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INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE AND GUIDING PRINCIPLES OF THE ATI PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

The Africa Trade and Investment (ATI) Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Plan (MELP) is a strategic tool for monitoring the performance of the ATI program and reporting on the progress made towards the achievement of its target results. The MELP includes: a) the program’s theory of change; b) a conceptual framework and a results framework with critical assumptions; c) a set of well-defined performance indicators in the Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS), including descriptions of data collection and analysis methods; a) a Performance Indicator Table that will include expected targets once buy-ins are finalized; and b) learning and evaluation plan that highlights special studies and surveys that the project will undertake in support of a robust monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) system.

The indicators will identify successes and shortcomings in program activities, inform decisions to maintain or adjust course, and facilitate communication of results to USAID, counterparts, and other stakeholders. The MELP will rely on systematic collection, analysis, and reporting of information (both quantitative and qualitative). Information generated from the MEL system will allow program managers to make informed decisions on the overall management and performance of the project and provide a rationale for any needed changes in project implementation and/or design. Highly complex and multifaceted, ATI has adopted an inclusive approach to the development of its MELP, engaging USAID/AFR, Prosper Africa, USAID Regional Missions, and ATI staff to define the different types of data needed for reporting and learning purposes. To this end, ATI will train partner staff in relevant data-collection methods and provide associated feedback to component managers, partners, and implementers.

The principles governing the ATI MELP are based on the USAID Automated Directives System (ADS) 201 Program Cycle Operational Policy and are consistent with the following:

- **A tool for learning and adaptive management.** This MELP should enable the ATI program and USAID management teams to systematically collect and analyze performance information to track progress toward USAID’s objectives and results while simultaneously using knowledge and learning gained from implementation to adjust approaches and activities, as needed. The learning plan below provides a roadmap for how ATI will integrate data and evidence to inform project decision making and adaptations that lead to better development results.

- **Alignment with Prosper Africa and USAID’s strategies and processes.** The MELP is aligned with Prosper Africa, the USAID/East, West, North and Southern Africa Regional Development Cooperation Strategies’ (RDCS) results framework (see figure 1). In addition, ATI aligns with USAID’s Private Sector Engagement Policy and with the collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) methodology of reviewing outputs and outcomes for learning and adaptation purposes by indicator on a set schedule in accordance with USAID requirements.

- **High-quality data.** To ensure that ATI has reliable and accurate data to inform results reporting, the project will conduct regular data quality assessments (DQAs) and will document any known limitations in the MELP and in DQA reports. In addition, limitations will inform adjustments to the MEL system to ensure that those bottlenecks are addressed.

- **Gender and youth inclusion.** The MELP will capture sex and age-disaggregated indicator data for ATI wherever possible, and lessons learned on inclusiveness through regular MEL implementation will be used to improve the design of interventions throughout implementation. ATI will consistently undertake data interpretation and analysis from a sex/gender perspective.
(among other approaches) to identify tacit gender relations that affect development problems and solutions addressed by ATI.

- **Climate and environmental considerations.** USAID has determined that ATI has a moderate climate risk, and therefore requires due diligence relating to the climate risk of program activities, particularly in the areas of agriculture, public health and industry. In addition, many small and medium enterprises have not had to consider the environmental and social impacts of their activities and therefore they may not be operating within their local environmental regulations and may be unaware of the expectations that international lenders have with respect to environmental compliance or that international lenders consider potential social impacts of business projects. With regards to these considerations, the MELP will capture data and learnings so as to ensure ATI’s implementation is environmentally-sound.

- **Communication.** The MELP is designed to enable the communication of results achieved—or not—to advance organizational learning and tell ATI’s story. A separate ATI communication plan illustrates the main approaches that the program will use to package and share results, from high-level development outcomes tracked through performance indicators to success stories of individuals and groups served by ATI collected through impact mapping.

### ATI Project Background

The USAID Africa Trade and Investment (ATI) program is a five-year, flexible buy-in mechanism managed by USAID’s Bureau for Africa. As USAID’s flagship effort under the Prosper Africa initiative and in line with USAID’s Private Sector Engagement (PSE) Policy, ATI is a continent-wide program that will boost trade and increase investment to, from, and within the African continent—generating thousands of African and American jobs and delivering billions in exports and investment by 2026. To achieve development outcomes, ATI works across North and Sub-Saharan Africa, by mobilizing enterprise-driven solutions and supporting healthy business climates that are inclusive and responsive to market needs.

As a demand-driven mechanism, ATI is flexible and responsive to strategic continental and emerging regional opportunities. Building on 20+ years of experience implementing the USAID trade and investment activities, ATI brings together a tested network of 700+ partner firms, organizations and consultants that can work across the intersection of trade and investment, deploying proven approaches, testing new trade and finance solutions, and building partnerships for scale and sustainability.

### Implementation Assumptions and Approach

ATI employs a facilitative, enterprise-led approach to strengthen African markets through partnership, co-creation/co-design, and co-delivery of program interventions with the private sector to support U.S.-African trade and investment opportunities that further USG development outcomes. As a facilitator, ATI will work with and through private sector firms — both U.S. and African — to strengthen market actor relationships and to create the necessary preconditions for trade and investment by addressing the business constraints that impede their growth.

Unlike traditional programming, ATI’s delivery approach is heavily integrated and draws from:

- Technical support and leveraged buy-ins across ATI’s trade, investment, and business environment objectives
- A myriad of USG tools, partners, and resources across USAID and the interagency
• Private sector investment, expertise, and innovations through co-investment and co-design
• Highly efficient operations and systems; and
• Interactive learning to maximize impact across a broad range of actors and perspectives

A facilitative, enterprise-led approach focuses interventions at strategic leverage points in order to optimize the system’s functionality and inclusiveness by strengthening relationships among different types of actors, realigning incentives for actors to change their behaviors, and introducing innovative models and approaches into the system. Implementers use a “light-touch” in activities, minimizing their presence in the system and reducing the direct provision of material goods or services. This allows local actors to more fully engage in development efforts through a process of “self-selection.” With these actors taking a more central role, an activity can increase local ownership, enhance the likelihood of sustainable behavior change, and expand the potential for increased impact and scale of activities over time.

In deploying this approach, ATI has been designed expressly for engendering private sector ownership and for implementing initiatives at scale. As a facilitator, ATI’s role will be to draw in the right partners, technical interventions, and tools to help private sector actors capitalize on trends and opportunities, while overcoming challenges that impede Africa’s growth. Underpinning the fine-tuned operations on ATI are strategic communications focused on transactions, results, and learning across all ATI objectives to amplify impact.

ATI will base operations on the following core principles:

• **Agile, flexible, and efficient.** ATI will move at the speed of business, quickly mobilizing resources and services and pivoting where deals, market forces, and opportunities dictate. This flexibility means utilizing subcontracts and grants to achieve ATI objectives, and efficiently scaling up (or down) based on market demands. It also means minimizing predetermined programming and partners, and instead work with the private sector, USAID’s Bureau for Africa, Prosper Africa, the regional and bilateral missions, and Embassy Deal Teams to define a majority of activities.

• **Demand-driven.** As a buy-in mechanism, ATI will not have a defined set of services. Instead, ATI will customize its offerings to achieve the objectives of each buy-in scope to respond to private sector-led opportunities and deals with bespoke facilitation services.

• **Collaborative and co-designed.** All of ATI’s work will be undertaken in close collaboration with the private sector, USAID’s Bureau for Africa, Prosper Africa, and the regional and bilateral missions. This approach will require continuous engagement not only at the planning stage, but throughout the activity lifecycle.

• **Innovative and iterative.** ATI will not be afraid to try out new, big ideas. ATI will use evidence and learning to adjust, replicate, and scale activities. Iterative learning coupled with a strong monitoring system and adaptive management will also be used to better understand system change and to manage decisions aimed at improving the competitiveness, inclusiveness, and resilience of market systems.

• **Bilateral, regional, and continental.** ATI is a continent-wide initiative, which aligns how investors and businesses look at investment and trade opportunities—geographically unconstrained. ATI’s continental mandate will draw from bilateral, regional, and continental programming and leverage points to capitalize on real business opportunities that have never been on the table before.

• **Gender equality as a priority.** ATI will operate with a fundamental awareness around the role that women play in African economies. Across the continent, women
entrepreneurs abound, and their influence is great. Despite this, women’s businesses tend to be less productive and have fewer employees than those owned by men due to a wide range of obstacles. As such, ATI will integrate women’s economic empowerment and gender equality as a cross-cutting objective across activities in order to achieve sustainable development outcomes and a more vibrant, inclusive economic ecosystem.

- Environmentally and socially sustainable. ATI will apply and promulgate good environmental and social practice across its interventions to foster development that minimizes social and environmental harm.

PROJECT THEORY OF CHANGE AND LOGIC MODEL

The purpose of the USAID ATI program is to mobilize enterprise-driven solutions that increase trade and investment in Africa, including both North and Sub-Saharan Africa. ATI has four main objectives:

1. Increased trade
2. Increased investment
3. Improved business environment
4. Programmatic and institutional support to USAID and Prosper Africa Secretariat

Underpinning ATI’s programming is the following Theory of Change:

**IF** the USAID ATI program can establish an efficient and flexible continental trade and investment platform that leverages and aligns USG and other resources; AND

**IF** the USAID ATI program can improve the business climate and ecosystem for trade and investment, including increased access to finance, and facilitate new and existing business linkages, especially between U.S. and African enterprises;

**THEN**, a more transparent and supportive trade and investment environment in nations across Africa will be established, trade and investment will increase – in particular between African economies and the U.S. –, and these African nations’ economic growth and development outcomes will be strengthened.

The ATI Results Framework on the next page shows the linkages between activities to outputs and outcomes within each of ATI’s activity objectives to mobilize the investment Africa needs to enhance its trade performance and create/sustain jobs.

LOGICAL FRAMEWORK AND GOALS

Project goals and logical framework have been adjusted to reflect ATI’s strategy.

FIGURE 1: ATI’S RESULTS FRAMEWORK
ATI employs a MEL approach that allows for adaptation to changes in the operating context and market dynamics, while still measuring progress towards agreed-upon targets. The MEL team will conduct routine data analysis activities, refining processes for data capture and analysis as necessary. It will foster a culture of ongoing learning by synthesizing data not only for performance measurement but also to improve ongoing and planned ATI activities. Accordingly, the project will rely on both performance and context monitoring indicators and methods.

**MONITORING PLAN**

ATI employs a MEL approach that allows for adaptation to changes in the operating context and market dynamics, while still measuring progress towards agreed-upon targets. The MEL team will conduct routine data analysis activities, refining processes for data capture and analysis as necessary. It will foster a culture of ongoing learning by synthesizing data not only for performance measurement but also to improve ongoing and planned ATI activities. Accordingly, the project will rely on both performance and context monitoring indicators and methods.

**PERFORMANCE MONITORING INDICATORS**

Project staff will monitor and report on 20 performance indicators, including three standard PSE indicators and 17 custom indicators. Detailed information on each indicator is presented in the Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (Annex I). Each PIRS includes a clearly stated definition of the indicator, data sources, methodology for collecting relevant data, data collection responsibilities, and plans for analysis. Table 1 on the following pages outlines the ATI results indicators, including information about indicator disaggregation.

In determining appropriate project indicators, the ATI MEL team conducted extensive consultations with project stakeholders in USAID AFR/SD, Middle East Regional Bureau, Prosper Africa and USAID.
Regional Missions to ensure that the work plan strategies are reflected in how ATI will measure performance. Key documents considered to ensure integration included the original ATI contract, Prosper Africa MEL Plan, the USAID/West, North, East and Southern Africa RDCS, Private Sector Engagement Framework, and the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) Indicator Handbook. Every effort has been made to ensure appropriate disaggregation and to keep the number of indicators to a manageable number while maintaining a robust set of multilevel indicators, appropriate for making management decisions and reporting on project progress including aggregation for reporting into the Prosper Africa MEL system.

Given the flexible and varied nature of ATI, appropriate measures of performance often depend on buy-in specific activities, their intended development outcomes, and on buy-in client reporting and learning objectives. ATI top-line performance indicators (listed in Table 1) may be adapted according to a buy-in's context, and customized buy-in level performance indicators are often developed to meet USAID needs. Wherever possible and logical, buy-in level indicator data is rolled up into top-line performance indicator analysis for aggregation. Based on buy-in implementation plans, annual targets will be established. These targets will be established in conjunction with ATI staff, USAID AFR/SD and Prosper Africa, taking into account plans for implementation of ATI activities and objectives.

BASELINE DATA AND ESTABLISHMENT OF INDICATOR TARGETS

Based on buy-in implementation plans which are yet to be established and finalized, targets will be established once USAID and ATI have a final set of activities for the year. While some inconsistency as it pertains to buy-in mechanism models is to be expected, the project will need to reexamine and adjust the indicator targets to account for the buy-in mechanism model which is both unpredictable and thus impossible to factor into the project’s targets and are also beyond the manageable control of the project. Baseline data for 20 of the selected indicators shall be set at zero since they track work specific to ATI which is starting from ground zero with no preceding activities.

INDICATOR DISAGGREGATION BY SEX

Supporting the development of new policies or raising awareness about existing policies, laws, and regulations, and facilitating processes for operationalization can help firms overcome practices that exclude women and other groups. But the success of well-designed and implemented strategies to enhance women’s benefits from trade ultimately depends on the availability of relevant gender-related data. Lack of sex-disaggregated data in trade and investment hinders the ability of policy makers to identify the differential impacts trade policy may have on women and men. ATI will disaggregate person-level indicators data by sex to analyze performance indicators to establish a baseline and monitor progress toward inclusive and equitable practices.

ATI will disaggregate performance indicators data by sex to analyze relevant performance indicators based on a Gender Equity and Social Inclusion (GESI) perspective to establish a baseline and monitor progress. Collaborative efforts will contribute to evidence-based decision making and more effective processes that identify and address specific issues related to gender equity and social inclusion. Data will be used to measure changes in the program as well as to determine the baseline starting point for ATI’s indicators. Proposed contractual indicators can be found in the ATI Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Plan (MELP) in the Indicator Performance Tracking Table (Table 1) and the PIRS (Annex 1). The data analysis from these disaggregates will inform how ATI may refine its program strategies to ensure there is more reach for particular target groups as needed.

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT MONITORING
ATI will consider environmental impacts as potential outcomes of expanding trade and investment activities and set standards and requirements within its own actions and that of its partners, to mitigate negative impacts. In keeping with ATI’s mandate to maintain flexibility and market responsiveness, the program will apply a collaborating, learning, and adapting mindset to evaluate and validate environmental screening and implementation processes, focusing on the efficacy of the ATI’s approach.

Annually, there will be at least an informal “pause and reflect” session to review the environmental monitoring and learning framework with relevant USAID environmental stakeholders. The group will discuss required adjustments that would improve the project’s ability to manage environmental, social, or climate risks and mitigation measures and/or adjust decision-making processes to better incorporate the potential direct and indirect environmental and social impacts of proposed interventions.

