PN-ADE-355

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN INDICATORS

ANNEXES C-F

Prepared for:

USAID/Ecuador

Prepared by

Harry Carr, Team Leader

Clarence Zuvekas

Checchi and Company
Consulting/Louis Berger
Joint Venture

1899 L Street, NW
Suite 800
Washington, D.C. 20036

Contract No. AEP-I-824-00-00022-00

January,2004

Best Available

ANNEX C

Northern Border Development–SO 13

Data Quality Assessment Checklists
Performance Indicator Reference Sheets
Field/Site Visit Reports

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT

Intermediate Result: NA

Indicator: 13.0: Number of beneficiaries in the target region whose lives are improved by participation in access to social and infrastructure services

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): A more appropriate definition would be, "units of person-benefits resulting from heterogeneous activities in the target region designed to improve quality of life through greater access to infrastructure and social services."

Unit of Measure: One benefit per person for each type of benefit received

Disaggregated by: Type of activity (potable water systems, rehabilitated irrigation systems, land titling, drug-prevention education, etc.)

Justification/Management Utility: Since double-counting is often difficult to eliminate, and a way needs to be found to show that some individuals benefit from more activities than others, some double-counting of beneficiaries is acceptable. However, it would be more appropriate to think of the unit of measure as "units of person-benefits" rather than "beneficiaries." A weakness of this indicator is that each benefit is weighted equally. Thus the Mission might give some thought to devising a weighting system for benefits. Double-counting of beneficiaries of closely related activities (e.g. persons with potable water connections and persons attending "conscientization" sessions to foster prompt payment of water bills), should be eliminated.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Location of Data Storage:
Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

Data Quality Assessment Checklist

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT: Improved quality of life of the population living along the northern border

Intermediate Result (if applicable):

Performance indicator:
13.0: Number of beneficiaries in the target region whose lives are improved by participation in access to social and infrastructure services

Data source(s):
IOM (International Organization for Migration) records

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
IOM

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES [NO]

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito & Sucumbíos Province, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Ray Waldron, Ken Farr, Paulyna Martínez, Hugo Ramos
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?		NO	The identification of beneficiaries is difficult because of the heterogeneity of the activities, their location in several distinct geographic areas, and the practical difficulties of eliminating double-counting of persons who benefit from more than one activity. USAID reports that some double-counting has been eliminated. Nevertheless, it is evident that a significant amount remains. For example, IOM reports 56,447 beneficiaries of rehabilitated, expanded, or newly-built water-supply systems through September 2003. It also reports that 40,880 of these persons participated in conscientization campaigns encouraging them to pay their water bills; these persons are double-counted as beneficiaries of this second, related activity.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
or outsiders? Was there any quality control in the selection process?			
➢ Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	See comments on IR-level indicators.
➢ 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)	❑	❑	See comments of IR-level indicators.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	See comments on IR-level indicators.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:			
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?			
➢ Are the same formulae applied consistently from year to year, site to site, data source to data source (if data from multiple sources need to be aggregated)?	❑	❑	See comments on IR-level indicators.
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	See comments on IR-level indicators.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	YES		Several totals were checked and did in fact add up.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ 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:

Double-counting of beneficiaries of closely related activities, such as the water-systems example above, should be eliminated. In other cases, it seems best not to eliminate double-counting (*) but rather to regard the indicator as consisting of "units of person-benefits," recognizing that these units have unequal value. At the same time, the Mission might indicate in a footnote the rough order of magnitude of the double-counting it believes is likely to exist. (*Experience in other countries suggests that eliminating double-counting of beneficiaries of unrelated projects in a particular community can be difficult and costly, even if the database is good.)

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

2. RELIABILITY–Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			See comments for IR-level indicators.
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	❑	❑	
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	❑	❑	
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			See comments for IR-level indicators.
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	❑	❑	
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	❑	❑	
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	❑	❑	
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

4. PRECISION—Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	See comments on IR-level indicators.
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	❑	❑	See comments on IR-level indicators.
➢ Has there been independent review?	❑	❑	See comments on IR-level indicators.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	See comments on IR-level indicators.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?		NO	The indicator measures the intended result, but not clearly. Because of double-counting (see #1-VALIDITY), the number of beneficiaries is overestimated significantly.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		In the sense that it seeks to measure direct beneficiaries. IOM specifically excludes indirect beneficiaries in some cases.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?		NO	Skeptics would regard the extent of double-counting as being unacceptably large.
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

(See recommendation for #1-VALIDITY.)

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?		NO	See discussion under #1-VALIDITY.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?		NO	The indicator measures the number of (unequal) "beneficiary units," rather than the number of beneficiaries.
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?		NO	The indicator aggregates a number of different types of benefits.
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		It is operationally precise in the sense that direct beneficiaries for each specific activity seem to be clearly identified. The problem lies instead in aggregating the beneficiaries, as significant double-counting occurs.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

The Mission will need to examine disaggregated figures by individual activity to see whether, e.g., an overall figure that exceeds the target hides shortfalls in targets for some specific activities.

The Mission should work closely with IOM to reach agreement on what additional double-counting can be eliminated.

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	❑	❑	See comments for IR-level indicators.
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	❑	❑	See comments for IR-level indicators.
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		The cost of obtaining data on beneficiaries for each activity is reasonable. The cost of eliminating all double-counting may be unduly high.
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		For the most part, the indicator shows how many beneficiaries have been given access to benefits from various activities. But it does little to show the impact on beneficiaries' well-being.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?	YES		For what it is intended to measure, the overall indicator, and the disaggregated data on beneficiaries for each specific activity, adequately address progress toward the intended result.
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		One could think of the double-counting problem in this context, in that the total number of beneficiaries is overstated.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?	YES		An examination of the completed activity or process would have to look at the impact on beneficiaries' well-being.
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product	YES		Some activities represent delivery/improvement of physical infrastructure. But the indicator says very little about impact on beneficiaries.
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		The great majority of "beneficiary units" can be attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners.
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?		NO	The Mission would need to look at actual vs. planned beneficiaries for each specific activity.
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		However, the Mission will not know where these problems are without looking at disaggregated data by specific activity.
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?		NO	No, because of the confusion between beneficiaries and "beneficiary units." (See #1-VALIDITY recommendations.)
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?		NO	The indicator will be more credible when additional double-counting has been eliminated.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations for #1-VALIDITY and #7-OBJECTIVITY.

The Mission should seek uniformity in the definitions of its SO-level indicators for Northern Border Development (SO 13) and Southern Border Integration (SpO 11).

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
Strategic Objective: SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT **Intermediate Result:** IR 13.1: Health conditions improved in vulnerable villages and towns **Indicator:** 13.1(d): Number of Water Administration Units in municipalities created and/or strengthened
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): The indicator should be rephrased in such a way as to reflect the outcome of what the WAUs are expected to accomplish, according to a pre-established set of quantitative and qualitative criteria. **Unit of Measure:** Number of water boards **Disaggregated by:** **Justification/Management Utility:** The current statement of the indicator does not make clear what constitutes an acceptable level of "strengthening." Thus pre-established criteria need to be agreed upon so that "strengthening" can be measured objectively.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID
Data Collection Method: **Method of Acquisition by USAID:** **Data Source(s):** **Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:** **Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:** **Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:**
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: **Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):** **Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:** **Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:**
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Data Analysis: **Presentation of Data:** **Review of Data:** **Reporting of Data:**
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: **Location of Data Storage:** **Other Notes:**
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT: Improved quality of life of the population living along the northern border

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 13.1: Health conditions improved in vulnerable villages and towns

Performance indicator:
13.1(d): Number of Water Administration Units in municipalities created and/or strengthened

Data source(s):
IOM (International Organization for Migration) progress reports

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
IOM

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito & Sucumbíos Province, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Ray Waldron, Ken Farr, Paulyna Martínez, Hugo Ramos
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?		NO	The indicator does not focus on what the WAUs are expected to accomplish, and it does not directly measure the IR. Also, what constitutes an acceptable level of "strengthening" is not clear.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Were there incentives for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	❑	❑	"Strengthening" of WAUs is not defined precisely.
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	YES		The potential for error seems relatively small given the very small number of WAUs, and the review of field-submitted forms by the IOM office in Quito.
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error?	❑	❑	Data reported by field offices are reviewed by IOM staff in Quito, who

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
(e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)			question data that appear incorrect.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	YES		
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the 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?	YES		
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			
➢ Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	❑	❑	
➢ Did all units of the population have an equal chance of being selected for the sample?	❑	❑	
➢ Is the sampling frame (i.e., the list of units in the target population) up to date? Comprehensive? Mutually exclusive (for geographic frames)	❑	❑	
➢ Is the sample of adequate size?	❑	❑	
➢ Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	❑	❑	

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**

Recommendations for improvement:

The indicator should be rephrased and stated in such a way that it reflects the outcome of what the WAUs are expected to accomplish, according to a pre-established set of quantitative and qualitative criteria.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Consistency			Not applicable
➢ 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)?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			Not applicable
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			Not applicable
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	n.a.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	YES		See #2: RELIABILITY, Internal quality control.
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	YES		See #2: RELIABILITY, Internal quality control.
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	USAID audits do not include an examination of the quality of indicators.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?		NO	The indicator does not directly address the IR (improved health) because it does not focus on the number of persons obtaining water from the activity or how their quality of life has changed.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		Municipal governments have long been involved in the provision of water, although part of the financing of this activity comes from earmarked funds transferred from the central government. The Association of Municipalities of Ecuador (AME) provides effective technical assistance.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?	YES		Once it is clear what is meant by "strengthened" WAUs.
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?	YES		However, what is meant by "strengthened" needs to be clarified.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?		NO	See comment immediately above.
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?	YES		
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		Once the word "strengthened" is made clear.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		The indicator does not make clear what WAUs are expected to accomplish. Nor does it focus on how beneficiaries' lives are affected.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?		NO	
➢ Is there are particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		See comment immediately above.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?	YES		
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product		NO	
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #1: VALIDITY.

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the missions purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		Again, provided that "strengthened" is clearly defined.
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	The Mission would need to look at quantitative and qualitative information for each specific WAU to determine the sources of the problems.
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		In the sense that most observers would have a general idea of what "strengthened" is meant to convey. But this term needs to be clearly defined.
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		Credible regarding what it is intended to measure, but not as an indicator of achievement of the IR.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT
Intermediate Result: IR 13.1: Health conditions improved in vulnerable villages and towns
Indicator: 13.1(a) Number of village potable water systems constructed/repaired/expanded in target areas

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): The DQA team recommends adding to the statement of the indicator, "and providing water to connected households on a regular basis." Also, it should refer to "town and village" systems, not simply "village" systems, and be disaggregated accordingly. The team further recommends adding a sub-indicator to show the number of beneficiaries actually obtaining water. (This information is included in the SO-level indicator.) Related indicators that might be considered include average of number of days per year with no interruption of service (except for normal maintenance); (weighted) average percentage of users paying bills on time; and average consumption per household.

Unit of Measure: Number of systems; number of beneficiaries

Disaggregated by: Towns and villages

Justification/Management Utility: The rationale for adding to the statement of the current indicator is that it goes beyond the construction phase to focus on water use, and thus looks forward to the impact of the activity on the IR (improved health) and other dimensions of quality of life.

The recommended indicator for beneficiaries would clarify the scope of the activity, since water "systems" can vary significantly in size. It is in this latter respect that we have recommended referring to "town and village" systems in the statement of the indicator, and disaggregating the data by towns and villages.

