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# Introduction

## Purpose of the PMEP

Program monitoring and evaluation is an integral part of Counterpart International’s management strategy. In the Participatory Responsive Governance-Principal Activity (PRG-PA) program Counterpart Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems will be integrated with program implementation to measure the impacts and effectiveness of the program interventions as well as provide feedback about the progress towards stated goals and objectives. Our M&E systems are also a key mechanism to ensure compliance with donor regulations and requirements.

The M&E strategy will generate and utilize systems that are practical, effective, and adaptable to the needs of the program which will provide timely information to program staff that will further assist in measuring program progress, identifying potential obstacles at an early stage, and make programmatic adjustments as needed based upon clear and robust data. Monitoring and evaluation is an on-going process that evolves as the program takes shape. In managing information, it is critical that a balance be maintained between the anticipated results of the program and information culled from all levels of Counterpart International. Changes in circumstances on the ground and the overall environment of democracy and governance programs necessitate a flexible and integrated M&E strategy that involves local partners, a focus on capacity building, and a continuous exchange of information between field staff and HQ.

PRG-PA’s comprehensive M&E system is designed to:

* Provide a system of data collection and ensure data efficacy and accuracy for meeting Participatory Responsive Governance-Principal Activity indicator targets;
* Help the PRG-PA program team collect and organize information to measure progress and to make programmatic adjustments in response to shifting needs; and
* Provide guidance to the program management team for program planning.

## The Development Context

Niger, with an estimated population of 18 million, is a landlocked country characterized by a high population growth rate, environmental challenges due to desertification, a vulnerable economy lacking in diversification, and a high dependence on development assistance. Niger consistently ranks at the bottom of the United Nations (UN) Human Development Index and

the government of Niger’s (GON) inability to meet the basic needs of its citizens and to decentralize governance has diminished public confidence and caused citizens to question democracy as a credible system of governance. Niger’s departments and municipalities, are largely dependent on the central government, its leaders often lack connections to communities. Instead, these communities often rely on traditional leaders, including sultans and chiefs, to advise them and negotiate through informal structures to address local needs. Exacerbating Niger’s governance crisis are challenges related to both internal and external security threats, as regional conflicts in Libya and Mali, as well as Boko Haram along Niger’s border with Nigeria, have increased trafficking and criminal activity in Niger, diverting the state’s already limited financial resources to security.

Nigerien women and youth are among the most alienated groups. Youth constitute more than half the population in Niger. Frequently unemployed and politically voiceless, they are vulnerable to recruitment into violent extremist and gang-like groups. Niger ranks last in the UN Development Program (UNDP) Gender Inequality Index due to the lack of decision-making power and status afforded to women, and high rates of sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV) and early marriage. Men are often charged with decisions related to women’s and girls’ education and healthcare and regulate their participation in public life.

Having recently completed the first round of legislative and presidential elections in February and a second round presidential run-off election in March, Niger is preparing to hold local elections currently scheduled for January 2017.

The level of voter participation for the legislative and presidential election was the highest since independence recorded at over 67%. The participation level for the presidential run-off election is disputed. The opposition called for a boycott of the vote and claims there was very low voter turn-out while the Independent National Electoral Commission (CENI) reported a participation rate of nearly 60%.

## The USAID/Niger Strategy

The PRG-PA program contributes to Mission Goal number one of the United States Government Integrated Country Strategy for Niger 2015-2017 (ICS) that *Niger is a friendly, stable democracy with increasingly accountable governance and respect for human rights*, by aiming to render the electoral processes more responsive, participatory, and focused on citizen priorities, and by following up on elections with efforts to hold politicians accountable for their campaign promises but also by assisting these elected leaders through collective action together with civil society, private sector, thought leaders and other actors. In alignment with the mission of the ICS, PRG-PA activities support the consolidation of democratic advances in Niger in ways that aim to lead to effective democratic institutions and increased national and regional stability providing greater well-being for more Nigeriens.

The PRG-PA program is a principal contributor to the achievement of Development Objective 2 under the Niger Operational Framework: *Citizen Confidence in the state increased among target populations.* Activities under the electoral Phase 1 of the program will help achieve this goal through major contributions to IR 2.1: *Participatory governance improved*, particularly by working to make the elections more responsive to citizen priorities. Post-electoral activities focused on targeted citizen priorities under Phase 1 will provide initial contributions to results under IR 2.2: *Equitable access to public sector services increased in target areas* while continuing to contribute to the participatory processes under IR 2.2, including civic engagement in governance.

Together with current USAID programming under the Resilience and Economic Growth in Sahel-Enhanced Resilience (REGIS-ER), Peace Through Development II, Consortium for Elections and Political Party Strengthening (CEPPS) National Assembly Strengthening, Youth, Advocacy, Women, Work and Alliances (YAWWA) Social Entrepreneurship, Niger Education and Community Strengthening program, Development Food Assistance Program (DFAP); and USAID’s Office of Transition Initiative activities in Agadez and Diffa, PRG-PA will work to achieve the DO2 goal of increased citizen confidence in the state and as such contribute to the country development goal of *Increased resilience and stability for Nigeriens to build a more prosperous society***.**

## Theory of Change & Program Strategy

Counterpart International’s strategic approach to improving collective responsiveness to priority public needs is guided by the program’s theory of change that increased understanding of local dynamics hindering or promoting reform (research) and increased positive and constructive public discourse (dialogue), combined with the improved ability of civil society, government, and political parties to form alliances and partnerships to achieve reform (collective action), will ultimately bolster local solutions that promote the public good and shift incentives away from behaviors that undermine this good.

### PRG-PA Strategy

PRG-PA will work with stakeholders to examine the interaction of these local dynamics, systems, and incentives and create opportunities for dialogue leading to collective actions that encourage government stakeholders to work with civil society and the media toward initiatives that benefit Nigerien society as a whole. PRG-PA will support this through capacity strengthening activities aimed to increase the ability of local actors to understand and carry out research-dialogue-action steps to reach shared public policy goals.

PRG-PA activities will work with CSOs and others to build on the results of the Initial Political Economy Analysis Action Research Activity (IPEAAR) to support citizen participation in dialogue with government, and to help multiple stakeholders take action around shared goals based on existing formal and informal ways of influencing the provision of public goods in Niger.

PRG-PA will collaborate with the PRG Political Parties Activity (PRG-PP) to complement this work by supporting political parties to better respond to citizens’ priorities and needs. The program will also coordinate with the Local Capacity Strengthening Initial Activity (LCSIA) in its support of select civil society organizations’ ability to engage effectively in issue-focused dialogues and collective action. Monthly meetings of the aforementioned PRG-PA partner organizations have begun already.

### Critical Assumptions

* Existence of political will for adoption and implementation of social reforms in the Government of Niger
* Political parties remain willing to engage on dialogue around citizen priorities despite electoral conflicts
* Receptivity of public authorities and citizens for public dialogue on the targeted citizen priorities
* Willingness of public authorities to engage with citizens/CSOs and other governmental actors, private sector and traditional actors, and vice-versa, to address and tackle key public services needs
* Interest and willingness of media to report on the targeted citizen priority issues
* Project period is a long enough timeline for concrete government actions
* Non-governmental actor solutions are sufficiently coordinated with public sector solutions for the same targeted citizen priorities
* Country remains politically stable
* Security situation allows for movement and activity implementation in designated regions
* Stakeholders participate in program activities
* Enough qualified (with capacity) civil society organizations and other entities apply for sub-grants

### Results Framework

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| PRG-PA Results Framework | | |
| Purpose: Improve collective (government and citizen) responsiveness to priority public needs | | |
| Outcome 1: Elections are more responsive to priority public needs | **Outcome 2: Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities** | **Outcome 3: Increased capacity of key actors to promote collective action** |
| *Results*  1.1.1: Increased non-governmental actor advocacy and support to increase political actor responsiveness to citizen priorities  1.1.2: Increased multi-stakeholder dialogue to increase political actor responsiveness to citizen priorities  1.2: Improved multi-stakeholder promotion of youth and women’s active participation in political platforms and electoral campaigns  1.3: Improved multi-stakeholder support to the application of electoral “rules of the game” particularly regarding electoral integrity and conflict mitigation  1.4: Improved media coverage of citizen public priorities and political processes | ***Results***  2.1: Public dialogue on targeted citizen priorities increased  2.2: Increased stated commitment of targeted actors to take collective action on targeted citizen priorities  2.3: Increased availability of reliable information on targeted citizen priorities  2.4: CSO/citizen advocacy for action on targeted citizen priorities improved  2.5: Increased contributions to public sector actor (legislature, central government, judicial, local government) measures to improve targeted citizen priorities  2.6: Increased non-governmental (NGO/CSO, citizen, traditional leader or private sector, etc.) measures enacted to improve the targeted citizen priorities  2.7: Accountability mechanisms strengthened or established on targeted citizen priorities in targeted geographical areas | ***Results***  3.1: Local Resource Entities are able to conduct PEA based-action research to inform public sector  3.2: Media are more effective in facilitating public dialogue and providing reliable information on governance/civic engagement issues  3.3: Increased organizational capacity of targeted non-governmental entities |
| *PRG Project Coordination*   * *Initial Political Economy Analysis Action Research Activity* * *PRG Political Parties Activity* | ***PRG Project Coordination***   * *Initial Political Economy Analysis Action Research Activity* | ***PRG Project Coordination***   * *Initial Political Economy Analysis Action Research Activity* * *Local Capacity Strengthening Initial Activity* |

# Management and Monitoring and Evaluation Plan

## Roles and Responsibilities

The M&E Team will be responsible for enhancing systems in support of the new program, including general monitoring and evaluation approaches, practices, and tools. They will also be responsible for building the capacity of all program staff and reporting on program activities., The Monitoring and Evaluation Officer will be responsible for developing, revising, implementing, and overseeing the program’s performance management and reporting system, including preparing and updating the Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), ensuring the accuracy and effectiveness of calculation methodologies used in the PMP, establishing data collection and management systems, coordinating with organizations, ensuring data integrity, verifying data, preparing and submitting all required performance reports to USAID in a timely manner. The Monitoring and Evaluation Officer will also be responsible for providing technical assistance to the program’s local sub-grantees as required. The Monitoring and Evaluation Assistant is responsible for assisting in the implementation of the performance management and reporting systems, including assisting in updating the PMP and verifying the accuracy of data and methodologies used in the PMP

In addition to the Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and Assistant all Participatory Responsive Governance-Principal Activity program staff will play a role in monitoring of program activities, targets and accomplishments and ensuring quality of performance and reporting.

