



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

LAC BUREAU'S EQUITABLE GROWTH BEST PRACTICES PROJECT

**INDICATORS FOR TRACKING THE IMPACT OF THE PORTMAN-
BINGAMAN "EARMARK"
FOR THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC**

June 24, 2008

LAC BUREAU'S EQUITABLE GROWTH BEST PRACTICES PROJECT

**INDICATORS FOR TRACKING THE IMPACT OF THE PORTMAN-
BINGAMAN "EARMARK"
FOR THE DOMINICAN REPUBLIC**

CONTENTS

1. Objective and Context	1
2. Portman-Bingaman “earmark” activities in the Dominican Republic	2
3. Portman-Bingaman Indicators	4
Agro-RED Performance Indicator Reference Sheets	12

1. Objective and Context

The purpose of the LAC Bureau’s Equitable Growth Best Practices project is to assess, distill and disseminate proven development approaches to fostering rapid and equitable trade-led economic growth, in order to guide USAID and local partners’ policies and programs. By sharing and piloting best practices, the project seeks to catalyze a consensus in favor of programs that improve the enabling environment for business growth. The goal is to provide practitioners and development agents with tools and strategies to generate greater opportunities for poor and disenfranchised populations in the LAC region to contribute to, and benefit from, trade-led economic growth.

The objective of this task order is to develop a common approach among implementers for tracking the impact of the USAID funds being programmed under the Portman-Bingaman (hereafter, P-B) “earmark” for the Dominican Republic, the context of which is described below.

1.1 Context of the Portman-Bingaman “earmark”

The context of the P-B “earmark” is the United States - Central America – Dominican Republic Free Trade Agreement (CAFTA-DR). Among other things, the agreement provides the opportunity for agricultural producers in the Dominican Republic and Central America to export a wide range of agricultural products to the United States within a regime of favorable tariffs.¹ The agreement also entails the phased-in reduction of tariffs by the Dominican Republic and Central American signatories on the importation of basic grains from the United States, and the removal or reduction of non-tariff barriers on those products.

During this phased tariff-reduction period – up to 20 years for some products – farmers in the Dominican Republic and Central America are offered an opportunity to adjust toward higher value-added production for the domestic market, and for export. This is important, because in these countries the majority of the farmers that produce basic grains for sale into the domestic market tend to be poor smallholders characterized by low productivity, vulnerable to malnutrition and dislocation.

The Portman-Bingaman “earmark” refers to a letter from then USTR Rob Portman to Senator Bingaman that the Administration would provide funding to assist the rural sectors of the Dominican Republic and Guatemala to adjust to a more competitive agricultural sector under the treaty, so that once the terms of the CAFTA-DR agreement are in full force, the risk to poor, small-scale producers of basic grains or other sensitive commodities will have been significantly reduced or eliminated. USAID programs in each country are allocated \$10 million annually for this purpose, beginning in fiscal year 2007, for up to five years or until the country has an MCC Compact in place that can support rural development. (The reason the other signatories of the CAFTA-DR agreement are not included in the “earmark” is that they have signed MCC Compact

¹ The agreement effectively establishes a Free Trade Area, providing all the signatories with opportunities for increased trade among themselves under favorable tariff regimes.

agreements with the United States, enabling them to allocate funds from their Compacts to rural sector adjustment programs.²⁾

2. Portman-Bingaman “Earmark” Activities in the Dominican Republic

Under the P-B “earmark”, the USAID Mission in the Dominican Republic (USAID / DR) has allocated \$10 million in annual funding toward support for rural sector adjustment. Three projects have been developed and implementers selected to carry them out; and they were just in the process of initiation during the period of this task order, allowing more flexibility in the development of indicators and results targets relating specifically to Portman-Bingaman. The projects are:

- The Agro Rural Economic Diversification (Agro-RED) project, which is designed to promote crop diversification, and higher value-added non-traditional domestic sales and exports, to the benefit of small farmers and agribusinesses
- The Dominican Sustainable Tourism Alliance (DSTA) project, which is designed to promote rural employment and small business growth in environmentally sustainable tourism enterprises
- The CAFTA-DR Implementation Program (CAFTA-DR IP), which is designed to strengthen the capacity of the Government of the Dominican Republic (GDR) to monitor implementation of the CAFTA-DR agreement’s various chapters, and to help Dominican farmers and businesses to fully enjoy the benefits that the trade accord allows.

2.1 USAID program in support of rural sector adjustment

The USAID / DR program comprised by these three projects supports Dominican adjustment to the terms of the CAFTA-DR agreement within several dimensions. First, the Agro-RED project directly supports the transition of farmers in the Dominican Republic toward integration into agricultural value chains with greater opportunities for rapid and inclusive growth, and explicitly targets assistance toward including small farmers in that growth. Second, recognizing that rural sector adjustment may entail some small farmers and farm family members moving into other sectors, the DSTA project targets employment and small business growth opportunities in the tourism sector.

Finally, the CAFTA-DR IP project is an explicit recognition that effective implementation of the Dominican Republic’s undertakings under the trade accord – including increased imports from the United States – requires institutional strengthening of the government’s capacity to monitor and enforce them. Through training activities in such things as food safety and sanitary-phytosanitary requirements for export to the United States, the project also supports the Dominican private sector’s understanding of how to benefit from the terms of the agreement.

The USAID program is designed to support the adjustment of the Dominican Republic’s rural sector to the terms of the CAFTA-DR as well as the ability to do so by taking

2 Costa Rica is an exception, because it is a middle-income country, ineligible for either MCC or USAID funds.

advantage of the opportunities afforded by the agreement. It addresses this support both at the enterprise level – small farms and agribusinesses, small tourism enterprises and employment; as well as a more systemic level – government implementation of the terms of the agreement, and broad-based training of the private sector concerning its terms.

2.2 Program theories underlying the Portman-Bingaman projects

The development theory underlying the Agro-RED project is that, through transactions support to agricultural value chains selected for their growth and value-added potential, small farmers can diversify out of low-productivity and low-income crops by integrating themselves into those value chains. The challenge is to select the value chains that will indeed provide the greatest growth and value-added opportunities, help value-chain participants to identify the supply-chain bottlenecks that impede more rapid growth and value-added, and provide a combination of technical assistance, training and small-scale financing that will remove or reduce those barriers and create development models for future diversification and income growth. Potential obstacles to achieving commercially viable and broad-based impacts within such projects include how to integrate small farmers effectively into value chains with buyers that require consistent product quality and quantity, and how to replicate model farm or agribusiness successes more broadly across the agricultural sector. In general, for such value-chain support activities, USAID emphasizes the need to monitor indicators that measure not only project implementation and outcomes, like numbers trained, and sales of project beneficiaries, but also sectoral impacts such as trends in nontraditional agricultural exports in proportion to total exports.

The program theory underpinning the DSTA project is that economic opportunities exist in the rural tourism sector that can provide a lucrative alternative to low-productivity, low-income smallholder agriculture, opportunities that can produce increasing employment and growing numbers of small businesses. The challenge is first to identify tourism sites and activities that will prove economically viable as well as environmentally sustainable, assemble the critical mass of stakeholders needed to make an identified tourism cluster a success, help them to identify the principal impediments to that success, and provide a combination of technical assistance, training and small-scale financing that will remove or reduce those impediments and create development models for future cluster growth. Potential obstacles to achieving commercially viable and broad-based impacts in the tourism sector include how to draw growing numbers of tourists to sites that are amenable to the growth of small, rural tourism enterprises, and how to replicate tourism enterprise successes more broadly across the rural sector. In general for such small enterprise support activities, USAID emphasizes the need to monitor indicators that measure not only project implementation and outcomes, like numbers trained, and sales of project beneficiaries, but also sectoral impacts such as increases in the value of tourism sales in the rural sector.