Adopting one of the other suggested indicators, which focus on various aspects of water use, should be given serious consideration, since the remaining life of the project is nearly three years.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: **Location of Data Storage:** **Other Notes:**
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

(Data Quality Assessment Checklist

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT: Improved quality of life of the population living along the northern border

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 13.1: Health conditions improved in vulnerable villages and towns

Performance indicator:
13.1(a): Number of village potable water systems constructed/repaired/expanded in target areas

Data source(s):
IOM (International Organization for Migration) reports

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
IOM

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito & Sucumbíos Province, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Ray Waldron, Ken Farr, Paulyna Martínez, Hugo Ramos
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?	YES		The indicator clearly measures what the activity seeks to accomplish. But it does not provide any indication of how well the water systems function after they have been constructed/repaired/expanded.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?		NO	IOM works with a relatively few systems, so keeping track of the number should be easy, thus keeping the potential for error low.
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error? (e.g., double keying of	YES		Data from the field are reviewed in the Quito headquarters office.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
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?	YES		
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:			Not applicable
➢ 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**

Recommendations for improvement:

Add to the statement of the indicator: "and providing water to connected households on a regular basis."

Since the water systems vary significantly in size, it would be useful to disaggregate the indicator by "towns" and "villages," using a locally appropriate distinction. Also, the indicator itself should refer to "town and village" systems, not simply "village" systems.

The Mission should consider developing a new indicator(s) to measure some aspect(s) of performance (e.g., average number of days/year with no interruption of service, except for normal maintenance such as cleaning tanks; and (weighted) average percentage of users paying their bills on time).

Another possible indicator is average consumption per household, a figure that should be readily available given the presence of meters. Trends in this indicator, together with those in the percentage of households paying their bills on time, would provide a good indirect measure of trends in households' well-being. IOM can easily keep track of the number of water systems is has helped construct/repair/expand. Once the works are completed, IOM collects technical and other data monthly.

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)?	YES		
➢ 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?	YES		
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			Not applicable
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			Not applicable
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	n.a.

2. RELIABILITY–Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	YES		
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	YES		
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	YES		
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	YES		
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	YES		
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	YES		
➢ Has there been independent review?	YES		
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?		NO	The indicator per se does not directly address the IR (improved health) because it does not focus on the number of persons obtaining water from the activity, although the number is known and included in the SO-level indicator.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		Clear evidence exists that potable water systems have significant positive health benefits. They also reduce the time households spend in obtaining water, and often reduce unit-cost cash outlays for water, sometimes significantly.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?	YES		
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

The Mission should consider adding a sub-indicator showing the number of beneficiaries (persons) actually obtaining water from the new/improved/expanded systems. (These data are already included as part of the SO-level indicator.)

The Mission should also investigate the feasibility of establishing an indicator that would measure improvements in health status. It is not clear whether adequate baseline data are available.

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?		NO	The size of a "system" is unclear. Also, a large town might have several "systems."
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?	YES		However, the average size (and range) of a water system is unclear.
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?	YES		
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		The indicator is sufficiently precise. Although some large towns might be deemed to have several systems, this would not appear to be a major concern.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #1-VALIDITY and #6-DIRECTNESS.

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		Ultimately, USAID would want to know not only the number of beneficiaries, but also how much their quality of life has changed by being connected to a potable water system.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?	YES		The indicator adequately measures **progress toward** the end result but falls short of measuring actual improvements in health conditions.
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		See comment immediately above.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?			The outcome of the program should be improved health conditions, which are not measured.
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product	YES		
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations for #1: VALIDITY and #6: DIRECTNESS.

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT
Intermediate Result: IR 13.1: Health conditions improved in vulnerable villages and towns
Indicator: 13.1(c): Number of water boards created, legalized, trained and functioning, by category A and B

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): The DQA team recommends that the word "functioning" be replaced by "functioning in a way that significantly improves water service delivery," or some similar phrase. Also, the definitions of categories A, B, C, and D, which indicate how well water boards are functioning, should not be relegated to a separate page, and a brief description of how these grades are determined (by a computerized formula) should be provided. The indicator should also show how many water boards fall into categories C and D.

Unit of Measure: Number of water boards

Disaggregated by:

Justification/Management Utility: The grading of water boards' performance by categories A through D, which is done monthly, is an excellent management tool for identifying problems and taking steps to correct them.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Location of Data Storage:
Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/0

Strategic Objective:
SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT: Improved quality of life of the population living along the northern border

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 13.1: Health conditions improved in vulnerable villages and towns

Performance indicator:
13.1(c): Number of water boards created, legalized, trained and functioning, by category A and B

Data source(s):
IOM (International Organization for Migration) progress reports

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
IOM

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito & Sucumbíos Province, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Ray Waldron, Ken Farr, Paulina Martínez, Hugo Ramos
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?	YES		However, the word "functioning" does not adequately describe what the water boards are expected to accomplish, and the indicator does not directly measure the IR.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	YES		Detailed technical data are collected monthly and reviewed at IOM headquarters in Quito. Classification into categories (A,B,C,D) is made automatically by a computer program incorporating relevant criteria.
➢ Were there incentives for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?		NO	None were evident.
➢ Are definitions for data to be collected operationally precise?	YES		Some require informed judgment by operations and maintenance technicians.
➢ Are enumerators well trained? How were they trained? Were they insiders or outsiders? Was there any quality control in the selection process?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Were there efforts to reduce the potential for personal bias by enumerators?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is	YES		The potential for error exists but seems small. The forms are clear and

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
there potential for error?			their number is not large. Thus the likelihood of errors in entering data electronically appear not to be great.
➢ 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)	YES		Data reported by field offices are reviewed by IOM staff in Quito, who question data that appear incorrect and travel twice a month to the field.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	YES		
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:			
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?	YES		The formula was borrowed from a similar project in Honduras, where it was used in a satisfactory manner.
➢ 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)?	YES		
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	YES		
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	YES		Several columns were checked and did add up.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
size?			
➢ Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	❑	❑	n.a.

Recommendations for improvement:

"Functioning" should be replaced by "functioning in a way that significantly improves water-service delivery," or some similar phrase. The indicator should show not only how many water boards are classified as "A" and "B," respectively, but also how many fall into categories "C" and "D." In addition, the definitions of these categories should not be relegated to a separate page.

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)?	YES		
➢ 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?	YES		
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	YES		IOM staff in Quito review field reports (see above #1: VALIDITY, Transcription Error).
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	YES		
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			Not applicable
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	n.a.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	YES		
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	YES		Data are collected monthly. Also, IOM technicians are scheduled to meet with each community in the program at least twice monthly.
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	YES		
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	YES		
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	YES		See #2: RELIABILITY, Internal quality control.
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	YES		See comment immediately above.
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	USAID audits do not include an examination of the quality of indicators.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?		NO	The indicator per se does not directly address the IR (improved health) because it does not focus on the number of persons obtaining water from the activity or how their quality of life has changed.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		Local control should permit relatively efficient operations. Effective local water boards have a long history in Ecuador, predating the passage of the 1979 law that regulates them.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?	YES		However, the word "function" does not adequately convey what the water boards are expected to accomplish.
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	Not for the result it seeks to measure. Rather, it is incomplete.
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #1: VALIDITY.

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?	YES		Water boards are governed by a 1979 law. Their legal status and composition is clear.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?		NO	Not with respect to the meaning of "functioning." However, quantitative and qualitative criteria for defining categories A, B, C, and D have been established.
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?		NO	No, in that it identifies four separate phases of activity.
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		Provided that the word "functioning" is made clear.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #1: VALIDITY.

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		The indicator does not make clear what water boards are expected to accomplish. Nor does it focus on how beneficiaries' lives are affected.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?		NO	
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		See comment immediately above.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?	YES		
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product		NO	
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #1: VALIDITY.

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the missions purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		Again, provide that "functioning" is given an appropriate operational meaning.
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	The Mission would need to look at disaggregated data to see at which phase of activity the problems are occurring in individual water boards.
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		In the sense that most observers would have a general idea of what "functioning" is meant to convey. But this term needs to be defined clearly.
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		Credible regarding what it is intended to measure, but not as an indicator of achievement of the IR.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #1: VALIDITY.

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT
Intermediate Result: IR 13.2: Roads and related infrastructure improved in vulnerable areas
Indicator: 13.2(c): Number of irrigations systems repaired and number of hectares of land irrigated

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Add after "repaired": ", number of systems having established investment funds,"
Unit of Measure: number of systems; number of hectares
Disaggregated by:
Justification/Management Utility: The efficiency of irrigation systems can steadily deteriorate over time unless they are properly maintained, watersheds are conserved to prevent siltation, and illegal diversion of water is made more difficult. Establishment of investment funds, which IOM is promoting for 2004, is an important step that allows local irrigation boards to set aside income to finance these important activities.

The Mission might also consider adopting an indicator of water availability or water use, if these data can be collected relatively easily. Over the long run, such an indicator would help irrigation boards monitor the efficiency of their systems.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Location of Data Storage:
Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT: Improved quality of life of the population living along the northern border

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 13.2: Roads and related infrastructure improved in vulnerable areas

Performance indicator:
13.2(c): Number of irrigation systems repaired and number of hectares of land irrigated

Data source(s):
IOM (International Organization for Migration) progress reports

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
IOM

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Ray Waldron, Ken Farr, Paulyna Martínez, Hugo Ramos
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?	YES		The indicator clearly measures what the activity is expected to accomplish. However, it does not show whether this activity has increased the efficiency of the irrigation systems repaired.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?			Given the nature of the activity and the small number of systems, the likelihood of transcription errors would appear to be relatively small.
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error? (e.g., double keying of	❑	❑	Not applicable

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			
➢ Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the population served by the activity?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**

Recommendations for improvement:

An additional indicator might be added to show the number of irrigation systems that have established funds to provide resources for maintenance, watershed protection, and protection against theft (water diversion). IOM is promoting the establishments of such funds in 2004.

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)?	YES		
➢ 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?	YES		
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			Not applicable
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			Not applicable
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	n.a.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	YES		
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	YES		
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	USAID audits do not include an examination of the quality of the indicators.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	YES	❑	Data on the number of hectares come from the project-design report, prepared by a consultant who, according to the IOM director, is well respected in the Mission. Also, irrigation boards in Ecuador are well established and many have good records.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?	YES		The indicator closely measures the result as stated but gives no idea of the extent to which the efficiency of irrigation systems has been improved.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		Improving small irrigation systems such as these should significantly increase agricultural productivity. But for these gains to be maintained over time, effective mechanisms are needed to ensure proper maintenance and watershed management.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?	YES		
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

The Mission should consider developing an indicator of water availability or water use, depending on what kind of data are readily available.

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?	YES		
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?	YES		
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?	YES		Each of the two indicators is unidimensional.
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?	YES		See #5: INTEGRITY
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	YES		
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	YES	❑	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		The indicator does not focus on maintenance, watershed conservation, or other activities that would preserve the efficient operation of the systems over the long run.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?	YES		The indicator is adequately focused on the IR.
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		The indicator does not show the quality (or effects) of repairs or focus on sustaining efficient operation.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?	❑	NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?	YES		
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product	YES		
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		However, the indicator does not focus on the quality of the repairs or their effects.
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		To the extent that targets are not being met.
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		However, what constitutes an acceptable level of repair is not clear.
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		See comment immediately above.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT

Intermediate Result: IR 13.3: Civil society strengthened to better respond to local needs and to the challenges of Plan Colombia

Indicator: 13.3(b): Number of students, teachers, and parents participating in drug education/prevention programs

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Now that the educational programs are well established, the Mission should seek to develop an indicator to measure their effectiveness.