## Knowledge Management Portal

PRG-PA will use Counterpart’s Knowledge Management Portal for its program monitoring, evaluation and reporting purposes. The Portal will capture PRG-PA’s generated inputs, outcomes and impacts to enable effective monitoring of and reporting on all program activities. All related data and activity documentation will be entered in the three following components of the system:

1. Management Information System (MIS) – allows Counterpart and its implementing partners to enter and access program information in real time and run monitoring reports that inform management decisions;
2. Local Contacts Database – provides a list of local contacts, including CSOs, media, and government agencies; and
3. Document Management System – enables users to share important programmatic, financial, marketing, reporting, and other documents with project staff, Counterpart, and USAID.

Once all staff are on board, Counterpart will develop a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan that outlines timing of activity monitoring, including training and granting monitoring, frequency of data quality reviews, data and document submission to the Knowledge Management Portal, and responsibilities within the team for monitoring, reporting and quality controls.

### Management Information System (MIS)

The MIS will be at the core of the program’s knowledge management and performance monitoring and evaluation system; it will serve as a living body of information that grows and expands as PRG-PA is implemented. It will provide immediate, updated performance information related to indicators, benchmarks, and milestone achievements. This information will be an integral part of project planning, monitoring, evaluation and management decision making. USAID will have access to information in the MIS related to the program. This system will allow USAID/Niger and program managers to access information in real time and in clear report formats from any desktop with internet access. Project input, output and outcome data will be organized by activity. The data can be disaggregated by type of activity, CSO, geographic area, dates, type of organization receiving assistance, sex of beneficiaries, sub-grantee conducting activity, training or technical assistance topics and sub-grant focus among others.

### Local Contacts Database

Counterpart International has employed the Local Contacts Database to maintain up-to-date information on past, present and future partners as well as to track all assistance provided to a given organization through PRG-PA. Counterpart will continue populating the database with information on all organizations that will receive any assistance through the program. USAID, Counterpart and its implementing partners will be able see what type of assistance has been provided to any given organization. The database provides contact information (name, address, contact person, phone number, email address, website) for the organization; keyword description of the mission (i.e. advocacy, gender mainstreaming, legal education, decentralization/local government strengthening, civic education, etc.); and affiliation with a network, if any. The database is searchable by any and all of the following: name, country, location, umbrellas/networks the organizations belong to, and the keyword description of the organization’s mission. This information will be edited periodically as contact information for the organization changes.

### Document Management System

The document management portion of the MIS will house all key project documents that will be easily accessible to USAID and Counterpart. The Document Management System will include: program updates, the PMEP, annual implementation plans, progress reports, financial reports, methodologies/tools by activity, reports and publications, monitoring and evaluation documents, best practices and lessons learned, project innovations, success stories, impact statements, media, notes of appreciation, country related non-program publications and photos.

At the end of each quarter, actual outputs will be compared and management decisions will be made with a view to producing intended results. The system makes for ready data analysis by comparing planned with actual performance to help both field and headquarters managers keep on top of program targets and benchmarks, and enable them to identify priorities for programming during the next quarter and to take corrective actions in a timely way. Data and information in the MIS will be used for program management and learning purposes by Counterpart and USAID.

### Reporting **System**

This portion of the KM portal aggregates data from the Management Information System allowing for quick and easy reporting based upon a number of different reports types.

***Table 1:*** *Types of Documents that can potentially be uploaded with KM Portal Forms*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Events:**   * Implementation plan, with budget * Agenda * Event Report * List of Invitees * Participant List (in PDF) * Presentations * Evaluation * Photos * Other Event Documents | **Training:**   * Implementation plan with budget * List of Invitees * Participant List (in PDF) * Evaluation * Training Module/Manual * Training Monitoring Report * Training Output * Training Report * Photos * Other Training Documents | | **Technical Assistance:**   * Comparative Analysis Paper * Legal Commentary * Technical Assistance Report * White Paper * Photos * Other Technical Assistance Documents |
| **Grants:**   * Grant Agreement * Grant Application/proposal * Grant final financial report * Grant final progress report * Grant periodic financial report * Grant progress reports * Impacts * Project Work Plan * Project M&E Plan * Site Visit reports * Photos * Other Grant Documents | **Assessments/Evaluations:**   * Implementation plan with budget * Report * Research SOW/Design * Research Tools/Instruments * Photos * Other Research Documents | | **Exchange/Study Tours:**   * Implementation plan with budget * List of Invitees * Participant list * Exchange/Study Tour Report * Photos * Other Exchange and Study tour Documents |
| **Media and Public Outreach:**   * TV and radio Broadcast * Mobile Messages * Listserv Material * Press release * Printed news articles * Printed Materials * Publication * Facebook content * Blog content * Twitter content * Website content * YouTube video clip * Other relevant media files/documents | | **Other Documents:**   * Weekly, quarterly and final reports * Program impacts, success stories * Annual work plans and PMEP * Methodologies and tools * Grant RFAs, manuals, procedures and policies * Quantitative data and analysis, if available * Locally written proposals, concept papers, teaming agreements | |

## Organizational Development Assessment

PRG-PA’s key partners will receive training on how to conduct action research, specifically political economy analysis (PEA) in support of advocacy and accountability campaigns and reforms and actions to improve responses to citizen priorities. These organizations and entities will engage in Counterpart’s organizational development assessment and have specific organizational development/institutional strengthening goals within the context of PEA research training including, leadership and strategic management; program management and quality control; accounting and financial management; financial sustainability; human and material resources; and external relations and communications.

By providing capacity building in PEA principles, PRG-PA will enable partners and grantees to apply PEA in their advocacy, community mobilization, and accountability campaigns to encourage citizens, government officials, media, and private sector actors to identify constructive, locally-driven solutions in support of their development priorities. The assessment and trainings will address the improvement in overall capacity of target organizations and their ability to use PEA effectively to identify and to orient action to address citizens’ priorities.

## Training, Monitoring, and Evaluation

Effective and high value training, including sensitivity to gender-specific issues and outreach techniques, as well as technical assistance will be critical to the success of PRG-PA. It is therefore essential to monitor the quality of training during (or immediately after) delivery. To evaluate the quality of the training, and to determine whether the PRG-PA is meeting equity goals in trainings and program activities, participants will be asked to complete a training evaluation form to evaluate the logistics, content and quality of instruction in the PRG-PA sponsored trainings. The M&E Specialist will conduct a quarterly analysis of the training evaluations and will provide a snapshot of the quality of the training and recommendations for improvement.

## Advocacy Tracking Matrix

PRG-PA will utilize Counterpart’s Advocacy Tracking Matrix to track the progress of legislation and regulations drafted, proposed, amended, adopted or advocated for with technical or financial support from the program. The Matrix tracks all action related to a particular legislation or regulation, including the date of the action, location of action, target of the action (i.e. government official, government agency, general public), outcome of the action, and potential beneficiaries of the legislation or regulation. Actions can range from meetings with relevant government officials to dialogues among stakeholders or town hall meetings, etc. The matrix is integral in identifying the time, activities and resources that contribute to legislative or regulatory changes.

## Grant Monitoring and Evaluation

Grantee monitoring is an integral part of PRG-PA’s grant management process and PRG-PA program implementation. Following approval of each set of grants, the Program and Grants staff will meet with the M&E Manager to assign each grant to one program staff person and one grant staff person (based on their expertise, interests and the needs of the projects) to act as a Grants Focal Point (GFP) and Program Focal Point (PFP), respectively, to monitor the grant (See Table 2, below). This list will be updated on a quarterly basis. These GFPs and PFPs have the responsibility of monitoring their grantee’s performance and supporting that/those grantees in implementation of the funded project. Each quarter, a schedule of monitoring visits will be developed and coordinated amongst the Grants, Program and M&E Teams, and disseminated to all relevant staff.