Finally, the CAFTA-DR IP project supports economic adjustment to implementation of the trade agreement, as well as improvements in the enabling environment for trade-led growth and equitable participation in that growth. Institutional strengthening of the government entity responsible for tracking compliance with the various chapters of the CAFTA-DR agreement is undertaken on the theory that this will add to the GDR's capacity to identify and confront implementation bottlenecks. Without effective

implementation of GDR commitments relating to grain imports, for example, the incentive for Dominican farmers to adjust to the terms of the agreement in a timely fashion will be blunted. Training of private sector representatives in technical questions about how to take advantage of the CAFTA-DR agreement is also important to the transition of the agricultural sector to the terms of the treaty. Potential obstacles to achieving success in such systemic reform efforts include how to mobilize the general interests of the business community to overcome political or institutional impediments interposed by interested parties. That is why, in addition to monitoring project performance indicators like numbers trained, for such systemic reform activities USAID encourages the use of objectively verifiable measures of institutional progress in implementing the reforms.

2.3 Complementarity and attributability of impacts

There is a good deal of complementarity among the objectives of the three different projects, and their contribution toward the goal of providing improved income and employment opportunities for the rural sector. The Agro-RED and DSTA activities, while each focusing on different sectors, are both designed to increase beneficiary incomes and employment directly. The CAFTA-DR IP activity is designed, through institutional strengthening, to remove the barriers and improve the incentives to increase rural incomes and employment more generally. None of the projects, in isolation, would be sufficient to accomplish the full potential of transactions support to model value chains and clusters combined with an enabling environment conducive to rapid replications of the successful models across the rural sector.

In terms of attributability, each of the projects contributes to a program concept that, all things equal, should result in increased sales of nontraditional goods (agricultural products) and services (sustainable tourism) by the rural sector. Nonetheless, obviously not all things remain equal in economic growth; external shocks and trends, both positive and negative, will affect intended impacts. For example, the recent rapid rise in international food commodity prices has made the possibility of Dominican producers eventually having to compete on price with basic grain imports from the United States much more remote. On the other hand, recent fuel price increases, through increases in the cost of transport, and agricultural production, among other things, may affect the growth potential of both tourism and agribusiness in the Dominican Republic. These are only some of the numerous trends and developments, falling outside the control of project implementers, that must be taken into consideration when attempting to attribute changes in indicators like sectoral exports and employment to program activities.

3. Portman-Bingaman Indicators

The consultant undertook extensive documentation review and consultation with USAID and implementer representatives, both in Washington, D.C. and in Santo Domingo, concerning the assignment to define a set of indicators that would best represent progress being made under the P-B “earmark” for the Dominican Republic. This section reports on the considerations leading to the selection of a subset of indicators to be recommended, and then describes the recommended indicators themselves. Further detail is provided in Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS) for each proposed indicator (annexed).

3.1 Considerations relating to indicator selection

The following is a description of several elements of a consensus that began to emerge about the assignment to define P-B program indicators.

Telling the full story. The P-B activities focus principally on USAID support to the rural sector, and in particular, activities to enable small farmers and rural residents to adjust to the terms and impacts of CAFTA-DR. This is clear from the background documents exchanged between members of Congress and the administration prior to the establishment of the earmark, and the Scope-of-Work for this task order. Thus, indicators of the progress being made by the projects funded by the P-B “earmark” should focus on USAID support to the rural sector in making that adjustment.

Nonetheless, there are a number of areas in which planned sub-activities to be implemented by the projects supported by the P-B “earmark” will contribute to complementary U.S. goals under the CAFTA-DR agreement. These include, in particular, several activities intended to improve the quality of employment and environmental protection, topics relevant to two of the chapters of CAFTA-DR. Examples include:

- Farm labor protection activities integrated into the Agro-RED project, such as training in the safe handling and usage of crop protection products and fertilizers
- Employee safety and rights training, in tourism activities within the DSTA Project
- Environmental protection activities, such as soil conservation and on-farm water usage training, included within the support provided to farmers under the Agro-RED project
- Environmental planning activities, as envisioned within the context of tourism cluster stakeholder meetings and action planning under the DSTA project
- Monitoring of GDR performance in meeting commitments to allow negotiated levels of agricultural imports from the United States to enter the Dominican Republic unimpeded, in accordance with activities to be implemented by the CAFTA-DR IP project.

These are but several examples of instances in USAID activities contribute more broadly to achieving the objectives of various chapters of CAFTA-DR. The fact is that USAID projects routinely engage in sub-activities similar to those cited above, as part of programs involving sectoral technical assistance and training efforts, but implementers may report only sporadically on the progress that has been made in specific sub-activities of interest. To tell the full story of what USAID has been able to accomplish relating to implementation of CAFTA-DR and with the funding provided by the P-B “earmark,” implementers should be encouraged to report more fully on progress being made in implementation of these sub-activities.

Providing timely reports on program progress. Although USAID guidance tends to focus on the ultimate impact of the activities it funds, it is also important to provide periodic updates on progress being made. In part this is true because it can take five or more years

for the impact of USAID-supported activities to be felt fully within the economy, and policy makers need more timely information to ensure that activities are on track. In addition, as discussed in Section 2.3, above, economic shocks and trends, both positive and negative, that are entirely outside the control of project implementers, often complicate the attribution of project impacts. And so, although they are not “impact” indicators, project performance indicators like number of numbers of small farmers trained in good agricultural practices and environmental protection, or numbers of small rural tourism business owners trained in accounting and marketing, can go a long way toward telling the story of what USAID is trying to accomplish. In addition, such indicators are available in the short- to medium-term, which is when policy decisions frequently need to be made. To track Portman-Bingaman program performance, it is recommended to report on a subset of such performance indicators on a regular basis.

Not re-inventing the wheel. The indicators already contemplated by the Agro-Red and CAFTA-DR IP teams are based on best practices incorporated into Portman-Bingaman program planning and development by the USAID Mission in Santo Domingo, followed by competitive bidding processes and contract awards.³ These best practices explicitly take into account the alignment of project indicators with F Framework indicators for economic growth. A number of the indicators were required by USAID as part of the solicitation materials circulated during the bidding process for the contracts awarded. Under these conditions, the best course for Portman-Bingaman reporting purposes is to take existing performance monitoring planning fully into account, with the intention of refining and amplifying a subset of the indicators already planned, and only under exceptional circumstances to recommend additional data collection and monitoring.

Nonetheless, within the context of a number of planned indicators, the level of aggregation for reporting purposes may be too great to provide sufficient information relating to P-B program performance, and so a recommendation may be made for indicator disaggregation for P-B reporting purposes. For example, data on the number of legal, regulatory or institutional actions taken to improve implementation or compliance with CAFTA-DR may not be nearly as interesting, or as pertinent, as information on what the regulatory or institutional actions were, and how they related specifically to achieving the goals of the P-B “earmark.”