Unit of Measure: Number of participants

Disaggregated by:

Justification/Management Utility: Courses such as these can be expected to have positive effects in the very short run. But it is important for the Mission to know how well these effects are maintained over time, even though it is planning to discontinue this activity. Without any focus on impact, the relationship of the current indicator to the IR (civil society strengthened) is only a presumption.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:

Method of Acquisition by USAID:

Data Source(s):

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:

Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:

Presentation of Data:

Review of Data:

Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:

Location of Data Storage:

Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT: Improved quality of life of the population living along the northern border

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 13.3: Civil society strengthened to better respond to local needs and to the challenges of Plan Colombia

Performance indicator:
13.3(b): Number of students, teachers, and parents participating in drug education/prevention program

Data source(s):
Ministry of Education & IOM (International Organization for Migration)

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
IOM

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito & Sucumbíos Province, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Ray Waldron, Ken Farr, Paulyna Martínez, Hugo Ramos
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

---

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?	YES		The indicator clearly measures what the activity seeks to accomplish. However, it does not focus on the effectiveness of the drug-prevention programs.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			Not applicable
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			n.a.
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?			IOM reports that it has lists of participants in the courses and that no double-counting is taking place.
➢ Are steps being taken to limit transcription error? (e.g., double keying of data for large surveys, electronic edit checking	❑	❑	Not applicable

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
program to clean data, random checks of partner data entered by supervisors)			
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	YES		
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	YES		
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	YES		
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	YES		

Recommendations for improvement:

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	❑	❑	
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?	YES		However, the indicator does not focus on the results (impact) of the program (e.g. on drug consumption.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		It emphasizes such factors as strengthening self-esteem among Ecuadorean youth and channeling their energies into productive and healthy free-time activities.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?	YES		
➢ Other aspects of directness		NO	Without any focus on impact, the relationship of the indicator to the IR (civil society strengthened) is only a presumption.
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

Now that the educational programs are well established, the Mission should seek to develop an indicator of their effectiveness, even though it is planning to drop this activity.

7. OBJECTIVITY–Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?	YES		
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?	YES		
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?	YES		However, it combines different groups of people participating in different types of education and training programs.
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		Ultimately, this activity is expected to result in reduced drug consumption. The presumption that drug-prevention education will reduce consumption needs to be tested.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?		NO	See comment immediately above.
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?		NO	
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product		NO	
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the missions purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	The Mission would need to examine disaggregated data as well as narrative/oral judgments and evaluations.
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations for #6: DIRECTNESS.

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

FIELD TRIP

SO 13: NORTHERN BORDER DEVELOPMENT
SUCUMBÍOS PROVINCE, ECUADOR
9-10 DECEMBER 2003

Clarence Zuvekas, Jr.
Consultant, Louis Berger Group
10 December 2003

On the morning of Tuesday, 9 December 2003 I flew from Quito to Lago Agrio, Sucumbíos Province, Ecuador to talk with the staff of the International Office for Migration (IOM), which is implementing USAID/Ecuador's Northern Border Development Strategic Objective in this and two other locations, and to visit several project sites or meet project beneficiaries in the local IOM office.

I met with the IOM staff soon after arriving and received a briefing on the scope of the IOM's activities in Sucumbíos province. The Colombian border was reported to be 28 kilometers from the main town, Nueva Loja, located in the municipality of Lago Agrio and home to the IOM offices in the province. The local IOM staff was well organized and appeared to be quite competent in dealing with both technical and social-development activities.

On the afternoon of 9 December, along with the director of IOM's Sucumbíos office and two other IOM staff members, I visited three projects sites where potable water systems had recently been installed:

Cascales: This town of approximately 1,850 inhabitants gave the impression of being a thriving frontier community. All of its approximately 380 households were recently hooked up to a new water system, and all these connections have meters. The percentage of those paying their bills on time was reported to be at least 70% (I may also have heard a higher figure). IOM staff reported that they were using high-quality equipment and materials in constructing this and other water systems, to assure a high degree of reliability in service delivery.

I attended a meeting whose other participants included the local mayor and his wife, the head of the local water advisory board, the water administrator, and perhaps a dozen other citizens. I was asked to give a brief speech, and largely restricted myself to noting that I was glad to be back in an area I had visited 35 years ago, when it consisted of jungle, indigenous settlements, a grass landing strip, and a few oil wells and other structures built by Texaco.

Residents of the community expressed satisfaction with their water service. I tried to elicit specific comments from those present about how their lives had improved, but the responses I received were rather general in nature. Several people noted that health conditions in the town had improved, and that the availability of water in the school was especially beneficial; but no systematic examination of the impact of the new water system on health status had been made. Perhaps it was a bit early for such benefits to be clear. Still, an opportunity to collect good baseline data on health status prior to the installation of the water system may have been missed. In a visit to one of a number of different sites in this community, I overheard part of a conversation between one of the beneficiaries of the water system and the mayor and some of those with direct responsibilities for managing it. The gist of what I heard was that the beneficiary thought his meter was registering too much water flow. Someone suggested that the problem might be due to elevated pressure in the pipe leading to this gentleman's connection. The mayor and others agreed to investigate the problem.

My impression was that the community placed a high value of education. (Indeed, this was true of all the communities I visited. The province has more high schools that I had expected.) The mayor was addressed as "Ingeniero," and his wife was identified as a lawyer. She told me she had made two trips to the United

States in the last few years, one to Washington and one to New York, where she participated in a march of indigenous women. Both were impressive leaders.

Jambelí. This small community received its water system a short time ago. I spoke briefly with several member of the 5-person Junta de Agua, a legal entity under the 1979 law providing for local management of community water systems. The number of metered connections, as I recall, was a bit over 100. People were satisfied with their water service, and with the percentage of households paying their bills on time. Again, I received no specific information on changes in health status.

Nueva Esperanza. This community is similar in size to Jambelí. The head of the water board told me they had 110 connections, and about 70 customers were paying their bills on time. This payment record seems to be a good start for a community that has had its water system in operation for only about a month and a half. (One of the IOM staff told me the figures were 105 connections and 80% on-time payments.) One person pointed out that having a home connection was a lot better than getting water out of a well with a bucket, which is what he had to do before the water system was built. Once again, however, it seemed to be too early for people to have noted much a change in health status. Since the water system began operations, it has been out of service twice; but in neither case were these problems caused by the system itself. In one instance, a motorcyclist drove into the main water pipe and ruptured it; repairs took two days to accomplish. The second incident was similar in nature.

On the morning of Wednesday, December 10, before returning to Quito, I met with a group of 15 high-school students (including a few recent graduates) who had participated (3) or were participating (12) in a school-based anti-drug education program in the province. This program is for the equivalent of U.S. high-school juniors and requires them to take the initiative to organize anti-drug education programs in their neighborhoods, schools, or other venues. The program is one of a number of options—which also include other social-service activities or the writing of a thesis—for meeting a graduation requirement. The teacher directing this program had only been on the job for a few months, and she seemed a bit unsure of how she was going to run the program. (IOM staff had high praise for the previous director, who established it.) The other adult present, who also participated in the discussion, was a representative of the Ministry of Education.

Perhaps seven of the 15 students offered comments. Two had been through the program two years ago. Neither had done any systematic follow-up with those with whom they had worked, but both said that informal subsequent contacts made them believe their efforts had borne some fruit. An articulate, impressive young woman of Colombian origin, who was in the program last year, also reported seeing positive results. I believe four of the current students spoke; only one was specific about her or his proposed project. Start-up of these student projects, which has been delayed by the current teachers' strike (now in its fourth week), is now expected to be in mid-January.

To the extent that students were willing to talk about specific drug problems, they spoke almost exclusively about alcohol and cigarette consumption, which they seemed to agree were serious problems in their communities even well before high school. IOM staff reported that coca consumption is not a big problem in the area, although trafficking in this commodity is.

ANNEX D

Poverty Reduction – SO 14

Data Quality Assessment Checklists
Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION
Intermediate Result: IR 14.1: Increased Access to Microfinance Services
Indicator: POV 14.1(a): Increased number of microfinance credit clients in selected microfinance institutions

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Add to the statement of the indicator: ", by gender of borrower and loan-size category"
Unit of Measure: Number of microfinance clients; size of loan
Disaggregated by: Male/female clients; size of loan (e.g. 3 categories) in constant (e.g. 2003) dollars
Justification/Management Utility: USAID should be aware of the extent to which the microfinance programs it is supporting are responsive to gender-equity concerns. It should also be aware of the extent to which borrowers come from very poor households (a Congressional as well as USAID concern). Relative loan-size amount is a good proxy for relative household income.

While it is important to know the number of borrowers, USAID should keep in mind that this indicator does not provide any measure of achievement of the SO, since it does not focus on borrowers' incomes.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Location of Data Storage:
Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION: Increased Economic Opportunities for the Poor

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 14.1: Increased Access to Microfinance Services

Performance indicator:
POV 14.1(a): Increased number of microfinance credit clients in selected microfinance institutions

Data source(s):
16 microfinance institutions (MFIs) transmitting data to DAI and WOCCU

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
DAI and WOCCU

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:

USAID: Rick Garland, Gustavo Carrera, María Eulalia Dueñas, Mike Lofstrom, Sofía Villalba
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

---

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?	YES		Although the number of microenterprise clients and the IR of "increased access to microfinance services" are appropriate for measuring the coverage of the program, they provide no indication of how clients' lives have changed (e.g. increased income) as a result of the program. A (probably minor) problem is that the indicator measures the **gross** increase in clients in USAID-supported MFIs; the **net** increase is likely to be somewhat less, as some clients may have transferred from other MFIs.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
personal bias by enumerators?			
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?		NO	The potential for error seems relatively small. MFIs supported by DAI (all 8) and WOCCU (6 of 8)submit data electronically to their respective USAID partners, using the partners' standard templates.
➢ 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)	YES		DAI and WOCCU validate the data submitted by their cooperating MFIs by checking these data electronically with the data submitted directly to the Superintendencia de Bancos by those MFIs that are regulated (currently 7 of the DAI-supported MFIs and 4 of those supported by WOCCU).
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	YES		For example, WOCCU found that the 15 branch offices of one cooperative were reporting data using different formats. The resulting discrepancies have been and continue to be reduced.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:			Not applicable
➢ 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
for the sample?			
➢ Is the sampling frame (i.e., the list of units in the target population) up to date? Comprehensive? Mutually exclusive (for geographic frames)	❑	❑	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:

The indicator should reflect only the unit of measure and should not refer to "increases." In the Nov. 2002 PMP, the targeted increase is incorrectly stated as "approximately 350%"; the figure should be "approximately 250%."