Grantee monitoring is carried out through a variety of ways (See Table 2, below for summary), including:

1. **Monitoring of Grantees and Activities:** Monitoring visits can and will be conducted by PRG-PA’s M&E Officer, and Grants manager. PRG-PA’s staff will conduct at least one organizational-monitoring visit (e.g. visit the grantee’s/partner’s office, meet with staff, check systems and management protocols, etc.) on a quarterly basis. PRG-PA will conduct at least one visit to a grantee, per month. Additionally, PRG-PA managers will make “monitoring phone calls”, to check in on a partner/grantee on a regular basis.
2. **Ad-hoc, spontaneous Spot Checks:** It is important to coordinate with partners before going to visit them. Nevertheless, ad-hoc/spontaneous spot checks would give PRG-PA staff an opportunity to actually see the organization on-site, to make sure the offices and the staff are in place and operational – especially when there are signs or suspicions of grantee/partner difficulties. PRG-PA staff may conduct at least one ad-hoc spot check during the course of each grant. It is expected that those organizations that have already worked with PRG-PA and proven they are capable of grant implementation will require fewer checks than those with whom PRG-PA has little or no working experience.
3. **Monitoring of Programmatic and Financial Reporting:** It is through program and financial reporting that PRG-PA learns details about successes, challenges and lessons learned of grantees/partners during the course of grant implementation. Both program and financial reports are effective means of verifying that reported activities and expenses associated with them are relevant and in sync with the project work plan. All monitors will review progress reports in preparation for any monitoring visits, to provide recommendations on improving the reporting quality, and to discover and document lessons learned by the partners or PRG-PA in the course of implementation of the funded project. Programmatic and financial reporting is reviewed and approved by program and the grants team, respectively**.** Also, theM&E Officer will review progress reports preceding any monitoring visits.
4. **Monitoring of KM Portal Reporting:** Similar to the requirements for PRG-PA staff reporting, grantees will be required to report on all activities conducted under the PRG-PA grant. This reporting enables PRG-PA staff to remain up to date on each grantee’s activities, identify trends for further technical assistance, as well as to verify data reported in programmatic reports.

The table below illustrates the responsibilities of PRG-PA staff and the frequency of monitoring checks:

***Table 3:*** PRG-PA *Frequency of Grantee Monitoring*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Monitoring Tools** | **Who is Responsible** | **Frequency of Monitoring or Visits** |
| Grantees/Partners Monitoring | Grant Manager | Monitoring Quarterly/technical support visits |
| Activities Monitoring | M&E Officer/M&E Assistant | Technical support visits; phone calls |
| Ad-hoc/ spontaneous Spot Checks | M&E Officer/M&E Assistant/Grants Officer | Quarterly |
| Monitoring Programmatic and Financial Reporting | Director of Finance and Administration/Finance Officer/Finance Assistant/Capacity Building Specialist | Monitoring quarterly/technical support visits |
| KM Portal Reporting | Monitoring and Evaluation Officer and Assistant | Quarterly |
| Advocacy Tracking Matrix | Advocacy and Accountability Specialist/Capacity Building Specialist | Quarterly |

## Ensuring Data Quality

Counterpart will follow USAID's data quality standards, a description of which may be found in USAID’s Automated Directives System (ADS), Chapter 203.3.5. They include Validity, Integrity, Precision, Reliability, and Timeliness. We will follow the instructions for conducting data quality assessments included in that chapter. Data Quality Assessments will be conducted by the M&E Officer semi-annually.

Counterpart’s Knowledge Management Portal will be an integral part of PRG-PA data collection and analysis. As such, PRG-PA will develop a reporting and review plan that outlines timing of data entry, and stipulates both random and periodic quality reviews by PRG-PA managers, PRG-PA M&E Officer, PRG-PA COP and Counterpart staff at headquarters to ensure that data collected is accurate, timely, valid, and reliable and reflect activities conducted in the field. Where weaknesses should arise, Counterpart M&E staff in Niger and Arlington will provide training and support to staff and institute additional quality controls; monitoring frequency will be increased until data collection and reporting have improved.

## Learning through M&E

Counterpart’s approach to learning couples M&E methods and processes that surface data necessary for decision making and reporting with learning goals and activities that support continuous improvement. PRG-PA’s **Learning Agenda**, developed in the first three to six months with stakeholder and USAID input, will not only include the PRG-PA’s key learning questions, it will explain how the Principal Activity will align with the PRG Project so that it is in line with USAID/Niger’s long-term agenda. It will help ensure that appropriate feedback elements and loops are integrated across all Activity Outcomes. The Learning Agenda will articulate the tools and methods the program will use to generate the requisite data, including after action reviews, most significant change activities, interactive evaluation methods, and progress markers. Learning activities will be written into the program’s work plan to become part of overall management activities. Our findings from our implementation of PRG-PA’s learning agenda will be shared with USAID in order to facilitate a collaborative discussion (including the findings of the impact assessment) to detail the best strategy for Phase 2. We may also conduct additional PEA action research under phase 2 to adjust strategies and work in support of collection action strategies.

## Reporting

### Annual Work Plans

After issuance of the cooperative agreement, USAID/Niger requested that Counterpart submit a draft rapid work plan for activities focused on the local elections, then scheduled for May 2016. Counterpart submitted that rapid work plan and a subsequent expanded version per USAID’s request when the local elections were rescheduled to January 2017. The year one annual work plan is due on June 15, 2016. Subsequent annual work plans will be submitted following each year of program implementation, respectively. All plans are due to USAID on January 26th of each year.

Unless otherwise instructed by USAID, Counterpart shall submit to USAID 90 days before the end of Phase 1 a Phase 2 program plan (narrative and timeline) proposing activities for a possible Phase 2 continuation and/or scale-up of activities conducted under Phase 1, particularly with regard to Outcomes 1 and 2. If approved, Phase 2 will then begin on the basis of this approved plan and subsequent work plan, to be submitted 30 days before the start of any Phase 2.

### Quarterly Performance Reports

At the heart of the PRG-PA monitoring and evaluation system will be Quarterly Performance Reports that will track progress against benchmarks and objectives. The reports highlight: (1) outcomes of the project activities; (2) program accomplishments or progress toward results during the reporting period; (3) a comparison of those results to the tasks in the implementation plan and PMP and a discussion of potential constraints that might prevent Counterpart/PRG-PA from meeting targets; (4) progress since the last report; (5) problems encountered and whether/how they were solved or if they are outstanding (i.e. challenges); (6) proposed solutions to new or ongoing problems; (7) success stories; and (8) documentation of best practices. Quarterly reports also incorporate the final, approved PRG-PA Performance Monitoring Plan indicators and targets as a baseline for reporting results, and identify progress made toward the PRG-PA’s targets on a quarterly basis. The quarterly report will be used to compare planned actions and results with actual implementation and results during each reporting period. The reports will be prepared based on regular monitoring by field teams of program implementation with local partners and beneficiaries, and will be finalized by Counterpart’s Headquarters team prior to submission to USAID by the end of the first month of each quarter, for activity in the previous quarter. Counterpart shall prepare a Phase 1 final report in lieu of the final quarterly performance report for Phase 1, reporting on performance to date per all indicators established in the performance management plan, summary of activities completed during Phase 1, any challenges encountered during implementation, lessons learned, and opportunities to potentially pursue in a Phase 2 of the project.

All programmatic reporting will be housed in Counterpart’s Knowledge Management Portal, and will be accessible to Counterpart and USAID/Niger, who will all have real-time access to qualitative and quantitative data demonstrating program implementation progress.

### Quarterly Financial Reports

Counterpart also prepares quarterly financial reports for USAID, which are submitted within 30 days of the completion of each quarter. The Finance and Administration Department in Counterpart's headquarters office supports the field-based finance staff, backstopping the field staff as they monitor the grant program and all expenditures to ensure compliance with USAID regulations. The HQ Finance and Administration Department also provides pipeline reports to the Counterpart Niger office on a monthly basis.

### End-of-Project Report

Counterpart will prepare a final report on the program within 90 days of the close of the project. The final report, among other things, will: (1) contain an overall description of the activities under the program during the period of the agreement, and the significance of the activities; (2) describe the methods of assistance used and the pros and cons of these methods; (3) present life of project results toward achieving the project objectives and the performance indicators, as well as an analysis of how the indicators illustrate the project’s impact on the accomplishment of the program’s overall objectives; (4) summarize the program’s accomplishments, as well as any unmet targets and the reasons for them including leveraging; and (5) discuss the issues and problems that emerged during program implementation and the lessons learned in dealing with them (i.e. challenges, Lessons Learned).

### Lessons Learned Documentation

Counterpart will organize annual meetings of PRG-PA staff and partners to take stock of program activities and develop work plans for the following year. Integral to this planning will be the identification and articulation of lessons learned and best practices in program implementation during the course of the previous years. This will involve review of information entered into the KM Portal, grantee files, internal and external evaluations as well as IP implementation experience. The lessons learned and best practices will serve as the basis for developing the following year’s work plan.

Best practices will also be gleaned from evaluations, reports to USAID, and internal monitoring guidelines.

## Evaluations

Counterpart’s evaluation methodology for PRG-PA comprises of a three wave evaluation process that includes a baseline assessment and final evaluation. These are described below.