Non-quantifiable impacts. Not all results are quantifiable, even through the use of proxies, which is why USAID guidance often recommends mid-term and final evaluations by disinterested experts. In general, economic growth impact indicators fall into two categories – the performance of beneficiary enterprises, and more systemic sectoral performance. The former can be measured through ongoing surveys of project beneficiaries, and so are usually considered quantifiable. But the latter involve qualitative considerations like improvements in the enabling environment, and the extent to which model enterprise successes are replicated across the sector, that are much more amenable to assessment by qualified experts. Other examples of indicators that are difficult to quantify include improvements in the quality of employment, as well as the number of

3 The case of the DSTA project is different, because the award involved a design and implement contract, under which project design and performance management planning began following the award.

jobs; the extent to which enterprises gain economically and environmentally sustainable sources of increased income; or the effectiveness in implementation of governmental institutions charged with carrying out policy, regulatory and institutional reforms.

3.2 Recommended Portman-Bingaman indicators

Following a short field visit to Santo Domingo for briefings by project implementers, and cognizant USAID and State Department personnel, the consultant developed an initial list of illustrative indicators for further review and discussion with implementer representatives in Washington, D.C. The process of review and discussion utilized USAID's standardized Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) for each of the illustrative indicators, as a means to explore planned indicator definitions, responsibility for collection, frequency of measurement, cost of collection and other issues. These have been drafted / revised in collaboration with implementer staff, and represent their plans to monitor project performance and impact.

The following summarizes the indicators selected. They are categorized according to whether they are "input" indicators, essentially project performance benchmarks; "output" indicators, or outcomes directly attributable to project activities; or "impact" indicators, to which project activities must be attributed.

3.2.1 Agro-RED project

As discussed in previous sections, the goal of the Agro-RED project is to support diversification of small farmers and agribusinesses into higher value-added, non-traditional production. Results monitoring related to the achievement of this goal would be accomplished via the following shortlist of indicators:

Impact Indicators

- Percentage change in domestic sales of all agricultural commodities targeted by project
- Percentage change in exports of all agricultural commodities targeted by project

Output Indicators

- Number of MSMEs that diversify into value-added products
- Number of MSMEs that obtain quality certifications
- Number of MSMEs that are credit approved
- Number of hectares under improved Natural Resources Management

Input Indicators

- Number of MSMEs trained on improved technologies and Natural Resources Management (NRM) practices

- Safe usage of agricultural inputs (pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, etc.)
- Natural resources conservation / protection

An important definitional issue relates to MSMEs – micro, small and medium-scale enterprises – which are the direct beneficiaries of the project. These are to include small farmers and agribusinesses, the latter amounting to services providers and processors that add value to the product at various stages of the supply chain.

The key project “input” indicator recommended is the number of MSMEs trained in improved technologies – including agricultural production, post-harvest handling, storage, cold chain, processing, transport, food safety, and so on, as well as in Natural Resources Management. The consultant has recommended that this fairly aggregate project performance measure might be disaggregated for P-B reporting purposes to show the numbers trained in safe usage of agricultural inputs (pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, etc.), as well as in natural resources conservation / protection. One advantage of this indicator is that it can be monitored starting within the first quarter of project implementation.

Project “output” indicators are those that show the results of various activities the project is undertaking to prepare small farmers and agribusinesses to diversify into higher value-added products in an economically and environmentally sustainable fashion. The project will track improvements in NRM, the award of quality certifications, and utilization of credit, as well as the number of beneficiaries that diversify into value-added products. These are all measures that the project should be able to report on in the medium term – beginning, say, within one year of project initiation.

Finally, “impact” indicators include the percentage changes in both domestic sales and exports of all the agricultural commodities / value chains targeted by the project. These may be reported in the medium term as well, but the full impact of project activities may not be felt until the closing years of the project, or even beyond. Project reporting will have to describe the extent to which the participation of small farms and agribusinesses figures into trends in domestic sales and exports by each value chain, and the replication of model successes more broadly across the sector.

3.2.2 CAFTA-DR IP project

Also as discussed in previous sections, the goal of the CAFTA-DR IP project is to strengthen the capacity of the GDR to monitor implementation of the CAFTA-DR’s various chapters, and to help Dominican farmers and businesses to fully enjoy the benefits that the treaty allows. Results monitoring related to the achievement of this goal would be accomplished via the following shortlist of indicators:

Impact Indicators

- Exports as a percentage of GDP⁴
 - Non-traditional exports
- Scorecard of Dominican Government institutional effectiveness to implement CAFTA-DR (by chapter)
 - Percentage of quotas filled for selected U.S. agricultural imports (by commodity)

Output Indicators

- Number of legal, regulatory or institutional actions taken to improve implementation or compliance with CAFTA-DR and adjustment to its impacts
 - Removal of cocoa “tax” of 200 pesos / metric ton

Input Indicators

- Number of people trained to understand and maximize benefits of CAFTA-DR
 - Labeling & packaging for export to the USA
 - Meat & meat products regulation for export to the USA
 - SPS requirements for export to the USA

The key project “input” indicator recommended is the number of persons trained to understand and maximize the benefits of the CAFTA-DR agreement. The consultant has recommended that this fairly aggregate project performance measure might be disaggregated for P-B reporting purposes to show the numbers trained in various requirements relating to the Dominican agricultural sector being able to take full advantage of the accord, e.g., labeling and packaging, meat products regulation and sanitary-phytosanitary requirements for export to the United States. Again, one advantage of this indicator is that it can be monitored starting within the first quarter of project implementation.

The key project “output” indicator recommended is the number of legal, regulatory or institutional actions taken to improve implementation or compliance with CAFTA-DR and adjustment to its impacts. As described above, although it is important to track such a quantitative measure, the real interest for policy makers is probably going to be qualitative project reporting on the policy, legal, regulatory or institutional actions themselves. For example, the USAID Mission has identified the implicit “cocoa tax” of 200 pesos per metric ton as a fundamental barrier to production and export of this commodity. Because of this tax, Dominican farms have not been able to benefit fully from the dramatic rise in world prices in recent years. Other such policy reform targets should be discussed on a case-by-case basis with the project CTO and described qualitatively in periodic project reporting.

⁴ CAFTA-DR/CAFTA-DR IP staff have also proposed to monitor agricultural exports as a percentage of GDP over time, and of that the proportion attributable to non-traditional agricultural exports. This would be an overall program measure that also relates to the impact of Agro-RED activities.