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)?	YES		DAI and WOCCU use the same criteria for reporting the number of clients.
➢ 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?	YES		
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	YES		Both DAI and WOCCU have made significant efforts of this nature.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	YES		
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	YES		Not all these procedures are applicable to reporting the number of clients.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?		NO	Not always. For example, discrepancies in branch-to-main office reporting (see above) were identified by WOCCU rather than by the branches themselves.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		NO	Some but not all problems are clearly described in writing. Others were identified orally by the partners.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	YES		
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	YES		
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	YES		For regulated MFIs, data for a given month must be reported to the Superintendencia de Bancos with 6 days after the end of the month.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	YES		
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	YES		
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	YES		
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	However, both DAI and WOCCU have good internal-review procedures.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?	YES		Participating MFIs are able to distinguish between number of clients and number of loans, and report the former (at a given point in time).
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		Data provide an accurate measure of the gross (*) increase in access to formal or quasi-formal financial services. (* See #1: VALIDITY re gross vs. net.)
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?	YES		Skeptics can accept the validity of the indicator while arguing that impact indicators are necessary to determine whether MFI activity is actually reducing the incidence of poverty.
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?		NO	Not quite unambiguous, since it measures gross rather than net increase in access to financial services (see #1: VALIDITY). The difference, however, is probably minor.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?	YES		Data refer to number of credit clients and not to number of loans.
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?	YES		
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		In principle it should be operationally precise, although the potential exists for new MFIs entering the program initially to confuse number of clients and number of loans.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	DAI and WOCCU collect data from primary sources—i.e. the MFIs with which they work.
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		A full description of the intent or purpose of the activity would require information on its impact, particularly on borrowers' incomes. A planned survey of Ecuadorean MFIs in 2004 (the first since 1990) should lay the groundwork for impact studies.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?	YES		
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		No indication is provided of average loan amount of distribution of loans by category (range) of loan amounts. Also, no information is provided of loan repayment capacity, which is reflected in another of the Mission's indicators.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?	YES		The indicator does reflect access, which is the desired IR. But it does not reflect repayment capacity or the impact on borrowers' incomes; increasing the latter is the ultimate (de facto) objective.
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product	YES		"Physical" in the sense of loans obtained by clients.
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**

Recommendations for improvement:

Consideration might be given to disaggregating current MFI credit clients by loan account in **constant** (e.g. 2003) dollars. Possible categories are: <$300; $300-999; $1,000+.

The Mission should consider further disaggregating the number of current credit clients (by loan amount) into male and female clients. WOCCU can now provide these data very easily.

Although the indicator is appropriate for measuring access to microfinance services, the IR is weak in that it does not focus on how clients' incomes have changed as a result of increased access. Ultimately, the mission should want to know whether the MFI programs it is supporting are having a significant impact on poverty reduction. Therefore it should consider developing an impact indicator of this nature, recognizing that reliable indicators will probably have to be based on a sophisticated and relatively costly survey design.

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?			The Mission would need to look at disaggregated data by partner (DAI and WOCCU) and then by individual MFI to obtain a reasonably clear indication of the source of implementation problems.
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION

Intermediate Result: IR 14.1.1: Facilitative financial policy, regulatory and support environment created

Indicator: POV 14.1.1(a): Appropriate microfinance, regulatory and supervisory mechanisms established and/or implemented

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Now that the three planned mechanisms (supervisory manuals, normative framework, and credit referencing services) are in place, it would be appropriate to define, as clearly and objectively as possible against pre-established criteria, benchmarks that would indicate a desirable degree of implementation.

Unit of Measure: Yes/No for criteria-based benchmarks established for each of the three mechanisms

Disaggregated by:

Justification/Management Utility: The current indicator represents qualitative judgments regarding the "appropriateness" of three "processes" whose "completeness" with respect to "establish[ment] and/or implementation" is being measured according to a Yes/No indicator. While completion of the establishment of each "mechanism" can be readily determined, the planned results do not actually seek to measure any progress in implementation. Thus it is misleading to refer to the current Unit of Measure as "processes completed."

Progress toward meeting implementation targets should be reported according to a regular schedule (at least quarterly).

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:

Method of Acquisition by USAID:

Data Source(s):

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:

Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:

Presentation of Data:

Review of Data:

Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:

Location of Data Storage:

Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION: Increased Economic Opportunities for the Poor

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 14.1.1: Facilitative financial policy, regulatory and support environment created

Performance indicator:
POV 14.1.1(a): Appropriate microfinance, regulatory and supervisory mechanisms established and/or implemented

Data source(s):
Superintendency of Banks and DAI reports

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
DAI

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Rick Garland, Gustavo Carrera, María Eulalia Dueñas, Mike Lofstrom, Sofía Villalba,
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

---

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?		NO	The "data" represent qualitative judgments regarding the "appropriateness" of three "processes" whose "completeness" with respect to "establish[ment] and/or implement[ation]" is being measured according to a Yes/No indicator. While completion of the establishment of each "mechanism" can be readily determined, the planned results do not actually seek to measure any progress in implementation. Thus it is misleading to refer to the Unit of Measure as "processes completed."
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Transcription Error			Not applicable
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are the data complete? (i.e., have all data points been recorded?)	❑	❑	n.a.

Recommendations for improvement:

Now that the three planned mechanisms (supervisory manuals, normative framework, credit referencing services) have been established, it would be appropriate to define, as clearly and objectively as possible against pre-established criteria, benchmarks that would indicate a desirable degree of implementation.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Consistency			Not applicable
➢ 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)?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	n.a.
Internal quality control			Not applicable
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			Not applicable
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	n.a.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?	❑	❑	Not fully applicable. The indicator is a one-time measure calling for a Yes/No response. The issue here thus becomes on of frequency (and content) of narrative progress reports. DAI's quarterly reports discuss progress under the three components of the indicator, but these discussions are brief and not as informative as would be desirable.
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	❑	❑	Not fully applicable (see above).
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	❑	n.a.

Recommendations for improvement:

Progress toward any future, related indicator(s) dealing with implementation should be reported according to a regular schedule (at least quarterly). The nature of the indicator(s) would probably call for narrative reports specifically focused on movement toward benchmarks rather than quantitative measures of progress.

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	Not fully applicable. The integrity issue in this case revolves around pressures placed on the executive and legislative branches of government to dilute the content of the desired reforms.
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has there been independent review?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?		NO	While the indicator does show that three mechanisms intended to create a facilitative financial policy, regulatory and support environment were in fact established, the indicator provides no direct evidence regarding the appropriateness or likely effectiveness of these mechanisms.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		Experience in other countries suggests that the three mechanisms, if properly designed and implemented, should have a significant positive effect on achievement of the IR.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?		NO	The indicator is not an acceptable measure in itself, since the target for its three dimensions does not exclude an explicit qualitative dimension.
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	Not a proxy; just incomplete.
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

Any future indicator(s) related to implementation should include quantitative (if possible) or at least explicitly qualitative dimensions against which informed judgment would have to be exercised according to a pre-established set of criteria.

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?		NO	The lack of a qualitative dimension to judge appropriateness leaves room for ambiguity regarding what really has been accomplished.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?		NO	See above.
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?		NO	The indicator has three separate components.
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?		NO	See above.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations for #6: DIRECTNESS.

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		Progress toward legislative or executive approval can be tracked, but the nature of political processes is such that neither progress itself nor the provision of information on progress occurs in regular increments of time. In principle, current data on progress can be obtained at any time, as needed; but reasonably reliable and timely information requires a keen understanding of political processes.
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		See above.
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	Pieces of qualitative information are gathered from various actors, both governmental and non-governmental, involved in the process.
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #6: DIRECTNESS.

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		As noted above, the indicator does not have a qualitative dimension and does not look forward to implementation.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?		NO	No companion indicators are evident.
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		Qualitative dimension (adequateness of mechanisms) and implementation (see #1: VALIDITY; #6: DIRECTNESS; and #7: OBJECTIVITY).
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?	YES		See above.
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?		NO	
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product	YES		"Physical" in the sense of documents.
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #6: DIRECTNESS.

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?		NO	The lack of any explicit judgment regarding the appropriateness of the three mechanisms limits the usefulness of this indicator.
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?		NO	Discussed in various places above.
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		Its limitations are also easy to understand.
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?		NO	The lack of a qualitative dimension means that the appropriateness of the three mechanisms established cannot be judged.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #6: DIRECTNESS.

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION
Intermediate Result: IR 14.1.2: Strong, sustainable microfinance institutions
Indicator: POV 14.1.2(a): Financial sustainability of microfinance institutions increased to 100%

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): The indicator could be appropriately rephrased as follows: "Degree of financial sustainability according to internationally accepted standards (100% or more indicates achievement of financial sustainability)."

It should be expressed as a **weighted** average of the figures for the participating MFIs, and USAID's two implementing partners (DAI and WOCCU) should use the same weighting system.

A sub-indicator would be useful to report how many of the participating MFIs fall below the target of 100%. This indicator could be reported as, e.g., "3/15", rather than as a percentage figure that would not show how the number of MFIs is changing over time.

Unit of Measure: Annual percentage (index) of financial sustainability according to international standards

Disaggregated by:

Justification/Management Utility: The indicator should reflect only the unit of measure and should not refer to increases.

This indicator is especially important for showing the likely long-run sustainability (self-sufficiency, without dependence on donations or external subsidies) of MFIs. A brief definition of the international standard should be provided.

The current figure, calculated by USAID from DAI and WOCCU reports, does not measure a consistent concept, since DAI uses an unweighted average of the figures for the MFIs with which it is working, while WOCCU uses a weighted average.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: **Location of Data Storage:** **Other Notes:**
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION: Increased Economic Opportunities for the Poor

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 1.2: Strong, sustainable microfinance institutions developed

Performance indicator:
POV 14.1.2(a): Financial sustainability of microfinance institutions increased to 100%

Data source(s):
15 microfinance institutions (MFIs) reporting to DAI and WOCCU

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
DAI and WOCCU

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:

USAID: Rick Garland, Gustavo Carrera, María Eulalia Dueñas, Mike Lofstrom, Sofía Villalba
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

---

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?	YES		This indicator is especially important for indicating the likely long-run sustainability (self-sufficiency, without dependence on external donations or subsidies) of MFIs.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?		NO	The potential for error is small. MFIs supported by DAI (all 8) and WOCCU (6 of 8) submit data electronically to their respective USAID partners, using the partners' standard templates.
➢ Are steps being taken to	YES		DAI and WOCCU validate the data

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
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)			submitted by their cooperating MFIs by checking these data electronically with the data submitted directly to the Superintendencia de Bancos by those MFIs that are regulated (currently 7 of the DAI-supported MFIs and 4 of those supported by WOCCU).
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	YES		For example, WOCCU found that the 15 branch offices of one cooperative were reporting data using different formats. The resulting discrepancies have been and continue to be reduced.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:			
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?	YES		DAI has been using, since early 2003, an internationally accepted definition agreed upon by an inter-agency Roundtable on Standardization of Financial Terms, Ratios, and Adjustments for Microfinance (see the *MicroBanking Bulletin*, Nov. 2002, pp. 3-15). DAI adjusts raw data provided by the individual MFIs to conform to the international standard. Calculations are made automatically, by password-protected formula, on an Excel database. See Nathanael Bourns and Carlos Palán Tamayo, *Sistema de Monitoreo e Indicadores de desempeño de las Instituciones de microfinanzas contrapartes: Nota Metodológica* (DAI, March 2003). WOCCU's formula seems to be slightly different but fundamentally the same.
➢ 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)?		NO	To obtain the average financial sustainability percentage for the MFIs with which it works, DAI uses an unweighted average, while WOCCU calculates an average that is weighted by the liabilities of its participating MFIs. Thus the combined average calculated by USAID does not measure a consistent concept.
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a	YES		Several balance sheets tested did in fact balance. WOCCU's reporting of

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
number reported as a "total" actually add up?)			the financial sustainability indicator by quarter is misleading (except for the end of the year) rather than inaccurate.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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:

The indicator should reflect only the unit of measure and should not refer to increases. It could appropriately be stated as: "Degree of financial sustainability according to internationally accepted standards (100% or more indicates achievement of financial sustainability)."