# Annex A Performance Indicator Tracking Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Participatory and Responsive Governance -- Principal Activity** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Annex 1** | |  | **Performance Indicator Tracking Table** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Program Goal: Improved collective (government and citizen) responsiveness to public needs** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|
|
|  | **Cross-cutting** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind.** | **Indicators** | **Data Source** | **Method and frequency of data collection; frequency of reporting** | **Disaggregation** | **Baseline** |  | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **LOP** |
| **Output Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CC1 | # of people trained (Outcomes 1, 2, 3) | Counterpart | Method: KM Portal, sign-in sheets, training curriculum, event agendas, invitation letters, and activity reports. | Sex; Youth: binary; Sector; Third-level administrative division; Training topic/subject; Training format | 0 | Target | **50** | **170** | **100** | **70** | **50** | **440** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CC2 | # of CSOs/Social Organizations/Government Agencies/Media Outlets assisted (Outcomes 1, 2, 3) | Counterpart | Method: KM Portal, sign-in sheets, training curriculum, event agendas, invitation letters, and activity reports. | Sector; Third-level administrative division; New/Continuing; Leader sex | 0 | Target | **0** | **10** | **0** | **10** | **0** | **20** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CC3 | (F Indicator) # of civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions (Outcomes 1, 2, 3) | Partners/grantees | Method: KM Portal, advocacy plans or strategies, implementation plans, recording of press conference, copy of testimony or press release, advocacy campaign materials, etc. | Third-level administrative division; New/Continuing; Leader sex; Advocacy topic | 0 | Target | **0** | **10** | **5** | **5** | **0** | **20** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CC4 | (F Indicator) # of consensus building forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and/or civil/political) held with USG assistance (Outcomes 1, 2) | Partners/grantees | Method: KM Portal, activity plans, sign-in sheets, recording of press conference, copy of testimony or press release etc. | Primary topic/subject; Third-level administrative division | 0 | Target | **52** | **52** | **52** | **52** | **52** | **260** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CC5 | # of participants in consensus building forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and/or civil/political) held with USG assistance (Outcomes 1, 2) | Partners/grantees | Method: KM Portal, activity plans, sign-in sheets, recording of press conference, copy of testimony or press release etc. | Sex; Youth: binary; Sector; Third-level administrative division; Primary topic/subject; | 0 | Target | **171** | **171** | **171** | **171** | **171** | **855** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CC6 | # of broadcasts through new and traditional media in the course of CSO led public outreach campaigns (Outcomes 1, 2) | Partners/grantees | Method: KM Portal, activity plans, sign-in sheets, recording of press conference, copy of testimony or press release etc. | Third-level administrative division; Broadcast type; Messaging topic | 0 | Target | **0** | **350** | **100** | **200** | **150** | **800** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| CC7 | (F indicator) # of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use supported by USG assistance (Outcomes 1, 2) | Counterpart | Method: Oversight mechanism development and implementation matrix, public resource use analysis reports, mechanism procedure guides, copy of testimony or press release. | Third-level administrative division; Type of mechanism; Sub-sector | 0 | Target | **0** | **3** | **3** | **5** | **0** | **11** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Annually | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| CC8 | # of public policies changed consistent with citizen input (Outcomes 1, 2) | Counterpart | Method: Policy advocacy matrix, public session sign-in sheets, meeting agendas, event photos, activity reports, etc. | Sub-sector; Stage | 0 | Target | **0** | **0** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **3** |
| Frequency: Annually | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Annually | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Outcome 1: Elections are more responsive to priority public needs** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind.** | **Indicators** | **Data Source** | **Method of data collection; frequency** | **Disaggregation** | **Baseline** |  | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **LOP** |
| **Output Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | # of public outreach activities conducted | Partners/grantees | Method: KM Portal, activity plan/agenda, participant list, event photos, recording of radio programs, copy of press release etc. | Outreach topic; Activity type | 0 | Target | **100** | **30** | **0** | **30** | **30** | **190** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.2 | # of measures taken by non-political party actors to support the electoral code of conduct | Partners/grantees | Method: TBD | None | 0 | Target | **5** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **5** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.3 | # of measures taken by non-political party actors targeted by the project to mitigate electoral violence | Partners/grantees | Method: Follow-up phone calls, online conferences with, and visits to targeted non-political party actors | None | 0 | Target | **20** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **0** | **20** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.4 | % of citizens who report increased multi-stakeholder engagement demanding more responsiveness of political actors to citizen priorities | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **50%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.5 | % of citizens who report increased opportunity to positively influence social platforms | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **25%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.6 | % of citizens who report increased opportunity to mitigate electoral-related conflict | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **25%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.7 | % of citizens who report they have been exposed to media reporting and/or other media activities around the electoral process | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **75%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1.8 | % of citizens who report they have participated in media reporting and/or other media activities around the electoral process | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **10%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Outcome 2: Informed Multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind.** | **Indicators** | **Data Source** | **Method of data collection; frequency** | **Disaggregation** | **Baseline** |  | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **LOP** |
| **Output Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.1 | # of cultural actions supported by PRG-PA | Partners/grantees | Method: KM Portal, activity plan/agenda, participant list, event photos, copies of drawings, etc. | Third-level administrative division; Type of action | 0 | Target | **3** | **2** | **1** | **1** | **1** | **8** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Quarterly | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.2 | (F indicator) # of awards made directly to local organizations | Counterpart | Method: KM Portal, on-site observation | Type of award; Third-level administrative division; New/Continuing; Leader sex; Sub-sector | 0 | Target | **3** | **10** | **5** | **5** | **5** | **28** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Annually | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Outcome Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.3 | # of white paper and/or communal action plans created through policy dialogues | Counterpart | Method: KM Portal, copies of white papers and communal action plans | Third-level administrative division; Sub-sector | 0 | Target | **0** | **3** | **3** | **3** | **1** | **10** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Annually | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.4 | (F indicator) # of new USG-supported public-private partnerships (PPPs) formed | Counterpart | Method: Record of formal agreements indicating any PPP formed through PRG-PA interventions | Partnership focus | 0 | Target | **0** | **0** | **2** | **2** | **1** | **5** |
| Frequency: Quarterly | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: Annually | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2.5 | % of citizens who report awareness of the public goods provision process | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **70%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.6 | % of citizens who report awareness of whom to contact within the GoN to address provision of priority public goods | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **50%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.7 | % increase in citizens' reported expectations of the value of contacting GoN officials about citizen priority public goods | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **25%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.8 | % of citizens who report willingness to contact government officials (e.g., local and national representatives) to call for provision of priority public goods | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **70%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.9 | % of citizens who report that CSO/citizen advocacy on targeted citizen priorities is effective | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **70%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2.10 | % increase in the number of citizens who report use of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **25%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | **Outcome 3: Increased capacity of key actors to promote collective action** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Ind.** | **Indicators** | **Data Source** | **Method of data collection; frequency** | **Disaggregation** | **Baseline** |  | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Year 4** | **Year 5** | **LOP** |
| **Outcome Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.1 | # of organizations with improved organizational capacity in PEA per Counterpart's OD Assessment | Counterpart | Method: Comparison of different assessment scores per organization and tallying organizations that increase by at least one point from the baseline to end line | Sector; Sub-sector; Third-level administrative division; Functional area | TBD at baseline | Target | **0** | **0** | **0** | **10** | **10** | **20** |
| Frequency: TBD | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: TBD | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.2 | % increase in PEA capacity assessment scores of PEA-based action research organizations | Counterpart | Method: Comparison of different assessment scores per organization and tallying organizations that increase by at least one point from the baseline to end line | Sector; Sub-sector; Third-level administrative division; Functional area | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **0** | **0** | **10%** | **10%** | **21%** |
| Frequency: TBD | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: TBD | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Impact Indicators** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.3 | % of citizens who report that media investigative reporting is promoting collective action | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **50%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.4 | % of citizens who report that cultural artists messaging is influencing governance practices | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **50%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3.5 | % of citizens and public officials who report that investigative journalism in Niger is fair | Baseline study and final evaluation | Method: Review of third-party evaluation reports | Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; | TBD at baseline | Target | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **NA** | **15%** |
| Frequency: Twice: baseline and final | Actual |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Analysis & Reporting: baseline and final evaluation reports | Variance |  |  |  |  |  |  |