Finally “impact” indicators include country exports as a percentage of GDP (and nontraditional exports as a subset of that measure); and a “scorecard” of GDR performance in meeting commitments undertaken within various chapters of CAFTA-DR. The consultant has recommended that, in addition to a quantitative “scorecard” of overall performance, the project should report qualitatively on performance relating to key GDR undertakings within the agreement. An example would be the percentage of agricultural commodity import quotas allocated under CAFTA-DR that are actually being filled by imports from the United States. If the percentage does fall below 100% in any given year, the reasons why should be outlined in qualitative reporting by the project. Other examples should be discussed on a case-by-case basis with the project CTO and described qualitatively in periodic project reporting.⁵

3.2.3 DSTA Project

The context of the DSTA project is that it was awarded as a design-and-implement activity; the project’s design, work plan and performance management plan were in preparation during the period of this assignment. The consultant circulated a list of illustrative indicators that would be the kind amenable for monitoring of P-B program performance, and discussed them with the implementer during the finalization of the DSTA project design phase. The final recommendations for P-B indicators to be monitored included:

Impact Indicators

- Tourism revenues in proportion to GDP
- Tourism sales by direct and indirect project beneficiaries
- Number of jobs created in the tourism sector as a result of USAID interventions

Output Indicators

- Increase in investment in tourism clusters supported by USAID interventions
- Number of SME tourism enterprises created in rural areas with USAID support
- Number of environmentally sustainable practices and processes adopted by tourism cluster stakeholders supported by USAID interventions

Input Indicators

- Number of public-private dialogues that occur due to support from USG-assisted organizations
 - Improving the enabling environment for sustainable tourism
 - Enhancing environmental protection

5 The consultant discussed with project and USAID personnel the expressed interest of Dominican private sector representative bodies, like AIRD, in receiving some initial support from the project to begin monitoring and periodically reporting on CAFTA-DR implementation performance, an institutionally sustainable outcome that would continue once the project itself phased down.

- Number of co-management agreements signed in protected and sensitive areas
- Number of persons trained in sustainable tourism
 - Environmental protection best practices
 - Employee safety / rights

The key project “input” indicators recommended for monitoring the results of the P-B “earmark” relate to training small tourism business owners and employees in best practices for sustainable tourism, signing agreements with local communities to enhance and monitor the protection of environmentally sensitive areas, and policy dialogue within tourism clusters on how to make sustainable tourism grow and flourish. These results may be reported in the short- to medium-term.

Recommended project “output” indicators are intended to demonstrate the results of various activities the project is undertaking to prepare small tourism enterprises to grow their businesses sustainably, including new business creation, new investment, and adoption of sustainable environmental practices and processes within tourism clusters. These results may begin to be observed in the medium term and through the closing years of the project.

Finally, “impact” indicators include increases in tourism revenues within the tourism clusters supported by the project, and the number of full-time-equivalent jobs created as a result. These results may also be reported in the medium term, but the full impact of project activities may not be felt until the closing years of the project, or even beyond. Although not attributable solely to project activities, the performance of national tourism revenues in proportion to GDP should serve as a reference point for gauging the impact of USAID support to the sector. Project reporting should describe the extent to which the promotion of small and medium-sized tourism businesses in clusters supported by project activities contributes to growth trends more broadly across the tourism sector.

Agro-RED Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Element: Increased Agricultural Sector Productivity (EG 4.5.2) Sub-Program Element: Research and Technology Dissemination (EG 4.5.2.1) Sub-Program Element: Agricultural Livelihoods and Safety Nets (EG 4.5.2.7) Agro-Red Project Result 1: Sales value of selected agricultural-related cluster products is increased Agro-Red Performance Indicator 5: Percentage change in exports of all agricultural commodities targeted by project</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the average annual percentage change in exports of all agricultural commodities targeted by the project. Unit of Measure: The average annual percentage change in exports is calculated as a weighted average of the annual percentage changes in exports of each selected product, for primary and secondary project beneficiaries. Primary project beneficiaries are direct recipients of assistance; secondary beneficiaries are members of producer associations or clusters of which other members are direct beneficiaries. Disaggregation: Information on the percentage change in exports of each selected product will also be available. Justification/Management Utility: Increased exports of targeted commodities are among the most direct factors in meeting USAID's Sub-program elements of increasing agricultural sector productivity and improving agricultural livelihoods and safety nets for the rural poor.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with the beneficiaries, will closely monitor the outcome of project support activities, measuring the value of sales of selected commodities on a periodic basis. Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual M&E reports will be provided to USAID Data Source(s): Ongoing longitudinal surveys of project beneficiaries Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: semi-annual Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO for Abt Associates Contract (L. González)</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: // Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): No existing baseline studies. Exogenous shock or trends not attributable to project activities may affect raw sample numbers. Reporting by enterprises is not always reliable. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Will conduct baseline surveys, and communicate with cluster stakeholders the importance of measuring indicator correctly, and utilize project extension agents familiar with project beneficiaries for data collection. Reports to USAID will estimate and report on the importance of exogenous factors. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: // Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by Agro-Red in reports to be submitted to USAID Presentation of Data: Tables and accompanying reports Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: See results projections (attached) Location of Data Storage: Contractor files, and project files</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

Agro-RED Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Element: Increased Agricultural Sector Productivity (EG 4.5.2) Sub-Program Element: Research and Technology Dissemination (EG 4.5.2.1) Sub-Program Element: Agricultural Livelihoods and Safety Nets (EG 4.5.2.7) Agro-Red Project Result 1: Sales value of selected agricultural-related cluster products is increased Agro-Red Performance Indicator 4: Percentage change in domestic sales of all agricultural commodities targeted by project</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the average annual percentage change in domestic sales of all agricultural commodities targeted by the project. Unit of Measure: The average annual percentage change in domestic sales is calculated as a weighted average of the annual percentage changes in sales of each selected product, for primary and secondary project beneficiaries. Primary project beneficiaries are direct recipients of assistance; secondary beneficiaries are members of producer associations or clusters of which other members are direct beneficiaries. Disaggregation: Information on the percentage change in domestic sales of each selected product will also be available. Justification/Management Utility: Increased domestic sales of targeted commodities are among the most direct factors in meeting USAID's Sub-program elements of increasing agricultural sector productivity and improving agricultural livelihoods and safety nets for the rural poor.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with the beneficiaries, will closely monitor the outcome of project support activities, measuring the value of sales of selected commodities on a periodic basis. Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual M&E reports will be provided to USAID Data Source(s): Ongoing longitudinal surveys of project beneficiaries Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: semi-annual Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO for Abt Associates Contract (L. González)</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: // Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): No existing baseline studies. Exogenous shock or trends not attributable to project activities may affect raw sample numbers. Reporting by enterprises is not always reliable. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Will conduct baseline surveys, and communicate with cluster stakeholders the importance of measuring indicator correctly, and utilize project extension agents familiar with project beneficiaries for data collection. Reports to USAID will estimate and report on the importance of exogenous factors. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: // Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by Agro-Red in reports to be submitted to USAID Presentation of Data: Tables and accompanying reports Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: See results projections (attached) Location of Data Storage: Contractor files, and project files</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

Agro-RED Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Program Element: Increased Agricultural Sector Productivity (EG 4.5.2)
Sub-Program Element: Agribusiness and Producer Organization
Agro-Red Project Result 2: Agriculturally-related MSMEs more able to compete at national and international levels
Agro-Red Performance Indicator 12: Number of MSMEs that diversify into value-added products

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of project-assisted MSMEs that diversify into higher value-added products as a result of project assistance, through producing higher value products or varieties, or adding value through packaging, processing or other post-harvest activities.

Unit of Measure: The number of MSMEs (including small producers) employing successful value-adding strategies, first among direct beneficiaries of project assistance; and then among secondary beneficiaries who are members of producer associations or clusters of which other members are direct beneficiaries.

Disaggregation: Information on successful value-adding strategies disaggregated by each selected product will also be available.

Justification/Management Utility: The capacity of Dominican small farmers to diversify away from traditional agricultural products is key to agricultural sector productivity and improving agricultural livelihoods and safety nets for the rural poor; and also is a direct measure of the ability to adjust successfully to CAFTA-DR impacts.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with the beneficiaries, will closely monitor the outcome of project support activities, measuring the introduction of new products/varieties and other value-adding strategies on a periodic basis.

Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual M&E reports will be provided to USAID

Data Source(s): Ongoing longitudinal surveys of project beneficiaries

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium

Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO for Abt Associates Contract (L. González)

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: //

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): No existing baseline studies. Exogenous shock or trends not attributable to project activities may affect raw sample numbers. Reporting by enterprises is not always reliable.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Will conduct baseline surveys, and communicate with cluster stakeholders the importance of measuring indicator correctly, and utilize project extension agents familiar with project beneficiaries for data collection. Reports to USAID will estimate and report on the importance of exogenous factors.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: //

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by Agro-Red in reports to be submitted to USAID

Presentation of Data: Tables and accompanying reports

Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID

Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: See results projections (attached)
Location of Data Storage: Contractor files, and project files

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

Agro-RED Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Element: Increased Agricultural Sector Productivity (EG 4.5.2) Sub-Program Element: Rural and Agricultural Finance (EG 4.5.2.3) Agro-Red Project Result 3: Enabling environment for agricultural MSMEs is improved Agro-Red Performance Indicator 17: Number of MSMEs that are credit approved</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of project-assisted MSMEs that are approved to receive credit from DCA participating banks or other financial intermediaries. Unit of Measure: The number of MSMEs (including small producers and agricultural inputs and services providers) that obtain approval from officers of DCA-participating banks or other financial intermediaries, first among direct beneficiaries of project assistance; and then among secondary beneficiaries who are members of producer associations or clusters of which other members are direct beneficiaries. Disaggregation: Information may be disaggregated by male and female MSME owners/borrowers Justification/Management Utility: The capacity of agricultural MSMEs to obtain credit is key to their ability to increasing agricultural sector productivity and the ability to adjust to the impacts of CAFTA-DR</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with the beneficiaries, and agricultural credit intermediaries, will closely monitor the outcome of project support activities, measuring the number of MSMEs obtaining credit approvals. Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual M&E reports will be provided to USAID Data Source(s): Ongoing longitudinal surveys of project beneficiaries Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO for Abt Associates Contract (L. González)</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: // Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None anticipated. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: // Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by Agro-Red in reports to be submitted to USAID Presentation of Data: Tables and accompanying reports Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: See results projections (attached) Location of Data Storage: Contractor files, and project files</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

Agro-RED Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Element: Increased Agricultural Sector Productivity (EG 4.5.2) Sub-Program Element: Agribusiness and Producer Organization Development Agro-Red Project Result 2: Agriculturally-related MSMEs more able to compete at national and international levels Agro-Red Performance Indicator 13: Number of MSMEs that obtain quality certifications</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of project-assisted MSMEs that obtain quality certifications, enabling them to increase profit margins. Quality certification may range from international certifications (e.g., GlobalGAP, organic), to industrial certification of quality control systems, to agricultural inputs usage training by input suppliers, etc.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: The number of MSMEs (including small producers and agricultural inputs and services providers) that obtaining recognized quality certifications, first among direct beneficiaries of project assistance; and then among secondary beneficiaries who are members of producer associations or clusters of which other members are direct beneficiaries.</p> <p>Disaggregation: Information on the kinds of quality certifications obtained disaggregated by each selected product will also be available.</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: The capacity of agricultural MSMEs to improve product quality is a critical measure of Dominican agricultural sector productivity</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with the beneficiaries, will closely monitor the outcome of project support activities, measuring the number of MSMEs obtaining quality certifications on a periodic basis.</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual M&E reports will be provided to USAID</p> <p>Data Source(s): Ongoing longitudinal surveys of project beneficiaries</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO for Abt Associates Contract (L. González)</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: //</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None anticipated.</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: //</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by Agro-Red in reports to be submitted to USAID</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables and accompanying reports</p> <p>Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: See results projections (attached)</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: Contractor files, and project files</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

Agro-RED Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Element: Increased Agricultural Sector Productivity (EG 4.5.2) Sub-Program Element: Land and Water Management (EG 4.5.2.2) Agro-Red Project Result 4: Residents, private sector and GDR invest in good natural resources Agro-Red Performance Indicator 21: Number of hectares under improved Natural Resources Management</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of hectares under improved natural resources management as a result of project assistance Unit of Measure: The number of hectares farmed by project beneficiaries under improved natural resources management, first among direct beneficiaries of project assistance; and then among secondary beneficiaries who are members of producer associations or clusters of which other members are direct beneficiaries. Disaggregation: Information may be disaggregated by type of agricultural commodity produced Justification/Management Utility: The ability of Dominican small producers to improve natural resources management is critical to their ability to increase agricultural sector productivity in a sustainable manner</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with the beneficiaries, will closely monitor the outcome of project support activities, measuring the number of hectares under improved natural resources management. Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual M&E reports will be provided to USAID Data Source(s): Ongoing longitudinal surveys of project beneficiaries Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO for Abt Associates Contract (L. González)</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: // Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None anticipated. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: // Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by Agro-Red in reports to be submitted to USAID Presentation of Data: Tables and accompanying reports Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: See results projections (attached) Location of Data Storage: Contractor files, and project files</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

Agro-RED Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Element: Increased Agricultural Sector Productivity (EG 4.5.2) Sub-Program Element: Land and Water Management (EG 4.5.2.2) Agro-Red Project Result 4: Residents, private sector and GDR invest in good natural resources Agro-Red Output Indicator 14: Number of MSMEs trained on improved technologies and Natural Resources Management (NRM) practices</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of MSME owners and employees (including small producers and farm workers) trained in the application of Good Agricultural Practices and Best NRM practices through project activities Unit of Measure: The number of persons trained, first among participants in training-of-trainers (TOT) certificate program, and second among beneficiaries receiving training through certified trainers Disaggregation: Information may be disaggregated by type of training received Justification/Management Utility: The ability of Dominican small producers and farm workers to implement Good Agricultural Practices (including safe usage of agricultural inputs), and Best NRM practices (including soil and water conservation) is critical to their ability to increase agricultural sector productivity in a sustainable manner</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with the beneficiaries, will closely monitor the outcome of project support activities, measuring the number of persons trained in best practices Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual M&E reports will be provided to USAID Data Source(s): Ongoing longitudinal surveys of project beneficiaries Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO for Abt Associates Contract (L. González)</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: // Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None anticipated. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: // Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by Agro-Red in reports to be submitted to USAID Presentation of Data: Tables and accompanying reports Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: See results projections (attached) Location of Data Storage: Contractor files, and project files</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