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)?		NO	As discussed under #1-VALIDITY, DAI and WOCCU use slightly different formulas to calculate the indicator for each individual MFIs. Also, WOCCU uses a weighted-average indicator for its cooperating MFIs, while DAI uses an unweighted average.
➢ 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?	YES		The instruments (formulae) used by DAI and WOCCU are slightly different, but the differences do not appear to be great enough to affect the reliability of the data.
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	YES		
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	YES		
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	YES		
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?		NO	Not always. For example, discrepancies in branch-to-main office reporting were identified by WOCCU rather than by the branches themselves.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		NO	Some but not all problems are clearly described in writing. Others were identified orally by the partners.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments

Recommendations for improvement:

DAI and WOCCU should calculate the average indicator for their respective cooperating institutions in the same manner. The consultants recommend that a weighted-average indicator be used, with each partner using the same weighting system.

Partners should make greater efforts to ensure that they are obtaining full coverage of significant financial and in-kind donations being received by the individual MFIs.

Data-quality problems should be described in more detail.

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?	YES		
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	YES		
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	YES		For the regulated MFIs, data for a given month must be reported to the Superintendencia de Bancos within 6 days after the end of the month.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	YES		

Recommendations for improvement:

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?	YES		The margin of error resulting from incomplete data (e.g. incomplete recording of in-kind donations), and from slightly different formulas, seems to be small.
➢ 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)	YES		
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	NO	Obtaining more complete data on significant financial and in-kind contributions to MFIs should not be unduly costly.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See first recommendation under #2: RELIABILITY.

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?	YES		
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	YES		
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	However, both DAI and WOCCU have good internal-review procedures.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?	YES		
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		Data are adjusted according to international standards to account for inflation, donations, subsidies, and other factors distorting actual financial sustainability (see reference in #1: VALIDITY above).
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?	YES		The measure conforms to recently agreed-upon international standards.
➢ Other aspects of directness		NO	The indicator is not a direct measure of poverty reduction; and even as an indirect indicator it is limited in this respect.
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

7. OBJECTIVITY–Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?		NO	Not as stated, since the term "financial sustainability" may be defined in different ways. Also, what is meant by "100%" is not clear, as it may refer to the % of MFIs that have achieved financial sustainability, the weighted or unweighted average (or median) degree of financial sustainability of the individual MFIs, or something else.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?	YES		Once the definition of financial sustainability was made clear to the assessment team, the interpretation of the results became clear.
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?		NO	It is multidimensional in the sense that it requires (appropriately) adjustments that are external to MFI accounting records and even to overall MFI operations (inflation).
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?		NO	The descriptions of the inflation adjustment in the consultants' reports are not clear regarding which inflation rate to use and over what period of time it should be calculated. Discussions with the two partner organizations, however, suggest that an appropriate inflation rate is being used.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

The statement of the indicator should reflect (briefly, of course) the fact that it is based on an international standard of financial sustainability. It should also clarify what "100%" refers to—in this case the average degree of internationally-defined financial sustainability of the 15 participating MFIs. Adding "at least" before "100%" would further clarify the nature of the indicator. Again, we recommend that both partners use weighted-average indicators.

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	YES		DAI and WOCCU verify data gathered from primary sources by comparing them with data reported by the MFIs to the Superintendencia de Bancos on that institution's web site (http://www.superban.gov.ec/bal/jsp/index.jsp).
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		A fuller description would need to be based on disaggregated data by individual MFIs, because averages can hide poor and non-improving performance by some individual MFIs.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?		NO	For the IR, this indicator and companion indicators such as the at-risk portfolio % are adequate. Ultimately, however, USAID needs to know the impact of MFI lending on borrowers' incomes and quality of life. The relationship between sound MFIs and rising borrower incomes is only a presumption; it needs to be verified.
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		See above.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?	YES		Answering this question is somewhat difficult. While the achievement of financial sustainability could be regarded as the completion of an activity or process, ultimately USAID needs to know whether borrowers have higher incomes and improved quality of life.
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services	YES		Financial sustainability suggests that an MFI has achieved both a significant volume of operations and efficiency in service delivery.
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction	YES		Financial success suggests customer satisfaction with credit, savings, and other services provided.
➢ Physical product		NO	
➢ Major milestone	YES		Financial sustainability means that the MFI is no longer dependent on external support.

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

As noted under #2: RELIABILITY, the consultants recommend that both partners use a **weighted**-average indicator.

A sub-indicator would be useful to report how many MFIs fall below the target of 100%. This indicator could be reported quite simply as, e.g., "3/15", in preference to a percentage indicator that would not make clear how the number of MFIs was changing over time.

Re the impact of MFI lending on borrowers' incomes and quality of life, see the last recommendation under #9: ADEQUACY for the first SO 14 indicator.

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?

	Yes	No	Comments
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		A decline in the % figure would alert the Mission to possible financial problems. The Mission could then investigate to determine whether the reduction in financial sustainability were due to internal problems in the MFIs or to external forces (e.g. stagnant or declining GDP).
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?	YES		The Mission would also need to look at disaggregated data by MFI in order to pinpoint the location of implementation problems.
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?		NO	See #7: OBJECTIVENESS.
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		Yes, once it is carefully described (see #7: OBJECTIVENESS).
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

The Mission should regularly examine disaggregated data by individual MFI, since this is probably the most important broad indicator available to USAID management for indicating whether strong, stable MFIs are being developed.

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION

Intermediate Result: IR 14.1.2: Strong, sustainable microfinance institutions

Indicator: POV 14.1.2(b): Average portfolio at risk maintained below 5%

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): The indicator could be appropriately rephrased as follows: "Average portfolio at risk according to internationally accepted standards."

It should be expressed as a **weighted** average of the figures for the participating MFIs.

A sub-indicator would be useful to report how many of the participating MFIs exceed the targeted ceiling of 5%. This indicator could be reported as, e.g., "4/16", rather than as a percentage figure that would not show how the number of MFIs is changing over time.

Unit of Measure: % of total loan balances outstanding at 30 days

Disaggregated by:

Justification/Management Utility: The indicator should reflect only the unit of measure and should not refer to "maintained below 5%."

The current figure, calculated by USAID from DAI and WOCCU reports, does not measure a consistent concept, since DAI uses an unweighted average of the figures for the MFIs with which it is working, while WOCCU uses a weighted average.

The indicator appropriately refers to the delinquency of entire loan balances, not just individual payments overdue.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:

Method of Acquisition by USAID:

Data Source(s):

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:

Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:

Presentation of Data:

Review of Data:

Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Location of Data Storage:
Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION: Increased Economic Opportunities for the Poor

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 14.1.2: Strong, sustainable microfinance institutions

Performance indicator:
POV 14.1.2(b): Average portfolio at risk maintained below 5%

Data source(s):
DAI and WOCCU reports

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
DAI and WOCCU

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Rick Garland, Gustavo Carrera, María Eulalia Dueñas, Mike Lofstrom, Sofía Villalba
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?	YES		This indicator is important for determining the likelihood that MFIs will achieve and maintain financial sustainability, thus surviving and growing over the long run. The quantitative target established is appropriate.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?		NO	The potential for error is small. MFIs supported by DAI (all 8) and WOCCU (6 0of 8) submit data electronically to their respective USAID partners, using the partners' standard templates.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ 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)		NO	DAI and WOCCU validate the data submitted by their cooperating MFIs by checking these data electronically with the data submitted directly to the Superintendencia de Bancos by those MFIs that are regulated (currently 7 of the DAI-supported MFIs and 4 of those supported by WOCCU).
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	YES		For example, WOCCU found that 15 branch offices of one cooperative were reporting data using different formats. The resulting discrepancies have been and continue to be reduced.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the indicator:			
➢ Are the correct formulae being applied?	YES		
➢ 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)?		NO	WOCCU computes an average for its cooperating institutions that is weighted by liabilities. DAI computes an unweighted average. Thus the aggregated figure calculated by USAID is not based on a consistent methodology.
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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?	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
(i.e., have all data points been recorded?)			

Recommendations for improvement:

The consultants recommend that both DAI and WOCCU calculate a weighted-average figure for their respective cooperating institutions, using the same weighting system.

A useful sub-indicator would be the number of MFIs in relation to the total (e.g. 4/16) that exceed the 5% target (i.e. have an undesirable percentage of their portfolio at risk).

The indicator should reflect only the unit of measure and not incorporate the target.

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)?	YES		See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ 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?		NO	
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	YES		
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	YES		
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	YES		
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?		NO	Not always. For example, discrepancies in branch-to-main office reporting were identified by WOCCU rather than by the branches themselves.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?		NO	Some but not all problems are clearly described in writing. Others were identified orally by the partners.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments

Recommendations for improvement:

See first recommendation under #1: VALIDITY.

Data-quality problems should be described in more detail.

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?	YES		
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?	YES		
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	YES		For regulated MFIs, data for a given month must be reported to the Superintendencia de Bancos within 6 days after the end of the month.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	YES		
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	YES		The margin of error resulting from the two partners' different calculations of averages is probably relatively small.
➢ 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)	YES		
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?		NO	Weighted averages can be easily calculated electronically.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See first recommendation under #1: VALIDITY.

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?	YES		
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	YES		
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	However, both DAI and WOCCU have good internal-review procedures.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?	YES		This indicator is one of the most important measures of strength and sustainability.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		It appropriately refers to the delinquency of entire loan balances, not just individual payments overdue.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?	YES		
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?	YES		The indicator by itself could be subject to different interpretations, but the unit of measure makes clear what is being reported.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?	YES		
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?	YES		
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		Although it is operationally precise, it is possible that new MFIs entering the program might initially report delinquent payments rather than the entire loan balances at risk.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

Especially for new MFIs entering the program, partners should ensure that the indicator is interpreted correctly. The potential problem here does **not** lie with the precision of the indicator.

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	YES		Data reported by the regulated MFIs (not all of them are at this point) can be verified by checking what they report to the Superintendency of Banks (http://www.superban.gov.ec/bal/jsp/index.jsp).
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		The indicator is comprehensive; it fully describes what the activity is expected to accomplish.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?	YES		
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?		NO	Together with the financial sustainability indicator, it adequately describes progress toward meeting the IR.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?	YES		
➢ Impact of services	YES		
➢ Quality of services	YES		
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction	YES		
➢ Physical product		NO	
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	Additional information would be necessary to identify specific MFIs where problems are concentrated, and the extent to which these problems are caused by internal rather than exogenous forces.
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		In combination with information on the unit of measure.
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

The Mission should regularly examine disaggregated data by individual MFI.

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION

Intermediate Result: IR 14.2.1: Macroeconomic Policies/Environment for More Equitable Growth

Indicator: POV 14.2.3(b): Increased tax revenue collections as percentage of GDP

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): The indicator could be appropriately rephrased as follows: "Tax revenue collections by the Servicio de Rentas Internas (SRI) as a percentage of GDP

The ratios (baseline and target) will need to be recalculated to reflect the recently revised (upwards) GDP figures.

Unit of Measure: Percentage (ratio of three selected tax revenues to GDP)

Disaggregated by: Income tax, value added tax, and excise and other minor taxes

Justification/Management Utility: The indicator should reflect only the unit of measure and not refer to increases. The increases will be evident in the targets.

The tax revenue/GDP indicator is not a direct measure of poverty reduction (the SO). A stronger fiscal situation should stimulate more investment and economic growth, thus reducing poverty indirectly; but higher tax revenues do not guarantee greater social-service delivery, which would benefit the poor more directly.