# Annex B Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Name of Indicator (CC1):** Number of people trained |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** This indicator will track the number of people who have attended a half-day or more PRG-PA-sponsored[[1]](#footnote-1) training implemented by any partner or grantee. Training is defined as a session with clear training/learning objectives that is intended to transfer knowledge about a specific topic. Trainings can be conducted on any topic (e.g. gender mainstreaming, financial management, community mobilization, advocacy, etc.) and should have a clear outline or curriculum led by an identified trainer. Trainings include, but are not limited to, seminars (lecture with questions and answers), workshops, webinars, study tours, vocational training, on-the-job training/internships, etc. that have clear learning objectives. Trainees should not be double counted within the same fiscal year. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of trainees |
| **Disaggregated by:** Sex; Youth: binary; Sector; Third-level administrative division; Training topic/subject; Training format |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** PRG-PA will conduct trainings with CSO personnel, journalists, and public sector actors. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Counterpart will use KM Portal to track the number of people trained. Quarterly KM data quality check will be conducted to verify numbers on the KM Portal through reviewing program records, including sign-in sheets, training curriculum, event agendas, invitation letters, and activity reports. |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** Potential double counting of trainees |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** Provide all of the partners/grantees with standard attendance sheets that require the same sign-in information for all training events. |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/440 |
| **Other Notes:** None at this time |
| Updated: 6/4/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Name of Indicator (CC2):** Number of CSOs/Social Organizations/Government Agencies/Media Outlets assisted |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Civil society organizations (CSOs) and social organizations are non-governmental organizations that manifest the interest and will of citizens/communities/environments/etc. Governmental agencies are state-controlled organizations who act independently to carry out the policies of the Government of Niger. Media outlets in this indicator include privately-owned, community, or independent public service news outlets. Types of platforms include: television, radio, print, or Internet media outlets that produce news and public affairs related contents. For the entity to be counted under this indicator, it (or an individual representing it) must have received PRG-PA technical or financial support[[2]](#footnote-2). This includes, but is not limited to: training; technical assistance; events; grants; exchange/study tour; etc. This indicator will be disaggregated by new versus continuing for the LoP:   * New = this reporting quarter is the first time that a CSO/social organization/government agency has received assistance * Continuing = this CSO/social organization/government agency has received assistance in previous program quarters |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of CSOs/Social Organizations/Government Agencies/Media Outlets |
| **Disaggregated by:** Sector; Third-level administrative division; New/Continuing; Leader sex |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator tracks the level at which the program is able to provide CSOs/social organizations/government agencies with assistance. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Counterpart will use KM Portal to track the number of organizations assisted. Quarterly data quality check will be conducted to verify numbers on the KM Portal through reviewing program records, including sign-in sheets, training curriculum, event agendas, invitation letters, and activity reports. Direct observation will be carried out during follow-up visits to assisted organizations to ensure data quality in terms of quality of assistance. |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/20 |
| **Other Notes:** None at this time |
| Updated: 6/4/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Name of Indicator (CC3):** Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No \_Yes \_X (2.4.1-9) |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** CSOs receiving technical or financial support from PRG-PA that initiate or participate in advocacy interventions. Advocacy should be understood as a means for individuals, constituencies, or organizations to shape public agendas, change public policies, and influence other processes that impact their lives. Advocacy does not involve one march, meeting or poster, but a series of strategic, interconnected, integrated activities designed to achieve a goal. It may include a wide range of activities, such as lobbying, public interest litigation, letter writing campaigns, civil disobedience, etc. Advocacy interventions tend to:  Be strategic (a deliberate, planned action, not random);  Involve a set of actions that are sustained in order to build and direct pressure;  Be designed to persuade;  Be targeted;  Involve alliance building.  Successful advocacy efforts result in change.  PRG-PA will support CSOs’ advocacy efforts in teacher deployment in the education sector and human resource distribution in the health sector.  All CSOs engaged in any quarter should be counted once for that quarter. Some CSOs can be counted multiple times during the LOP. For example, a CSO with a campaign spanning more than one quarter will be counted for each of the quarters during which the campaign is on-going. This indicator is disaggregated by new versus continuing to reflect the timeframe in which a CSO is engaged:   * New = this reporting quarter is the first time that a CSO/social organization/government agency has received assistance * Continuing = this CSO/social organization/government agency has received assistance in previous program quarters |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of CSOs |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; New/Continuing; Leader sex; Advocacy topic |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** Advocacy interventions are essential aspects of democratic policy making, citizen participation, and oversight of all branches of government. These interventions play an important role in determining social justice, political and civil liberties, and in giving voice to citizens and historically marginalized groups. At its best, advocacy expresses the power of an individual, constituency, or organization to shape public agendas and change public policies. As part of a broader civil society strategy, advocacy-oriented action goes beyond specific objectives (e.g., raising the minimum wage) to providing the means to mobilize society, ideas, and resources in an effort to bring about democratic change and/or its consolidation. It is a critical means for citizens to express their needs and concerns to government.  PRG-PA managers will use the data for program planning. This indicator sheds light on the extent to which PRG-PA is working with civil society to assist them in having a voice in public decision-making and other political processes. This would be relevant for the USAID Forward reforms which include a component on strengthening civil society capacity to advance aid effectiveness. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Counterpart will use KM Portal to track information of CSOs assisted. Partners/grantees will submit advocacy plans or strategies, implementation plans, recording of press conference, copy of testimony or press release, advocacy campaign materials, etc. to support the claim of engagement in advocacy intervention. Counterpart will verify and aggregate data in quarterly reports. |
| **Data Source:** PRG-PA partners/grantees |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/20 |
| **Other Notes:** None at this time |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Name of Indicator (CC4):** Number of consensus building forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and/or civil/political) held with USG assistance |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No \_Yes \_X (2.3.1-7) |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Multi-party, civil/military, civil /political forums are events, seminars, meetings, and conferences that bring together groups in an effort to generate greater understanding, consensus, and common interests around citizen priorities, key concerns and public agenda. Civil in this sense means “public” and indicates a meeting, town hall, forum, etc. in which the public can communicate directly with representatives of parties (or government) or the security sector (military, police). For purposes of this indicator, a series of regularly recurring meetings/events that are part of the same process are counted as one event: e.g. a series of municipal government hearings to get feedback on a three-year development plan should be counted as one event. For the forum to be counted under this indicator, it must have been conducted by entities that receive PRG-PA technical or financial support[[3]](#footnote-3). |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of forums |
| **Disaggregated by:** Primary topic/subject; Third-level administrative division |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** Increased communication between groups enhance understanding and increase the possibility that consensus building processes will result in an agreement, such as agreed citizen priorities, key concerns, and public agenda. It contributes to peaceful agreement on democratic reform, rules, and frameworks. This data indicates level of effort. If there is a perceived need for consensus-building forums and this is a low number, then PRG-PA management might increase the number of consensus building forums the activity produces. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Partners/grantees will enter consensus building information into KM Portal with supporting documentation, including activity plans, sign-in sheets, recording of press conference, copy of testimony or press release etc. Counterpart will conduct quarterly data quality check on KM Portal through reviewing supporting documents and on-site observation. |
| **Data Source:** Partners/grantees |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/260 |
| **Other Notes:** None at this time |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Name of Indicator (CC5):** Number of event participants in consensus building forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and/or civil/political) held with USG assistance |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** This is a complementary indicator to CC4, number of consensus building forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and/or civil/political) held with USG assistance. Multi-party, civil/military, civil /political forums are events, seminars, meetings, and conferences that bring together groups in tension in an effort to generate greater understanding and consensus. Civil in this sense means “public” and indicates a meeting, town hall, forum, etc. in which the public can communicate directly with representatives of parties (or government) or the security sector (military, police). For purposes of this indicator, a series of regularly recurring meetings/events that are part of the same process are counted as one event: e.g. a series of municipal government hearings to get feedback on a three-year development plan should be counted as one event. For the forum to be counted under this indicator, it must have been conducted by entities that receive PRG-PA technical or financial support[[4]](#footnote-4). This indicator counts the number of individuals who participated in consensus building forums. Participants should not be double counted within the same fiscal year. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of individuals |
| **Disaggregated by:** Sex; Youth: binary; Sector; Third-level administrative division; Primary topic/subject |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** Increased communication between groups in tension will enhance understanding and increase the possibility that consensus building processes will result in an agreement, such as agreed citizen priorities, key concerns, and public agenda. It contributes to peaceful agreement on democratic reform, rules, and frameworks. This data complements CC4 to indicate the reach of consensus building forums, providing more in-depth information to PRG-PA management for program planning. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Partners/grantees will enter consensus building information into KM Portal with supporting documentation, including activity plans, sign-in sheets, recording of press conference, copy of testimony or press release etc. Counterpart will conduct quarterly data quality check on KM Portal through reviewing supporting documents and on-site observation. |
| **Data Source:** Partners/grantees |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/855 |
| **Other Notes:** None at this time |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Name of Indicator (CC6):** Number of broadcasts through new and traditional media in the course of CSO led public outreach campaigns |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Broadcasted public outreach campaigns that are led by CSOs and conducted with PRG-PA assistance will be counted towards this indicator. Public outreach campaigns are intended to provide information to populations that may have not otherwise had access to this information through new or traditional media (e.g., newspapers, radio, billboards, posters, online advertisements, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, etc.). For each specific broadcasting message, the indicator will track the number of times it is published by the media type. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of broadcasts |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Broadcast type; Messaging topic |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** The indicator is intended to help PRG-PA track the number broadcasts that have been made public intended to increase awareness around a given topic |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Partners/grantees will enter broadcast information into KM Portal with supporting documentation, including activity reports, broadcast frequency matrix, copy of articles with release dates etc. Counterpart will conduct quarterly data quality check on KM Portal through reviewing supporting documents and on-site observation. |
| **Data Source:** Partners/grantees |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/800 |
| **Other Notes:** None at this time |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Name of Indicator (CC7):** Number of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use supported by USG assistance |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Mechanisms for external oversight include but not limited to: citizen oversight committees, external audits or procedures for external review of government audits; procurement review boards; public expenditure tracking surveys; public accounts committees of legislatures; freedom of information and similar transparency laws, civil society review mechanisms for budget implementation and/or procurements; financial disclosure mechanisms for officials or parties/candidates. To be counted towards this indicator, the mechanism must have been developed or implemented by entities that receive PRG-PA technical or financial support[[5]](#footnote-5). |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of mechanisms |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Type of mechanism; Sub-sector; Benchmark |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator focuses on the essential elements of transparency and external accountability in public goods/service provision programming and refers to PRG-PA assistance aimed at strengthening those mechanisms. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Oversight mechanism development and implementation matrix will be developed by Counterpart and partners/grantees to track the development and use of different mechanisms. Counterpart will verify data with supporting documents, such as public resource use analysis reports, mechanism procedure guides, copy of testimony or press release. |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Annual Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on an annual basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Annual Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the annual narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/11 |
| **Other Notes:** Implementation benchmarks of mechanisms will be set according to partners’/grantees’ action plans |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Name of Indicator (CC8):** Number of public policies changed consistent with citizen input |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Public policy is the means by which a government maintains order or addresses the needs of its citizens through actions defined by its constitution. It refers to a collection of laws, mandates, or regulations established through a political process. The public policy process is a multi-stage cycle, involving problem identification, agenda setting, policy making, budgeting, implementation, and evaluation. Citizens need to be engaged in the stages of problem identification and agenda setting so that government officials can make policy, budgeting, and implementation decisions consistent with citizen input. Specifically, PRG-PA will facilitate citizens’ engagement in the review of existing policy and/or proposal of new policy and consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised policy through consensus building forums. This indicator will track the number of public policies that have gone through different benchmarks of: analysis; stakeholder consultation/public debate; drafting or revision; approval; and full and effective implementation. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of policies |
| **Disaggregated by:** Sub-sector; Benchmark |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** The indicator measures the number of policies (disaggregated by sub-sector) completing the various processes/steps required to improve public goods/service provision to address citizens’ key concerns and priorities. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** After the identification of citizen key concerns/priorities through public dialogue, a policy advocacy matrix will be developed by Counterpart and partners/grantees to track the number of policies going through the different stages of public policy process. Public session sign-in sheets, meeting agendas, event photos, activity reports, etc. will be documented to indicate “citizen input.” Counterpart will confirm policies are going through then change process via receipt letters from the government, official repeal of policies, and other types of evidence. |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Annually |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Annual Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on an annual basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Annual Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the annual narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/3 |
| **Other Notes:** Public policy benchmarks will be set according to partners’/grantees’ action plans |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 1:** Elections are more responsive to priority public needs |
