USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

USAID COMMUNITY STABILIZATION PROGRAM (CSP) COUNTERINSURGENCY (COIN): DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT

September 11, 2008
This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Rich Mason, Harvey Herr, ----------, and Cyndi Scarlett

COMMUNITY STABILIZATION PROJECT (CSP) COUNTERINSURGENCY (COIN): DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT

International Business & Technical Consultants, Inc.
Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Program, Phase II (MEPP II)
8614 Westwood Center Drive
Suite 400
Vienna, VA 22182

Contracted under 267-C-00-05-00508-0

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS i

1. DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FROM THE COMMUNITY STABILIZATION PROJECT (CSP) ii
- **1.1. Background** ii
- **1.2. Approach and Methodology** ii
- **1.3. Limitations** iii
- **1.4. Findings and Recommendations** iii

2. INTRODUCTION 1

3. PMP and Indicator Review 2
- **3.1 CSP M&E and QAQC Data Quality Procedures** 2
- **3.2 Indicator 7.1.1.1 Number of Person Months of Employment Generated for Short-Term Employment** 3
- **3.3 Indicator 7.1.1.2 Number of Long-term Jobs Directly Created** 4
- **3.4 Indicator 7.1.1.3 Number of Long-term Jobs Indirectly Created** 5
- **3.5 indicator 7.1.1.4 Weekly Employment Summary** 6
- **3.6 indicator 7.2.1 Number of Youth Completing Non-formal Education Activities** 7

ANNEX 1. COMPLETED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DATA QUALITY WORKSHEETS 9

ACRONYMS

ADS	Automated Directives System
CSP	Community Stabilization Program
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
FO	Field Office
IBTCI	International Business & Technical Consultants, Inc
IR	Intermediate Result
IRD	International Research and Development
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEPP II	Monitoring and Evaluation Performance Program II
MOLSA	Iraqi Ministry of Labor and Social Affairs
MSME	Micro-Small-Medium Enterprises
PIRS	Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
PMP	Performance Management Plan
QAQC	Quality Assurance and Quality Control
SO	Strategic Objective
SOW	Scope of Work
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

1. DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF SELECTED PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FROM THE COMMUNITY STABILIZATION PROJECT (CSP) [1]

1.1. Background

In August 2008, the USAID/Iraq Mission requested International Business & Technical Consultants, Inc. (IBTCI) to conduct a Data Quality Assessment (DQA) of five indicators contained in the August 2008 CSP M&E Plan. In addition to multiple reviews of previous versions and drafts of the CSP M&E plan conducted by IBTCI, a previous DQA had been performed on several of the CSP performance indicators as part of the USAID Iraq Mission DQA in August of 2006. The current DQA was requested to provide compliance with Recommendation 7 of the March 2008 RIG audit of CSP.

1.2. Approach and Methodology

USAID's five standard quality criteria; Validity, Reliability, Integrity, Precision and Timeliness, (VRIPT) are documented in USAID's PMP Toolkit. The CSP DQA goal was to apply the five criteria across the five selected indicators of the CSP M&E Plan: four of which corresponded to the RIG audit recommended focus of CSP's employment indicators and one indicator that tracks CSP youth activity outputs. These indicators included:

Indicator Number	Name of the Indicator
7.1.1.1	Number of Person Months of Employment Generated for Short-Term Employment
7.1.1.2	Number of Long-Term Jobs Directly Created
7.1.1.3	Number of Long-Term Jobs Indirectly Created
7.1.1.4	Weekly Employment Summary
7.2.1	Number of Youth Completing Non-Formal Education Activities

The IBTCI team based its assessment approach on the specific request of the USAID SO7 Program Team to focus on the systems that have been put in place and are described in the M&E plan to assure data quality. This focus was requested for several reasons. IRD had already conducted their own DQA as part of the most recent revision of the M&E plan and indicators as well as due to the short time frame for completing this task. As a result, the IBTCI DQA did not include a review of source data and project datasets. The DQA assessment relied on a review of CSP documentation, a rapid review of the CSP web access database, interviews of key project management, program quality control and quality assurance and monitoring and evaluation staff and email and telephone correspondence with the same.

Four of the five indicators selected by USAID were reviewed using the Indictor Work Sheets as guidelines. This was due to one indicator, the Weekly Employment Summary, being a summary report of other indicators rather than a unique statistic. Furthermore this indicator did not have a Performance Reference Indicator Sheet (PIRS) to provide detailed guidance on the collection, calculation, validation and verification of data reported in the Summary report.

[1] Names of some people have been removed for security reasons.

1.3. Limitations

Lack of Data Review

The DQA results are limited to a review of the systems that are described in the CSP M&E Plan and were reviewed and explored through a site visit to one CSP program office. While CSP has clearly exerted substantial effort in implementing multiple layers of quality control and verification of reported project results, it was not possible to verify that these systems are actually producing the desired results without reviewing a sample of actual project source data at the field level and project databases that produce the results provided to USAID.

Working Remotely

Due to the short time frame of the assessment, MEPP II program staff was only able to visit the IZ and Baghdad offices of CSP. As described in the report, CSP validation and quality control practices, procedures and structures vary from office to office. Furthermore, HQ level staff was unable to answer detailed questions about field office practices in M&E and Quality Assurance/Quality Control (QAQC) in terms of data verification and reporting. As a result, the DQA results may be skewed by non-representative observations.

1.4. Findings and Recommendations

The indicators selected by the project and the definitions and procedures detailed in the M&E Plan and PIRS if implemented by CSP as described and reported <u>should</u> result in reporting valid results to USAID.

