and Economic Management Assistance Program (GEMAP)
Paul Jourdan, IBI Chief of Party
Onur Erdem, IBI Deputy Chief of Party
Andrew Gilboy, Associates for Global Change
Tom Downing, SUGURA Consulting Chief of Party

Liberia Accelerated Learning Plus, Creative Associates, Inc.
Peggy Polling, Chief of Party
Trokon Wayne, M&E Officer

Liberia Teacher Training Program, Academy for Educational Development

Chris Ashford, Chief of Party
Tereza Mancini, Senior Finance and Operations Manager
John Newman, M&E Officer

Adult and Youth Literacy Program, Alfalit International- Liberia

Reverend Emmanuel J. Giddings, Chief of Party
Jerome C. Williams

Ambassador's Girls Scholarship Program (AGSP)

Deroe A. Weeks, AGSP Program Director, Children Assistance Program (CAP)
Chester Kwennah, AGSP Program Director, Development Education Network-Liberia, (DEN-L)
Varbah M. Tennie, AGSP Field Officer, (DEN-L)

Million Book March for Literacy in Liberia, Vision in Action

Steve Miller, Executive Director
Natalie Barnard, Deputy Director

Improved Community Health, Africare

Abdelhadi Eltahir, Chief Of Party
Jushua K. Ofori, BCC Advisor

Malaria Control Program, Mentor Initiative

Laura Hendrix, Technical Director
Mike Mulbah, Data Coordinator

Rehabilitation in Health Care for Resettled and War affected Population, Equip/Liberia

Roland T. Suomie, National Coordinator
John G. Nenwah, Data Supervisor

Primary Care for Liberians in Bomi and Grand Cape Mountain Counties, International Medical Corp

Berhanu Deneke, Medical Coordinator

Strengthening Delivery of Routine Immunization, World Health Organization (WHO)

Nwaokomah Ignatius, AO
Wambai Zakari, MO/EPI
Thelma Debrah, AA/EPI

Basic Package for Health Care Services (BPHS), BASICS

Luke L. Bawo, Health Systems Strengthening Technical Officer
Margaret Korkpor, BPHS Technical Officer

Logistics and Procurement for PMI, DELIVER

Emmanuel Taylor, Resident Logistics Advisor