| **Name of Indicator (1.1):** Number of public outreach activities conducted |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Public outreach activities are activities that aim to identify, raise the awareness about, and advocate for citizens’ key concerns and priorities in the electoral process. The intended audience for these activities are populations in PRG-PA’s target areas, including religious and traditional leaders, community networks, women, youth, and other vulnerable groups, who might not otherwise have access to election-related information or opportunities to express their opinions in the electoral process. Specifically, public outreach activities can include: communication of priorities through public awareness campaigns, media, and other culturally appropriate venues; citizens’ engagement with political party leaders in town hall meetings, public debates, and roundtables. Beyond the public dialogue sessions, the participatory theater performances and local radio productions that will be conducted to reinforce public priorities and reach broader audiences in advance of elections should also be counted towards this indicator. In addition, these activities must have been initiative or conducted by entities that receive PRG-PA technical or financial support[[6]](#footnote-6). |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of activities |
| **Disaggregated by:** Outreach topic; Activity type |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** Public outreach activities will ensure citizens’ equal access to election-related information and that their experiences, assets, and resources inform public policy priorities. This indicator tracks PRG-PA’s progress in conducting public outreach activities prior to and during the electoral process. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Partners/grantees will enter public outreach information into KM Portal with supporting documentation, including activity plan/agenda, participant list, event photos, recording of radio programs, copy of press release etc. Counterpart will conduct quarterly data quality check on KM Portal through reviewing supporting documents and on-site observation. |
| **Data Source:** Partners/grantees |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/190 |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 1:** Elections are more responsive to priority public needs |
| **Name of Indicator (1.2):** Number of measures (actions, decisions, calls or events) taken by non-political party actors to support the electoral code of conduct |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Niger’s electoral Code of Conduct was updated and signed b on by over 50 political parties before and after the February 2016 presidential elections. The code of conduct provides guidance for political parties to what is and is not considered acceptable behavior during the campaign, polling day and acceptance of results during the local election. The PRG-PP program is working with political parties to garner more signatories to the code of conduct be for the January 2017 local election. To ensure the electoral integrity in the local elections in January 2017, PRG-PA will conduct workshops and multi-stakeholder dialogues, focusing on the principles stated in the Code of Conduct, with election officials, political parties, CSOs, traditional leaders, social entrepreneurs, and cultural leaders. PRG-PA will seek to secure pledges of support from non-party actors after building their support and respect for the Code. PRG-PA will promote dialogue focused on how civil society actors and traditional leaders can act upon those pledges of support, and undertake measures (actions, calls, or events) organized with the aim to promote electoral integrity and mitigate electoral violence. They will identify sustainable mechanisms through which non-party actors can effectively promote electoral integrity and mitigate conflict. This indicator will track the number of measures undertaken by non-party actors to support the Code of Conduct due to PRG-PA’s interventions. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of measures |
| **Disaggregated by:** None |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** Non-party actors’ actions in supporting the electoral code of conduct will reinforce the pressures on political party actors to adhere to it, ultimately promoting electoral integrity and non-violence. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** TBD |
| **Data Source:** Partners/grantees |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Specialist in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/5 |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 1:** Elections are more responsive to priority public needs |
| **Name of Indicator (1.3):** Number of measures (actions, decisions, calls or events) taken by non-political party actors targeted by the project to mitigate electoral violence |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Niger’s electoral Code of Conduct was updated and signed on by over 50 political parties before and after the February 2016 presidential elections. The code of conduct provides guidance for political parties to what is and is not considered acceptable behavior during the campaign, polling day and acceptance of results during the local election. The PRG-PP program is working with political parties to garner more signatories to the code of conduct be for the January 2017 local election. To ensure the electoral integrity in the local elections in January 2017, PRG-PA will conduct workshops and multi-stakeholder dialogues, focusing on the principles stated in the Code of Conduct, with election officials, political parties, CSOs, traditional leaders, social entrepreneurs, and cultural leaders. PRG-PA will seek to secure pledges of support from non-party actors after building their support and respect for the Code. PRG-PA will promote dialogue focused on how civil society actors and traditional leaders can act upon those pledges of support, and undertake measures to promote electoral integrity and mitigate electoral violence. They will identify sustainable mechanisms through which non-party actors can effectively promote electoral integrity and mitigate conflict. This indicator will track the number of measures undertaken by non-party actors to mitigate electoral violence. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of measures |
| **Disaggregated by:** None |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** Non-party actors’ actions in mitigating electoral violence will reinforce the pressures on political party actors to adhere to the Code of Conduct, ultimately promoting electoral integrity and non-violence. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Follow-up phone calls, online conferences with, and visits to targeted non-political party actors. |
| **Data Source:** Partners/grantees |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/20 |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 1:** Elections are more responsive to priority public needs |
| **Name of Indicator (1.4):** Percent of citizens who report increased multi-stakeholder engagement demanding more responsiveness of political actors to citizen priorities |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Multi-stakeholders refer to CSO, CBO, and other local organizations that operate in the civic engagement field. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What percentage of citizens perceive increase in multi-stakeholder engagement demanding more responsiveness of political actors to citizen public priorities? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates increase or decrease regarding citizens’ perception of multi-stakeholder engagement within the period PRG-PA operated in the area. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. Citizens’ perception of multi-stakeholder engagement is influenced by many factors, including those that are outside of PRG-PA’s intervention. An increase in citizens’ perception of multi-stakeholder engagement cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline assessment and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the baseline assessment and final evaluation reports |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/50% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 1:** Elections are more responsive to priority public needs |
| **Name of Indicator (1.5):** Percent of citizens who report increased opportunity to positively influence social platforms |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. social platform refers to media, political parties, associations, etc. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the result is expected to answer the following question: What percentage of citizens perceive/report that there is increase in opportunities to positively influence social platforms? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates increase or decrease regarding citizens’ perception of to influence social platforms within the period PRG-PA operated in the area. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. Citizens’ perception of the opportunities to influence social platforms is influenced by many factors, including those that are outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in citizens’ perception of opportunities to influence social platforms cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline assessment and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/25% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 1:** Elections are more responsive to priority public needs |
| **Name of Indicator (1.6):** Percent of citizens who report increased opportunity to mitigate election-related conflict |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What percentage of citizens perceive/report that there is increase in opportunities to mitigate electoral-related conflict? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates increase or decrease regarding citizens’ perception of opportunities to mitigate election-related conflicts within the period PRG-PA operated in the area. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. Citizens’ perception of the opportunities to mitigate election-related conflict is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in citizens’ perception of opportunities to mitigate election-related conflict cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/25% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 1:** Elections are more responsive to priority public needs |
| **Name of Indicator (1.7):** Percent of citizens who report they have been exposed to media reporting and/or other media activities around the electoral process |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Media reporting and/or other media activities include: media partners’ coverage of PRG-PA public events around the electoral process, candidates campaign events, radio discussion programs and live open-air public debates; public awareness-raising messaging on citizen priorities; and social media messaging. “Exposed to” refers to citizens’ exposure to PRG-PA messaging, including the passive receipt of information. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizens who have been exposed to media reporting and/or other media activities around the electoral process? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to citizens’ exposure to media messaging around the electoral process, candidates’ campaign issues, and citizen priorities. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**  This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**  Discussions with be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline assessment and final evaluation |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/75% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 1:** Elections are more responsive to priority public needs |
| **Name of Indicator (1.8):** Percent of citizens who report they have participated in media reporting and/or other media activities around the electoral process |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Media reporting and/or other media activities include: media partners’ coverage of PRG-PA public events around the electoral process, candidates campaign events, radio discussion programs and live open-air public debates; public awareness-raising messaging on citizen priorities; and social media messaging. “Participate” refers to citizens’ active decision to provide inputs or interact with PRG-PA’s media activities. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizens who participated in media reporting and/or other media activities around the elections that address citizen priorities? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates increase or decrease in citizens’ participation in media reporting and other media activities around the electoral process within the period PRG-PA operated in the area. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**  This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**  Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/10% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.1):** Number of cultural actions supported by PRG-PA |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X \_Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Cultural actions refer to singing, dancing, theater performance, drawing, traditional art actions taken by traditional and modern musicians, artists, and actors. This indicator tracks cultural actions that aim to advocate for citizen priorities and are supported, financially or technically, by PRG-PA. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of cultural actions |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Type of action |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** Integrating cultural actions in PRG-PA’s civil society work will ensure that marginalized groups, such as the illiterate population, are provided equal access to information. This indicator directly tracks PRG-PA’s efforts in conducting cultural actions. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Partners/grantees will enter cultural action information into KM Portal with supporting documentation, including activity plan/agenda, participant list, event photos, copies of drawings, etc. Counterpart will conduct quarterly data quality check on KM Portal through reviewing supporting documents and on-site observation. |
| **Data Source:** Partners/grantees |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/8 |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.2):** Number of awards made to local organizations |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X\_ Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** This indicator counts the number of awards made directly by Counterpart to local organizations. Awards can be either acquisition or assistance. For purposes of indicator reporting, at the time of the award a “local organization” must,  • Be organized under the laws of the recipient country;  • Have its principal place of business in the recipient country;  • Be majority owned by individuals who are citizens or lawful permanent residents of the recipient country or be managed by a governing body, the majority of whom are citizens or lawful permanent residents of a recipient country; and  • Not be controlled by a foreign entity or by an individual or individuals who are not citizens or permanent residents of the recipient country.  The term “controlled by” means a majority ownership or beneficiary interest as defined above, or the power, either directly or indirectly, whether exercised or exercisable, to control the election, appointment, or tenure of the organization’s managers or a majority of the organization’s governing body by any means, e.g., ownership, contract, or operation of law.  “Foreign entity” means an organization that fails to meet any part of the “local organization” definition.  Government controlled and government owned organizations in which the recipient government owns a majority interest or in which the majority of a governing body are government employees, are included in the above definition of local organization. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of awards |
| **Disaggregated by:** Type of award; Third-level administrative division; New/Continuing; Leader sex; Sub-sector |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator is a direct count of the number of awards awarded to local partners. One partner could be awarded once or multiple times during the intervention period. It will be used by PRG-PA management and Counterpart at HQ to assess progress in achieving partnership development and capacity building objectives. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Counterpart will enter grants information into the KM Portal and track the number of awards on a quarterly basis. On-site observation will be conducted through grantee monitoring activities. |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on a quarterly basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Quarterly Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/28 |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.3):** Number of white paper and/or communal action plans created through policy dialogues |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X\_ Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Policy dialogues” refer to the local, regional, and national post-election town hall meetings in target regions with municipal and traditional leaders, CSOs, CBOs, and other community groups, private sector representatives, religious leaders, and media. These policy dialogues are an iterative, participatory research process that seeks to understand community needs and resources in its local, social, institutional, and political contexts. This process incorporates the perspectives of a range of stakeholders and involve them directly in planning follow-up actions. PRG-PA will equip partner CSOs to bring together representatives of disparate community groups and government officials to prioritize public agenda issues, mobilize community members to spearhead the design and carry forward the implementation of public projects. Partner CSOs will produce white papers and action plans based on policy dialogues. A white paper is a report or guide that informs citizens in PRG-PA’s target regions about a political or civic issue and presents PRG-PA’s stance on the matter. It is meant to help citizens understand this issue, solve a problem, or make a decision. A communal action plan is the plan for carrying out a strategy for addressing citizen needs. This indicator includes any white paper and/or communal action plan that is developed by Counterpart or entities receiving technical/financial assistance from the PRG-PA project in the reporting period (i.e., quarter). |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of white papers/communal action plans |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sub-sector |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** Policy dialogues involving different community groups will allow PRG-PA to build partnerships with women and men of concern, of all ages and backgrounds, through systematic, structured dialogue on issues that they identify as important. As community members describe their situation from their perspective, voice their concerns, and mobilize their own efforts in solving problems within the community, the local capacity and commitment to follow-up action will be increased. This number indicates level of effort and will be useful in program planning and adjustment. If there is a perceived need for policy dialogue or communal action plans in a community, then programmers might prioritize (e.g., allocate more resources to) this community. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Counterpart will enter policy dialogue information into KM Portal and keep copies of the final products, including white papers and communal action plans. The number of white papers and communal action plans will be determined through review of KM Portal data and program records. |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Annual Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on an annual basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Annual Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the annual narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/10 |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.4):** Number of new USG-supported public-private partnerships (PPPs) formed |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No \_ Yes \_X (PPP5) |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** Number of PPPs formed during the reporting year to address citizens’ key concerns, priorities in public goods/service provision/delivery due to PRG-PA intervention (i.e., consensus building forums, advocacy campaigns, and outreach activities). A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity, and USAID must be one of the public partners represented by PRG-PA. A private entity can be for-profit enterprises, including private companies, state-owned enterprises which seek to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully), and can be NGOs, including community groups. A public entity can be national or sub-national government as well as a donor-funded implementing partner. It could also include state enterprises which are non-profit. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during that current reporting year. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of PPPs |