The CSP is a mature project with substantial experience in implementing and documenting its core activities of building community infrastructure, generating employment for and improving the employability of Iraqis and engaging youth in productive activities. In developing the current M&E plan, IRD appears to have approached the task of indicator revision and systems strengthening and development with a primary lens of ensuring data quality and improving confidence in reported project results. IBTCI was able to confirm the existence of dedicated quality assurance and M&E systems that, if implemented as described, would ensure a high level of data quality.

IBTCI requested and was granted access to the CSP web access database. MEPP II staff reviewed the database in order to assess the potential for USAID and other parties to use remote access to project data through this system as a means of verifying the use and results of M&E and QAQC efforts. Based on a very limited and unscientific review of completed projects in the three CSP program domains, the database did not appear to be complete enough to serve such a purpose. While several of the reviewed projects did have field monitoring reports attached and accessible through a clickable link, most did not. The CSP M&E Director informed IBTCI in advance that the database was incompletely populated with relevant monitoring reports so this result was not surprising. Furthermore, CSP does not currently populate the database with soft copies of QAQC field visit reports. If the database is brought up to an acceptable level of completion that a random sample of projects would generate useful information, future

monitoring exercises may be able to rely on the database to assess CSP compliance with its internal M&E and QAQC procedures.

IBTCI's review of the Weekly Employment Summary confirmed the timely reporting of project performance data against the employment and youth indicators contained in the M&E plan. The frequency of reporting against such a large number of project performance indicators is much greater and more useful for program management and results reporting than the Quarterly or Semi-annual Performance Data Table reports of other projects in Iraq.

The Weekly Employment Summary uses terminology to describe different aspects of job creation, placement and skills improvement that is used in an inconsistent and potentially misleading fashion.

The report interweaves the terms job "placement", "creation" and "generation" in chart and table titles and descriptive text in a way that makes it difficult to distinguish between what are very different project activities and results. This is compounded by the combining of cumulative long-term employment, non-cumulative short-term employment and cumulative and non-cumulative "engagement" activities such as job training, apprenticeships and youth activities into one weekly summary "employment" statistic. In the most recent report reviewed (July 26, 2008), more than half of the reported numbers in this summary statistic were engagement in youth and job training and not employment in wage earning activities. Despite acknowledging the intermingling of such figures in the text describing the results, the title of "Weekly Employment Summary" is misleading and subject to misinterpretation by consumers of the information.

The report should be reviewed and revised to ensure that the results presented therein can be clearly understood and appropriately interpreted by consumers of the data who may not be intimately familiar with the details of CSP activities, results and reporting definitions. While the existence of a detailed set of guidelines for completing the report is a strong positive indication of CSP's efforts to standardize the report and maximize its quality and utility, it is suggested that the guidelines be changed to ensure that clear, precise terminology is used throughout the report.

Procedures for adjusting reported employment and engagement indicator data based on verification results are not clear and should be detailed in the M&E Plan.

While IBTCI did not review the actual employment and engagement data collected and reported by CSP, detailed review of such data reported by other USAID projects using similar data collection methodologies and indicators as part of other assessments has highlighted the challenge of ensuring that such data are routinely modified and updated based on the results of CSP quality assurance and M&E unit verification procedures. Both the QAQC and M&E units reportedly conduct spot checks in the field to assess the accuracy of reported data such as the number of workers on a work site, the number of apprentices reported on local partner-provided sign-in sheets and the number and age of youth participants enumerated in activity reports. It is highly unlikely that irregularities and errors have not been identified through these commendable efforts on the part of CSP staff to ensure accurate and accountable reporting. In order to complete the loop of validation and quality control however, there should be a procedure for revising previously reported results in the project database and subsequent written reports. The Baghdad Field Office of CSP was able to provide some description of how such revisions would take place. However, the details of this process were not clear and may vary from office to office.

It is recommended that data and reporting correction procedures be detailed in writing and be included in the project's M&E plan.

While many of the indicators contained in the M&E plan are lower-level outputs, the implementation of multiple Special Studies described in the M&E Plan should provide additional evidence to evaluate CSP's longer-term effects on job creation and the employability of Iraqi beneficiaries.

IBTCI has previously expressed its view that the performance indicators utilized by the CSP project are more heavily output-focused than is preferred. In addition, the long-term employment indicators are reported in a cumulative fashion, without assurance that the reported jobs continue beyond the three-month minimum required for inclusion in reported long-term employment creation. CSP and the SO7 team have responded to this critique by proposing a series of Special Studies designed to document the durability of project achievements in long-term job creation; to assess the impact of vocational skills building on the employment of participants; and to assess other key program areas. The MEPP II project is currently implementing two such studies, the results of which should provide useful information on the long-term impact of selected program activities.

2. INTRODUCTION

In August 2008, the USAID/Iraq Mission requested International Business & Technical Consultants, Inc. (IBTCI) to conduct a Data Quality Assessment (DQA) of five indicators contained in the August 2008 CSP M&E Plan. In addition to multiple reviews of previous versions and drafts of the CSP M&E plan conducted by IBTCI, a previous DQA had been performed on several of the CSP performance indicators as part of the USAID Iraq Mission DQA in August of 2006. The current DQA was requested in order to provide compliance with Recommendation 7 of the RIG audit of CSP, which was completed in March of 2008.

This IBTCI Data Quality Assessment for the USAID/Iraq CSP has the following main objectives:

- To ensure that USAID/Iraq CSP team and implementing partner staff are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the indicators and systems used for reporting in the March 2008 M&E Plan;
- To provide recommendations to improve data quality and address identified vulnerabilities and concerns, where necessary.