**CONTEXT MONITORING**

ATI will employ context monitoring techniques to track changes regarding the assumptions underlying the project’s theory of change and any changes in market conditions that might prompt changes in ATI’s approach to engaging target sectors. These techniques will include:

- **Monitoring context indicators using secondary and primary data analysis.** The project team will monitor annual export flows both within the continent and internationally to better understand the market dynamics within which ATI is operating. In addition, ATI will undertake special studies to inform program redesign and implementation as part of adaptive management.
- **Ongoing internal technical staff and market actors' observation and reflection, complemented by project results monitoring, to assess target sector performance.** This will ensure that selected target sectors are performing as anticipated and will allow for adjustments to ATI’s implementation strategy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>INDICATOR</th>
<th>OUTPUT OR OUTCOME</th>
<th>FTF INDICATOR REFERENCE</th>
<th>DISAGGREGATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Value of exports achieved as a result of USG assistance</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom EG.3.2-23</td>
<td>Commodity/product; value chain; destination market; AGOA vs. non-AGOA country of origin; sector: FTF agriculture (staple foods); other non-FTF agriculture; ag/non-ag</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Percentage of firms/organizations with increased profitability or increased self-sufficiency</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Type of organization (cooperative, producer group, faith-based, government agency, women-owned, civil society, firm, etc.); country; sector/value chain (FTF agriculture, non-FTF agriculture and non-agriculture); sex of owner/manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percentage of USG-assisted organizations with improved performance</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom CBLD-9</td>
<td>Type of organization (cooperative, producer group, faith-based, government agency, women-owned, civil society, firm, etc.); country; sector/value chain; sex of owner/manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Number of agriculture and non-agriculture jobs created or maintained with USG assistance</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom FTF 4.5-2; EG 3-9</td>
<td>Agriculture/non-agriculture; country; sex of job holder; direct jobs and indirect jobs; created or maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Value of new USG commitments and private sector investment leveraged by the USG to support economic growth</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom EG.3.1-14</td>
<td>Type of investment: cash and in-kind investment; investment purpose: operating capital/capital investments; USG commitment type and amount; country where the investment occurs; sector/value chain: agriculture only; type of organization (firm, civil society/nongovernmental, women-owned, association, other)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Value of financing accessed as a result of USG assistance</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Type of financing accessed; ag/non-ag; debt (type of debt: cash, in-kind); size of recipient (individual/microenterprise, small and medium-sized enterprise, large enterprise/corporation); sex of producer/proprietor(s) (male/female/mixed); age (15–29, 30+, mixed); non-debt: size of recipient (individual/microenterprise); sex of producer or proprietor(s) (male, female, mixed); age: 15–29, 30+, mixed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Number of firms that have applied improved organization-level technologies or management practices with USG assistance</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Type of organization (women-owned, civil society, firm, etc.); country; ag or non-ag; sector/value chain; optional – type of technology and management practice (for reporting); women-owned or managed; ag/non-ag services; non-FTF agriculture;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Number of assisted firms/associations meeting international grades and standards to export</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Country, ag/non-ag, sector/value chain, type of organization, type of standard/grade; ag/non-ag services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Number and value of export deals identified or supported</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Commodity/value chain; destination market; country of origin; ag/non-ag; sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Indicator Description</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Number and value of finance deals identified or supported</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Type of investment and financing accessed: private equity/debt (type of debt: cash, in-kind); ag/non-ag; size of recipient (individual/microenterprise; small and medium-sized enterprise, large enterprise/corporation); sex of value chain actor(s) (male, female, mixed); age (15–29, 30+, mixed); non-debt: size of recipient (individual/microenterprise)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Number of firms receiving USG-funded technical assistance</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Type of firm (formal, informal); assistance type; assistance purpose; duration (new, continuing); country; sector/value chain; sex of firm owner; women owned/managed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Number of engagements jointly undertaken with the private sector to achieve a U.S. foreign assistance objective</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Standard PSE3</td>
<td>Type of partnership/focus; country; sector/value chain (FTF agriculture, non-FTF agriculture and non-agriculture); sex of owner/manager of organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Number of private sector enterprises engaged with the USG to support U.S. foreign assistance objectives</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Standard PSE2</td>
<td>U.S. Foreign Assistance Objective(s) Addressed: Peace and Security, Democracy and Governance, Health, Education, Economic Growth, Climate Change, Environment, Food Security, Nutrition, Resilience, Water, Hygiene, and Sanitation, and Other; type of private sector enterprise: for-profit commercial entities (excluding financial enterprises and social enterprises), private financial enterprises (excluding social enterprises), private social enterprises, corporate foundations and corporate philanthropic entities, private grant-making foundations, business, trade and industry associations (including chambers of commerce), private cooperatives, and other; origin of private sector enterprise: U.S.-based, host country-based, third-country-based; size of private sector enterprise: large (100+ employees), medium (50-100 employees), and small (10-50 employees)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for trade and investment achieved with USG support [Multi-Level]</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Level: subnational, national, regional, continental, and international level; Initiative Affiliation policy element: Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework, Policy Development and Coordination, Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation, Evidence-based Analysis, Policy Implementation, Mutual Accountability; gender inclusivity; FTF agriculture, non-FTF agriculture and non-agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Number of non-tariff barriers mitigated as a result of USG assistance (cross-cutting)</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Type of organization; type of barrier (trade/finance/other); country, agriculture/non-agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Number of private sector enterprises with improved participation in the local economy as a result of USG assistance</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Standard PSE3</td>
<td>Type of private sector enterprise: for-profit commercial entities (excluding financial enterprises and social enterprises), private financial enterprises (excluding social enterprises), private social enterprises, corporate foundations and corporate philanthropic entities, private grant-making foundations, business, trade and industry associations (including chambers of commerce), private cooperatives, and other; origin of private sector enterprise: US-based, host country-based, third-country-based; type of improvements: internal management processes, access to new markets, government advocacy, access to finance, and other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Country of origin, destination country, Ag/Non-ag, type of products, type of firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>New trade and investment mechanisms/solutions developed and supported</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Country of origin, destination country, Ag/Non-ag, type of products, type of firm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Percent of activities screened for environmental risk</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Country, Ag/Non-ag, Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Percent of ATI partners with documented environmental and social risk management policies</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Country, Ag/Non-ag, Sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Percent of ATI activities reporting environmental and social compliance data accurately and timely</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Country, Ag/Non-ag, Sector</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DATA MANAGEMENT

ATI will use high-quality data, captured throughout the program life cycle, to ensure accurate and reliable results reporting on key performance indicators. The entire ATI team is committed to providing high-quality inputs into data management and ensuring that USAID is provided with the highest standards of validated results.

DATA COLLECTION

ATI’s MEL team will use primary data as the principal source for reporting progress and results against project indicators. The MEL unit will then generate reports on project progress in alignment with USAID reporting requirements.

DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

The ATI MEL team will develop standardized data collection tools to collect project performance data efficiently and effectively. Detailed guidelines or standard operating procedures will be developed for each data collection tool and consolidated within an internal ATI MEL Operations Manual. The MEL Operations Manual will also contain standard procedures for data processing, analysis, reporting, and storage. The manual will be updated regularly and will be available for all data collectors as a reference. It will also form the foundation for MEL staff to train ATI field staff in data collection to ensure that those collecting the data understand the steps required and to ensure the highest data quality. To collect data, ATI will use data collection tools that are designed to capture the complexity of market system relationships and diverse technical assistance activities. This will enable the team to better capture and analyze data, learn from them, and communicate the results of its work. In FY2022 ATI will ensure that these data collection tools are built in a relational database that has a web interface and allows for the team to report into the Prosper Africa Salesforce system. The relational database will need to be developed and customized and be accessible online to a geographically dispersed ATI team.

DATA STORAGE, PROCESSING, AND ANALYSIS

DATA STORAGE

All primary and secondary program data will be stored electronically. For audit purposes, hard copies of all data collected will be available for review. The project will make use of DAI’s Microsoft SharePoint for secure file storage while working on building a relational database which would also serve as a repository of the project data. As is appropriate, ATI will ensure that appropriate firewalls are in place for confidential/proprietary/commercially-sensitive data and information to protect partners’ information. In addition, the option for redacting materials may be exercised in the event of the same level of sensitivity of information.

DATA QUALITY CHECKS

There will be a multi-layer check on project data starting from data collection all the way to final reporting. These data quality checks will be guided by an internal data quality protocol to be developed by the ATI MEL team to document data quality steps and processes, thus ensuring uniformity in implementation.

DATA QUALITY ASSURANCE

The overall purpose of ATI’s data quality systems is to ensure that the program team is aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the data collected, as determined by five data quality standards: validity,
precision, reliability, integrity, and timeliness. DQAs are used to help inform decision makers on the extent to which the data integrity can be trusted to influence project management decisions. The MEL team will follow the standard USAID DQA checklist and ensure data quality through close monitoring of supporting documents and verification on a quarterly basis. These internal DQA results will yield recommendations for corrective measures that may be needed to ensure a high level of performance and high data quality.

DQAs focus on applying data quality standards and examining the systems and approaches for collecting data to determine whether they are likely to produce high-quality data over time. The DQAs provide processes, protocols, and templates addressing how to:

- Assess the design and implementation of the project’s data management and reporting systems
- Trace and verify data collection processes and systems that led to indicator results
- Follow up on DQA findings and implement recommendations

ATI’s MEL team will align with USAID’s agency standards for DQAs and will use the following data quality standards in the management of data collection and reporting processes:

VALIDITY
Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result.
- Are the people collecting data qualified and properly supervised?
- Are steps taken to identify and correct data errors?
- Are steps taken to minimize errors such as sampling, transcription, and measurement errors, and sample representativeness?
- Has an acceptable level of error been established?
- Are data quality problems clearly described in the DQA final reports?

RELIABILITY
Data should reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time.
- Is the indicator clearly and objectively defined?
- Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, and data source to data source?
- Are there consistent sampling methods or comparable data collection instruments and procedures in place?
- Are data collection and maintenance procedures periodically reviewed and documented in writing?

TIMELINESS
Data should be available at a useful frequency, should be current, and should be timely enough to influence management decision making.
- Is a data collection schedule in place that meets project management needs?
- Are data sufficiently up to date to be useful to the project?
- Are data properly stored and readily available?

PRECISION
Data must have a sufficient level of detail to permit management decision making, e.g. the margin of error is less than the anticipated change.
- Is there a method for detecting duplicate data?
- Is there a method for detecting missing data?
INTEGRITY

Data collected should have safeguards to minimize the risk of transcription error or data manipulation.
- Are there proper safeguards in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data?
- Is there a system in place to provide independent review of data and results reported?

DATA STORAGE MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM

The program’s MEL tools will be incorporated into the electronic system to facilitate efficient and effective decentralized data collection, analysis, and storage at bilateral, regional and continental levels. ATI will in the beginning draft simple Excel spreadsheets to capture data from partners for initial buy-in activities. In anticipation of ramping up buy-ins, more complex activities with unique reporting requirements such as Prosper Africa, and value-added data analysis and visualization, we are looking into utilizing a more robust system to manage and report data, such as DAI’s Power BI, as well as client relationship management (CRM) and project management systems modules. A customized MEL information system will facilitate data quality assurance and management, as well as analysis and reporting, including visual graphic generation and other customized functions that we anticipate will be necessary and useful for USAID. ATI will engage a systems specialist to define requirements and recommend integrated, effective, and cost-efficient options that meet its data management needs.

Technical staff will input data relevant to their components. This data will then be reviewed and verified by MEL staff. Once the data have been verified, viewing rights will be restricted to MEL staff to safeguard against manipulation.

DATA SECURITY

ATI data will be stored in a DAI-owned and managed electronic database system. All data, particularly investor data, will be safeguarded through differentiated levels of user access and will be password-protected at the user level. MEL staff entering data online will receive training on how to use the data entry system, and protocols will be established to protect personally identifiable information. Non-staff users who wish to receive summary analysis will only be granted access to dashboards and reports when deemed safe by ATI, and data will be made available via a password-protected web portal.

DATA ANALYSIS AND USE

Project data will be reported to USAID primarily via quarterly and annual reports. All data will be reported in a disaggregated manner, as outlined in the PIRS in Annex I. Ad-hoc reporting of ATI’s data will be provided as requested by the Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR). In addition, ATI will provide timely reports for USAID’s Performance Plan and Report (PPR) and USAID Portfolio Reports, Prosper Africa Salesforce reporting system, as well as for the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS) and Development Information Solution (DIS).

ATI data will be shared with project and management staff on a quarterly basis to enable the team to review project performance and adjust implementation plans. In addition, the MEL staff will work closely with technical teams to collect lessons learned related to project activities so that a process of adaptive learning can feed into strengthened implementation of activities.

EVALUATION PLAN

INTERNAL EVALUATIONS
The ATI MEL system must include not only monitoring, but also thoughtful evaluation of activities and outcomes to inform the adaptive management of the project. While no formal internal evaluations are currently planned, ATI plans on conducting targeted studies, including annual surveys (e.g. of investment deals, trade flows, capacity development effectiveness, etc.) to examine medium-term outcomes of ATI’s technical assistance through most significant change or outcome harvesting methodologies.

Additionally, the project MEL team will ensure that data collection systems are built in such a way that data gathered can be thoughtfully used to inform evidence-based implementation and planning decisions.

**PLANS FOR COLLABORATING WITH EXTERNAL EVALUATORS**

On an as-needed basis, ATI may commission evaluations to be conducted by a third-party designee. Draft questions for these evaluations will be agreed with USAID and Prosper Africa. Initial example evaluation questions could include:

- How has the program made progress toward accelerating regional trade and investment?
- What positive and negative unintended consequences have resulted from project implementation?
- How has a continental model enabled delivery of results at scale versus traditional programming?
- To what extent has firm-level technical assistance successfully reached women and youth?
- To what extent have activities been environmentally monitored beyond implementation? Are there any unintended environmental impacts ATI and USAID did not anticipate?
- To what extent has the emphasis on public-private engagements led to improved economic activity in the priority sectors identified?
- What efforts have been most effective in mobilizing U.S. investors in alignment with Prosper Africa objectives?

**LEARNING PLAN**

USAID’s collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) methodology is central to the design and implementation of ATI. ATI will incorporate learning activities to build stronger feedback loops to inform adaptive management and enable changes in strategy, program design, and implementation as trade and investment opportunities within targeted sectors shift or new opportunities emerge.

ATI will conduct the following learning activities:

- **Monthly evidence and learning meetings.** Meetings led by the MEL team, project technical teams, and, when feasible, USAID will review results and the pipeline of private sector engagements to reflect on prioritization and performance to make necessary adjustments to implementation.

- **Quarterly pause and reflect sessions.** These sessions will be held with implementing partners and USAID to review progress against indicator targets, draw out lessons learned, and identify potential opportunities and risks not otherwise captured through routine monitoring. Reflection and learning sessions will serve as an essential tool supporting the project team to assess the results of its interventions and determine whether any course corrections/adjustments are needed.

- **Indicator dashboards.** Interactive indicator-by-indicator results dashboards will be used to assess progress in achieving targets. This approach will bring data to inform learning conversations and ensure that ATI’s decision making is adaptable and grounded in evidence.

- **Learning agenda.** As described below, ATI’s learning questions, based on the theory of change and knowledge gaps, will ensure that the project remains effective and grounded in local realities. This framework will be used as a starting point for the ongoing development of ATI’s learning agenda. Learning agenda areas of focus and activities will be regularly assessed to determine the most pressing areas of inquiry that will strengthen ATI’s implementation approach.
TABLE 2: LEARNING QUESTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARNING QUESTIONS TO ADDRESS POTENTIAL KNOWLEDGE GAPS BY OBJECTIVE AND PROGRAM AREA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**OBJECTIVE 1: INCREASED TRADE**

To what extent is ATI’s greater focus on intraregional trade leading to increased results in exports within the continent?

For firms increasing exports, is there evidence of their ability to meet international grades and standards to export?

What is the most effective buyer-driven model for engaging with regional exporters?

What is the appropriate balance between firm-level support to generate a demonstration effect of good practice in regional trade and industry-level support for systemic change and suitability effects?