| **Disaggregated by:** Partnership focus |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** The assumption of this indicator is that if more partnerships are formed it is likely that there will be more investment in public goods/service provision/delivery to address citizens’ key concerns and priorities. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Counterpart will keep record of formal agreements indicating any PPP formed through PRG-PA interventions, and the number of PPPs formed will be determined through review of program records. |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Quarterly |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Annual Reports and KM Portal |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data on an annual basis. |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in every Annual Report as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the annual narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/5 |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.5):** Percent of citizens who report awareness of the public goods provision process |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Public good is a good that is both non-excludable and non-rivalrous in that individuals cannot be effectively excluded from use and where use by one individual does not reduce availability to others. In this indicators, public goods refer to things provided by national and local governments for and to citizens, specifically the public education and health services. The public goods provision process concerns information about national and local governments’ responsibilities, organizational structure in administrating public service delivery, government protocols, and the implementation process. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting from the final evaluation result the baseline study result in target regions and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizens willing to contact government officials (local and national representatives) to call for provision of what the respondent perceive as priority public service? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to citizens’ awareness of the public goods provision process. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. Citizens’ awareness of the public goods provision process is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in citizens’ awareness of the public goods provision process cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/70% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.6):** Percent of citizens who report awareness of whom to contact within the GoN to address provision of priority public goods |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Public good is a good that is both non-excludable and non-rivalrous in that individuals cannot be effectively excluded from use and where use by one individual does not reduce availability to others. In this indicators, public goods refer to things provided by national and local governments for and to citizens, specifically the public education and health services. The public goods provision process concerns information about national and local governments’ responsibilities, organizational structure in administrating public service delivery, government protocols, and the implementation process. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizen who are aware of how the central or local government provides public services? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to citizens’ awareness of the public goods provision process. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. Citizens’ awareness of the public goods provision process is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in citizens’ awareness of the public goods provision process cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/50% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.7):** Percent increase in citizens' reported expectations of the value of contacting GoN officials about citizen priority public goods |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Public good is a good that is both non-excludable and non-rivalrous in that individuals cannot be effectively excluded from use and where use by one individual does not reduce availability to others. In this indicators, public goods refer to things provided by national and local governments for and to citizens, specifically the public education and health services. The public goods provision process concerns information about national and local governments’ responsibilities, organizational structure in administrating public service delivery, government protocols, and the implementation process. An increase in citizens’ expectation of the value of contacting GoN officials about citizen priority public goods refers to citizens’ perceived confidence in the GoN’s willingness to receive input and feedback from citizens regarding public goods provision and its ability to carry out improvements based on citizen feedback. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizen who perceive that contacting local and/or central government officials is of value or useful? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to citizens’ expected value of contacting government officials about the public goods provision process. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. Citizens’ expectations of the value of contacting GoN officials about citizen priority public goods is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in citizens’ expectations of the value of contacting GoN officials about citizen priority public goods cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/25% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.8):** Percent of citizens who report willingness to contact government officials (e.g., local and national representatives) to call for provision of priority public goods |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Public good is a good that is both non-excludable and non-rivalrous in that individuals cannot be effectively excluded from use and where use by one individual does not reduce availability to others. In this indicators, public goods refer to things provided by national and local governments for and to citizens, specifically the public education and health services. The public goods provision process concerns information about national and local governments’ responsibilities, organizational structure in administrating public service delivery, government protocols, and the implementation process. An increase in citizens’ willingness to contact GoN officials about citizen priority public goods provision is an indication of their potential actions to raise their opinions to government officials to demand quality and timely government service. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizens willing to contact government officials (local and national representatives) to call for provision of what the respondent perceive as priority public service? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to citizens’ willingness to contact government officials about the public goods provision process. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. Citizens’ willingness to contact government officials about the public goods provision process is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in citizens’ willingness to contact government officials about the public goods provision process cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/70% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.9):** Percent of citizens who report that CSO/citizen advocacy on targeted citizen priorities is effective |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Targeted citizen priorities will be identified through multi-stakeholder dialogues and be advocated for by PRG-PA partners/grantees. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizens who perceive that current advocacy endeavors on targeted citizens’ priorities is effective? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates increase or decrease in citizens’ perception regarding the effectiveness of CSO/citizen advocacy on targeted citizen priorities. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. The overall effectiveness of CSO/citizen advocacy on citizen priorities is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in citizens’ perception of the effectiveness of the CSO/citizen advocacy cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/70% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 2:** Informed multi-stakeholder (government and non-government) contribution to specific elements of reform implementation for targeted citizen priorities |
| **Name of Indicator (2.10):** Percent increase in the number of citizens who report use of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Mechanisms for external oversight include external audits or procedures for external review of government audits; procurement review boards; public expenditure tracking surveys; public accounts committees of legislatures; extractive industry revenue transparency mechanisms; freedom of information and similar transparency laws, if applicable to government finance management; civil society review mechanisms for budget implementation and/or procurements; financial disclosure mechanisms for officials or parties/candidates. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What percentage of citizens use mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to citizens’ use of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. Citizens’ use of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in citizens’ use of mechanisms for external oversight of public resource use cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/25% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 3:** Increased capacity of key actors to promote collective action |
| **Name of Indicator (3.1):** Number of organizations with improved organizational capacity in conducting PEA per Counterpart's OD Assessment |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Organizations” in this indicator refer to PRG-PA’s key partners that will receive training on how to conduct action research in support of advocacy and accountability campaigns. These organizations will engage in Counterpart’s organizational development assessment and have specific organizational development/institutional strengthening goals. Increased organizational capacity refers to an increase of at least one point overall across the six functional areas (leadership and strategic management; program management and quality control; accounting and financial management; financial sustainability; human and material resources; and external relations and communications) between the target organization’s different assessment scores. Whether this score increases or decreases, it will be tracked and reported. This indicator will be disaggregated by new versus continuing for the LoP:   * New = this reporting period is the first time that an organization has improved organizational capacity * Continuing = this organization has improved organizational capacity in previous program periods |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number of organizations |
| **Disaggregated by:** Sector; Sub-sector; Third-level administrative division; Functional area |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** By providing capacity building in PEA principles, PRG-PA will enable partners and grantees to apply PEA in their advocacy, community mobilization, and accountability campaigns to encourage citizens, government officials, media, and private sector actors to identify constructive, locally-driven solutions in support of their development priorities. This indicator directly addresses the improvement in overall capacity of target organizations and will demonstrate if training and capacity building support are effective in increasing overall organizational capacity across the six functional areas in the assessment. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Comparison of different assessment scores per organization and tallying organizations that increase by at least one point from the baseline to end line |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** TBD with program |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records; OD Assessment records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data when OD assessment is conducted |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in the Quarterly Report when OD assessment is conducted as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/20 |
| **Other Notes:** Implementation benchmarks of mechanisms will be set according to partners’/grantees’ action plans |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 3:** Increased capacity of key actors to promote collective action |
| **Name of Indicator (3.2):** Percent increase in PEA capacity assessment scores of PEA-based action research organizations |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Organizations” in this indicator refer to PRG-PA’s key partners that will receive training on how to conduct action research in support of advocacy and accountability campaigns. These organizations will engage in Counterpart’s organizational development assessment and have specific organizational development/institutional strengthening goals. Increased organizational capacity refers to an increase of at least one point overall across the six functional areas (leadership and strategic management; program management and quality control; accounting and financial management; financial sustainability; human and material resources; and external relations and communications) between the target organization’s baseline assessment and following end line assessments. Whether the OD assessment scores increase or decrease, it will be tracked by this indicator. If the score decreases, the indicator will be negative. Calculation should include percent change in the following scores: |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Sector; Sub-sector; Third-level administrative division; Functional area |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** By providing capacity building in PEA principles, PRG-PA will enable partners and grantees to apply PEA in their advocacy, community mobilization, and accountability campaigns to encourage citizens, government officials, media, and private sector actors to identify constructive, locally-driven solutions in support of their development priorities. This indicator directly addresses the improvement in overall capacity of target organizations and will demonstrate if training and capacity building support are effective in increasing overall organizational capacity across the six functional areas in the assessment. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Comparison of different assessment scores per organization and tallying organizations that increase by at least one point from the baseline to end line |
| **Data Source:** Counterpart |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** TBD with program |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Counterpart Knowledge Management (KM) Portal; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** None |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** None |
| **Presentation of Data:** In the Performance Indicator Tracking Table in Quarterly Reports |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data when OD assessments are conducted |
| **Reporting of Data:** This information will be included in the Quarterly Report when OD assessment is conducted as part of the PMP Annex. It will also be described in the quarterly narrative. |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** 0/21% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 3:** Increased capacity of key actors to promote collective action |
| **Name of Indicator (3.3):** Percent of citizens who report that media investigative reporting is promoting collective action |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Investigative reporting refers to the reporting style where journalists deeply investigate a single topic of interest, such as serious crimes, political corruption, or corporate wrongdoing. Collective action means actions undertaken by national and local governments with traditional, informal governance structures and community-based organizations (CBOs) to address citizens’ needs/priorities. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizens who perceive that media investigative reporting is influencing and promoting collective action? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to the effectiveness of investigative reporting. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. The overall effectiveness of investigative reporting is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in the effectiveness cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/50% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 3:** Increased capacity of key actors to promote collective action |
| **Name of Indicator (3.4):** Percent of citizens who report that cultural artists’ messaging is influencing governance practices |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. Cultural artists’ messaging refer to the cultural actions taken by artists to advocate for citizens’ needs/priorities. “Governance practices” refers the public goods provision process from local, national governments. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What is the percentage of citizens who perceive cultural artists messaging is influencing governance practices? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to the effectiveness of cultural artists’ messaging to advocate for citizens’ needs/priorities. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. The overall effectiveness of cultural artists’ messaging to advocate for citizens’ needs/priorities is by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in the effectiveness cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/50% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