CAFTA-DR IP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Area: Trade and Investment (EG 4.2) Program Element: Trade and Investment Enabling Environment (EG 4.2.1) Program Element: Trade and Investment Capacity (EG 4.2.2) Project Indicator Number: 11 Indicator: Improved trade readiness (i.e. complying with WTO standards and protocols for production and export) of LAC presence countries, as measured by country exports as a percentage of GDP</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): Country exports as a percentage of GDP Unit of Measure: Percentage (%) of GDP Disaggregated by: (1) National; (2) Free Trade Zones; (3) Traditional; and (4) Non-traditionals. Justification & Management Utility: This is a PART indicator and is not mandated in the contract but designed to support the USAID Economic Growth monitoring activity. CAFTA-DR IP project will be providing the data to USAID/DR Mission on this indicator. However, it is not intended to measure impact nor progress of the project.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
<p>Data Collection Method: Annual review of country exports as a % of GDP in DR Central Bank statistics Method of Data Acquisition by the Project: Data will be obtained from Central Bank records. The M&E/Public Outreach specialist will track the data through the Central Bank statistics available online Data Source(s): Dominican Republic Central Bank Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: ANNUAL Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low, the project will have access to online Central Bank statistics Responsible Individual(s) at the Project: M&E/Public Outreach specialist</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: February/March 2008 by M&E/Public Outreach specialist Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Exogenous shocks or trends not attributable to project activities may affect either total exports, disaggregated exports or GDP. Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Reports to USAID will estimate and report on the importance of exogenous factors. Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: February/March 2009, February/March 2010 Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: The M&E/Public Outreach specialist will compile data from Central Bank statistics and it will be reported to USAID on annual reports Presentation of Data: Tables Review of Data: Annual Reporting of Data: Annual</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline will be established by M&E/Public Outreach specialist based on the Central Bank statistics. Recommendation: baseline should be the information from 2007 Other Notes: Targets will be those established annually by the DR Central Bank</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

CAFTA-DR IP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Program Area: Trade and Investment (EG 4.2)
Program Element: Trade and Investment Enabling Environment (EG 4.2.1)
Program Element: Trade and Investment Capacity (EG 4.2.2)
Project Indicator Number: 1
Indicator: Percent of effectiveness of Dominican Republic government institutions in implementation of CAFTA-DR.

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): A scorecard will be developed to measure the Dominican Republic government's (specifically DICOEX's) effectiveness in implementation of CAFTA-DR commitments for 2008, 2009 and 2010. The scorecard will collate the effectiveness of the Dominican Government in implementation of a series of milestones identified by the project, corresponding to commitments within each chapter of the agreement.

Unit of Measure: % of effectiveness.

Disaggregated by: (1) Commitments in the CAFTA-DR agreement; (2) Year; (3) Activities.

Justification & Management Utility: There are certain commitments included in the Agreement that the country needs to fulfill each year to implement CAFTA-DR. The score card will allow the project to evaluate effectiveness of implementation of those CAFTA-DR commitments and serve as a guideline for the management team to assist the government of the Dominican Republic to meet them. An example would be the percentage of quotas allocated under the agreement that have been filled for selected U.S. agricultural imports. To date, this commitment has not been fulfilled, because the quotas were allocated to associations, which did not in turn allocate them fully to importers. Only under exceptional circumstances would it be expected that anything less than 100% of these quotas would be filled in any given year.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: DR Commitments included in the Agreement will be the main milestones to be ranked using the score card. The USAID CAFTA-DR IP Technical Director and Chief of Party will identify the effectiveness in implementation of each of the milestones over time. Fulfilling the commitment means that 80% or more of the milestone was achieved, according to a simple average of the effectiveness rankings of objective experts. The team will use monthly progress reports to track the completion of the milestones and at the end of the year will evaluate which milestones were completed, how they were completed and if the commitment was achieved as a result of the activities.

Method of Data Acquisition by the Project: CAFTA-DR IP Monthly Report.

Data Source(s): PIU team (monthly reports are produced from inputs from all the technical team).

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Once a month, after the 5th of each month the project team will record the progress of the project. Final score card for each commitment will be presented on an annual basis.

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium, obtaining periodic rankings by objective experts will require Projec resources

Responsible Individual(s) at the Project: Technical Director.

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: March 2008 by COP.

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): TBD once the score card is designed by the PIU team.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Monthly, quarterly and annual reports will serve as data quality assessment.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: March 2009, March 2010.

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: COP with assistance of PIU team members.

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Every month the project will prepare the technical report. Based on this information the achieved milestones will be recorded as completed. If the project completes 100% of the milestones established, the commitment will receive the highest point in the score card. This process needs to be done every month to ensure that all milestones are recorded and the progress is continuous.

Presentation of Data: Score card will be designed and the team will present the scorecard once a year.

Review of Data: Annual report.

Reporting of Data: Progress report of score card will be presented in Annual report and score card report will be presented separately in February of each year.

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator will be established once the score card is developed as well as the targets.

Other Notes: The commitments vary per year. Therefore, the scorecard will need to be updated every year based on CAFTA-DR agreement.

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: April 25,2008

CAFTA-DR IP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Program Area: Trade and Investment (EG 4.2)

Program Element: Trade and Investment Enabling Environment (EG 4.2.1)

Program Element: Trade and Investment Capacity (EG 4.2.2)

Project Indicator Number: 2

Indicator: Number of legal, regulatory or institutional actions taken to improve implementation or compliance with international trade and investment agreement due to support from USG assisted organizations

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Number of legal, regulatory, or institutional actions taken to improve implementation or compliance with international trade and investment agreements, and adjustment to their impacts, partly or fully due to analysis or advocacy by USAID programs, in this case CAFTA-DR IP.

For the purpose of this indicator, the criteria for “actions” is based on: draft regulations that will assist the GODR to implement CAFTA-DR; activities where the project participates to support the implementation of a law that promotes CAFTA-DR implementation; assisting in the development of controls that need to be implemented by certain institutions to improve the implementation of CAFTA-DR (e.g., . developing sanitary controls); review and assist in the drafting of specific laws, regulatory frameworks and institutional reforms that help the economy adjust to the anticipated impacts of the agreement.

Unit of Measure: # of actions.

Disaggregated by: (1) Type of Actions; (2) Institutions; (3) CAFTA-DR Topic.

Justification & Management Utility: Attracting trade and investment is critical for successful integration into the global economy, and may be a predominant source of technology transfer, market awareness, workforce development, trade expansion and economic growth. Throughout the LOP, the CAFTA-DR IP project will be supporting actions to improve CAFTA-DR implementation and adjustment to its impacts. An example might be the 200 peso “tax” placed on the exportation of cocoa, which limits incentives for small producers to diversify into production of cocoa.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Technical reports will serve as an indication that the action has been completed. Once the report is received by the project, the M&E/Public Outreach specialist will enter the data into the system.

Method of Data Acquisition by the Project: Technical reports on the action.

Data Source(s): COP and/or Technical Director will review and approve the technical report (and in some occasions may be involved in the production of the reports) and then the M&E/Public Outreach specialist will enter the data in the system.

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low, this data is a part of regular record keeping by CAFTA-DR IP.

Responsible Individual(s) at the Project: COP and/or Technical Director

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: March 2008

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Initial analysis of data will be done by the COP and/or technical director who will select those actions that have been completed by the project based on technical reports. Once they decide if the action has been successfully completed, they will pass the information to the M&E/Public Outreach specialist who will enter the data into the M&E system. The M&E/Public Outreach Specialist will report type of action, brief description (provided by the technical team) of the action and when it was completed.

Presentation of Data: Table and narrative

Review of Data: Data will be reviewed on a quarterly basis to ensure progress of the project

Reporting of Data: Data will be reported on annual reports for the project

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: The target for this indicator has been set by USAID/Dominican Republic. Nonetheless, during the preparation of the PMP and meetings in the analysis of the indicators with USAID, the CAFTA-DR IP team concluded that a more realistic target for this indicator in 2008 will be 6 actions and not 22, as set by USAID. Based on this, the CAFTA-DR IP proposes that the target for this indicator should be reviewed and reconsidered for future years.