Why are some trade deals failing or taking time to close?

**OBJECTIVE 2: INCREASED INVESTMENT**

What incentives are effective in catalyzing capital providers to enter new markets and make new investments in the continent?

What methods work best to attract new capital and what impact does it have on the business?

Why are some finance and investment deals failing or taking time to close?

**OBJECTIVE 3: IMPROVED BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT CLIMATE**

To what extent are the policy milestones leading to improved institutional architecture in trade and investment?

What are some of business environment, trade, and investment related challenges being experienced?

**OBJECTIVE 4: PROGRAMMATIC AND INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT TO USAID AND PROSPER AFRICA SECRETARIAT**

To what extent is the Secretariat accelerating USAID’s goals?

**CROSS-CUTTING OBJECTIVE: GENDER EQUITY AND SOCIAL INCLUSION**

What are the challenges that women-owned businesses are experiencing with regards to increasing exports and accessing finance?

Which financial products are most suitable for women-owned businesses?

What ATI activities have been most effective in empowering women and youth?

---

**ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND SCHEDULE**

**ATI MEL STAFFING**

The MEL function shall be performed by a team comprising the MEL Director, Reporting and Analysis Manager, and MEL Specialist, and bespoke Buy-In MEL support, with short-term technical assistance from experienced MEL specialists and research and data management experts as needed.
The MEL Director will report to the Senior Technical Director-Africa and will oversee all MEL activities for the project, including management of the MEL strategy and supporting the Reporting and Analysis Manager, and MEL Specialist.

The MEL Director will lead iteration of the MEL framework, providing guidance on indicators and sources, and ensure that appropriate and reliable data are collected, analyzed, and reported on a periodic basis as specified. The MEL Director will be responsible for organizing the processes surrounding data collection, analysis, verification, and reporting. S/he will ensure that project team members have the necessary tools to collect data and that they do so consistently and at the appropriate frequency. S/he will also be responsible for secondary data quality control (i.e. after data entry). S/he will perform basic data analysis and tabulation to identify potential erroneous data and design a spot-check system to verify data at the source through field visits to ATI’s counterparts.

When errors are identified early, the MEL Director can make appropriate corrections by consulting the data source. Annually, in conjunction with the technical team, the MEL Director will review the appropriateness of the MELP and make the necessary adjustments.

The MEL Director will delegate day-to-day management of data collection, verification, management, analysis, visualization and reporting to the Reporting and Analysis Manager and the MEL Specialist. The Reporting and Analysis Manager and the MEL Specialist are responsible for producing the MEL reports on time, and in a technically valid, high-quality, and client-relevant manner, with the purpose of providing firm grounds for management decisions. They will work with Activity Coordinators and subcontractors to define MEL reporting requirements for buy-in activities and will review data collected and reported on buy-in activities and at a top-line portfolio level.

Table 3: Schedule of Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Reports to USAID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>REPORT</th>
<th>FREQUENCY</th>
<th>TRANSMISSION TO USAID</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION OF CONTENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly Report</td>
<td>Quarterly</td>
<td>Electronically to the COR</td>
<td>Activity and results progress reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Report</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Electronically to the COR</td>
<td>Activity and results progress reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual FTF Report</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Electronically via DIS</td>
<td>FTF activity and results progress reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad Hoc Requested Reports</td>
<td>As Requested</td>
<td>Electronically to the COR</td>
<td>Special studies or assessments, data quality assessments, or learning activity read-outs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 1: Custom- EG.3.2-23 Value of exports/sales achieved with USG assistance**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** This indicator will measure the annual dollar value of exports from firms, associations, or other entities assisted by ATI in targeted agricultural commodities. Exports should be counted against the baseline of existing export levels from the previous year (existing exports before ATI intervention for the first year or additional exports for subsequent years). The commodities to be counted are those that are targeted in the work plan and/or contracts of the implementing partners. Both direct assistance (i.e. to firms and/or associations) and indirect assistance (through trade associations or industry associations/federations) should be counted. ATI support can include: training, technical assistance and capacity building, trade events, buyer/seller match-making programs, market analysis services, trade facilitations, standards and grades, certifications, trade finance assistance, and guidance on how to comply with foreign customs regulations and procedures.

Targeted commodities or value chains include any sectors supported by ATI which can include USG FTF staple foods and any other targeted value chains receiving assistance. Examples could include specialty foods, textiles and apparel, footwear and leather, and other value chains receiving ATI assistance.

A commodity should be counted as having been "exported" for purposes of the indicator when it is shipped, not when the contract is signed (because signed contracts could be voided or cancelled before exports are realized) or when partial or final payment is received by the exporter (because once shipped, it has in fact been "exported," regardless of when or whether the exporter receives payment). The value chains to be counted are those that are targeted in the ATI work plans by the firms/entities/associations ATI is assisting. Exports should include those within and outside of neighboring regions, to avoid loss of counter-seasonal exports, which often leave the proximate region.

| Unit of Measure: US$ (Note: Convert local currency to USD at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting quarter or year or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation) | Type of Indicator: Outcome | Category / Standard Number: Custom EG 3.2-23 | Desired Direction: Higher is better |

**Standard Disaggregation:** Commodity/value chain; destination market/country
- Country of origin
- Services and technology
- AGOA vs non-AGOA
- By sex of firm owner/managing director
- Size of enterprise

**Rationale:** Increased trade is one of the end results of efficient markets. This indicator reports progress on Increased Sustainable Economic Growth.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source(s):** ATI-assisted firms

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Two methods of data collection will be used:

1. An export-sales data confirmation tool and
2. Firm-level questionnaires administered at the end of the fiscal year.

Direct project records will be obtained to support contribution depending on the type of assistance that firms receive from ATI. Firms that have only received assistance linked to specific export sales (buyer linkages, trade fair/missions, etc.) will provide specific export sales data on transactions resulting from ATI assistance. This documentation will be collected by ATI technical staff working with the firms on a quarterly and annual basis. Firms that have only received more general assistance from ATI, which is not related to specific export sales (such as financial/investment facilitation, technological assistance, management strengthening, quality standards assistance, etc.) will be sent questionnaires to determine export sales toward which ATI may have contributed. This system is necessary to ensure attribution and at the same time avoid double counting of export sales of firms that may be in both groups mentioned above.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Collection:** Data on export sales of individual firms assisted with export transactions will be collected on a rolling basis with quarterly reviews and verification occurring once a year to ensure data for each firm is correct and complete. Annual export sales data will be collected from these firms once a year at the close of the project year.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Reporting:** Quarterly and annually, by October

**Location of Data Storage Within Implementing Partners (IPs):** ATI Management Information System (MIS), hard copies at MEL offices

---

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** September 2022

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** The evolution of firm-level exports depends on multiple factors besides ATI assistance.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** The use of the context indicator for exports can be used to assess how movement among ATI assisted firms compares with overall exports of the same commodities, providing an external frame of reference.

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD in consultation with USAID

---

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS**

**Data Analysis:** Compare value of exports as a result of ATI assistance in the current reporting year with the targeted value of exports. Analysis of the achievements will be determined as meeting the target, exceeding the target, or not meeting the target. Targets will have been met if the actual is within ±10 percent of the target. Analyze the data by all disaggregation listed.

---

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** Baseline for the performance indicator is zero.

**Rationale for Targets:** Annual targets are incremental. Life of project (LOP) target is cumulative. All targets will be set by the ATI team taking into account most recent work plan.
OTHER NOTES

Other Notes: N/A

THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: 12/23/21
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 2: Custom- Percentage of firms/organizations with increased profitability or increased self-sufficiency**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** To measure sustainable private sector investment, we will look at profitability of applicable firms and financial self-sufficiency of trade/business associations and/or civil society organizations (CSOs) as a marker of viability. An association is financially self-sufficient when the association’s annual income is more than annual operating expenses and annual amortization and depreciation of permanent assets. A firm should be counted if it operated more profitably in the reporting year than it did the previous reporting year. An association should be counted if it was more financially self-sufficient in the reporting year compared to the previous reporting year.

Although profitability or self-sufficiency measured during the period the USG is providing assistance does not demonstrate all aspects of whether a business or an association will remain sustainably successful after withdrawal of USG assistance, it is certainly an important measure of its capacity to function effectively. Only the profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of associations who are receiving USG capacity-building assistance that is intended to increase profitability or viability should be tracked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of firms &amp; associations; ratio of firms &amp; associations reporting higher profitability or self-sufficiency / total responding # of firms &amp; associations</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>% of firms &amp; associations; ratio of firms &amp; associations reporting higher profitability or self-sufficiency / total responding # of firms &amp; associations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disaggregated by:** Country, sector/value chain, type of entity (private enterprise, CSO/NGO, association), sex of owner/manager

**Rationale:** The main goal for local capacity building is to leave behind viable businesses and service providers to contribute to the economic growth of the local economy. Profitability of firms and self-sufficiency of civil society organizations is one way to demonstrate that viability and sustainability of the businesses/firms/CSOs in which we invest.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source(s):** ATI assisted firms/entities

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Firm-level questionnaire of ATI assisted firms. ATI technical and MEL staff will follow-up with firm managers to encourage them to respond to the questionnaire. It is proposed that one questionnaire is sent to the firms to assess ATI’s contribution to their profitability and any other significant changes. ATI will administer questionnaires, which will contain self-reported data points (i.e. profitability, most significant changes attributable to ATI). Data from these self-reported questions will establish ATI performance but most importantly will identify the relationship between technical assistance and outcomes, and impact realized. Self-report measures are popular for a number of reasons. Firstly, they represent an efficient way (in terms of both time and cost) of obtaining data. Secondly, they can be easily implemented to large samples with the advent of online questionnaire distribution sites such as Survey Monkey, befittingly in the case of ATI that is assisting hundreds of companies. Finally, they can be used to measure constructs that would be difficult to obtain with...
quantifiable measures.

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

**Frequency and Timing of Data Reporting:** Annually, by October

**Location of Data Storage Within IP(s):** MIS, hard copies in ATI MEL office

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** September 2022

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** There is an anticipated reluctance of assisted firms to divulge their sales figures and overall profitability. Access to accounting records will be difficult, making it hard to verify the information provided by the firms. Firms may also not always understand what is meant by profitability.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** The questionnaire used for this indicator will be kept as short and concise as possible to encourage response. ATI staff will follow up with firms by phone and in-person with visits to encourage response. Firms will also be asked to commit to filling out this annual questionnaire at the beginning of their assistance relationship with ATI.

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD in consultation with USAID

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS**

**Data Analysis:** Compare by type of entity and by sector where data are available. Compare actual percentage of firms experiencing an increase in profitability to targeted percentage. Analysis of the achievements will be determined as meeting the target, exceeding the target, or not meeting the target. Targets will have been met if the actual is within ±10 percent of the target. Analyze the data by all disaggregation listed.

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** Baseline for the performance indicator is zero

**Rationale for Targets:** No targets set in 2021

**OTHER NOTES**

**Other Notes:** Percentage of responding firms reporting an increase in profitability attributable to ATI will be calculated and reported in the narrative on this indicator, along with the absolute number of firms reporting increases in profitability attributable to ATI. Targets will be expressed in percentage terms with the number of firms reporting increases in profitability being the numerator for this calculation and the total # of responding firms being the denominator.

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 3: Custom- CBLD-9 Number of USG-assisted organizations with improved performance**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Definition:** This indicator measures whether USG-funded capacity development efforts have led to improved organizational performance in organizations receiving organizational capacity development support. **Capacity** is the ability of people, organizations and society as a whole to manage their affairs successfully. **Capacity development** is the process of unleashing, strengthening and maintaining such capacity. Capacity is a form of potential; it is not visible until it is used. Therefore, performance is the key consideration in determining whether capacity has changed. **Organizational performance improvement** reflects a deliberate process undertaken to improve execution of organizational mandates to deliver results for the stakeholders the organization seeks to serve.

This indicator should only be used when an activity intentionally allocates resources (human, financial, and/or other) toward strengthening organizational capacity and undergoes a deliberate performance improvement process that is documented. The activity’s theory of change should reflect how the process of performance improvement is predicted to improve the delivery of products or services that an organization produces. With support from the implementing partner, each organization being supported should determine how it will define and monitor performance improvement based on its organizational mandate, mission, and strategic priorities.

The implementing partner sets annual targets for this indicator based on how many organizations will achieve improved organizational performance each year. An organization can be counted as having improved organizational performance if it meets the following conditions:

1. As reflected in the activity theory of change, resources (human, financial, and/or other) were allocated for organizational capacity development.
2. An organization demonstrates that it has undergone and documented a process of performance improvement, including the following four steps:
   a. Obtaining organizational stakeholder input to define desired performance improvement priorities,
   b. Analyzing and assessing performance gaps (the difference between desired performance and actual performance),
   c. Selecting and implementing performance improvement solutions (or the development interventions), and
   d. Monitoring and measuring changes in performance.
3. An organization demonstrates that its performance on a key performance indicator has improved.

Organizations may choose their preferred approach and/or tools for documenting the process and achievement of performance improvement. The approach and/or tool may be one that has been or is being used by the organization prior to the implementation of USG funded activities. One example of a broad performance improvement and measurement tool that USAID has endorsed is the Organizational Performance Index (OPI), which can be used for assessing performance across multiple domains. Other examples include university accreditation self-assessments, a balanced scorecard approach, Six Sigma, and many others. The data quality, including reliability and validity of the approach and/or tool, should be documented to the extent possible in the monitoring and evaluation plan (specifically the Activity MEL Plan for USAID).

Targets should be set and results should be reported using this formula for the overall indicator and each of the disaggregates:
• Numerator = number of organizations with improved performance
• Denominator = number of USG-assisted organizations receiving organizational capacity development support

Only one organization type should be selected for each organization receiving USG-funded capacity development assistance. Organization type should reflect the primary type of organization with which an organization identifies.

**Unit of Measure:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT: Number of agricultural firms with improved performance/ total number of firms engaged by ATI</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Standard</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard disaggregation:**

**DISAGGREGATE BY:**

• Numerator = number of organizations with improved performance
• Denominator = number of USG-assisted organizations receiving organizational capacity development support

Both the numerator and denominator should be disaggregated by type of organization.

**Type of organization:**

• Education (higher education, secondary, primary)
• Research institutions (non-degree granting)
• Cooperative (formal and registered private sector firm that serves members voluntarily united to meet common needs and aspirations through joint ownership and democratically controlled business)
• Producer group (informal, unregistered group of producers who aggregate product to access markets)
• Faith-based organizations
• Governmental agencies (at national or sub-national levels)
• Health service delivery sites (hospital, clinic, community, pharmacies)
• Private sector firms
• Non-governmental and not-for profit organizations
• Other

**Rationale:** Capacity development is essential to achieving and sustaining the U.S. Government’s Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) objectives of inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led economic growth, resilience among people and systems, and a well-nourished population. This indicator data and supplementing documentation will provide the Feed the Future initiative with a better understanding about the scope and scale of organizational capacity development efforts within the Feed the Future Zones of Influence (ZOI), as well as outside the Feed the Future ZOIs at organizations that play a significant role in contributing to agriculture-led economic growth (e.g. organizational capacity strengthening of a ministry of agriculture or an agricultural university outside of the ZOI). This indicator data also provides information about which types of organizational performance support its partners need. This indicator is linked to Cross-Cutting Intermediate Result (CCIR) 6: Improved human, organizational, and system performance of the Global Food Security results framework.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Level of data collection:** Organization. This includes organizations within the Feed the Future ZOIs, as well as organizations outside the Feed the Future ZOIs that play a significant role in contributing to
agriculture-led economic growth, e.g. organizational capacity strengthening of a ministry of agriculture or an agricultural university outside of the ZOI.