|  |
| --- |
| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET |
| **Outcome 3:** Increased capacity of key actors to promote collective action |
| **Name of Indicator (3.5):** Percent of citizens and public officials who report that investigative journalism in Niger is fair |
| **Is this a Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator?** No X Yes \_ |
| Description |
| **Precise Definition(s):** “Citizens” in this indicator refers to population in PRG-PA’s target regions. “Public officials” refers to the government staff in PRG-PA’s target regions. Investigative journalism refers to the reporting style where journalists deeply investigate a single topic of interest, such as serious crimes, political corruption, or corporate wrongdoing. This indicator will be calculated by subtracting the baseline from the end line and the results is expected to answer the following question: What percentage of citizens and public officials perceive that investigative journalism in Niger is fair? |
| **Unit of Measure:** Percentage |
| **Disaggregated by:** Third-level administrative division; Sex; Youth: binary; Literacy: binary; Ethnicity; Education; |
| **Justification & Management Utility:** This indicator demonstrates PRG-PA’s contribution to the fairness of investigative journalism. The result will be useful for future program design for both USAID and Counterpart. |
| Plan for Data Acquisition |
| **Data Collection Method:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Data Source:** Baseline study and final evaluation report |
| **Frequency and Timing of Data Acquisition by Counterpart HQ:** Two times: baseline and final |
| **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** Costs included under established Cooperative Agreement |
| **Individual Responsible at PRG-PA:** Counterpart International M&E Officer in the Field |
| **Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID:** PRG-PA Program Manager at HQ |
| **Location of Data Storage:** Evaluation reports; PRG-PA Program Records |
| Data Limitations |
| **Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:** N/A |
| **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):**   1. This indicator will be determined by citizen perception surveys, vulnerable to selection bias and response bias; 2. The overall fairness of investigative journalism is influenced by many factors, primarily from outside of PRG-PA’s interventions. An increase in the fairness cannot be directly attributed to our activities. |
| **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:**   1. Discussions will be conducted with external evaluators to minimize data limitations in the baseline study and final evaluation 2. TBD with program |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments**: TBD |
| **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:** N/A |
| Plan for Data Analysis, Review, and Reporting |
| **Data Analysis:** External evaluators will analyze the data in evaluation reports |
| **Presentation of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation |
| **Review of Data:** Counterpart will review and analyze this data at the end of the final evaluation |
| **Reporting of Data:** Baseline study and final evaluation reports will be submitted to USAID and uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse |
| Other Notes |
| **Notes on Baselines/Targets:** TBD/15% |
| **Other Notes:** |
| Updated: 6/6/2016 |

1. Hosted by Counterpart, PRG-PA’s Partners, PRG-PA grantees or sub-grantees. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Provided by Counterpart, PRG-PA’s Partners, PRG-PA grantees or sub-grantees. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Provided by Counterpart, PRG-PA’s Partners, PRG-PA grantees or sub-grantees. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Provided by Counterpart, PRG-PA’s Partners, PRG-PA grantees or sub-grantees. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Provided by Counterpart, PRG-PA’s Partners, PRG-PA grantees or sub-grantees. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Provided by Counterpart, PRG-PA’s Partners, PRG-PA grantees or sub-grantees. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)