Consistent with ADS 203.3.5.2, the purpose of a DQA is to ensure that USAID's Operating Units and SO Teams are aware of the strengths and vulnerabilities of data by applying the five quality standards indicated in 203.3.5.1. The results of a DQA facilitate identifying, managing and acknowledging risks associated with reported data that may be used for determining strategic decisions.

The starting point was the CSP August 2008 M&E Plan, specifically five indicators that were selected by the USAID CSP Team (Table 2 below). These indicators were selected based on concerns raised by the RIG's March 2008 report and Recommendation 7 of the report, which requested that a DQA be performed on the project's employment indicators. USAID requested that the assessment be limited in scope with a primary focus on the data quality systems described in the M&E plan and other project documents.

Indicator Number	Name of the Indicator
7.1.1.1	Number of Person Months of Employment Generated for Short-Term Employment
7.1.1.2	Number of Long-Term Jobs Directly Created
7.1.1.3	Number of Long-Term Jobs Indirectly Created
7.1.1.4	Weekly Employment Summary
7.2.1	Number of Youth Completing Non-Formal Education Activities

To conduct the DQA, the IBTCI team used the USAID Worksheet 7 from The Performance Management Toolkit (April 2003). This worksheet provides a foundation for analyzing selected indicators on five key elements of indicator quality: Validity, Reliability, Integrity, Precision, and Timeliness of the data. IBTCI completed the worksheet for four of the five indicators. Indicator 7.1.1.4 Weekly Employment Summary was not included as it is not a true indicator and, instead, consists of a report that details data from other indicators in the M&E plan. The Worksheets are provided as Annexes.

In addition to completing the indicator worksheets, IBTCI staff met with key M&E and QAQC staff in both the Bagdad IZ headquarters and the Baghdad Field Office of the CSP. IBTCI reviewed documents including sample QAQC field visit forms for each program area and

request and received additional information via email and telephone communication. IBTCI was granted access to and conducted a review of the contents of the CSP's project reporting database.

IBTCI did not review project data beyond summary statistics that were available in the previous five submissions of the Weekly Employment Summary ending July 25, 2008 and a non-scientific sample of 30 completed projects in the CSP on-line database. This assessment was designed to evaluate the data collection, reporting and quality assurance systems as described by CSP with limited verification of system functioning, where possible, without delving into the numerous different datasets maintained by the project.

3. PMP and Indicator Review

The CSP provides employment through public works CIES (community infrastructure and essential services) projects, particularly for young men. It also provides opportunities to engage youth in vocational training, business training, apprenticeships, and programs that lead to short and long term employment. Vocational training and apprenticeship programs are implemented as part of the Employment Generation and Youth component of CSP. This program also provides a diverse array of activities to engage youth through sporting events, community awareness raising initiatives, summer camps and other such projects. CSP's Business Development Program (BDP) creates new businesses and supports existing enterprises through Micro Small and Medium-sized Enterprise (MSME) grants. These grants provide employment and income to business owners and their employees.

The objectives of the CSP are in direct alignment with the Mission's SO7 Reduced Incentives for Participation in Violent Conflict in Selected Communities. The project has two Intermediate Results: 7.1 Unemployment rate decreased and 7.2 Conflict mitigated through increased community activities. The DQA reviewed data collection, reporting and quality assurance procedures for three indicators under IR 7.1 and one indicator under IR 7.2.

IBTCI was informed that the current version of the CSP M&E Plan, dated August 2008, was revised and strengthened by IRD with a focus on data quality. To that end, IRD provided a detailed timeline of M&E revisions, assessments and actions to date that were generated based on feedback from USAID and IBTCI through the MEPP II contract. IRD M&E staff reportedly applied the DQA framework for analysis and the current M&E plan contains a one paragraph assessment of the five elements of data quality for each indicator. In addition, the M&E plan includes a description of the recently established Quality Assurance and Quality Control (QAQC) Unit and a table that outlines the responsibilities and methodologies of both the M&E and QAQC units in verifying and validating particular aspects of data quality.

3.1 CSP M&E and QAQC Data Quality Procedures

IBTCI's focused SOW and limited time frame for this assessment did not allow its staff to verify the implementation of M&E and QAQC data quality procedures in a rigorous fashion. Furthermore, IBTCI was only able to gather detailed information on M&E and QAQC practices in the Baghdad Field Office.

3.1.1 Quality Assurance and Quality Control Unit and Procedures

CSP Field Offices have a variety of different QAQC staffing configurations. According to interviews with Baghdad QAQC staff, in some FOs, QAQC staff are housed and supervised by the M&E unit or QAQC functions are implemented directly by M&E staff. The Baghdad office is the largest CSP FO and its prominence programmatically, financially and politically has encouraged the development of an independent QAQC unit under an expatriate director with dedicated staff members for the three CSP Programmatic Offices – EGY, CIES, and BDP.

The Baghdad office reportedly makes random unannounced visits to any project it chooses and can investigate any aspect of program quality and compliance. Detailed task and program specific monitoring forms guide field visits. These forms are kept in hard copy in each project's file and are not currently included in soft copy in the project database. The unit's staff submits detailed field reports concerning their findings to the relevant program directors who have the responsibility for taking action, in partnership with local implementing partners, QAQC and M&E staff, to correct any deficiencies.