**Who collects the data for this indicator:** Implementing partners that implement activities under which resources have been allocated to work with organizations to strengthen organizational capacity for improved performance.

**Data Source(s):** Data should be collected using appropriate methods (including relevant questionnaires or other data documentation methods). Tools and data collection methods should be documented in the Activity Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Plan.

**ATI Method of Data Acquisition:** The ATI MEL and Technical team will collect baseline data for firms from the outset of ATI engagement and at the end of the year administer the Capacity Assessment tool to measure organizations’ improved performance.

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

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** Although this is an outcome indicator, the baseline value at the start of activity implementation should be zero because the indicator measures the number of organizations that have improved performance each year (as opposed to measuring a performance improvement score). Organizations can be counted in subsequent years, as long as their performance improved relative to the previous.

**FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:**

Contractors and recipients who implement activities fully or partially funded by Feed the Future should upload documentation demonstrating that the conditions identified above (a through c) have been met for each organization being reported as having improved performance. The CBLD-9 supplementary worksheet available at https://agrilinks.org/ftfms may be used as documentation, and users should upload the completed worksheet on the “Other Reporting Docs” tab on the “Enter or View Narratives” screen in FTFMS.

Targets should be set and results should be reported using this formula for the overall indicator and each of the disaggregates:

- **Numerator** = number of organizations with improved performance
- **Denominator** = number of USG-assisted organizations receiving organizational capacity development support. Both the numerator and denominator should be disaggregated by type of organization.

Only one organization type should be selected for each organization receiving USG-funded capacity development assistance. Organization type should reflect the primary type of organization with which an organization identifies. Additional description of the mission and function of each assisted organization (such as type of services provided, role of organization in a relevant sector, etc.) should be included in the Implementing Mechanism (IM) performance narrative.

**PPR DATA ENTRY NOTES (USAID only):**

The CBLD-9 Indicator Narrative must include the mission and function of each assisted organization (such as type of services provided, role of organization in a relevant sector, etc.), as well as the tools or other approach used to monitor and measure performance. Narratives may also address the following:

- Describe which organizational stakeholder input was obtained to define desired performance improvement priorities and the process for obtaining input.
- Describe how performance gaps (the difference between desired performance and actual
• What is the key performance indicator or area for performance improvement that was being addressed? Describe the performance improvement solutions that were selected and how they were implemented.
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 4: Number of agriculture and non-agriculture jobs supported or created with USG assistance

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition: This indicator counts all types of direct jobs created during the reporting year in agriculture and non-agriculture sector with U.S. Government assistance. This indicator counts existing jobs that were created in the current or in previous reporting years. Length of job created will not be surveyed as work hours vary greatly. “With U.S. Government assistance” includes farm and non-farm jobs where Feed the Future investments are intentional in assisting in any way to expand employment and where an objective of the Feed the Future activity is job creation.

ATI defines a direct job is a full-time position created by firm assisted/ supported. This is what assisted firms should project as number of people they have hired or positions they have supported attributable to ATI assistance.

An indirect job is one created by suppliers and vendors as a result of ATI assisting the primary firm. ATI assisted firms will be required to obtained self-reported from the suppliers and vendors reportedly creating jobs as a result of ATI's assistance to the primary firm.

Unit of Measure: Number of full time equivalent (FTE) jobs

Type of Indicator: Outcome

Category / Standard Number: Custom (linked to Standard / FTF 4.5-2; EG 3-9 for ag-related jobs)

Desired Direction: Higher is better

Disaggregated by: Agriculture/non-agriculture (agricultural totals reported with the other disaggregation to FTF 4.5-2/EG 3-9); country; sex of job holder

Additional Disaggregates: Direct jobs and indirect jobs; supported vs. created

Rationale or Management Utility (optional): This is a direct measure of improved livelihoods, as it measures creation of employment and related income. This is a proxy indicator for both improved profitability and competitiveness; the theory of change is that as firms are better able to engage in trade, their profits and revenues will increase, resulting in more jobs.

PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION

Data Source(s): ATI assisted firms/entities

Method of Data Acquisition: Annual survey to assisted firms
Method of Data Acquisition: Firm-level questionnaire of ATI assisted firms/entities. Initial levels will be collected from each firm at the start of the ATI assistance relationship. Annual questionnaires will be used to produce annual updates. It is proposed to send annual questionnaires to the firms to document ATI contributions to jobs and profitability (indicator 2). The project will keep the questionnaire for these indicators as short and concise as possible to encourage response. ATI staff will follow up with firms by phone and in-person with visits to encourage response. Firms will also be asked to commit to filling out this annual questionnaire at the beginning of their assistance relationship with ATI. ATI will administer questionnaires, which will contain self-reported data points (i.e. profitability, most significant changes attributable to ATI). Data from these self-reported questions will be establish ATI performance but most importantly identify relationship between technical assistance and outcomes and impact realized. Self-report measures are popular for a number of reasons. Firstly, they represent a ‘cheap’ way (in terms of both time and cost) of obtaining data. Secondly, they can be easily implemented to large samples with the advent of online questionnaire distribution sites such as Survey Monkey, befittingly in the case of ATI that is assisting hundreds of companies. Finally, they can be used to measure constructs that would be difficult to obtain with quantifiable measures.

Frequency and Timing of Data Collection: Annually

Frequency and Timing of Data Reporting: Annually, by October

Location of Data Storage Within IP(s): MIS and ATI MEL records

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September 2022

Known Data Limitations and Significance: There is an anticipated reluctance of assisted firms to divulge the number of employees. Access to personnel records will be difficult, making it hard to verify the information provided by the firms. Firms may also not understand the notion of full-time equivalents when they fill out the questionnaire.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: ATI will seek to obtain commitments from firms at the beginning of the assistance relationship to provide data on jobs in the baseline and annual questionnaire.

Date of future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments: TBD in consultation with USAID

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW & REPORTING

Data Analysis: Compare number of jobs created with ATI assistance in the current reporting year with the targeted number of jobs. Compare changes from prior year to current year, accounting for direct jobs and indirect jobs. Analysis of the achievements will be based on number of jobs created that are attributable to ATI. ATI will be determined as meeting the target, exceeding the target, or not meeting the target. Targets will have been met if the actual is within ±10 percent of the target. Analyze the data by all disaggregation listed.

BASELINE AND TARGETS

Baseline Timeframes: The baseline for the performance indicator is zero.
**Rationale for Targets:** No targets set in 2021. Targets set in subsequent years for number of jobs attributable to ATI.

**Other Notes:** Percentage of responding firms reporting an increase in jobs attributable to ATI will be calculated and reported in the narrative on this performance indicator, along with the absolute # of direct and indirect jobs created by ATI from the responding firms.
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 5: Custom- EG.3.1-14 Value of new USG commitments and private sector investment leveraged by the USG [IM-level]

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** The indicator includes new long-term capital investments (e.g. property, plant, and equipment and other fixed assets) and new operating capital investments (e.g. inputs or inventory) leveraged by the USG. Private sector co-investment - both cash and in-kind - for implementing specific activities (e.g. resulting from a successful GDA application) should also be included. It includes both upstream and downstream investments. Upstream investments include any type of agricultural capital used in the agricultural production process such as inputs (e.g. seeds, fertilizer, pesticides, etc.) and machinery. Downstream investments could include capital investments in equipment used for post-harvest transformation or processing of agricultural products or the transport of agricultural products to markets. In-kind investments, which should be valued at market rates, could include legal or business development services.

“New USG commitments” refers to funds in the form of a direct loan, part of a grant, or other award designed to leverage additional funds from private sector organizations. Subsidies paid to structure a guarantee or insurance product do not count as new USG commitments. For multi-year activities, commitments are recorded at the outset of the activity, if made prior to the start of the activity, or during the year when they are made, if commitments are received during implementation of an activity.

“Private sector” includes for-profit formal companies managing nutrition, agriculture, and/or food system-related activities. A community-based organization (CBO) or nongovernmental organization (NGO) investment may be included if the CBO or NGO engages in for-profit nutrition, agriculture, and/or food system-related activities.

“Investment” is defined as any use of private sector resources intended to increase future production, output, or income, etc. Investments are recorded on a yearly basis, as they are made. In-kind investments are recorded at market value in USD.

“Leveraged by the USG” indicates that the new investment was directly encouraged or facilitated by activities supported by the Feed the Future initiative. Usually, the Feed the Future activities will take the form of a grant, direct loan, guarantee, or insurance coverage from the USG (see examples below).

**Examples:**

**Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC):**
Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical because it indicates that the investment is perceived by private agents to provide a positive financial return and therefore is likely to lead to sustainable improvements in agricultural market systems. Agricultural growth is critical to achieving the Feed the Future (FTF) goal to “Sustainably Reduce Global Hunger, Malnutrition and Poverty.” This indicator is linked to CCIR: Strengthened global commitment to investing in food security in the GFSS Results Framework.

**Unit of Measure:**

**UNIT:** U.S. Dollars

*Note: Convert local currency to U.S. Dollars at the average market foreign exchange rate for the reporting year or convert periodically throughout the year if there is rapid devaluation or appreciation*

**Type of Indicator:** Outcome

**Category / Standard Number:** Standard

**Desired Direction:** Higher is better

**Standard disaggregation:**

**Funding source:**

- USG commitment amount (using "commitment" to include funding in the form of direct loans or a grant)
- Private sector partner leveraged amount (using "leveraged" to include both cash and in-kind investment valued at market rates from the private sector partner)

**MEASUREMENT NOTES**

**Level of collection:** Activity-level; new commitments and investment leveraged within reporting year by the USG activity.

**Who collects data for this indicator:** U.S. Government agencies and implementing partners

**Data Source(s):** Private sector financial records, program data, and U.S. Government agency records

**Frequency of collection:** Annually (USG commitments are only reported once, in the year they are made)

**Baseline Timeframe:** Baseline is zero

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

DEFINITION:

This indicator combines the total U.S. dollar value of debt (both cash and in-kind loans) and non-debt financing, such as equity financing, disbursed during the reporting year as a result of USG assistance to producers (individual farmers, fishers, cooperatives, etc.), input suppliers, transporters, processors, other micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs), and larger enterprises that are in a targeted agricultural value chain and are participating in a USG-funded activity. USG assistance may consist of technical assistance, insurance coverage, guarantee provision, or other capacity-building and market-strengthening activities to producers, organizations, and enterprises. The indicator counts the value of non-debt financing and both cash and non-cash lending disbursed to the participant, not financing merely committed (e.g. loans in process, but not yet available to the participant).

Debt: Count cash loans and the value of in-kind lending. For cash loans, count only loans made by financial institutions and not by informal groups such as village savings and loan groups that are not formally registered as a financial institution [1]. However, the loans counted can be made by any size financial institution from microfinance institutions through national commercial banks, as well as any non-deposit taking financial institutions and other types of financial NGOs. In-kind lending in agriculture is the provision of services, inputs, or other goods up front, with payment usually in the form of product (value of service, input, or other good provided plus interest) provided at the end of the season. For in-kind lending, USAID may facilitate in-kind loans of inputs (e.g. fertilizer, seeds) or equipment usage (e.g. tractor, plow) via implementing partners or partnerships. NOTE: formal leasing arrangements should be captured in non-debt financing section below, or transport with repayment in kind.

Non-Debt: Count any financing received other than cash loans and in-kind lending. Examples include equity, convertible debt, or other equity-like investments, which can be made by local or international investors, and leasing, which may be extended by local banks or specialized leasing companies.

This indicator also collects information on the number of participants accessing agriculture-related financing as a result of USG assistance to assist with indicator interpretation. Count each participant only once within each financial product category (debt and non-debt), regardless of the number of loans or non-debt financing received. However, a participant may be counted under each category (debt and non-debt) if both types of financing were accessed during the reporting year.

Note: This indicator is related to indicator EG.3.1-14 Value of new USG commitments and private sector investment leveraged by the USG to support food security and nutrition. Where there is a USG commitment such as a grant, guarantee provision, or insurance coverage, the resulting value of debt or non-debt financing accessed by participants of USG-funded activities should be counted under this indicator. The total value of the private sector investment leveraged should be counted under indicator EG.3.1-14. To avoid “double counting,” these two indicators will not be aggregated.

[1] The value of loans accessed through informal groups is not included because this indicator is attempting to capture the systems-level changes that occur through increased access to formal financial services.
Rationale: Making more financial loans shows that there is improved access to business development and financial services. This in turn will help expand markets and trade and help achieve the key objective of sustainable sector growth. Increased access to finance demonstrates improved inclusion in the financial sector and appropriate financial service offerings. This in turn will help to expand markets and trade (and also contributes to IR.3: Increased employment, entrepreneurship and small business growth and to achieve the key objective of inclusive agriculture-led economic growth (with agriculture sector being defined broader than just crop production). In turn, this contributes to the goals of reducing poverty and hunger. This indicator is linked to IR.2: Strengthened and expanded access to markets and trade of the Global Food Security results framework.

### Unit of Measure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Indicator</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number</th>
<th>Desired Direction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output</td>
<td>EG 3.2-6</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Standard Disaggregation:

**FIRST LEVEL**

**Type of financing accessed:** Debt

**SECOND LEVEL**

- **Type of debt:** cash, in-kind
- **Size of recipient:** individuals/microenterprises; small and medium enterprises; large enterprises and corporations.
  - Microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.
- **Sex of producer or proprietor(s):** Male, female, mixed
  - If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female.
- **Age:** 15-29, 30+, mixed
  - If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups.

**FIRST LEVEL**

**Type of financing accessed:** Non-debt

**SECOND LEVEL**

- **Size of recipient:** individuals/microenterprises; small and medium enterprises; large enterprises and corporations.
  - Microenterprises employed <10 people in the previous 12 months, small enterprises employed 10-49 people, medium enterprises employed 50-249 individuals and large enterprises and corporations employed >250 individuals.
- **Sex of producer or proprietor(s):** Male, female, mixed
If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as Male if all of the proprietors are male, as Female if all of the proprietors are female, and as Mixed if the proprietors are male and female.

- **Age: 15-29, 30+, mixed**
  - If the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the age of the proprietor should be used for classification. If the enterprise has more than one proprietor, classify the firm as 15-29 if all of the proprietors are aged 15-29, as 30+ if all of the proprietors are aged 30+, and as Mixed if the proprietors are from both age groups.