Other Notes: This is an OP indicator

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

CAFTA-DR IP Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Area: Trade and Investment (EG 4.2) Program Element: Trade and Investment Enabling Environment (EG 4.2.1) Program Element: Trade and Investment Capacity (EG 4.2.2) Project Indicator Number: 3 Indicator: Number of people (cumulative) trained to implement trade agreements (CAFTA-DR) and adjust to their impacts</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): CAFTA-DR IP will be coordinating a large number of trainings, workshops and seminars on CAFTA-DR implementation and adjustment matters. This indicator will measure the number of people trained by the project on the different CAFTA-DR topics. Unit of Measure: # of people trained Disaggregated by: (1) Sector: a. Private, b. Public, c. Students, d. Media representatives; (2) CAFTA-DR Topic; (3) Gender. Justification & Management Utility: This is a primary means of delivering technical assistance to implement CAFTA-DR and assist the Dominican Republic with key provisions on the CAFTA-DR agreement. The training sessions will offer an opportunity for participants to understand CAFTA-DR; learn how to maximize the benefits that can be obtained from the implementation of the agreement; and adjust to the impact of its implementation. Examples of training sessions from year 1 of the project include labeling and packaging for export; meat and meat regulation for export; meeting sanitary and phytosanitary requirements, technical barriers to trade; and so on.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
<p>Data Collection Method: Enumeration collected at the end of each training. Method of Data Acquisition by the Project: PIU team member that organizes the training will ensure that the data is collected after the training, direct entry into M&E database by CAFTA-DR IP operations assistant with input and supervision from M&E/Public Outreach specialist for the project. Data Source(s): CAFTA-DR IP records Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low; this data is a part of regular record keeping by CAFTA-DR Responsible Individual(s) at the Project: M&E and Public Outreach</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: None Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: None Presentation of Data: Tables, narratives Review of Data: Quarterly Reporting of Data: In quarterly progress reports</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline 0 (zero) events Other Notes:</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 4/1/2008

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor

Program Element: Private Sector Development, Competitiveness and Market Access

Indicator: Tourism revenue in proportion to GDP

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportional contribution of the tourism sector to Gross Domestic Product (GDP).

Unit of Measure: The measurement of DR tourism income and its proportion to GDP is done by the Central Bank based on three indicators: tourist arrivals, tourist average stay, and average tourist daily expenditures.

Disaggregation: Information on the percentage change in rural tourism in proportion to GDP will also be collected, if available.

Justification/Management Utility: Although too broad to serve as a direct measure of DSTA project effectiveness, increased tourism sales in rural areas are essential to meeting USAID's program element of increasing private sector development, competitiveness and market access.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

Data Collection Method: Annual review of estimated tourism revenues as a % of GDP in DR Central Bank statistics

Method of Data Acquisition by the Project: Data will be obtained from Central Bank records. The M&E/Public Outreach specialist will track the data through the Central Bank statistics available online

Data Source(s): Dominican Republic Central Bank

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: ANNUAL

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low, the project will have access to online Central Bank statistics

Responsible Individual(s) at the Project: M&E/Public Outreach specialist

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: TBD

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Exogenous shocks or trends not attributable to project activities may affect either tourism sales, rural tourism sales, or GDP.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Reports to USAID will estimate and report on the importance of exogenous factors.

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis: The M&E/Public Outreach specialist will compile data from Central Bank statistics and it will be reported to USAID on annual reports

Presentation of Data: Tables

Review of Data: Annual

Reporting of Data: Annual

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline will be established by M&E/Public Outreach specialist based on the Central Bank statistics. Recommendation: baseline should be the information from 2007

Other Notes: Targets will be those established annually by the DR Central Bank

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-08

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor</p> <p>Program Element: Private Sector Development, Competitiveness and Market Access</p> <p>Indicator: Tourism sales by direct and indirect project beneficiaries</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the annual tourism sales revenues of direct and indirect beneficiaries of the DSTA project.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Increases in the annual sales of each cluster will be estimated by cluster leaders, for both direct and indirect project beneficiaries. Direct project beneficiaries are direct recipients of assistance; indirect project beneficiaries are members of the clusters supported of which other members are direct beneficiaries.</p> <p>Disaggregation: The data will be disaggregated by direct and indirect beneficiaries, by cluster.</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: Increased tourism sales in rural areas are among the most direct factors in meeting USAID's Program element of increasing private sector development, competitiveness and market access.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with cluster leaders, will closely monitor the outcome of project support activities, measuring the value of sales of selected commodities on a periodic basis.</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual M&E reports will be provided to USAID</p> <p>Data Source(s): Ongoing longitudinal surveys of supported clusters.</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: semi-annual</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO for AED (O. Perez)</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: //</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): No existing baseline studies. Exogenous shock or trends not attributable to project activities may affect raw sample numbers. Reporting by small enterprises is not always reliable.</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Will conduct baseline surveys, and communicate with cluster stakeholders the importance of measuring indicator correctly, and utilize project extension agents familiar with project beneficiaries for data collection. Reports to USAID will estimate and report on the importance of exogenous factors.</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: //</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by DSTA in reports to be submitted to USAID</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables and accompanying reports</p> <p>Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: See results projections (attached)</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: Contractor files, and project files</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-08

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor</p> <p>Program Element: Private Sector Development, Competitiveness and Market Access</p> <p>Indicator: Number of jobs created in the tourism sector as a result of USAID interventions</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of direct and indirect full-time equivalent (f.t.e.) jobs created as a consequence of specific project interventions in rural tourism areas, as well as, those that can be reasonably attributed to the project by supporting specific activities.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of jobs created</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Male/Female, direct and indirect beneficiaries.</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: Jobs are among the most direct factors in meeting the USAID/DR Strategic Objective of increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The project, in coordination with the beneficiaries, will closely monitor the outcome of each supported activity, measuring on a periodic basis the number of generated jobs. We will use surveys, reports from stakeholders, and deduce jobs created through additional hotel rooms.</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual reports</p> <p>Data Source(s): Cluster members, Central Bank, ASONAHORES.</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: low</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO – Odalis Perez</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: 2st. Qtr of FY 2009</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): No existing baseline study. Reporting by enterprises is not always reliable. No existing regional statistics and national statistics are erratic.</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Will conduct direct surveys. We communicate with cluster stakeholders the importance of measuring indicator.</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: FY 09, Q3</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by DSTA in reports to be submitted to USAID.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables</p> <p>Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline as of May 15, 2008. See results projections below.</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: AED files, DSTA Team computer files, and project files.</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-08

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor</p> <p>Program Element: Private Sector Development, Competitiveness and Market Access</p> <p>Indicator: Increase in investment in tourism clusters supported by USAID interventions</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the changes in of the amount of US dollars directly invested in tourism clusters and their members as a consequence of specific project interventions, as well as, those that can be reasonably attributed to the project by supporting specific activities.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Amount in U.S. dollars</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Areas of intervention (Rural/urban), male/female owned business.</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: Investment, as an indicator, captures future capabilities and enhancements in the tourism offer in tourism destinations. We believe enhancements in the tourism offer is an important measurement that reflects the stage of development we are achieving.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The CPP will collect information from cluster members on a semi-annual basis.</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual reports</p> <p>Data Source(s): Cluster members, local stakeholders.</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: low</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO – Odalis Perez</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: 2st. Qtr of FY 2009</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Reporting by enterprises is not always reliable. No existing regional statistics and national statistics are erratic.</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Will conduct direct surveys. We communicate with cluster stakeholders the importance of measuring indicator.</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: FY 09, Q3</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by DSTA in reports to be submitted to USAID.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables</p> <p>Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline as of May 15, 2008. See results projections below.</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: AED files, DSTA Team computer files, and project files.</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-08