The QAQC unit in Baghdad is involved in all aspects of CSP project implementation including project proposal evaluation, contractor approvals, bid analysis, quality assessment and assurance of project deliverables, and verification of any and all project documentation. This includes spot checks for verifying the number and identity of program participants and beneficiaries, including short and long-term employees, apprentices, vocational skills trainees, BDP recipients and employees, youth participants and other individuals. According to project staff, there is substantial overlap in several areas with M&E roles, responsibilities, and practices, including the verification of key source data utilized for reporting on project performance indicators.

3.1.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Unit and Procedures

CSP M&E staff is located in each of the project's field offices and in the IZ headquarters. As indicated previously, CSP M&E staff at the field office staff level share responsibilities for verifying and validating reported data for numbers of beneficiaries and participants across the range of CSP programming. This verification reportedly includes field visits to projects to assess reported data against project indicators as well as to assess the quality of construction, training, and business development initiatives. M&E staff also conducts spot checks of project files to ensure completeness and accuracy.

The field office M&E staff works with program staff to prepare, clean and clarify the weekly tracking sheets of CSP projects. This tracking sheet is sent to the IZ M&E team for further quality checks before these data are entered into the project's database, which is the unified source for CSP results reporting against the project's performance indicators. As described to IBTCI during several interviews and via email, modifications to previously reported results that ensue from monitoring and quality assurance activities are made at the field office level and uploaded to the database on a regular basis. This ensures that project reporting is based on the latest, corrected data.

3.2 Indicator 7.1.1.1 Number of Person Months of Employment Generated for Short-Term Employment

Indicator 7.1.1.1 is a measure of employment of workers through CSP CIES projects. According to CSP staff and documentation, source data for this indicator includes attendance

and time sheets reported daily by worksite supervisors. These data are reportedly verified through the regular presence of CSP local staff at the worksite and/or conduct of random visits to count workers, verify identity documents and assess work quality. Validation and verification procedures are discussed in separate cross-cutting sections of this report (2.1). The indicator is calculated by an established and rigorous method that should provide solid data on CSP accomplishments in this area. According to the M&E plan, performance data for this indicator data are reported every two weeks and are also summarized in quarterly reports. The current M&E plan includes only the Annual Target for this indicator. As a result, IBTCI could not confirm the reporting frequency for this specific indicator for M&E purposes. However, CSP does report both the number of person months of employment and the number of short-term workers in the Weekly Employment Summary, which IBTCI reviewed and which is discussed below.

IBTCI observed no significant challenges for this indicator as part of this assessment and makes no recommendations for action that are specific to the person-months of short-term employment.

3.3 Indicator 7.1.1.2 Number of Long-term Jobs Directly Created

"Job Creation" or "Employment"

According to the language of this indicator, it purports to report data on jobs that have been created as a result of CSP activities. However, as described in the M&E plan, the PIRS for the indicator and as observed in the Weekly Employment Summary, reported data for this indicator includes data on vocational training and apprenticeship graduates that have been placed in jobs by the CSP project and other "Ad hoc job placement". The Management Utility section of the PIRS highlights this issue as it states: "This indicator shows the number of people gaining long-term employment (page 35). "The inclusion of such data challenges the validity of the indicator as beneficiary placement in positions generated through other market forces, while laudable and important for the IR of reduced unemployment, is distinct from the creation of new jobs through project activities. An analysis of the most recent Weekly Employment Summary provided to IBTCI, July 26 2008, highlights the magnitude of the issue as almost 6,000 of the 24,000 reported "long-term jobs created" are Vocational Training, Apprenticeship and Business Training graduates who have found work outside of project-funded activities with the assistance of CSP.

IBTCI recommends that this indicator be revised through either the removal of the employed beneficiaries who are not working in CSP-created positions or through a rewording of the indicator language to reflect that it measures both job creation and employment.

Source Data Collection and Verification

There is a contradiction in the source data specified for BDP job creation between the language utilized on page 16 of the M&E Plan stating "Many long-term jobs…and are measured after the grant has been issued" and in the PIRS for this indicator on page 35 under data source "…Grant agreements for IRD business development grant program indicating the number of new jobs created."

IRD should specify clearly whether the data for these types of projects comes from the grant agreement or from field monitoring after the grant has been implemented. If the latter is correct, then there will be a delay in the reporting of job creation numbers for BDP projects until the

specified monitoring visit has been accomplished. This should be acknowledged in the discussion of timeliness.

There is a specific area of concern that should be addressed in regards to employment data for vocational training graduates reported by MOLSA. There is little detail in the M&E Plan and PIRS on how these data are collected by MOLSA and validated by CSP. IRD should develop written guidelines detailing the data collection procedures and project verification and validation procedures, share these with MOLSA staff and include them in the M&E Plan.

Cumulative Reporting

Based on a review of the M&E Plan definitions and the Weekly Employment Summary reporting for this indicator, it is unclear if data on long-term job creation is only reported cumulatively. It appears that this is the case based on the Weekly Employment Summary and the targets in the M&E Plan. If this is true, it should be clearly stated in the body of the M&E Plan and in the PIRS for this indicator. Two main issues result from cumulative reporting. First, the reporting of only cumulative data over an extended period of time for such indicators makes it challenging to immediately appreciate the recent accomplishments of the project in long-term job creation. Second, job gains from the past may have been lost if the position was eliminated after the three month requirement for inclusion in the indicator data. The data verification costs required for removing positions that no longer exist can be substantial and are generally the main justification for cumulative reporting of such information. However, this practice can lead to potentially serious overstatements of long-term project impact. It would be helpful in clarifying more recent accomplishments in this area if the project could report on long-term job gains for shorter time periods, such as for only the current reporting period on a weekly or monthly basis. This would help decision makers appreciate the more immediate gains of the project in key areas. IRD has already taken important steps to address this issue by disaggregating reporting on this indicator by year and quarter. Additionally, it is possible to calculate the weekly "incidence" of new jobs and employment by subtracting numbers presented in the bar graph of long-term jobs by week in the Weekly Employment Summary.