---

## MEASUREMENT NOTES

**Level of Collection:** Activity-level, activity participants

**Who collects data for this indicator:** Implementing partners

**Data Source:** Financial institution and investor records or survey of activity participants

**Frequency of collection:** Annually reported

**Baseline Info:** Baseline is zero

---

## REPORTING NOTES

**FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:**

Partners will need to enter the value of financing accessed in U.S. dollars, the value of financing accessed in local currency and the number of recipient enterprises that accessed the finance for each of the disaggregates. For example, an activity is working to increase cash loans available to small and medium agro-enterprises in the soy value chain. The implementing partner would enter the value of cash loans and the number of enterprises under each relevant aggregate category as follows after selecting the Debt disaggregate:

- **Type of financing accessed:** debt
- **Type of debt**
  - Value in US$ of cash debt disbursed

- **Size of recipient**
  - Value in US$ of loans disbursed to the participant small and medium soy agro-enterprises

- **Sex of recipient**
  - Value in US$ of loans disbursed to participant soy agro-enterprises with all male proprietors
  - Value in US$ of loans disbursed to participant soy agro-enterprises with all female proprietors
  - Value in US$ of loans disbursed to participant soy agro-enterprises with proprietors of both sexes (i.e. mixed)

- **Age of recipient**
  - Value in US$ of loans disbursed to participant soy agro-enterprises with all proprietors aged 15-29 years
  - Value in US$ of loans disbursed to participant soy agro-enterprises with all proprietors aged 30+ years
  - Value in US$ of loans disbursed to participant soy agro-enterprises with proprietors in both age groups
groups (i.e. mixed)

Number of recipients

- Number of participant soy agro-enterprises
- Number of participant soy agro-enterprises with only male proprietors
- Number of participant soy agro-enterprises with only female proprietors
- Number of participant soy agro-enterprises with proprietors of both sexes (i.e. mixed)
- Number of participant soy agro-enterprises with all proprietors aged 15-29 years
- Number of participant soy agro-enterprises with all proprietors aged 30+ years
- Number of participant soy agro-enterprises with proprietors of both age groups (i.e. mixed)

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FTFMS AND PPR (USAID only):

Only enter the Value of Financing Accessed in U.S. Dollars. The Local Currency and Number of Recipients data points are not required in the PPR. FTFMS will produce aggregated totals of the Value of Financing Accessed in U.S. Dollars for the indicator and for each disaggregate for entry in FACTS Info.

THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: 12/23/21
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 7: Custom- Number of firms that have applied improved organization-level technologies or management practices with USG assistance

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**USAID Standard Definition:** Agricultural private enterprises can include: processors, input dealers, storage and transport companies, manufacturers, producer associations, cooperatives, manufacturers’ associations, women’s groups, trade and business associations and community-based organizations (CBOs), including those focused on natural resource management, that applied improved technologies or management practices at the organization level during the reporting year. Organization-level technologies (e.g. digital embroidery machines, radio frequency identification tracking of pharmaceutical products, cold storage for medicines, etc.) and management practices include those in areas such as management (financial, planning, human resources), member services, procurement, technical innovations (processing, storage), quality control, marketing, etc. as a result of U.S. Government assistance in the current reporting year. Only count the entity once per reporting year, even if multiple technologies or management practices are applied.

Count the organization (enterprise, association, cooperative or CBO) applying an improved technology or management practice as one entity, and not as the number of employees or membership.

| Unit of Measure: Number of firms/associations applying | Type of Indicator: Outcome | Category / Standard Number: Custom [modified Standard - FTF 4.5.2-42; EG 3.2-20] | Desired Direction: Higher is better |

**Disaggregated by:** Type of organization (e.g. woman owned, firm, trade association, etc.), country, non-agricultural sector/value chain, optional – type of technology and management practice (for reporting), women owned or managed

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** Technological change and its adoption by different actors in targeted value chains will be critical to increasing overall productivity. This indicator tracks private sector and civil society behavior change to increase sector productivity ultimately contributing to increased competitiveness and overall economic growth

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Disaggregated by:** Type of organization (e.g. woman owned, firm, trade association, etc.), country, non-agricultural sector/value chain, optional – type of technology and management practice (for reporting), women owned or managed

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** Technological change and its adoption by different actors in targeted value chains will be critical to increasing overall productivity. This indicator tracks private sector and civil society behavior change to increase sector productivity ultimately contributing to increased competitiveness and overall economic growth

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** September 2022

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** Documenting the improved management practices and new organizational-level technologies will be difficult.
**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Questionnaires asking for the specific type of technology and/or management practice will need to be correctly designed, and responses from assisted firms will need to be reviewed for accuracy by technical/component leads. Spot checks and/or site visits by the technical/component teams and/or MEL teams may be necessary to confirm the accuracy of the reported data. ATI technical staff will also discuss with firms and associations the importance of tracking data that can be used to document technology/management practice use for reporting purposes.

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD in consultation with USAID

---

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

**Data Analysis:** Compare number of firms who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of ATI assistance with targeted number of firms. Compare changes from prior year to current year to determine whether reduction or increase has occurred. Analysis of the achievements will be determined as meeting the target, exceeding the target, or not meeting the target. Targets will have been met if the actual is within ± 10 percent of the target. Analyze the data by all disaggregation listed.

---

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** The baseline is the number of participant producers and other actors applying improved management practices or technologies promoted by the activity at the start of the activity

**Rationale for Targets:** Annual targets are incremental. LOP target is cumulative. All targets have been established based on the revised draft work plan and anticipated workloads.

---

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 8: Custom- Number of assisted firms/associations meeting international grades and standards to export

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition: Non-agricultural international export requirements include quality requirements (e.g. textiles or apparel), labeling requirements, international compatibility, or international best practices, international standards (e.g. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Organic Certification, ISO 9001 for quality management; ISO 14000 for environmental management; ISO 13485 for medical devices; ISPM 15 for wood packaging material; CITES convention for certain home décor and fashion accessories; etc.). The precise international standards should be relevant to the priority sectors identified by ATI. Firms are those assisted through ATI and are not engaged in the agricultural sector.

Number of firms and/or associations receiving ATI support meeting any international export requirements (i.e. sanitary and phyto-sanitary standards, quality requirements for agricultural products, etc.) from year to year. Do not double count a firm/association if they meet more than one new standard per year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of firms/associations</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregated by: Country, sector/value chain, type of organization (e.g. for-profit firm, women owned, CBO, etc.), type of standard/grade.

ATI Additional Disaggregates: Ag/ag services; non-ag/non-ag services

Rationale or Management Utility (optional): As more firms and associations are able to meet international standards and grades, they will be better prepared to export their goods and products.

PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION

Data Source(s): ATI assisted firms/entities

Method of Data Acquisition: Project records; a questionnaire or interview of assisted associations and firms. To increase response rates, ATI should consider having the technical/component staff contact the assisted firms to remind them to answer the questions, or even to walk the assisted firm through the questionnaire to collect the data themselves. To ensure that the assisted firms respond to the questionnaire, the Memorandum of Understanding (MOUs) or agreements with the firms should include the requirement to report data to all relevant ATI indicators (sharing the ATI PIRSs with the assisted firms is a best practice to increase the data sources’ understanding of the importance of this reported data).

ATI Method of Data Acquisition: Project records; a questionnaire or interview of assisted associations and firms.

Frequency and Timing of Data Collection: Annually

Frequency and Timing of Data Reporting: Annually, by October

Location of Data Storage Within IP(s): MIS and ATI MEL office records

DATA QUALITY ISSUES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:</strong></th>
<th>September 2022</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</strong></td>
<td>firms may not be accurate about meeting international standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</strong></td>
<td>Firms will be asked to provide specific documentation of meeting relevant formal international standards. This may include market-based evidence of increased quality such as written documentation of buyer quality judgments and evidence on shipment acceptance/rejections rates.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Date of future Data Quality Assessments:</strong></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:</strong></td>
<td>TBD in consultation with USAID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS

**Data Analysis:** Compare actual number of firms meeting quality grades and standards to targeted number of entities meeting such standards. Compare changes from prior year to current year and to a baseline, starting at zero, to measure change. Analysis of the achievements will be determined as meeting the target, exceeding the target, or not meeting the target. Targets will have been met if the actual is within ±10 percent of the target. Analyze the data by all disaggregation listed.

### BASELINE AND TARGETS

**Baseline Timeframe:** The baseline is zero.

**Rationale for Targets:** Annual targets are incremental. LOP target is cumulative. All targets will be set in accordance with the draft work plan and anticipated ATI workloads.

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 9: Custom- Number and value of export deals identified**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

Definition: This indicator measures both the total number and value of exports in U.S. dollars facilitated by ATI through buyer introduction and matchmaking, buyer missions, trade show preparation and attendance, business plan, development assistance, linkage with trade promotion service providers (TPSPs), or other trade promotion facilitation services. Deals are defined as a non-binding agreement between buyer and seller to transact some quantity of goods or services from the seller’s country of origin in Africa and/or USA.

**Unit of Measure: Type of Indicator: Category / Standard Number: Desired Direction:**

| UNIT: Number of deals and value in USD | Output | Custom | Higher is better |

**Disaggregated by:** Country of origin/investor and country of recipient/investee, destination market (East, North, Southern and West Africa, U.S. or other) ag/non-ag, sector/value chain

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** Tracking both the number and value of export deals will allow ATI to better understand which deals lead to a higher return on investment and adapt programming as necessary.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

- **Data Source(s):** ATI assisted firms and buyers
- **ATI Method of Data Acquisition:** Deal tracking conducted by technical teams and MEL team through regular monitoring of activities.
- **Frequency and Timing of Data Collection:** Ongoing
- **Frequency and Timing of Data Reporting:** Quarterly
- **Location of Data Storage Within IPs:** MIS and ATI Activity/Portfolio Managers Office and MEL records

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

- **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD
- **Known Data Limitations and Significance:** Tracking deals from contract signing all the way through to execution can be challenging given the volume of firms supported by ATI.
- **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Centralized data collection and tracking by technical team
- **Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS**

- **Data Analysis:** Data will be analyzed by totaling annual export amounts and number of deals. Comparative analysis will also be conducted to better understand how the size sector, amount of ATI support, and other contextual factors (country of buyer/seller) may have affected the size or frequency...
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 10: Custom- Number and value of finance deals identified

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Definition: This indicator measures both the total number and value in USD of investment deals ATI has contributed to through technical assistance, provision of financial resources, or other services.

Investment is defined as any use of private sector resources intended to increase future production output or income, etc. The “production chain” includes both upstream and downstream investments:

- **Upstream investments** include any type of capital (including operating capital) used in the production process such as land, ISO compliance, buildings, machinery, technical expertise, inputs, etc.
- **Downstream investments** take place after the production phase, and through to the point of sale, including advertisements, transportation, marketing, labeling, etc. This indicator includes operating capital for short-term uses as well as financial capital for longer-term uses.

Deals (investment or financing) facilitated means they directly encouraged or facilitated by ATI activities funded through the USG.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIT:</strong> Number of deals and value in USD</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disaggregated by:** Type of investment, type of financing, country of investee, ag/non-ag, sector/value chain, value, purpose of financing

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** Tracking both the number and value of export deals will allow ATI to better understand which deals lead to a higher return on investment and adapt programming as necessary.

PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION

**Data Source(s):** ATI assisted investors and investees

**ATI Method of Data Acquisition:** Deal tracking conducted by technical teams and MEL team through regular monitoring of activities.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Collection:** Ongoing

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IPs:** MIS and ATI Activity/Portfolio Managers Office and MEL records

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** Tracking deals from contract signing all the way through to execution can be challenging given the volume of investors supported by ATI.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Centralized data collection and tracking by technical team
Date of future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS**

**Data Analysis:** Data will be analyzed by totaling annual investment amounts and number of deals. Comparative analysis will also be conducted to better understand how the size of the sector, amount of ATI support, and other contextual factors (country of buyer/seller) may have affected the size or frequency of investments.

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

Baseline Timeframe: The baseline is zero.

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 11: Custom- Number of firms receiving USG funded technical assistance

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition: Defined as ATI supported firms that participate or receive technical assistance. This can include factory assessments, marketing support, business plan development, preparation for buyer missions, trade shows, technical assistance through TPSPs, etc. To be counted, evidence of attendance or record of support must be documented.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of firms</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregated by: Type of firm (e.g. private enterprise, CBO, NGO, government agency, government), type of assistance, country of firm origin, ag/non-ag, sector/value chain, sex of owner/MD, new/continuing: new (the entity is receiving USG assistance for the first time during the reporting year) or continuing (the entity received USG assistance in the previous year and continues to receive it in the reporting year)

Rationale or Management Utility (optional): Tracking technical assistance provided to each firm will help ATI to determine what amount and how much support is necessary to achieve intended results.

PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION

Data Source(s): Data will be collected through sign-in sheets, deal records, or trip reports from technical staff following when technical assistance support is provided.

ATI Method of Data Acquisition: Data on number of firms receiving technical assistance will be collected through activity sign-in sheets and ongoing project monitoring by the MEL and technical teams of ATI’s engagement with specific firms.

Frequency and Timing of Data Collection: ongoing, quarterly

Frequency and Timing of Data Reporting: Quarterly

Location of Data Storage Within IPs: MIS and ATI office MEL records

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: TBD

Known Data Limitations and Significance: Ensuring accurate reporting where firms engage in multiple ATI activities can lead to double counting or inaccurate counting.

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: ATI will centralize storage of data in a single database that relates each technical assistance activity to the relevant firms, including those that receive multiple instances of technical assistance.

Date of future Data Quality Assessments: TBD

Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments: TBD
## PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS

**Data Analysis:** Analysis will be conducted by reviewing technical assistance database and ensuring accurate counting is done to prevent duplicates.

## BASELINE AND TARGETS

**Baseline Timeframe:** The baseline is zero.

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 12: PSE 1 Number of USG engagements jointly undertaken with the private sector to achieve a U.S. foreign assistance objective**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** This indicator measures the breadth of USAID engagement with the private sector for the reporting year. An engagement is defined as a “strategic approach to planning and programming through which [the USG] consults, strategizes, aligns, collaborates, and implements with the private sector for greater scale, sustainability, and effectiveness of development or humanitarian outcome” (see USAID Private Sector Engagement Policy: https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1865/usaid_psepolicy_final.pdf). An engagement can be tangible/formal with a documented arrangement (e.g. financial assistance, materials, provision of goods and services) or informational/informal (e.g. convenings, facilitation, strategy development) exchange between a private sector actor and the USG or USG implementer. An engagement counts towards this indicator if the interactions between the USG and the private sector result in a documented exchange (e.g. memorandum of understanding, strategy, activity design documentation) that affects the approach or programmatic strategy or objective in achieving the desired U.S. foreign assistance objective.

An engagement can be one convening of private sector actors or a series of interactions with the private sector actor(s). An informational meeting with a business that does not yield documented changes to either the business or the USG’s strategic or programmatic approaches would not count. A Memorandum of Understanding that does not yield changes in the behavior of either the USG or the private sector actor in their approach to the MOU’s stated objective does not count as an engagement.

An engagement can have multiple documented purposes:

- Strategic alignment, project design and planning: engagements that advance development of complementary strategies and project design in line with U.S. foreign assistance objective(s)
- Advocacy/strengthening the enabling environment: engagements that address regulatory, legislative, and rule of law bottlenecks in a country’s business enabling environment
- Harnessing private sector expertise and innovation: engagements that harnesses innovation, technology, research and development, industry expertise, and/or entrepreneurial skills to achieve development outcomes with or without USG financial commitments
- Mobilizing private sector financial resources: engagements that leverage private-sector funding – including corporate social responsibility and philanthropy assets – or increase access to markets – such as through foreign direct investment or credit guarantees – to address a U.S. foreign assistance objective with or without USG financial commitments
- Technical assistance to local private sector actors – engagements that provide capacity building services – such as training or mentoring/coaching – to local private sector actors. Engagements with local or international private sector actors that only provide capacity building support to the local private sector is not counted.

Multiple USG engagements can occur within an implementing mechanism carrying out an activity. USG engagements can also occur outside any formal procurement process such as actions that aim to identify shared interests or jointly advocate for regulatory reforms and other enabling environment actions.

The private sector is defined as “for-profit, commercial entities and their affiliated foundations; financial institutions, investors and intermediaries; business associations and cooperatives; micro, small, medium and large enterprises that operate in the formal and informal sectors; American, local, regional, and multinational businesses; and for-profit approaches that generate sustainable income (e.g. a venture fund run by a non-governmental organization [NGO] or a social enterprise)” (See USAID’s Private Sector Engagement Policy).