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor</p> <p>Program Element: Private Sector Development, Competitiveness and Market Access</p> <p>Indicator: Number of small & medium-sized tourism enterprises supported in rural areas</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of small and medium enterprises (SME) and Community based Organizations (CBO) supported by the program through each destination cluster or by direct project intervention.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of enterprises</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Areas of intervention (Rural/urban), male/female owned business, and also by whether the business is a new-startup..</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: The small and medium enterprises are the main mean that the DSTA program will support for local development. As we increase the number of SMEs been supported by the various projects tools, each destinations will enhance the opportunities that a SME can increase their participation of the tourism value chain, increasing the opportunities of the poor.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The CPP will collect information from cluster members on a semi-annual basis.</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual reports</p> <p>Data Source(s): Cluster members and individual SME owners and CBO members.</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: low</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO – Odalis Perez</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: 2st. Qtr of FY 2009</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Reporting by enterprises is not always reliable. No existing regional statistics and national statistics are erratic.</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Will conduct direct surveys. We communicate with cluster stakeholders the importance of measuring indicator.</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: FY 09, Q3</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Summary of data analyzed and summarized by DSTA in reports to be submitted to USAID.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables</p> <p>Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline as of May 15, 2008. See results projections below.</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: AED files, DSTA Team computer files, and project files.</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-08

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor</p> <p>Program Element: Protecting the Environment and the Biodiversity</p> <p>Indicator: Number of environmentally sustainable practices and processes adopted by tourism cluster stakeholders</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): Number of environmentally sustainable practices and processes adopted by hoteliers, restaurants, SME, CBO, municipal governments, and other national institutions that have been promoted by the DSTA Project.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of practices</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Number Types of Practices and Processes adopted.</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: Environmental best practices in the tourism sector can greatly reduce the impact the sector hasve in the environment, increasing the sustainability of the sector.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The CPP will collect information from cluster members on a semi-annual basis.</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual reports</p> <p>Data Source(s): Cluster members, local stakeholders.</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: low</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO – Odalis Perez</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: 2st. Qtr of FY 2009</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Enterprises may be reluctant to report on inappropriate environmental practices. No existing baseline study. Reporting by enterprises is not always reliable. No existing regional statistics, and national statistics are erratic.</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Will conduct direct surveys. We communicate with cluster stakeholders the importance of measuring indicator.</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: FY 09, Q3</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Data analyzed and summarized by DSTA in reports to be submitted to USAID.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables</p> <p>Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline information from The Nature Conservancy activity will be utilized to identify the environmental practices and processes that most need to be improved with support from DSTA training activities. Baseline as of May 15, 2008.. See results projections below.</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: AED files, DSTA Team computer files, and project files.</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-08

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor</p> <p>Program Element: Protecting the Environment and Biodiversity</p> <p>Indicator: Number of public-private dialogues that occur due to support from USG-assisted organizations</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): Number of occasions in which policy dialogue occurs among tourism cluster stakeholders in the public and private sectors, relating to increasing sustainable economic opportunities for the poor, and protecting the environment and biodiversity.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of public-private dialogues</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Types of dialogue (e.g., improving the enabling environment, enhancing environmental protection).</p> <p>Justification & Management Utility: Public-private dialogue within the context of tourism clusters is an integral part of DSTA's approach to improving incentives, and opportunities, within the rural tourism sector.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
<p>Data Collection Method: Technical reports will serve as an indication that the action has been completed. Once the report is received by the project, the M&E/Public Outreach specialist will enter the data into the system.</p> <p>Method of Data Acquisition by the Project: Technical reports on the dialogue forums.</p> <p>Data Source(s): M&E/Public Outreach specialist will enter the data in the system.</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Low, this data is a part of regular record keeping by DSTA.</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project: M&E/Public Outreach specialist</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: March 2008</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None.</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: N/A</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: The M&E/Public Outreach specialist who will enter the data into the M&E system. The M&E/Public Outreach Specialist will report type of each public-private dialogue, include a brief description (provided by the technical team) of the action and indicate when it was completed.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Table and narrative</p> <p>Review of Data: Data will be reviewed on a quarterly basis to ensure progress of the project</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Data will be reported on annual reports for the project</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: The baseline for this indicator is zero.</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-2008

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor</p> <p>Program Element: Protecting the Environment and the Biodiversity</p> <p>Indicator: Number of co-management agreements signed in protected and sensitive areas</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): Number of co-management agreements signed with community groups in protected and sensitive areas together with SEMARENA, SME, CBO, Clusters, and the municipal governments, and other national institutions that have been promoted by the DSTA Project.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number of agreements</p> <p>Disaggregated by: N/A.</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: It has been shown that when local stakeholders and communities are involved in the preservation of a natural resource, it is better protected and conserved. Co-management agreements with local community groups have been an effective tool to achieve local commitments to preserve the natural resources in the areas concerned.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The CPP will collect information from stakeholder involved in the agreements.</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual reports</p> <p>Data Source(s): Cluster members, local stakeholders.</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: low</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO – Odalis Perez</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: 2st. Qtr of FY 2009</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None.</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: FY 09, Q3</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: None</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Data analyzed and summarized by DSTA in reports to be submitted to USAID.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables</p> <p>Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline as of May 15, 2008.. See results projections below.</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: AED files, DSTA Team computer files, and project files.</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-08

DSTA Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
<p>Program Objective: Increased sustainable economic opportunities for the poor</p> <p>Program Element: Work Force Development</p> <p>Indicator: Number of persons trained in sustainable tourism</p>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): Number of persons trained in all aspects of sustainable tourism, including participants from the public and private sectors in formal short courses, seminars or workshops.</p> <p>Unit of Measure: Number</p> <p>Disaggregated by: Areas of intervention (Rural/urban), male/female. Data will also be disaggregated by type of training received (e.g., better environmental practices, employee safety/rights, etc.)</p> <p>Justification/Management Utility: Creating capacity along the entire tourism value chain and training the tourism workforce will increase the sustainability and competitiveness of the sector and increase the opportunities of the human resources to improve their quality of life.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
<p>Data Collection Method: The CPP will collect information from each training provider, DSTA staff and cluster members.</p> <p>Method of Acquisition by USAID: Semi-annual reports</p> <p>Data Source(s): List of participants, consultant reports and DSTA staff logs and reports.</p> <p>Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual</p> <p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Medium cost – part of regular monitoring/data collection</p> <p>Responsible Individual(s) at USAID: CTO – Odalis Perez</p>
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: 2st. Qtr of FY 2009</p> <p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): None</p> <p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: None</p> <p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: FY 09, Q3</p> <p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: TDB</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
<p>Data Analysis: Number of individual and data analyzed and summarized by DSTA in reports to be submitted to USAID.</p> <p>Presentation of Data: Tables</p> <p>Review of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p> <p>Reporting of Data: Semi-annual reports to USAID</p>
OTHER NOTES
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline as of January 7, 2008. See results projections below.</p> <p>Location of Data Storage: AED files, DSTA Team computer files, and project files.</p>
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 6-23-08