Recommendations

IBTCI recommends that CSP supplement its cumulative long-term jobs reporting with shorter term reporting on more recent data such as weekly and monthly long-term job creation. CSP should also make it clear in such reports that the indicator includes jobs that may not currently exist unless the project's monitoring procedures allow it to remove jobs if they cease to exist during the reported period. Such procedures should be described clearly in writing and included in the M&E Plan.

3.4 Indicator 7.1.1.3 Number of Long-term Jobs Indirectly Created

The separate reporting of indirect job creation from direct CSP-sponsored job creation is a useful practice that helps to illustrate and quantify the diverse impacts of CSP investments in Iraqi public service infrastructure.

"Job Creation" or "Employment"

This indicator shares similar issues in definition concerning job creation and employment as indicator 7.1.1.2. For indirect job creation, however, the specific concern is not centered on the difference between CSP-sponsored employment and CSP assistance in job placement. Indirect jobs reporting numbers deserve specific attention and clarification regarding whether the reported jobs are actually newly created. While a school renovation project may put teachers to work, it is unclear that this is actual job creation if the total number of available teaching positions in that community is not increased over the number that existed before the renovation. Since teachers, clinic workers, and other professionals reported under this indicator are government employees, it is likely that some of them would have continued to collect paychecks while the school was closed. This indicator should either focus on new positions beyond the original number present before the project or should disaggregate reported job data so that the distinction is clear.

IBTCI recommends that the indicator be rewritten or redefined to address the issue of identifying indirect jobs that were truly created by the project versus preexisting positions.

Cumulative Reporting

The same issues concerning cumulative reporting for indicator 7.1.1.2 apply for this indicator.

Recommendations

IBTCI recommends that CSP supplement its cumulative long-term jobs reporting with shorter term reporting on more recent data such as weekly and monthly long-term job creation. CSP should also make it clear in such reports that the indicator includes jobs that may not currently exist unless the project's monitoring procedures allow it to remove jobs if they cease to exist during the reported period. Such procedures should be described clearly in writing and included in the M&E Plan.

3.5 indicator 7.1.1.4 Weekly Employment Summary

Terminology

The report interweaves the terms job "placement", "creation" and "generation" in chart and table titles and descriptive text in a way that makes it difficult to distinguish between what are very different project activities and results. On page 7, for example, the bar graph is entitled "Long-Term Job Placement." While CSP has a job placement program these data refer to the sum total of long-term job creation and employment reported in the report and not the subset of job placements. As the discussion of Indicator 7.1.1.2 describes above, CSP job creation results from BDP grants, CIES, and other activities that the project directly funds or that have indirect long-term employment benefits. The vocational training and apprenticeship graduates that have found work after completing the program should not be counted under "placement" unless they are specifically in a job that CSP helped them to find nor under "creation" unless they are employed in a position directly or indirectly generated by CSP activities.

Confusion over the exact meaning of particular figures may be compounded by the combining of cumulative long-term employment, non-cumulative short-term employment and cumulative and non-cumulative "engagement" activities such as job training, apprenticeships and youth activities into one weekly summary "employment" statistic that is presented in the first table.

The use of cumulative long-term numbers in a weekly summary statistic with non-cumulative numbers results in a minimum floor for the reported data that may not accurately reflect fluctuations in job creation, employment and engagement results overtime.

Finally, despite acknowledging the intermingling of such figures in the text describing the results, the title of "Weekly Employment Summary" is misleading and subject to misinterpretation by consumers of the information. In the most recent report reviewed (July 26, 2008), more than half of the reported numbers for "long-term employment" were actually participants engaged in youth activities and job training and not employed in wage earning activities.

Recommendations

IBTCI recommends that the report be reviewed and revised to ensure that the results presented therein can be clearly understood and appropriately interpreted by consumers of the data who may not be intimately familiar with the details of CSP activities, results and reporting definitions. While the existence of a detailed set of guidelines for completing the report is a strong positive indication of CSP's efforts to standardize the report and maximize its quality and utility, it is suggested that the guidelines be changed to ensure that clear, precise terminology is used throughout the report.

3.6 indicator 7.2.1 Number of Youth Completing Non-formal Education Activities

This indicator is a direct measure of the quantity of CSP youth engagement activities provided during a given time period. As CSP acknowledges in the August 2008 M&E Plan, counting the number of youth participants in sports, arts and life skills activities is most likely only weakly related to Sub-IR 7.2 Conflict mitigated through increased community activities. Based on the CSP development hypothesis that providing alternatives to the insurgency for young men will reduce conflict, however, this indicator provides a specific, valid measure of youth engagement outputs.

"Completing" or "Participating"

The definition and wording of the indicator are not consistent. The indicator uses the word "completing" to define the youth to be included in the count while the definition in the M&E plan and concomitant discussion use the looser concept of participation. Unless CSP disaggregates the indicator by type of activity, it is difficult to ensure that the indicator only counts youth who completed activities without substantial guidelines defining completion in terms of numbers of soccer games they played in or percentages of total days of life skills training attended. At the same time, the inclusion of youth who participate in the activities without some indication as to the level of engagement and attendance required further weakens the indicator's utility in supporting the Sub-IR of Conflict Mitigation.