The tax ratio should be disaggregated into its three component parts: income tax, value added tax, and excise and other minor taxes. If the share of the income taxes in the total is rising, it is likely that the tax system is becoming more equitable (a concern of the Mission's IR).

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Location of Data Storage:
Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 14: POVERTY REDUCTION: Increased Economic Opportunities for the Poor

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 14.2.1: Macroeconomic Policies/Environment for More Equitable Growth

Performance indicator:
POV 14.2.3(b): Increased Tax Revenue collections as percentage of annual GDP

Data source(s):
Servicio de Rentas Internas (SRI), Ministerio de Economía y Finanzas (MEF), Banco Central del Ecuador (BCE), International Monetary Fund (IMF)

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
DAI

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Rick Garland, Gustavo Carrera, María Eulalia Dueñas, Mike Lofstrom, Sofía Villalba
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

---

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?		NO	The logic behind this indicator seems to rest on two premises: (1) stronger public finances will improve the climate for economic growth, and faster economic growth will reduce the incidence of poverty; and (2) increased revenue will permit greater public spending on social services, thus reducing poverty directly. Empirical support for the former is so strong as to be almost indisputable; the major concern is that the effects seem to be weaker where income distribution is highly unequal, as in Ecuador. The second premise is more problematical. Increased revenues could well be used instead to reduce the fiscal deficit, or to finance other expenditures. Moreover, if increased social spending merely finances higher salaries rather than more or better service delivery (as has occurred recently in Ecuador), the effect on the poor is likely to be minimal. In theory, the equity of the tax system should be improved by increasing the importance of the (direct) income tax relative to the (indirect) VAT and excise taxes. However, the indicator does not show whether the tax structure is in fact shifting in this direction. Even without reference to poverty reduction, the indicator is not fully valid as a measure of tax revenues, since it excludes taxes on foreign trade as well as taxes and other revenues from the petroleum sector. Thus it provides an incomplete picture of both the level of and trend in total central-government revenues. Nevertheless, it is an appropriate indicator given the nature of USAID-supported activities.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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?	YES		
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			Not applicable
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the			

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
indicator:	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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**

Recommendations for improvement:

The indicator can be retained, given the nature of USAID-supported activities under IR 14.2; but its limitations as a contributor to the SO should be recognized. An indirect indication of changes in the equity of the tax structure could be provided by disaggregating the tax/GDP ratio (which covers only the taxes collected by the SRI) into its three constituent parts: income tax, value-added tax (VAT), and excise and other minor taxes. The tax system would probably become more equitable if the share of income taxes in the total were to rise.

The indicator should reflect only the unit of measure and not refer to increases. The increases will be evident in the targets.

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)?	❑	❑	Tax-revenue data can be obtained from one of four sources: SRI, MEF, BCE, and IMF. These sources can and often do report different figures. The initial baseline tax ratio is no longer valid, because GDP figures (the denominator) have been revised upward, thus lowering the calculated tax ratio.
➢ 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?	❑	❑	See comment immediately above.
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			Not applicable
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			Not applicable
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	n.a.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments

Recommendations for improvement:

The indicator should be based on tax revenues as reported by the SRI.

The tax ratio for all years, including the baseline year, should be calculated using the newly revised (upward) GDP figures as the denominator.

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?	YES		In principle, data for any particular month should now be available very soon after the end of that month (data through November 2003 were reported in the press on December 12), although it is unnecessary to have data with this degree of frequency. DAI has not asked for up-to-date figures on short notice, because USAID has not made such a request; but it believes these data could be made available within a couple of weeks of submitting the request.
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?		NO	DAI reports that USAID has not asked for these data on a regular basis.
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	❑	NO	See comments above.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

4. PRECISION—Do the data have an acceptable margin of error?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured?		NO	GDP (the denominator of the indicator) was significantly underestimated in the baseline year. Subsequent upward revisions make the time series data misleading regarding the extent and direction of change in the tax/GDP ratio.
➢ 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)		NO	Once tax ratios for all years have been recalculated with the new GDP denominator, the margin of error should not be of concern.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	❑	❑	
➢ Has there been independent review?	YES		The IMF closely monitors Ecuador's fiscal data.
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?	❑	❑	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?	YES		In the context of Ecuador's fiscal situation, raising the tax revenue/GDP ratio is important for establishing IR 14.2: a macroeconomic and other policy environment that would stimulate more equitable economic growth.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?	YES		See the discussion above in #1: VALIDITY. The limitation of the indicator is that increased fiscal revenues do not automatically translate into increased social-sector spending (or increased social-service delivery).
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?		NO	Skeptics would be concerned that it does not focus on the expenditure side of the budget.
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:	YES		It is in part a proxy. It is a direct indicator of an activity that would tend to reduce poverty by stimulating economic growth; but it is only a proxy for increased social-service delivery, which is not always closely related to increased revenues.
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?		NO	No, but since USAID activities are focused on the revenue side of the budget, it is an acceptable proxy if its limitations are understood.
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?		NO	See the discussion in #1: VALIDITY.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

The indicator should be based on tax revenues as reported by the SRI.

The tax ratio for all years, including the baseline years, should be calculated using the newly revised (upward) GDP figures as the denominator.

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?	YES		
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?	YES		
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?		NO	It is a combination of various sources of tax revenue (not comprehensive but appropriate given USAID's focus).
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., is data current and available on regular basis)?	YES		Data are available in a reasonably timely manner.
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?	❑	❑	Data are available from both primary (SRI) and secondary (MEF, BCE) government sources.
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	YES		SRI tax-revenue data can be considered acceptably reliable.
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?		NO	Validity problems currently exist because of the recent revision of the GDP figures, which are the denominator of the tax/GDP ratio that serves as the indicator (see #2: RELIABILITY above).
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?		NO	The answer to this question depends on one's perspective. If one focuses only on the revenue side of the budget—as do the USAID activities directed at this IR—then the indicator fully describes the desired end result. If one goes on to ask how the revenues are used for purposes of meeting the SO, the indicator provides no answers.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?	YES		Yes, in the sense of a focus on the revenue side of the budget only, which is the intent of the IR.
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		As noted above, the indicator reveals nothing about changes in the expenditure side of the budget that would produce a more equitable pattern of economic growth.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?	YES		Quarterly reporting of these data (now reported annually) would be desirable. At the same time, USAID needs to be aware of seasonal patterns of tax-revenue collections.
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?	YES		
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product	YES		"Physical" in the sense of taxes collected.
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement: USAID should obtain data for this indicator on a quarterly basis.			

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		However, judging the **magnitude** of the contributions of USAID and its partners would be difficult.
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?	YES		Only on an annual basis. Quarterly reporting would be desirable.
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?	YES		However, month-to-month or even quarterly changes have limited meaning unless one is aware of seasonal patterns in tax collections.
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?	YES		Only when disaggregated, in the sense of indicating which stream(s) of tax revenue are performing poorly. To understand why they are performing poorly, the Mission would need to probe more deeply. Sometimes the reasons are mainly exogenous (e.g. a poorly performing economy).
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?	YES		
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

ANNEX E

Biodiversity Conservation – SO 1

Data Quality Assessment Checklists
Performance Indicator Reference Sheets

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 1: BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION

Intermediate Result: IR 1.1: Strengthened capacity of targeted NGOs and CSOs active in biodiversity conservation

Indicator: BIO 1.1(a): Increased financing of local partners by outside (non-USAID) sources

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): The DQA consultants recommend a different type of indicator to measure "strengthened capacity." The basic idea would be to develop an index of institutional capacity covering perhaps 10-12 dimensions, including program management; financial management; degree of dependence on external resources, and in particular on a single financial source; implementation record; and staff capacity and their continuing education program. These various dimensions would be weighted in accordance with what the USAID Mission and its partners judge to be their relative importance. The resulting index would be designed in such a way as to permit continued improvements over the life of the activity. In other words, "adequate" performance on all 10-12 dimensions should not suffice; the indicator and its various dimensions should be able to reflect improved performance.

Unit of Measure: Index of institutional capacity (unweighted average for targeted NGOs and CSOs)

Disaggregated by: Individual NGOs and CSOs

Justification/Management Utility: Given the high degree of confusion among USAID partners and local cooperating organizations regarding the definition of this indicator (see DQA Checklist, #1: VALIDITY, Face Validity), the current indicator does not appear to be salvageable. Accordingly, the DQA consultants recommend that it be replaced.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:

Method of Acquisition by USAID:

Data Source(s):

Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:

Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:

Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:

Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):

Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:

Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:

Presentation of Data:

Review of Data:

Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:

Location of Data Storage:

Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01/06/04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 1: BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION: Biodiversity conserved in selected protected areas and their buffer zones

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 1.1: Strengthened capacity of targeted NGOs and CSOs active in biodiversity conservation

Performance indicator:
BIO 1.1(a): Increased financing of local partners by outside (non-USAID) sources

Data source(s):
Reports of The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Chemonics, and Altrópico

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
TNC, Chemonics, Altrópico

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Doug Mason, Rocío Cedeño, Mónica Zuquilanda, Sofía Villalba, Paula Zavala
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?		NO	The rationale for this indicator seems to be that additional non-USAID financing of environmental NGOs would provide evidence that USAID efforts to strengthen these organizations were bearing fruit. This argument is tenuous, as it could simply reflect an organization's greater dependence on outside funds generally, with no guaranty that any one source of funds would be quasi-permanent. No attention is paid to how organizations could generate some of their own revenue sources, which would be an important way to strengthen their financial positions. Confusion exists among USAID's partners over which institutions should count as cooperating organizations; whether in-kind donations should be counted and their value assessed; whether funding for operational support (as opposed to program support) should be counted; and whether "financing" received by a cooperating organization during the course of a year should refer to disbursements or to life-of-project funding. Another consideration is that dollars provided do not necessarily equal dollars spent, or spent well. Finally, the significance of changes in the indicator over time is unclear if the number of local partners and cooperating institutions varies from year to year.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ Were samples representative?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Were the questions in the survey/questionnaire clear, direct, easy to understand?	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			Not applicable
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the 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	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
sources need to be aggregated)?			
➢ Have procedures for dealing with missing data been correctly applied?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)	❑	❑	A recent report from one partner on the status of indicators through FY 2003 contains figures that are incorrectly stated.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**

Recommendations for improvement:

Given the limitations of this indicator, and the confusion surrounding its meaning, the consultants recommend that USAID and its partners jointly develop a set of criteria that would provide an organized, qualitative/quantitative measure of institutional strengthening. A pre-established minimum improvement in this indicator, expressed perhaps in percentage terms, would be required in any year to claim that an organization has been strengthened. Chemonics's indicators for adequate and improved management, more directly related to the BIO 1.2(b) indicator (natural resource management practices), could be used as a model. TNC's standard scheme for measuring institutional capacity would also provide useful inputs.

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)?		NO	USAID partners are reporting different kinds of figures. For example, TNC reports outside funds related only to USAID-supported activities, while Chemonics reports all outside funding received by cooperating institutions for all their activities, interpreting "institutional strengthening" to refer to the entire institution. USAID staff themselves do not agree on what the indicator is intended to measure.
➢ 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?		NO	See comments immediately above.
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			Not applicable
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			Not applicable
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	n.a.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?		NO	Chemonics, whose Proyecto Caimán is managed locally, provides quarterly reports; but not all of these show progress toward achieving indicator targets. TNC and WWF operate under cooperative agreements with USAID/Washington, and provide only annual reports.
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?		NO	Effective management would require more frequent reporting, probably semi-annual.
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?		NO	For example, USAID's Annual Report this year is due on December 19, but TNC's Annual Report (the only regular report provided to the Mission) is not due to reach the Mission until January 15, 2004. (TNC did, however, report progress with respect to the three USAID Annual Report indicators in early December.)
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?		NO	In some cases, the data are provided only annually.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

USAID should seek to obtain data from TNC and WWF on a semi-annual basis.