‘Jointly undertaken’ is defined as an engagement between the USG, or a USG implementer, and the private sector that results in a coordinated action that can be implemented jointly, or separately in parallel.

U.S. foreign assistance objective refers to strategic, development, and humanitarian assistance objectives as identified in the Department of State-USAID Joint Strategic Plan and USAID Country Development and
Cooperation Strategies. Under the “purpose of joint engagement” and “U.S. foreign assistance objective addressed” disaggregates, count all purposes and objectives that apply to the engagement. These disaggregates do not need to aggregate to the total result reported under the parent indicator. Report the engagement only once under the “market-based engagement” disaggregate.

A market-based approach is defined as the use of business models and leveraging of market forces to solve development and humanitarian challenges beyond the life of the engagement and without USG assistance. Proof of concept is not needed for an engagement to count toward this disaggregate. To be counted, documentation must exist that either market forces were addressed, or a business model was developed as part of the engagement development process with private enterprise(s). This documentation is typically found in implementation plans, strategy design, or MEL frameworks. Corporate or private philanthropies and foundation engagement with the USG that use business models and leveraging of market forces in the design and implementation of the engagement count as a market-based engagement. A market-based approach can engage low-income people as customers and supply them with products and services they can afford; or, as business associates (suppliers, agents, or distributors), to provide them with improved incomes. Government advocacy and anti-corruption engagements count as non-market-based engagement.

Note: This indicator is a snapshot indicator and cannot be summed across reporting years to calculate a total for the life of an activity. Engagements that continue beyond the reporting year should be counted for each reporting year that it is active.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT: Number</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregation
- **Purpose of Joint Engagement:** Strategic alignment/planning, advocacy/strengthening the enabling environment, harnessing private sector expertise & innovation, mobilizing private sector financial resources, provided technical assistance to the local private sector, and other
- **Type of Engagement:** Market-based/ non-market based

**Linkage to Long-term Outcome or Impact:** This indicator is linked to USAID’s Private Sector Engagement (PSE) Policy, the Department of State (DOS) USAID Joint Strategic Plan, and USAID Country Development and Cooperation Strategies. It captures the breadth of private sector engagement to advance U.S. foreign assistance objectives.

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** This is an Agency-wide cross-cutting indicator that applies to all sectors and standardized program areas. This indicator will be used to monitor implementation of the USAID PSE Policy, a finding from The Office of Inspector General’s Audit on the USAID PSE Policy.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source(s):** Operating units and implementing partners records

**ATI Method of Data Acquisition:** Data on number of firms receiving technical assistance will be collected through activity sign-in sheets and ongoing project monitoring by the MEL and technical teams of ATI’s engagement with specific firms.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Collection:** ongoing, quarterly

**Frequency and Timing of Data Reporting:** Quarterly
### Location of Data Storage Within IPs
- MIS and ATI office MEL records

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** Ensuring accurate reporting where firms engage in multiple ATI activities can lead to double counting or inaccurate counting.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** ATI will centralize storage of data in a single database that relates each technical assistance activity to the relevant firms, including those that receive multiple instances of technical assistance.

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS

**Data Analysis:** Analysis will be conducted by reviewing technical assistance database and ensuring accurate counting is done to prevent duplicates.

### BASELINE AND TARGETS

**Baseline Timeframe:** The baseline is zero.
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 13: PSE 2: Number of private sector enterprises that engaged with the USG to support U.S. Foreign Assistance objectives

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

This indicator sums the total number of private sector enterprises worked with in the reporting year. A private sector enterprise is defined as “for-profit, commercial entities and their affiliated foundations; financial enterprises, investors and intermediaries; business associations and cooperatives” (See USAID’s Private Sector Engagement Policy). Private sector enterprises can vary in size and origin. An engagement is defined as a tangible/formal with documentation arrangement (e.g. financial assistance, materials, provision of goods and services) or informational/informal (e.g. convenings, facilitation, strategy development) exchange between a private sector enterprise and the USG or USG implementer.

An engagement counts towards this indicator if the interactions between the USG and the private sector result in a documented exchange (tangible or informational) that affects the approach or programmatic strategy or objective in achieving the desired U.S. foreign assistance objective.

An engagement can be one convening of private sector enterprises or a series of interactions with the private sector enterprise(s). An informational meeting with a business that does not yield documented changes to either the business or the USG’s strategic or programmatic approaches would not count. A Memorandum of Understanding that does not yield changes in the behavior of either the USG or the private sector enterprise in their approach to the MOU’s stated objective does not count as an engagement.

U.S. foreign assistance objective refers to strategic development, and humanitarian assistance objectives as identified in the DOS-USAID Joint Strategic Plan and USAID Country Development and Cooperation Strategies. There are four disaggregate types: U.S. Foreign Assistance objective(s) addressed, type of private sector enterprise, origin of private sector enterprise, and the size of the private sector enterprise. Count the private sector enterprise only once under the “type of private sector enterprise,” “origin of private sector enterprise,” and “size of private sector enterprise.” You can select all the disaggregate types that apply to the private sector enterprise under the “U.S. Foreign Assistance objective(s) addressed.”

Note: This indicator is a snapshot indicator and cannot be summed across reporting years to calculate a total for the life of an activity. Engagements that continue beyond the reporting year should be counted for each reporting year that it is active.

PPR REPORTING NOTE: list all private enterprise names in the indicator narrative when reporting for the PPR. USAID will be responsible for analyzing data and cleaning any double counting as data is aggregated to reflect Agency-level results for the fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT: Number</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregation
- **Type of Private Sector enterprise:** For-profit commercial entities (excluding financial enterprises and social enterprises), private financial enterprises (excluding social enterprises), private social enterprises, corporate foundations and corporate philanthropic entities, private grant-making foundations, business, trade and industry associations (including chambers of commerce), private cooperatives, and other
- **Origin of Private Sector enterprise:** US-based, host country-based, third country-based
- **Size of Private Sector enterprise:** Large (100+ employees) Medium (50-100 employees) Small (10-50 employees)
**Linkage to Long-term Outcome or Impact**  
This indicator is linked to USAID’s Private Sector Engagement (PSE) Policy, the DOS USAID Joint Strategic Plan, and USAID Country Development and Cooperation Strategies. It captures the breadth of private sector engagement to advance U.S. foreign assistance objectives.

**Rationale or Management Utility** (optional):  
This is an Agency-wide cross-cutting indicator that applies to all sectors and standardized program areas. This indicator will be used to monitor implementation of the USAID PSE Policy, a finding from The Office of Inspector General’s Audit on the USAID PSE Policy.

---

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source(s):** Operating units and implementing partners records

**ATI Method of Data Acquisition:** Data on number of firms receiving technical assistance will be collected through activity sign-in sheets and ongoing project monitoring by the MEL and technical teams of ATI’s engagement with specific firms.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Collection:** ongoing, quarterly

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IPs:** MIS and ATI Office MEL records

---

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** Ensuring accurate reporting where firms engage in multiple ATI activities can lead to double counting or inaccurate counting.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** ATI will centralize storage of data in a single database that relates each technical assistance activity to the relevant firms, including those that receive multiple instances of technical assistance.

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

---

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS**

**Data Analysis:** Analysis will be conducted by reviewing technical assistance database and ensuring accurate counting is done to prevent duplicates.

---

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** The baseline is zero.

---

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 14: Custom- EG.3.1-d Number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for trade and investment policy achieved with USG support [Multi-Level]**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Definition:** This performance indicator measures the number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for food security policy reform. Institutional architecture (IA) broadly refers to “the entities and processes for policy formulation and implementation.” More specifically, this indicator refers to institutional architecture for food security policy. IA for food security policy reflects both the capacity of specific types of organizations (such as ministries, policy think tanks, citizen interest groups and district governments) and at different levels (e.g. regional, national, sub-national) as well as the processes through which these organizations interact towards a common food security goal (such as through inter-ministerial processes, scorecard reviews, or decentralization). A milestone is a ‘positive change’ that marks a significant achievement in the development of better performing, more effective policy systems and describes how the change contributes to improved policies and policy outcomes within a GFSS country or regional plan. Food security policy, in this context, includes policies that affect food security, such as policies in agriculture, nutrition, social safety nets, etc.

Operating Units (OUs) will be the primary reporting unit for this indicator. The OU will be responsible for setting milestones and targets, specifying timing, and reporting achievements. OUs should report milestones completed across GFSS partners facilitated with USG funding. The milestones should align strategically with country or stakeholder priorities. Support or assistance for the IA achievement may be provided by the OU, through implementing partners or other USG support. OUs will use internal planning documents and work with IPs and other stakeholders (e.g. government) to set targets. Milestones will be reported through a separate template and will identify the type of USG support provided, how the milestone improves IA, stakeholders receiving support, successes and/or lessons learned, and will provide evidence supporting achievement of the milestone.

The indicator is designed to be inclusive at different levels, including sub-national, national, regional and international, in both institutions and processes to capture a wide variety of potential changes in the policy making and implementation process. The milestones specified should fit within one or more of the six core IA policy elements that have been defined as important for a robust food security policy institutional architecture. Further descriptions of the Policy Elements are found in the attached document.

**IA Policy Elements**

- **Policy Element 1:** Predictability of the Guiding Policy Framework – the effectiveness of the legislative process and the extent to which the relevant laws, regulations, and policies governing the policy development process are transparent, predictable and consistently applied.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Establishment of parliamentary access to food security expertise; comment period for draft law established; citizen groups have regular and reliable access legislative processes and documentation.

- **Policy Element 2:** Policy Development and Coordination – the capacity and effectiveness of the organizations and entities to initiate and develop food security policy and the strengthening of the relationships among these entities.
  - Illustrative Milestones: Facilitation of the formation of a joint sector food security committee in the Prime Minister’s office (national); a regional protocol for coordinating staple food data (regional level); planned schedule of meetings between Planning, Finance and Agriculture Ministries; intergovernmental coordination forum established and operational (e.g. meets regularly, shares information, takes decisions).

- **Policy Element 3:** Inclusivity and Stakeholder Consultation – the degree of inclusivity in consultation
with key groups critical to the food security sector and the extent to which the different groups are engaged, including groups across government, the private sector and among non-governmental organizations.

- **Illustrative Milestones:** Concerted efforts resulting in farmer association membership in an apex society (sub-national level); support to a representative civil society association focused on food security priorities (sub-national/national); civil society and producer group platform for input to agricultural policy and program development; joint sector review (JSR) committee established; inclusive policy dialogues formalized.

- **Policy Element 4:** Evidence-based Analysis – the capacity and effectiveness of the organizations, processes, and fora responsible for collecting and analyzing data, and the extent to which evidence is used to inform or revise policy change.
  - **Illustrative Milestones:** Improved dissemination of agricultural data across multiple Ministries; improved timeliness and availability of food security-related surveys and survey analysis; public access to data on performance of the agriculture and food security sectors (e.g. dashboard monitoring systems; website data publication).

- **Policy Element 5:** Policy Implementation – the detail of implementation plans, alignment with line ministry and agency responsibilities, adequate funding, and quality of monitoring and evaluation plans
  - **Illustrative Milestones:** Improved budget justification for policy implementation; resources allocated for programs commensurate with objectives; capacity of local government authorities to implement programs strengthened; monitoring system for program and policy impacts established.

- **Policy Element 6:** Mutual Accountability – the effectiveness of the process by which multiple partners (such as government, donors, private sector and civil society organizations) agree to be held responsible for the commitments that they have voluntarily made to each other. It relies on trust and partnership around shared agendas. Mutual accountability is supported by evidence that is collected and shared among all partners. The principle of mutual accountability is expected to stimulate and broaden the practice of benchmarking, mutual learning and harmonization of national development efforts, while encouraging a greater level of trans-boundary cooperation and regional integration.
  - **Illustrative Milestones:** CAADP Joint Sector Review successfully completed; donor mapping tool providing input on donor investments available; joint metrics established for monitoring food security performance.

---

**Modified Definition:** Although the USAID standard definition does not explicitly exclude non-agricultural policies, the intent of the indicator is aligned with FTF and agriculture. Therefore, the modified definition will be to include non-agricultural milestones, which will be captured and reported as a separate disaggregate from agriculture related milestones.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of policies</td>
<td>Steps 1, 2, and 3 = Output Steps 4 and 5 = Outcome</td>
<td>Custom [modified Standard - FTF 4.5.1-24; EG 3.1-12]</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Standard Disaggregation:**

- Level: Subnational, national, regional, continental and international level
- IA policy element: Predictability of the guiding policy framework, policy development and coordination,
inclusivity and stakeholder consultation, evidence-based analysis, policy implementation, mutual accountability

**ATI Additional Disaggregates:** Country, Priority organizations, Gender inclusivity, FTF Agriculture, Non-FTF Agriculture and Non-Agriculture

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** A country’s capacity to undertake transparent, inclusive, predictable, and evidence-based policy change is fundamental to improving food security outcomes. Investing in strengthening a country’s IA for food security policy is a GFSS priority as it provides a foundation for building the systemic capacities for managing a multi-sectoral food security program. The importance of good governance and accountable institutions in delivering on predictable and transparent policy change is widely recognized. Data collected for this indicator across different levels will contribute to an improved understanding of the importance of policy IA and will be used in conjunction with other policy-related GFSS data to identify relationships between the policy system and policy changes. This indicator provides an opportunity to track the types of milestones and achievements OUs are delivering to improve systems, processes, and relationships that influence food security policy. This indicator is linked CCIR 5: More effective governance, policy, and institutions of the Global Food Security Strategy.

### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION

**Data Source(s):** Government agencies/ departments and project records

**ATI Method of Data Acquisition:** Collection and review of reports of relevant regional trade committees (regional policy organization and council of ministers) agreements and published national policy and project records

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

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IP(s):** MIS, ATI MEL office records

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** September 2022

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** None

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

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD in consultation with USAID

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
**Data Analysis:** Compare number of reform measures, regulations, rules and procedures in each stage in the current reporting year with the targeted number of new reform measures, regulations, rules and procedures. Compare current year’s data with data from the prior reporting year to determine whether reduction or increase has occurred. Compare actuals to targets. Analysis of the achievements will be determined as meeting the target, exceeding the target, or not meeting the target. Targets will have been met if the actual is within ±10 percent of the target. Analyze the data by all disaggregation listed.

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** The performance indicator baseline is zero.

**Rationale for Targets:** Annual targets are incremental. LOP target is cumulative. Targets have been set on the basis of ATI staff review of key policy targets and the initial draft work plan.

**REPORTING NOTES**

**FTFMS DATA ENTRY NOTES:**

This indicator requires documentation to be included in an OU IA template. The template will be submitted with the policy matrix for FTF target countries. Unique milestones can be disaggregated by more than one level and policy element. The total number of unique milestones should also be included in the disaggregate section of FTFMS.

**OTHER NOTES**

IA Policy Elements & Illustrative Sub-elements

**POLICY ELEMENT 1: PREDICTABILITY OF THE GUIDING POLICY FRAMEWORK**

**Clearly Defined and Consistent Policy Framework:** The policy framework impacting food security policymaking is clearly defined, and consistently applied and enforced from year to year.

**Predictability and Transparency of the Policy Making process:** The policy development process is transparent in accordance with the rules contained within the country’s constitution, basic law, and elsewhere in the formal legal framework.

**Clear and Functional Legislative System:** There is a legislative capacity to deal with food security change, and the legislative requirements are clearly defined and predictable.

**Appropriate Dispute Resolution Process/Judicial Framework:** The judicial system is perceived as fair and effective, and there is an appropriate system for dispute resolution where conflicts arise relating to food security policy.