Recommendations

IBTCI recommends that CSP reword the indicator to make it clear that it counts participants instead of "completing" youth. Further documentation of CSP requirements for inclusion in the indicator should be combined with disaggregated reporting by type of activity. This should help

improve the comprehension of consumers of CSP's EGY data in terms of scope and potential impact.

ANNEX 1. COMPLETED PERFORMANCE INDICATOR DATA QUALITY WORKSHEETS

INDICATOR 7.1.1.1 Worksheet

.

Name of Strategic Objective: Reduced Incentive for Participation in Violent Conflict in Selected Communities

Name of Intermediate Result (if applicable): Unemployment Rate Decreased

Name of Performance indicator: Number of Person Months of Employment Generated for Short-Term Employment
Data source(s): CSP reports and documents/ data bases/ key informant interviews

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable): International Relief and Development
Year or period for which the data are being reported: N/A

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* N/A

Date(s) of assessment: 13 August 2008

Location(s) of assessment: Baghdad, Iraq

Assessment team members: IBTCI: Harvey Herr; Rich Mason

For Office Use Only

SO team leader approval: X_____Date_____

Mission director or delegate approval: X_____Date_____

Copies to: _____

Comments: _____

_____

_____

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?

	Yes	No	Comments
Face Validity			
➢ Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	X	❑	The CSP creates short-term employment directly through CIES activities that put people to work on a variety of different projects. Total person-months of employment are an acceptable way of presenting employment data where the duration of employment can vary between a few weeks up to three months.
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Data Source is not a sample
➢ Were samples representative?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were response rates sufficiently large?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Has non-response rate been followed up?	❑	❑	N/A
Non Sampling Error			N/A
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were there incentives for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are enumerators well trained? How were they trained? Were they insiders or outsiders? Was there any quality control in the selection process?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	❑	❑	N/A
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	X	❑	Short-term employment data are reportedly taken from signed contractor-certified timesheets, and "other PMP documentation." The exact transcription process is unclear as is the risk for error.
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error? (e.g., double	❑	X	Double keying is a possibility and was evident in the vocational training data.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)			
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:	X	❑	Yes, raw data from timesheets are converted into person-months
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	Not observed
Representativeness of Data			
➢ Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Is the sampling frame (i.e., the list of units in the target population) up to date? Comprehensive? Mutually exclusive (for geographic frames)	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Is the sample of adequate size?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:
Provide resources for double-key data entry for cross-checking accuracy of data entry.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

	Yes	No	Comments
Consistency			
➢ Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	❑	X	No. According to interviews with CSP staff and documentation in the RIG audit, time sheets were not required initially as source data for this indicator. Furthermore, according to the M&E plan, there appear to be multiple sources of information that are unspecified.
➢ Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location? If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	N/A
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	X	❑	Not verified
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	X	❑	Not verified
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	X	❑	Both the M&E and QAQC units reportedly conduct regular and systematic validation and verification of project data and source documentation. These systems were not observed and verified.
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	X	❑	There is some detail in the M&E plan about how data are collected and verified including quality assessment. There are some gaps in documentation, such as how modifications are made based on monitoring visits, that should be addressed
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	X	❑	According to interviews with program staff and project documentation.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:
Document procedures for handling all aspects of data collection, cleaning, verification, analysis and adjustment in a set of standardized SOPs that are distributed to each program office and partner office, including MOLSA, and included in the M&E Plan.

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?

	Yes	No	Comments
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	X	❑	Data are updated and reported on a weekly basis
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X	❑	Data are updated and reported on a weekly basis
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	X	❑	Data are updated and reported on a weekly basis
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	X	❑	
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X	❑	Generally within one week.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	X	The time period for the reported data is included but there may be some time lag that is not apparent in the report.

Recommendations for improvement:
None

4. PRECISION—Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	X	❑	There is a possibility of error in reporting, but this seems small compared to the overall reporting.
➢ Is the margin of error is acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)	X	❑	Yes, except where errors might be associated with fraudulent reporting of employment.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	X	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:
None

5. INTEGRITY—Are data are free of manipulation?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	X	❑	QA/QC unit is in place, reportedly resulting in multiple layers of verification and oversight.
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Has there been independent review?	X	❑	There was a DQA performed by IBTCI on this indicator in 2006.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:
None

INDICATOR 7.1.1.2 Worksheet

Name of Strategic Objective: Reduced Incentive for Participation in Violent Conflict in Selected Communities

Name of Intermediate Result (if applicable): Unemployment Rate Decreased

Name of Performance indicator: # of long-term jobs directly created

Data source(s): CSP reports and documents/review of data bases/ key informant interviews
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable): International Relief and Development
Year or period for which the data are being reported: N/A

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* N/A

Date(s) of assessment: 13 August 2008

Location(s) of assessment: Baghdad, Iraq

Assessment team members: IBTCI: Harvey Herr; Rich Mason

For Office Use Only

SO team leader approval:
X Date

Mission director or delegate approval:
X_____Date_____

Copies to:

Comments

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?

Face Validity	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	❑	X	Some of the data reported are not jobs created but employment by various groups as a result of skills building or job placement. As a result, the actual number of jobs created may be substantially overstated.
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Data Source is not a sample
➢ Were samples representative?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were response rates sufficiently large?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Has non-response rate been followed up?	❑	❑	N/A
Non Sampling Error			N/A
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were there incentives for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are enumerators well trained? How were they trained? Were they insiders or outsiders? Was there any quality control in the selection process?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	❑	❑	N/A
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	X	❑	Long-term employment data are reportedly taken from BDP grant agreements, which are verified through site visits, "employment agreements" and letters of verification from MOLSA staff. The exact transcription process is unclear as is the risk for error.
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys,	❑	X	Double keying is a possibility and was evident in the vocational training data.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?