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?		NO	Because the definition of the indicator is unclear, objectivity is lacking.
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?		NO	USAID is aware that it is not getting consistent data.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?		NO	
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?		NO	
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:	YES		
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?		NO	
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?		NO	Not always. It might reflect other, exogenous factors.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?		NO	
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?	YES		In principle, it is unidimensional. However, that dimension has been interpreted in different ways.
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., are data current and available on regular basis)?		NO	See comments under #3: TIMELINESS.
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		Data **can** be collected frequently enough, but in some cases they are not being reported with sufficient frequency.
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	Data are obtained from the USAID partners and the organizations cooperating with them.
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		Even the "progress" it indicates is not clear (see #1: VALIDITY).
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?		NO	
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES		The indicator does not provide a clear measure of institutional strengthening. Nor does it show how effectively funds are spent.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?			
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product		NO	
➢ Major milestone		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		Changes in the indicator can be attributed at least in part, and probably in most cases, to the efforts of USAID and its partners. The meaning of the changes, however, is unclear (see #1: VALIDITY).
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?		NO	
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SO 1: BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION

Intermediate Result: IR 1.2: Economically viable natural resource management (NRM) practices adopted, in selected protected areas and their buffer zones

Indicator: BIO 1.2(b): Hectares of land in selected protected areas and their buffer zones under participatory NRM plans

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): Confusion exists over various aspects of the current indicator, including what is meant by participation (in planning? In implementation? In both?) and how protected areas are defined (e.g. double-counting is possible because a given tract of land can be governed by one or more level or type of NRM plan). Moreover, the indicator does not distinguish between existence of a plan and its implementation.

The DQA consultants recommend that large tracts of land (more than 10,000 hectares) not be covered by this indicator; that all double-counting be eliminated; and that the indicator include a dimension (or sub-indicator) that measures the adequacy of NRM plan implementation. The measure of implementation might be based on Chemonics's indices of "adequate" and "improved" management.

Unit of Measure: Number of hectares

Disaggregated by: Type of protected area; range of scores on an index of NRM plan implementation

Justification/Management Utility: The Mission's ability to obtain an adequate measure of effective protection of large tracts of land can be questioned.

Souble-counting provides a misleading indication of hectares actually protected.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets: **Location of Data Storage:** **Other Notes:**
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01 / 06 /04

Data Quality Assessment Checklist

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 1: BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION: Biodiversity conserved in selected protected areas and their buffer zones

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 1.2: Economically viable natural resources management (NRM) practices adopted, in selected protected areas and their buffer zones

Performance indicator:
BIO 1.2(b): Hectares of land in selected protected areas and buffer zones under participatory NRM plans

Data source(s):
Reports of The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Chemonics, and Altrópico

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
TNC, Chemonics, Altrópico

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Doug Mason, Rocío Cedeño, Mónica Zuquilanda, Sofía Villalba, Paula Zavala
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?		NO	Several terms in the indicator are not clearly defined, including "protected areas" and "participatory." With respect to the former, the problem arises because some geographic areas my be covered by several NRM plans, thus creating the potential for double-counting, which is believed to occur in some cases. "Participatory" could be defined to mean participation during the planning process, during implementation, or both. One interviewee asked rhetorically, "What good is participatory planning if the plan is not implemented?" Partners generally agreed that the indicator was meant to refer to implementation, not just development of the plan. But the indicator as stated does not adequately do so. No mechanism apparently exists to remove hectares from the cumulative total if implementation backslides and is no longer adequate.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ Is the data collection instrument well designed?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Were there incentives for respondents to give incomplete or untruthful information?	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			Not applicable
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ If raw data need to be manipulated to produce the data required for the 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)		NO	A recent report from one partner on the status of indicators through FY 2003 contains figures that were incorrectly entered.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ Is the sample from which the data are drawn representative of the	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
population served by the activity?			
➢ 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.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	No	Comments

Recommendations for improvement:

Representatives of two USAID partners questioned the validity of claiming that NRM plans could adequately protect large tracts of land. One interviewee pointed out that good protection on 100 hectares means little if the full 10,000 hectares under the plan cannot be adequately protected. He suggested that NRM plans concentrate on watersheds or micro-watersheds rather than larger areas. As USAID considers revising its indicators following the transition year 2003 for this SO, the DQA team recommends that it "think small" in reformulating this indicator and establishing targets for it.

USAID partners should make greater efforts to ensure that no double-counting occurs of land under several different types of NRM plans.

USAID should clarify what it means by "participation."

The revised indicator should also include a dimension that measures the adequacy of NRM plan implementation. Chemonics's indicator for "adequate" management (based originally on achieving 5 of 9—now 10—milestones) and "improved" management (an annual increase of at least 20% in the management index) could be used as models. One weakness of these indicators, as Chemonics itself recognizes, is that the milestones are given equal weights. Devising a weighting system for these or similar milestones would seem to be feasible in a collaborative effort between USAID and its partners. TNC has a standard scheme for measuring institutional capacity that is more complex and implicitly assigns weights to a large number of indicators for which qualitative judgments are sought. This scheme should provide useful suggestions for an indicator that could be agreed upon by all parties.

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)?		NO	Some cooperating organizations are probably double-counting land under NRM plans, and not all of them may be applying the term "participatory" to implementation (as opposed to the planning process).
➢ 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?		NO	
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	YES		Hectares attributed to a given project area are generally verified by data from land titles and/or management-plan documentation from the Ministry of the Environment. At least one partner takes other measures to verify area, although it admits that area figures are sometimes subject to question.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement: See second and third recommendations under #1: VALIDITY.			

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?		NO	Chemonics, whose Proyecto Caimán is managed locally, provides quarterly reports; but not all of these show progress toward achieving indicator targets. TNC and WWF operate under cooperative agreements with USAID/Washington and provide only annual reports.
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?		NO	Effective management would require more frequent reporting, probably semi-annually.
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?		NO	For example, USAID's Annual Report this year is due on December 19, but TNC's Annual Report (the only regular report provided to the Mission) is not due to reach the Mission until January 15, 2004. (TNC did, however, report progress with respect to the three USAID Annual Report indicators in early December.)
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?		NO	No, because in some cases the data are provided only annually.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?		YES	

Recommendations for improvement:

USAID should seek to obtain data from TNC and WWF on a semi-annual basis.

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?		NO	Because the definition of the indicator is unclear, objectivity is lacking.
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?		NO	USAID is aware that it is not getting consistent data.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?		NO	The IR refers to "NRM plans adopted," which does not clearly refer to implementation, although the intent of the IR probably is to include implementation. Similarly, the performance indicator refers to land "under NRM plans," again without explicitly mentioning implementation. While the indicator seems intended to measure the IR directly, it does not necessarily do so.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?		NO	
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	Not a proxy, just insufficiently precise.
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?		NO	It is not unidimensional in the sense that in some (but not all) cases it double-counts land under different types of plans.
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations under #1: VALIDITY.

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., are data current and available on regular basis)?		NO	See comments under #3: TIMELINESS.
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		Data **can** be collected frequently enough, but in some cases they are not being reported with sufficient frequency.
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		It does not clearly focus on implementation (see #1: VALIDITY).
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?		NO	
➢ Is there a particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?	YES	NO	The focus on implementation is not clear.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?		NO	
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product	YES		In the sense that a "plan" is a physical product.
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?		NO	
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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

WORKSHEET 6: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

Use this comprehensive reference sheet to record and update all relevant specifications and details for a particular indicator. Modify the sheet to meet Operating Unit requirements as needed. For suggestions on how to complete this form, see following page. Also, an example of a completed performance indicator reference sheet can be found in Part 2, Task 2.4 of the toolkit.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheet

Strategic Objective: SSO 1: BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION

Intermediate Result: IR 1.3: Key policies and legal frameworks introduced and/or implemented to conserve biodiversity in selected protected areas and their buffer zones

Indicator: BIO 1.3(b): Key policies, legal frameworks and enforcement mechanisms prepared, modified and introduced at appropriate government level to improve biodiversity conservation in targeted protected areas and their buffer zones

DESCRIPTION

Precise Definition(s): The indicator refers both to different types of documents and to different levels of government. National policies, laws, and related actions have a significantly greater potential impact than local ones. A further complication is that the IF phrase, "introduced and/or implemented" creates confusion about what is being measured.

The types of documents covered by this indicator should be precisely defined and separated into 2-3 categories. At the national level, a small number of specific, high-priority documents should be identified each year, with the targets for them focusing on the individual stages of preparation, submission, approval, and implementation, recognizing that the full process might take several years.,

Unit of Measure: Policy and legal documents submitted to executive, legislative , municipal or other authorities

Disaggregated by: Level of government (national vs. municipal/other local); type of document; stage of process (documents prepared, submitted, approved, and implemented)

Justification/Management Utility: Submission of a document is an important step in biodiversity conservation; but the Mission should look beyond submission to approval and implementation, and it should be able to measure implementation effectively.

PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION BY USAID

Data Collection Method:
Method of Acquisition by USAID:
Data Source(s):
Frequency/Timing of Data Acquisition:
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition:
Responsible Individual(s) at USAID:

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment:
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any):
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments:
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments:

PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

Data Analysis:
Presentation of Data:
Review of Data:
Reporting of Data:

OTHER NOTES

Notes on Baselines/Targets:
Location of Data Storage:
Other Notes:

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 01 /06 /04

DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

Date last modified: 01/05/04

Strategic Objective:
SO 1: BIODIVERSITY CONSERVATION: Biodiversity conserved in selected protected areas and their buffer zones

Intermediate Result (if applicable):
IR 1.3: Key policies and legal framework introduced &/or implemented to conserve biodiversity in selected protected areas & their buffer zones

Performance indicator:
BIO 1.3(b): Key policies, legal frameworks and enforcement mechanisms prepared, modified, and introduced at appropriate government level to improve biodiversity conservation in targeted protected areas and their buffer zones

Data source(s):
Reports of The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Chemonics, and Altrópico

Partner or contractor who provided the data (if applicable):
TNC, Chemonics, Altrópico

Is this indicator reported in the Annual Report? *(circle one)* YES NO

Date(s) of assessment: November 28-December 20, 2003

Location(s) of assessment: Quito, Ecuador

Assessment team members:
USAID: Doug Mason, Rocío Cedeño, Mónica Zuquilanda, Sofía Villalba, Paula Zavala
Contractors: Harry Carr, Checchi & Co. Consulting; Clarence Zuvekas, Louis Berger

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?		NO	What is being measured is unclear for several reasons. The indicator refers to different types of documents/measures (policies, legal frameworks, enforcement mechanisms) and to different levels of government (the potential impact will be significantly greater at the national level than at the community level). In addition, the IR phrase "introduced and/or implemented" creates confusion about what is being measured.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Measurement Error			
Sampling Error (only applies when the data source is a survey)			Not applicable
➢ 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			Not applicable
➢ 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.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transcription Error			Not applicable

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ What is the data transcription process? Is there potential for error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have data errors been tracked to their original source and mistakes corrected?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ 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?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are final numbers reported accurate? (E.g., does a number reported as a "total" actually add up?)		NO	A recent report from one partner on the status of indicators through 2003 contains figures that were incorrectly recorded.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Representativeness of Data			Not applicable
➢ 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?	❑	❑	n.a.