**Clearly Defined Institutional Responsibilities:** Institutional responsibilities are clearly defined, consistently applied, and predictable from year to year.

**POLICY ELEMENT 2: POLICY DEVELOPMENT & COORDINATION**

**Approved Food Security Strategy/Investment Plan:** There is an approved/official multi-sectoral, multi-year food security plan developed, which specifies priorities and objectives, and addresses the roles of various contributors, including across government, the private sector, and CSOs. The vision and strategy to improve food security is clear.

**Predictable Policy Agenda and Priorities Developed:** The policy items required to achieve the national food strategy have been identified and documented, i.e. specific policy objectives exist.
### Annual Work Plans

There is an annual work plan that identifies objectives and activities in regard to policy development.

### Coordination Process

There is an entity, such as a coordination unit or task force, that has defined membership and meets regularly to discuss, develop and coordinate food security policy development (and oversee cross-sector coordination).

### Secretariat/Administrative Support Function

There is an adequate staff capability to perform required support processes, including coordination, meeting management, communication, and document management. This may be a stand-alone secretariat, or a responsibility within an existing entity.

### Technical Capacity

There are work groups, or technical committees, that have the authority and capacity to perform the following functions: identify policy and technical challenges/issues, develop sector- or project-specific policies/strategies, consult within the sector and draft funding proposals. There should be active participation by the private sector and CSOs on the technical work groups (as appropriate).

### Political Support and Approval

There is a line of authority/participation by high-level decision-makers above the ministerial level so as to enable efficient political support for the passage and development of new policies, e.g. involvement of prime minister’s office (especially for policies that cut across sectors, e.g. trade and agriculture).

### Engagement of Parliament/Legislative Body

There is engagement from the country’s legislative entity to debate and engage on food security issues, and to sponsor and advocate for the required legal/policy changes.

### Approved Food Security Strategy/Investment Plan

There is an approved/official multi-sectoral, multi-year food security plan developed, which specifies priorities and objectives, and addresses the roles of various contributors, including across government, the private sector, and CSOs. The vision and strategy to improve food security is clear.

### POLICY ELEMENT 3: INCLUSIVITY AND STAKEHOLDER CONSULTATION

#### Inclusive Participation within the Policy Coordination Management Entity

The main coordination entity has a) clear goals and participation from key government ministries (beyond just Ministry of Agriculture) and b) some representation from non-government entities, particularly from donors.

#### Outreach and Communications

There is a process for interacting with stakeholders and sharing information. This could include regular public “forums,” a website of key information and other mechanisms.

#### Private Sector Participation – Opportunity/Space

The private sector is provided meaningful opportunity to participate in policy formulation and strategy discussions. This could be through participation in the management/steering committee, in technical work groups and/or through other forums. Communications and interactions should be two-way, and access to key information should be readily available.

#### Private Sector Participation – Capacity to Participate

Some organizations representing the private sector have the capacity to participate in government-led discussions on food policy. This is to say they are able to represent their members, they are able to articulate and communicate policy positions, and they are able to provide some level of evidence-based analysis to support their viewpoints.

#### Participation of CSOs – Opportunity/Space

The CSO sector, including representation from women’s associations and farmers’ associations, is provided meaningful opportunity to participate in policy formulation and strategy discussions. This could be through participation in the management/steering committee, in technical work groups and/or through other forums. Communications and interactions should be two-way, and access to key information should be readily available.

#### Participation of CSOs – Capacity to Participate

Some organizations representing civil society, including representation from women’s associations and farmers associations, have the capacity to participate in government-led discussions on food policy. This is to say they are able to represent their members, they are able to articulate and communicate policy positions, and they are able to provide some level of evidence-based analysis to support their viewpoints.

### POLICY ELEMENT 4: EVIDENCE-BASED ANALYSIS
**Economic and Financial Analysis Completed as a Component of Planning:** National food security priority policy initiatives/investment plans are based on economic and financial analysis, including independent policy analysis. The analysis is available for public review.

**Performance Monitoring Measures and Targets Developed:** The national food security policies/plans include specific objectives, performance indicators, and targets exist to monitor the accomplishment of the objectives.

**Quality Data Exists for Policy Monitoring:** There is a database of quality statistics that is used to routinely report and analyze progress in achieving objectives. (Analysis to be conducted by USDA – and not as part of this assessment framework.)

**Quality Data is Available for Policy Making:** Data on the performance of the agriculture sector and the food security are publicly available and shared in a timely manner. This information is available for others to use and analyze.

**Inclusion of Analysis in the Policy Development Process:** Evidence-based analysis is considered and used to develop policy priorities/policy proposals.

**Capacity to Monitor Policy Implementation and Results:** The government has the ability to review data on policy performance and produce an analysis of the policy’s effectiveness. A policy analysis function/unit exists and has adequate and skilled staff and is sufficiently funded. If required, specific analysis can be outsourced to specialized firms or consultants as needed (case-by-case).

**Annual Performance Measurement Report Produced and Reviewed:** Evidence-based analysis is produced to review policy effectiveness (for implemented policies). A formal review session is held and includes key development partners (including principal donors and multilateral partners, such as Food and Agriculture Organization [FAO] and International Food Policy Research Institute [IFPRI]). Recommendations are developed as a result of the review and incorporated into subsequent plans.

**Independent Analysis Capacity Exists:** There exists an independent capacity to analyze food security data and use the analysis to make policy recommendations and engage in policy discussion and advocacy. Such an analysis could be conducted by a research institute, university, or similar non-governmental/objective organization. This capacity should be engaged in the government’s policy development and review process as, for example, through papers, forums or participation introduced in official policy review and discussion meetings.

**POLICY ELEMENT 5: POLICY IMPLEMENTATION**

**Implementation Plans Developed:** The overall food security strategy has been broken down into programs and projects that have a) a sufficient level of detail to permit implementation; b) have been “packaged” into priority projects that can be managed by ministerial units; and 3) “packaged” priorities can be translated into funding proposals to gain support for projects/programs from development partners (to address financing gaps).

**System in Place to Analyze Implementation Capacity Constraints:** An analysis of institutional, workforce, system and financial constraints is conducted. Critical implementation constraints are identified; a work plan is developed to address constraints; and implementation actions are moved forward (and periodically reviewed).

**Food Security Policy Priorities Aligned with Work Plans of Line Ministries:** The priority policy and associated objectives of the national food security strategy are broken down into specific programs and projects (with a sufficient level of detail) so that policy actions can be implemented by line ministries. The plans of individual ministries, and units within ministries, align with overall national strategy and its policy objectives.

**Policy Implementation Budget Committed by Host Country:** Resources are committed by the host country to implement the identified policy agenda. Over time, the country’s budget is adjusted to provide adequate financing for the implementation of actions required to implement policy priorities. Budget documents, including budget proposals, are released fully and in a timely manner.

**Supplemental Implementation Funds Secured:** Proposals can be submitted, and funds secured, to address financing gaps. Funds may come from multilateral funds (such as Global Agriculture and Food Security Program [GAFSP]), regional organizations, bilateral donors and the private sector.
**Monitoring and Evaluation:** Capacity exists within the public sector, private sector, or civil society to review the effectiveness and impact of policy changes. Sector reviews are performed and other research evidence is collected. There is a system to share, store, and access the findings from these reviews.

**POLICY ELEMENT 6: MUTUAL ACCOUNTABILITY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A Forum Exists for Regularly Scheduled Donor-Government Meetings:</strong></td>
<td>These meetings discuss policy and programs and set priorities. Meetings may include, for example, Joint Sector Reviews, sector working groups or other similar arrangements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joint Policy Priorities Developed:</strong></td>
<td>A document exists that articulates the shared policy objectives between the government and the donor community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monitoring System Exists:</strong></td>
<td>Performance measures exist (for the performance commitments of the government and for the performance commitments of the donors). There is a schedule for reviewing and documenting progress – at least on an annual basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor Coordination – Alignment and Harmonization:</strong></td>
<td>There is a process for donor participation in the food security policy process and for aligning government and donor objectives and priorities. Donor programs should contribute directly to host country strategies, plans, and objectives. This may include the signing of cooperation frameworks that indicate a joint commitment to specific policy change goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private Sector Accountability:</strong></td>
<td>The government provides feedback to the private sector on the performance of the food security program (including the private sector’s role) and provides an opportunity for dialogue on the program and its performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CSO Sector Accountability:</strong></td>
<td>The government provides feedback to the CSO sector on the performance of the food security program (including the role of CSOs) and provides an opportunity for dialogue on the program and its performance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 15: Number of organizations assisted to reduce Non-Tariff Barrier (NTB), which are relevant to the SADC region.**

### PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

**ATI Definition:** This indicator tracks the number of organizations being assisted by ATI to mitigate or reduce NTBs. It is related to ATI Indicator 14; in that it reflects the number of organizations taking the measures to address specific NTB-related policies that are tracked under that indicator. Thus, as organizations make progress towards reducing NTBs, by progressing through any of the stages of Indicator 14 “Milestones in improved institutional architecture,” they will be counted under Indicator 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of organizations</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ATI Disaggregates:** Type of organization, type of barrier (trade/finance), country, ag/non-ag

**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** This indicator measures the organizational reach of ATI efforts to address NTBs, with a greater number of organizations (mainly on the national level across major trading corridors) reflecting a higher level of expected impact in terms of reduced NTBs.

### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION

**Data Source(s):** SADC, government agencies/departments and project records

**ATI Method of Data Acquisition:** Collection and review of reports of relevant regional trade committees (SADC regional policy organization and council of ministers) agreements and published national policy and project records

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

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IP(s):** ATI MIS, ATI MEL office records

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** None

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

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD in consultation with USAID
### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Compare number of organizations in the current reporting year with the targeted number of organizations. Compare actuals to targets. Analysis of the achievements will be determined as meeting the target, exceeding the target, or not meeting the target. Targets will have been met if the actual is within ±10 percent of the target. Analyze the data by all disaggregation listed.

### BASELINE AND TARGETS

**Baseline Timeframe:** The performance indicator baseline is zero.

**Rationale for Targets:** Annual targets are incremental. LOP target is cumulative. Targets have been set on the basis of ATI staff review of key NTB targets and the initial draft work plan.

### OTHER NOTES

**Other Notes:** this indicator has been added to permit USAID to track performance specifically against NTBs as a particularly important type of policy that warrants specific targets.

### THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: 12/23/21
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 16: PSE 3: Number of private sector enterprises with improved participation in the local economy as a result of USG assistance

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition: This indicator measures whether the USG private sector engagement improved economic opportunities in areas that we worked during the reporting year. A private sector enterprise is defined as “for-profit, commercial entities and their affiliated foundations; financial enterprises, investors and intermediaries; business associations and cooperatives” (see USAID’s Private Sector Engagement Policy). Private Sector enterprises can vary in size and origin.

Participation refers to a private sector enterprise’s exchange of goods or services in the local economy. Private sector enterprises with improved participation have changed their relationships or processes to either maximize efficiency or create new opportunities. This is typically done by developing their:

- Internal Management Processes: refers to changes to their business operations such as their supply chain management, input distribution system, business to business services, or quality and standards that improve the private sector enterprise’s services or products offered or processes in place
- Access to New Markets: refers to creation of new products or services, expanded geographical reach, expanded customer/client base, or entry into the local economy
- Government Advocacy: refers to changes in the private sector’s enterprise relationship with the host country government—either national or subnational—and ability to engage in regulatory and legislative policy processes
- Access to Finance: unlocking or mobilizing investment opportunities for the enterprise

The local economy is defined as a national or sub-national economy of a country. A market system may be part of the local economy depending on the boundaries of the system.

There are three disaggregate types: type of private sector enterprise, origin of private sector enterprise, and the type of improvement that improved the private sector enterprise’s participation in the local economy. Count the private sector enterprise only once in the “Type of Private Sector enterprises” and “Origin of Private Sector enterprise” disaggregate categories. Select all that apply to the private sector enterprise when reporting against the “Type of Improvement” disaggregate categories.

PPR REPORTING NOTE: list all private enterprise names in the indicator narrative when reporting for the PPR. USAID will be responsible for analyzing data and cleaning any double counting as data is aggregated to reflect Agency-level results for the fiscal year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNIT: Number</td>
<td>Outcome</td>
<td>Standard</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disaggregation

Type of Private Sector enterprise: For-profit commercial entities (excluding financial enterprises and social enterprises), private financial enterprises (excluding social enterprises), private social enterprises, corporate foundations and corporate philanthropic entities, private grant-making foundations, business, trade and industry associations (including chambers of commerce), private cooperatives, and others.

Origin of Private Sector enterprise: US-based, host country-based, third-country-based

Type of Improvements Internal management processes, access to new markets, government advocacy, access to finance other

Linkage to Long-term Outcome or Impact This indicator is linked to USAID’s Private Sector Engagement (PSE) Policy, the DOS USAID Joint Strategic Plan, and USAID Country Development and Cooperation Strategies. It captures the breadth of private sector engagement to advance U.S. foreign assistance objectives.
**Rationale or Management Utility (optional):** This is an Agency-wide cross-cutting indicator that applies to all sectors and standardized program areas. This indicator will be used to monitor implementation of the USAID PSE Policy, a finding from The Office of Inspector General’s Audit on the USAID PSE Policy.

### PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION

**Data Source(s):** Operating units and implementing partners records

**ATI Method of Data Acquisition:** Data on number of firms receiving technical assistance will be collected through activity sign-in sheets and ongoing project monitoring by the MEL and technical teams of ATI’s engagement with specific firms.

**Frequency and Timing of Data Collection:** ongoing, quarterly

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IPs:** MIS and ATI MEL records

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** TBD

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** Ensuring accurate reporting where firms engage in multiple ATI activities can lead to double counting or inaccurate counting.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** ATI will centralize storage of data in a single database that relates each technical assistance activity to the relevant firms, including those that receive multiple instances of technical assistance.

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS

**Data Analysis:** Analysis will be conducted by reviewing technical assistance and documentation of the improvements experienced by firms.

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: 12/23/21**
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 17: New investment mechanisms/solutions developed and supported**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** To measure new investment mechanisms/solutions developed an exploration of the development of new financial approaches, products, and structures, particularly those with potential to engage U.S. firms and investors and increase access to finance for women-owned and men-owned African businesses and entrepreneurs. This may include expansion and uptake of existing but underutilized trade finance mechanisms, such as secured lending and factoring. Introducing new sources of liquidity, patient capital, and financial expertise to the continent should be considered. Efforts may also include support for commodity and export financing vehicles, deepening/strengthening capital markets, partnerships with emerging African sovereign commodity and export financing vehicles, deepening/strengthening capital markets, partnerships with emerging African sovereign wealth funds and other local institutional capital such as pension funds and insurance companies, or developing new financial product offerings, including tailored products need to reduce gender gaps.