	Yes	No	Comments
electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)			
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	Not observed
Representativeness of Data			
➢ Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Is the sampling frame (i.e., the list of units in the target population) up to date? Comprehensive? Mutually exclusive (for geographic frames)	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Is the sample of adequate size?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:

IBTCI recommends that this indicator be revised through either the removal of the employed beneficiaries who are not working in CSP-created positions or through a rewording of the indicator language to reflect that it measures both job creation and employment.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

	Yes	No	Comments
Consistency			
➢ Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	❑	X	At some point in the CSP, additional data such as employed apprentices and vocational training graduates were added to the indicator. In addition, the indicator relies of reports from CSP and MOLSA staff in multiple locations throughout Iraq. It is not clear that there are standard SOPs harmonizing practices across project offices and, specifically, across MOLSA offices.
➢ Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location? If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	N/A
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	X	❑	Not verified
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	X	❑	Not verified
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	X	❑	Both the M&E and QAQC units reportedly conduct regular and systematic validation and verification of project data and source documentation. These systems were not observed and verified.
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	X	❑	There is limited documentation in this area. Particular concern should be raised about the data collection and reporting procedures of MOLSA staff in regards to vocational training graduates who have found employment.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	X	❑	According to interviews with program staff and project documentation.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	Not observed

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

	Yes	No	Comments

Recommendations for improvement:
IRD should specify clearly whether the data for these types of projects comes from the grant agreement or from field monitoring after the grant has been implemented. If the latter is correct, then there will be a delay in the reporting of job creation numbers for BDP projects until the specified monitoring visit has been accomplished. This should be acknowledged in the discussion of timeliness.

Document procedures for handling all aspects of data collection, cleaning, verification, analysis and adjustment in a set of standardized SOPs that are distributed to each program office and partner office, including MOLSA, and included in the M&E Plan.

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?

	Yes	No	Comments
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	X	❑	Data are updated and reported on a weekly basis.
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	X	❑	
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	X	❑	
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X	❑	Generally within one week.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	X	The time period for the reported data is included but there may be some time lag that is not apparent in the report.

Recommendations for improvement:

IBTCI recommends that CSP supplement its cumulative long-term jobs reporting with shorter term reporting on more recent data such as weekly and monthly long-term job creation.

CSP should also make it clear in such reports that the indicator includes jobs that may not currently exist unless the project's monitoring procedures allow it to remove jobs if they cease to exist during the reported period. Such procedures should be described clearly in writing and included in the M&E Plan.

4. PRECISION—Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	X	❑	There is a possibility of error in reporting, but this is small compared to the overall reporting.
➢ Is the margin of error is acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)	❑	❑	This is unclear. If the magnitude of reported job creation from apprentices and vocational graduates continues at a high level or grows, it may lead to a misinterpretation of the actual impacts of the CSP in job creation.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	X	
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	X	
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	Unclear. It depends on the program planning implications of the reported data.

Recommendations for improvement:
Targets should be set for an acceptable margin of error with the margin of error reported to USAID.

5. INTEGRITY—Are data are free of manipulation?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	X	❑	QA/QC unit is in place, reportedly resulting in multiple layers of verification and oversight. It is not clear how CSP verifies specific data included in the indicator, especially in regards to MOLSA reported employment of vocational training graduates.
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Has there been independent review?	X	❑	There was a DQA performed by IBTCI on this indicator in 2006.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:
None.

INDICATOR 7.1.1.3 Worksheet

Name of Strategic Objective: Reduced Incentive for Participation in Violent Conflict in Selected Communities

Name of Intermediate Result (if applicable): Unemployment Rate Decreased

Name of Performance indicator: # of long-term jobs indirectly created

Data source(s): CSP internal documents/ data bases/key informant interviews

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable): International Relief and Development

Year or period for which the data are being reported: N/A

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* N/A

Date(s) of assessment: 13 August 2008

Location(s) of assessment: Baghdad, Iraq

Assessment team members: IBTCI: Harvey Herr; Rich Mason

For Office Use Only

SO team leader approval:
X_____Date_____

Mission director or delegate approval:
X_____Date_____

Copies to:

Comments

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?

Face Validity	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	X	❑	The relationship is clear but the exact definition of the indicator and the issues surrounding whether the reported jobs are actually created or not should be addressed.
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Data Source is not a sample
➢ Were samples representative?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were response rates sufficiently large?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Has non-response rate been followed up?	❑	❑	N/A
Non Sampling Error			N/A
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were there incentives for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are enumerators well trained? How were they trained? Were they insiders or outsiders? Was there any quality control in the selection process?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	❑	❑	N/A
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	The exact transcription process is unclear as is the risk for error.
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)	❑	X	Double keying is a possibility and was evident in the vocational training data for long-term employment directly created.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the	❑	❑	N/A

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?

	Yes	No	Comments
indicator:			
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	Not observed
Representativeness of Data			
➢ Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Is the sampling frame (i.e., the list of units in the target population) up to date? Comprehensive? Mutually exclusive (for geographic frames)	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Is the sample of adequate size?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:
IBTCI recommends that the indicator be rewritten or redefined to address the issue of identifying indirect jobs that were truly created by the project versus preexisting positions.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

	Yes	No	Comments
Consistency			
➢ Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	❑	❑	It is not clear that there are standardized procedures harmonizing practices across project offices and, specifically, across MOLSA offices.
➢ Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location? If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Is the same sampling method used	❑	❑	N/A

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

	Yes	No	Comments
from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?			
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	X	❑	
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	X	❑	
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	X	❑	Both the M&E and QAQC units reportedly conduct regular and systematic validation and verification of project data and source documentation
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	X	❑	There is some detail in the M&E plan about how data are collected and verified including quality assessment. There are some gaps in documentation, such as how modifications are made based on monitoring visits, that should be addressed
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	X	❑	According to interviews with program staff and project documentation.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:

Document procedures for handling all aspects of data collection, cleaning, verification, analysis and adjustment in a set of standardized SOPs that are distributed to each program office and partner office, including MOLSA, and included in the M&E Plan.