1. VALIDITY—Do the data adequately represent performance?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
(i.e., have all data points been recorded?)			

Recommendations for improvement:

The indicator refers to different types of documents (policies, legal frameworks, enforcement mechanisms) at different levels of government. Thus it combines things whose nature and relative importance are different. As the Mission considers revising (or replacing) this indicator, as it intends to do as a result of experience during the transition year of the SO (FY 2003), at the very least it should disaggregate the total figure by both type of document and level of government (national and municipal/community). At the national level, it might be best to identify documents the Mission would like to see prepared, submitted, approved, and effectively implemented (according to a pre-established set of criteria). The entire process might well take several years, so that the target for any one year might include only one of two stages for any particular document. The national-level documents reported under a modified indicator should be few in number: only those with the greatest 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)?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ 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?		NO	Different partners and cooperating institutions have different criteria for reporting with respect to this indicator.
➢ Is the same sampling method used from year to year, location to location, data source to data source?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Internal quality control			Not applicable
➢ Are there procedures to ensure that data are free of significant error and that bias is not introduced?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are there procedures in place for periodic review of data collection, maintenance, and processing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Do these procedures provide for periodic sampling and quality assessment of data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Transparency			Not applicable
➢ Are data collection, cleaning, analysis, reporting, and quality assessment procedures documented in writing?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data problems at each level reported to the next level?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Are data quality problems clearly described in final reports?	❑	❑	n.a.

2. RELIABILITY—Are data collection processes stable and consistent over time?			
	Yes	No	Comments
Recommendations for improvement:			

3. TIMELINESS—Are data collected frequently and are they current?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
Frequency			
➢ Are data available on a frequent enough basis to inform program management decisions?		NO	Chemonics, whose Proyecto Caimán is managed locally, provides quarterly reports; but not all of these show progress toward achieving indicator targets. TNC and WWF operate under cooperative agreements with USAID/Washington and provide only annual reports.
➢ Is a regularized schedule of data collection in place to meet program management needs?		NO	Effective management would require more frequent reporting, probably semi-annual.
➢ Are data collected at a time in the year appropriate to the desired meaning of the indicator, e.g. agriculture produce pricing *vis a vis* harvest?		NO	For example, USAID's Annual Report this year is due on December 19, but TNC's Annual Report (the only regular report provided to the Mission) is not due to reach the Mission until January 15, 2004. (TNC did, however, report progress with respect to the three USAID Annual Report indicators in early December.)
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Currency			
➢ Are the data reported in a given timeframe the most current practically available?	YES		
➢ Are data from within the policy period of interest? (i.e., are data from a point in time after intervention has begun?)	YES		
➢ Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?		NO	In some cases the data are reported only annually.
➢ Is the date of collection clearly identified in the report?	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

USAID should seek to obtain data from TNC and WWF on a semi-annual basis.

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?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ 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)	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Have targets been set for the acceptable margin of error?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Has the margin of error been reported along with the data?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Would an increase in the degree of accuracy be more costly than the increased value of the information?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

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?	❑	❑	
➢ Is there objectivity and independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?		NO	Because of the definition of the indicator is unclear, objectivity is lacking.
➢ Has there been independent review?		NO	
➢ If data is from a secondary source, is USAID management confident in the credibility of the data?		NO	USAID is aware that it is not getting consistent data.
➢ Other	❑	❑	
Recommendations for improvement:			

6. DIRECTNESS—How directly (synonymously) does the indicator measure (reflect) the result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it closely measure the result it is intended to measure?		NO	See comments under #1: VALIDITY.
➢ Is it grounded in theory and practice?		NO	No, because different kinds of outputs, with very different implicit weights, are lumped together.
➢ Does it represent an acceptable measure to both proponents and skeptics?		NO	
➢ Other aspects of directness	❑	❑	
➢ Is it a proxy?:		NO	
➢ If so, is it as directly related to the relevant result as possible?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ Does change in the proxy truly reflect change in the desired result?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Is it tautological, i.e. is the "proxy" really the desired result itself in another form?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations for #1: VALIDITY.

7. OBJECTIVITY—Can it be independently recognized, at "face value", as an acceptable measure of the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments** See above
➢ Is it unambiguous about what is being measured?		NO	
➢ Is there general agreement over the interpretation of the results?		NO	
➢ Is it unidimensional (i.e., does it measure only one phenomenon at a time)?		NO	
➢ Is it operationally precise (i.e., is there no ambiguity over what kind of data should be collected)?		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations for #1: VALIDITY.

8. PRACTICALITY—Can data be obtained at a reasonable cost and timely fashion?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Are timely data available (i.e., are data current and available on regular basis)?		NO	See comments under #3: TIMELINESS,
➢ Can the data be collected frequently enough to inform management decisions?	YES		Data **can** be collected frequently enough, but in some cases they are not being reported with sufficient frequency.
➢ Are the costs of data collection reasonable?	YES		
➢ Are data gathered from secondary, e.g. government, sources?		NO	
➢ If so, are data reliable, particularly in the way they are gathered and calculated?	❑	❑	Not applicable
➢ If so, are data valid, e.g. are they really measuring what they purport to measure?	❑	❑	n.a.
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendation for #3: TIMELINESS.

9. ADEQUACY—How completely does the indicator, together with its companion indicators if more than one, measure the desired result?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Does it merely indicate progress rather than attempt to fully describe everything an activity accomplishes?	YES		The indicator does not focus on implementation, although he IR (somewhat ambiguously) does.
➢ Taken as a group, are the indicator and its companion indicators the minimum necessary to ensure that progress toward the intended result is sufficiently captured?		NO	
➢ Is there are particularly important dimension to the result that is missed in the indicator or group of indicators?		NO	Implementation; differentiation (disaggregation) according to order of magnitude of effects.
➢ Is there an aspect of timing or timeliness, important to the desired result, that is missing?		NO	
➢ Other aspect of "sufficiency?	❑	❑	
➢ Does the indicator reflect an outcome of the program, as opposed to the completion of an activity or process?		NO	
➢ Impact of services		NO	
➢ Quality of services		NO	
➢ Customer (end-user) satisfaction		NO	
➢ Physical product	YES		In the sense of documents prepared.
➢ Major milestone	YES		
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations for #1: VALIDITY.

10. USEFULNESS-Does the indicator achieve the Mission's purposes of performance management and communication of results?			
	Yes	**No**	**Comments**
➢ Can changes in the value of the indicator be reasonably attributed to the efforts of USAID and its partners?	YES		
➢ Does the indicator effectively tell the mission if it is "on track" regarding expected performance to-date in the implementation of the program plan?		NO	
➢ Does it help the mission know about the existence possible problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Does it help the mission locate the sources of problems in implementation?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator easy to understand as stated?		NO	
➢ Is the indicator a credible measure of the intended result?		NO	
➢ Other	❑	❑	

Recommendations for improvement:

See recommendations for #1: VALIDITY.

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

ANNEX F

Persons Interviewed

PERSONS INTERVIEWED

USAID/Ecuador

Rick Garland, Acting Mission Director
Gustavo Carrera
Rocío Cedeño
María Eulalia Dueñas
Karina Durán
Kenneth Farr
Hernán Granja
Paulina Gutiérrez
Jill Kelly
Michael Lofstrom
Paulyna Martínez
Douglas Mason
Thomas Moore
Marí Palacios
Hugo Ramos
Lucrecia Tola
Sofía Villalba
Raymond Waldron
Paula Zavala
Mónica Zuquilanda

Partners (International and Local)

Paulina Arroyo	The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
Silvia Benítez	Conservation Projects Director, Ecuador Program, The Nature Conservancy (TNC)
Simón Castro Waimín	Program Officer, International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Alfonso Escobar	Social Promoter, International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Patricio Espinosa	CARE Field Staff, Programa Sur
Fernando Fernández	Microfinance Specialist, Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI) (Proyecto SALTO)
Roberth Gallegos	International Organization for Migration (IOM)

Alejandro Guidi Vásquez	Program Director, International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Jaime Levy	Executive Director, Fundación Alternativas para el Desarrollo Sostenible en el Trópico (ALTROPICO)
Fernando Martínez	CARE International in Ecuador
Miguel Mera	International Office for Migration (IOM)
María Isabel Moncayo	Civil Society Coordinator, International Organization for Migration (IOM)
Fernando Moreno	Project and Follow-up Coordinator, Fundación Alternativas para el Desarrollo Sostenible en el Trópico (ALTROPICO)
Gustavo Mosquera	Fundación Antisana
Oscar Oswaldo Oliva	World Council of Credit Unions (WOCCU) (Director, Strengthening Cooperative Financial Institutions Project)
Carlos Palán Tamayo	Microfinance Specialist, Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI) (Proyecto SALTO)
Janine Pauta	CARE Field Staff, Programa Sur
João S. de Queiroz	Chemonics (Director, Proyecto Caimán)
Henry Quiroz	Senior Technical Specialist, Design, Monitoring and Evaluation, CARE International in Ecuador
Pablo Salcido	ARD, Inc. (Chief of Party (Decentralization/Democracy/Development Project)
Daniel Selener	CARE International in Ecuador
Alexander Shapleigh	Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI) (Chief of Party, Proyecto SALTO)
Farid Simons	Fundación Esquel
Amarro Socola	CARE Field Staff. Programa Sur

Fernando Solís C.	Director, Programa SUR, CARE International in Ecuador
David Wright	ARD, Inc.

Other

Rosa Bastidas	Provincial Coordinator, Drug Education/Prevention, Sucumbíos Province
Bernardo Quevedo	Drug Education/Prevention Program, Ministry of Education, Sucumbiós Province
Jose Luis Paladines	Mayor, Arenillas Municipality
Nardi Carrión	City Accountant, Arenillas Municipality
Washington Campoverde	Information System Director, Arenillas Municipality
Edwin Rengel	Director of Environmental Management, Arenillas Municipality
Franklin Cuervo	Mayor, Calvas Municipality
Noela Morocha	Social Promoter, Calvas Municipality
Angel Correa	Water Board President, Tarapuca Village
Luis Cumbicus	Water Board Treasurer, Tarapuca Village
Procedio Malacatos	Water Board Operator, Tarapuca Village
Juan Andrade	Dir. Agua Potable y Alcantarrillado, Otavalo Municipality
Peter Ubidia	Coordinador de Diálogo Inter-Cultural, Otavalo Municipality
Gonzalo Nicalalde	Coordinador, Grupo MPA, Otavalo Municipality
Jose Freire	Jefe de Evaluos y Catastro, Pedro Moncayo Municipality
Frank Gualsaqui	Grupo MPA, Pedro Moncayo Municipality
María Belém	Jefa Area de Comunicación, Pedro Moncayo Municipality
Ruben Carlosama	Urbana Consultores, Pedro Moncayo Municipality

Guillermo Sánchez	Urbana Consultores, Pedro Moncayo Municipality
Víctor Viteri	Urbana Consultores, Pedro Moncayo Municipality

15 high school students and recent graduates participating in drug education/prevention programs

Leaders and citizens of the Municipality of Cascales, Sucumbíos Province

Leaders and citizens of the community of Jambelí, Sucumbíos Province

Leaders and citizens of the community of Nueva Esperanza, Sucumbíos Province