**Unit of Measure:** Number  
**Type of Indicator:** Output  
**Category / Standard Number:** Custom  
**Desired Direction:** Higher is better

**Disaggregated by:** Country of origin, destination country, Ag/Non-ag, type of products, type of firm

**Rationale:** Development of new financial approaches, products, and structures, particularly those with potential to engage U.S. firms and investors and increase access to finance for women-owned and men-owned African businesses and entrepreneurs.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source(s):** ATI assisted firms/entities

**Method of Data Acquisition:** Project documents

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

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IP(s):** MIS, hard copies in ATI MEL office

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** September 2022

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** N/A

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A
**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD in consultation with USAID

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS**

**Data Analysis:** Compare by mechanism, gender lens and by sector where data are available.

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** Baseline for the performance indicator is zero

**Rationale for Targets:** No targets set in 2021

**OTHER NOTES**

**Other Notes:** N/A

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 18: Percent of activities screened for environmental risk**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** Screening entails reviewing systematic implementation of environmental safeguards as they help reduce drivers of food insecurity related to degraded natural resources, poor environmental health and hygiene, as well as risks from to weather and geological hazards. Interventions to ensure adequate and safe drinking water and sanitation; promote health and safety at work; ensure household-level air quality; and prevent exposure to hazardous chemicals and waste can significantly reduce disease burden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disaggregated by:** Country, Ag/Non-ag, Sector

**Rationale:** To uphold USAID environmental policies and regulation, the environmental impact assessment methodology is incorporated into program design and implementation across USAID programs globally. This methodology supports risk management and adaptive capacity, as well as an investment in resilient and sustainable livelihoods.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source(s):** ATI

**Method of Data Acquisition:** ATI Project documents

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

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IP(s):** MIS, hard copies in ATI MEL office

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** September 2022

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** N/A

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

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD in consultation with USAID
## PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS

**Data Analysis:** N/A

## BASELINE AND TARGETS

**Baseline Timeframe:** Baseline for the performance indicator is zero

**Rationale for Targets:** No targets set in 2021

## OTHER NOTES

**Other Notes:** N/A

## THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON: 12/23/21
Number/Name of Performance Indicator 19: Percent of ATI partners with documented environmental and social risk management policies

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** Documented environmental and social risk management policies entails conducting an environmental and social risk and opportunity screening or assessment. This entail the systematic identification, assessment, and management of climate risks at the strategy, project, and activity levels.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disaggregated by:** Country, Ag/Non-ag, Sector

**Rationale:** To uphold USAID environmental policies and regulation, the environmental impact assessment methodology is incorporated into program design and implementation across USAID programs globally. This methodology supports risk management and adaptive capacity, as well as an investment in resilient and sustainable livelihoods.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source(s):** ATI

**Method of Data Acquisition:** ATI Project documents

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

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IP(s):** MIS, hard copies in ATI MEL office

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** September 2022

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** N/A

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

**Date of future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD

**Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:** TBD in consultation with USAID
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BASELINE AND TARGETS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Timeframe: Baseline for the performance indicator is zero</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rationale for Targets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No targets set in 2021</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OTHER NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other Notes: N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
**Number/Name of Performance Indicator 20: Percent of ATI activities reporting environmental and social compliance data accurately and timely**

**PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DESCRIPTION**

**Precise Definition:** This indicator tracks number of ATI activities that they are environmentally and socially compliant:
- **Accurately:** 1. Does the information collected measure what it is supposed to measure? 2. Do results collected fall within a plausible range? 3. Is there reasonable assurance that the data collection methods being used do not produce systematically biased data (e.g., consistently over- or under-counting)? 4. Are sound research methods being used to collect the data?
- **Timely:** 1. Is data available frequently enough to inform program management decisions? 2. Is the data reported the most current practically available? 3. Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection (on a quarterly basis)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit of Measure:</th>
<th>Type of Indicator:</th>
<th>Category / Standard Number:</th>
<th>Desired Direction:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Custom</td>
<td>Higher is better</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Disaggregated by:** Country, Ag/Non-ag, Sector

**Rationale:** To uphold USAID environmental policies and regulation, the environmental impact assessment methodology is incorporated into program design and implementation across USAID programs globally. This methodology supports risk management and adaptive capacity, as well as an investment in resilient and sustainable livelihoods.

**PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION**

**Data Source(s):** ATI

**Method of Data Acquisition:** ATI Project documents

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

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

**Location of Data Storage Within IP(s):** MIS, hard copies in ATI MEL office

**DATA QUALITY ISSUES**

**Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** September 2022

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:**
1. Timelines: Late delivery, Out of date information, Collected too infrequently
2. Accuracy: Inconsistencies in data collection process; Instruments not always completed; Transcription errors

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Date of future Data Quality Assessments:</strong></th>
<th>TBD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedures for future Data Quality Assessments:</strong></td>
<td>TBD in consultation with USAID</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS**

**Data Analysis:** N/A

**BASELINE AND TARGETS**

**Baseline Timeframe:** Baseline for the performance indicator is zero

**Rationale for Targets:** No targets set in 2021

**OTHER NOTES**

**Other Notes:** N/A

**THIS SHEET WAS LAST UPDATED ON:** 12/23/21
## ANNEX II: ATI AND PROSPER AFRICA INDICATOR ALIGNMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATI INDICATOR</th>
<th>PROSPER AFRICA INDICATOR</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Indicator 1: Value of targeted exports with USG assistance</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Impact 4 Indicator: Total value of African exports of goods and services to the U.S.</td>
<td>ATI indicator measures the total, actual value of continent-wide African exports of goods and services to the U.S. ATI will be able to provide data to meet the Prosper Africa requirements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosper Africa Impact 1 Indicator: Total value of U.S. exports of goods and services to Africa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosper Africa Impact 4 Indicator: Total value of African exports of goods and services to the U.S.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Percentage of firms/organizations with increased profitability or increased self-sufficiency</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Percentage of USG-assisted organizations with improved performance</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Number of agriculture and non-agriculture jobs created with USG assistance</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Outcome Indicator: Number of jobs supported or created by USG-assisted deals</td>
<td>Indicator is the same. ATI disaggregation will track jobs supported and jobs created.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Value of new USG commitments and private sector investment leveraged by the USG to support economic growth in non-agricultural targeted sectors</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Indicator Outcome 3: Total value (in USD) of private sector investment capital mobilized for enterprises/projects in Africa from deals closed with USG support</td>
<td>This indicator measures the total value of private sector investment capital committed and/or disbursed (on commercial or semi-commercial terms) for enterprises/projects in Africa from deals closed with USG support. The dollar value of mobilized private capital investment is a key measure of the impact of private sector engagement and is one of the DFC’s Impact Quotient metrics under its Innovation pillar. It includes private loans or cash for stock and excludes all public funding and grants. This value can include commitments at the time of commercial close (a disaggregate of outcome 2 for investment deals), as well as actual capital disbursed after commercial close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Value of financing accessed as a result of USG assistance</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Indicator Outcome 3: Total value (in USD) of private sector investment capital mobilized for enterprises/projects in Africa from deals closed with USG support</td>
<td>This indicator measures the total value of private sector investment capital committed and/or disbursed (on commercial or semi-commercial terms) for enterprises/projects in Africa from deals closed with USG support. The dollar value of mobilized private capital investment is a key measure of the impact of private sector engagement and is one of the DFC’s Impact Quotient metrics under its Innovation pillar. It includes private loans or cash for stock and excludes all public funding and grants. This value can include commitments at the time of commercial close (a disaggregate of Outcome 2 for investment deals), as well as actual capital disbursed after commercial close.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Number of firms that have applied improved organization-level technologies or management practices with USG assistance</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Output 5 Indicator: Number of unique, registered, U.S. or African businesses or investors using the Virtual Deal Room</td>
<td>This indicator measures the number of unique U.S. or African business or investment firms which have registered to use the Virtual Deal Room. The Virtual Deal Room is Prosper Africa’s effort to provide an online marketplace for U.S. and African businesses and investors to engage in curated trade and investment opportunities. This metric helps assess use of technology application</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATI INDICATOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>PROSPER AFRICA INDICATOR</strong></td>
<td><strong>NOTES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Number of assisted firms/associations meeting international grades and standards to export</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>by businesses. ATI will also measure other platforms used by firms to achieve the same purpose.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 9 Number and value of export deals identified [Custom] | Prosper Africa Output 6 Indicator: Number of unique email inquiries to the Prosper Africa inquiry email from U.S. or African firms seeking trade or investment opportunities  
Prosper Africa Output 8 Indicator: Total number of active, Secretariat-sourced trade or investment deal opportunities in the pipeline  
Prosper Africa Output 9 Indicator: Total estimated value (in USD) of active, Secretariat-sourced trade or investment deal opportunities in the pipeline  
Prosper Africa Outcome 1 Indicator: Total number of successfully closed trade or investment deals supported by USG  
Prosper Africa Outcome 2 Indicator: Total estimated value (in USD) of successfully closed trade or investment deals supported by USG  
Total number of U.S. or African enterprises which successfully close deals to export or receive investment to/from Africa/U.S. with USG support  
Prosper Africa Outcome 6 Indicator: Total number of African diaspora-owned enterprises which successfully close deals to export or receive investment with USG support. | Using the value of the export deals indicator we will be able to disaggregate deals at different levels including only contact level. This means that as soon as ATI receives such inquiries from enterprises, the project would be in a position to document the deal pipeline while making a note of the fact that it’s still at the contact level. Furthermore, the Prosper Africa Outcome 1 indicator is aligned with ATI’s Indicator 10 as they both measure the total number of successfully closed trade or investment deals that have been supported by the USG including two-way trade/investment deals. The ATI indicator disaggregates by stage at which the deal is at e.g. deals still at negotiation stage, closure or falling through. Furthermore, the ATI indicator disaggregates its indicator by sector, women-owned, and size of enterprise. |
| 10 Number and value of finance deals identified [Custom] | Prosper Africa Output 6 Indicator: Number of unique email inquiries to the Prosper Africa inquiry email from U.S. or African firms seeking trade or investment opportunities  
Prosper Africa Output 8 Indicator: Total number of active, Secretariat-sourced trade or investment deal opportunities in the pipeline  
Prosper Africa Output 9 Indicator: Total estimated value (in USD) of active, Secretariat-sourced trade or investment deal opportunities in the pipeline  
Prosper Africa Outcome 1 Indicator: Total number of successfully closed trade or investment deals supported by USG  
Prosper Africa Outcome 2 Indicator: Total estimated value (in USD) of successfully closed trade or investment deals supported by USG  
Total number of U.S. or African enterprises which successfully close deals to export or receive investment with USG support. | Using the ATI indicator number and value of finance deals facilitated/supported we will be able to disaggregate deals at different levels including only contact level. This means that as soon as ATI receives such inquiries from enterprises, the project would be in a position to document the deal pipeline while making a note of the fact that it’s still at contact level. Further to that the Prosper Africa Outcome 1 Indicator is aligned with ATI’s Indicator 10 as they both measure the total number of successfully closed trade or investment deals that have been supported by the USG including two-way trade/investment deals. The ATI indicator disaggregates by stage at which the deal is at e.g. deals still at negotiation stage, closure or falling through. Furthermore, the ATI indicator disaggregates its indicator by sector, women-owned, and size of enterprise. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ATI INDICATOR</th>
<th>PROSPER AFRICA INDICATOR</th>
<th>NOTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>successfully close deals to export or receive investment to/from Africa/U.S. with USG support</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prosper Africa Outcome 6 Indicator: Total number of African diaspora-owned enterprises which successfully close deals to export or receive investment with USG support.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Number of firms receiving USG-funded technical assistance [Custom]</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Outcome 5 Indicator: Total number of U.S. or African small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) which successfully close deals to export or receive investment to/from Africa/U.S. with USG support.</td>
<td>This indicator measures the total number of SMEs located in the U.S. or Africa that have closed trade or investment deals with the support of the USG. This metric assesses whether the USG is successfully assisting smaller firms to close deals, as well as whether investments into financial intermediaries are achieving the critical development objective of allocating capital to underserved populations. Empirical research has demonstrated that SMEs are the engines of job creation in the U.S. and globally, and that SMEs are owned by women and minority groups at higher rates. This metric includes disaggregated data from Outcome 4 and can also include firms that received investment through financial intermediaries after project commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Number of engagements jointly undertaken with the private sector to achieve a U.S. foreign assistance objective [PSE Indicator 1]</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Number of private sector enterprises engage with the USG to support U.S. Foreign Assistance objectives [PSE Indicator 2]</td>
<td>Total number of U.S. or African enterprises which successfully close deals to export or receive investment to/from Africa/U.S. with USG support.</td>
<td>This indicator measures the total number of SMEs located in the U.S. or Africa that have closed trade or investment deals with the support of the USG. This metric assesses whether the USG is successfully assisting smaller firms to close deals, as well as whether investments into financial intermediaries are achieving the critical development objective of allocating capital to underserved populations. Empirical research has demonstrated that SMEs are the engines of job creation in the U.S. and globally, and that SMEs are owned by women and minority groups at higher rates. This metric includes disaggregated data from Outcome 4 and can also include firms that received investment through financial intermediaries after project commitment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Number of milestones in improved institutional architecture for trade and investment policy achieved with USG support [Multi-Level]</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Output 1 Indicator: Total number of laws, policies, regulations, or licensing agreements—both indiscriminate and company or deal-specific—that aim to improve the trade, investment, or business climate in African countries officially adopted or implemented, with USG support.</td>
<td>This indicator measures the total number of changes to the “rules of the game” at any level of government that are intended to improve the trade, investment, and business environment, whether to improve the overarching climate, or the environment surrounding a specific transaction. Topic areas that fall under this indicator, according to the Prosper Africa Strategy and Implementation Plan, include: trade and investment barriers, including all of the categories of trade/investment barriers identified by the United States Trade Representative (USTR) such as import policies; subsidies; technical barriers to trade; sanitary standards; intellectual property protection; barriers to digital trade; service barriers; government procurement;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATI INDICATOR</td>
<td>PROSPER AFRICA INDICATOR</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Number of Non-tariff barriers mitigated (cross-cutting)</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Output 11 indicator: Total number of laws, policies, regulations, or licensing agreements--both indiscriminate and company or deal-specific--that aim to improve the trade, investment, or business climate in African countries officially adopted or implemented, with USG support.</td>
<td>This indicator measures the total number of changes to the “rules of the game” at any level of government that are intended to improve the trade, investment, and business environment, whether to improve the overarching climate, or the environment surrounding a specific transaction. Topic areas that fall under this indicator, according to the Prosper Africa Strategy and Implementation Plan, include: trade and investment barriers, including all of the categories of trade/investment barriers identified by the USTR (import policies; subsidies; technical barriers to trade; sanitary standards; intellectual property protection; barriers to digital trade; service barriers; government procurement; and investment barriers); trade facilitation; customs and border management; financial sector strengthening, including banking regulations, new financial services and products, access to finance, and anti-money laundering and counter-terrorist financing; monetary and fiscal policies; macroeconomic policies to stimulate inclusive economic growth; other relevant business climate issues that are included in the World Bank Doing Business indicators, such as the transportation and energy infrastructure; and worker protection regulations. This indicator also includes deal or company-specific, independent power producer laws/power purchasing agreements (such as those adopted under the Power Africa program), as well as similar laws intended to stimulate private investment in other sectors, such as water, health, and ICT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Number of private sector enterprises with improved participation in the local economy as a result of USG assistance [PSE Indicator 3]</td>
<td>Prosper Africa Outcome 3 Indicator: Total value (in USD) of private sector investment capital mobilized for enterprises/projects in Africa from deals closed with USG support.</td>
<td>This indicator measures the total value of private sector investment capital committed and/or disbursed (on commercial or semi-commercial terms) for enterprises/projects in Africa from deals closed with USG support. The dollar value of mobilized private capital investment is a key measure of the impact of private sector engagement and is one of the DFC’s Impact Quotient metrics under its Innovation pillar. It</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATI INDICATOR</td>
<td>PROSPER AFRICA INDICATOR</td>
<td>NOTES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>includes private loans or cash for stock and excludes all public funding and grants. This value can include commitments at the time of commercial close (a disaggregate of Outcome 2 for investment deals), as well as actual capital disbursed after commercial close.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>