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?

	Yes	No	Comments
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	X	❑	Data are updated and reported on a weekly basis
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	X	❑	
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	X	❑	
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X	❑	Generally within one week.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	X	The time period for the reported data is included but there may be some time lag that is not apparent in the report.

Recommendations for improvement:

IBTCI recommends that CSP supplement its cumulative long-term jobs reporting with shorter term reporting on more recent data such as weekly and monthly long-term job creation.

CSP should also make it clear in such reports that the indicator includes jobs that may not currently exist unless the project's monitoring procedures allow it to remove jobs if they cease to exist during the reported period. Such procedures should be described clearly in writing and included in the M&E Plan.

4. PRECISION—Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	X	❑	There is a possibility of error in reporting, but this is small compared to the overall reporting.
➢ Is the margin of error is acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)	X	❑	Yes, except where errors might be associated with fraudulent reporting of employment.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	X	
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	X	
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	X	❑	

4. PRECISION—Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Recommendations for improvement: None			

5. INTEGRITY—Are data are free of manipulation?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	X	❑	QA/QC unit is in place, resulting in multiple layers of verification and oversight.
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	X	❑	
➢ Has there been independent review?	❑	X	
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	N/A
Recommendations for improvement: **None**			

INDICATOR 7.2.1 Worksheet

Name of Strategic Objective: Reduced Incentive for Participation in Violent Conflict in Selected Communities

Name of Intermediate Result (if applicable): Conflict Mitigated Through Increased Community Activities

Name of Performance indicator: # of youth participating in non-formal education programs
Data source(s): Partner reports and documents/data bases and key informant interviews
Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable): International Relief and Development
Year or period for which the data are being reported: N/A

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* N/A

Date(s) of assessment: 13 August 2008

Location(s) of assessment: Baghdad, Iraq

Assessment team members: IBTCI: Harvey Herr; Rich Mason

For Office Use Only

SO team leader approval:
X_____Date_____

Mission director or delegate approval:
X_____Date_____

Copies to:

Comments

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?

	Yes	No	Comments
Face Validity			
➢ Is there a solid, logical relation between the activity or program and what is being measured, or are there significant uncontrollable factors?	X	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			
➢ Were samples representative?	❑	❑	Data Source is not a sample.
➢ Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ If the instrument was self-reporting were adequate instructions provided?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were response rates sufficiently large?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Has non-response rate been followed up?	❑	❑	N/A
Non Sampling Error			N/A
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were there incentives for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are enumerators well trained? How were they trained? Were they insiders or outsiders? Was there any quality control in the selection process?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	❑	❑	N/A
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	The exact transcription process is unclear as is the risk for error.
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)	❑	X	Double keying is a possibility and was evident in the vocational training data for long-term employment directly created.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:	❑	❑	N/A

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	Not observed
Representativeness of Data			
➢ Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Is the sampling frame (i.e., the list of units in the target population) up to date? Comprehensive? Mutually exclusive (for geographic frames)	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Is the sample of adequate size?	❑	❑	N/A
➢ Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:

IBTCI recommends that CSP reword the indicator to make it clear that it counts participants instead of "completing" youth. Further documentation of CSP requirements for inclusion in the indicator should be combined with disaggregated reporting by type of activity. This should help improve the comprehension of consumers of CSP's EGY data in terms of scope and potential impact.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?

	Yes	No	Comments
Consistency			
➢ Is a consistent data collection process used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source (if data come from different sources)?	❑	❑	It is not clear that there are standardized procedures harmonizing practices across project offices.
➢ Is the same instrument used to collect data from year to year, location to location? If data come from different sources are the instruments similar enough that the reliability of the data are not compromised?	❑	❑	Not observed
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	N/A
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	X	❑	
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	X	❑	
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	X	❑	Both the M&E and QAQC units reportedly conduct regular and systematic validation and verification of project data and source documentation
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	X	❑	There is some detail in the M&E plan about how data are collected and verified including quality assessment. There are some gaps in documentation, such as how modifications are made based on monitoring visits, that should be addressed
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	X	❑	According to interviews with program staff and project documentation.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:
None

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?

	Yes	No	Comments
Frequency			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	X	❑	Data are updated and reported on a weekly basis
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	X	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	X	❑	
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	X	❑	
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X	❑	Generally within one week.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	X	The time period for the reported data is included but there may be some time lag that is not apparent in the report.

Recommendations for improvement:
None

4. PRECISION—Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	X	❑	There is a possibility of error in reporting, but this is small compared to the overall reporting.
➢ Is the margin of error is acceptable given the likely management decisions to be affected? (consider the consequences of the program or policy decisions based on the data)	X	❑	Yes, except where errors might be associated with fraudulent reporting of participants.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	X	
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	X	
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	X	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:
None

5. INTEGRITY—Are data are free of manipulation?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Are mechanisms in place to reduce the possibility that data are manipulated for political or personal reasons?	X	❑	QA/QC unit is in place, resulting in multiple layers of verification and oversight.
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	X	❑	
➢ Has there been independent review?	❑	X	
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	N/A

Recommendations for improvement:
None