**Mission Order: Performance Monitoring**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mission Order Number**: MO 203 | **Series/Chapter**: [ADS 201](http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201) |
| **Effective Date**: March 31, 2017 | **Supersedes**: MO203 as of January 31, 2014 |

# i. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Mission Order is to provide Mission guidelines, procedures and recommendations related to monitoring the Mission’s strategy, projects, and activities.

# II. AUTHORITY/POLICY

* [Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) of 1993](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/mgmt-gpra/gplaw2m) and [Government Performance and Results Modernization Act (GPRMA) 2010](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/performance/gprm-act) regarding government-wide requirements regarding performance management.
* [Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016 (FATAA)](https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ191/PLAW-114publ191.pdf) requirements for how U.S. Government agencies monitor, evaluate, and report on U.S. foreign assistance programs and share this data with the public.
* [Performance Plan and Report (PPR) guidance](http://f.state.sbu/default.aspx) regarding reporting in the Evaluation Registry of the PPR.
* [ADS 201](http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201)regarding all aspects of performance monitoring:
	+ ADS 201.3.2.7 – Monitoring in the CDCS
	+ ADS 201.3.2.16 – Monitoring in the Performance Management Plan
	+ ADS 201.3.3.13 – Monitoring in the Project MEL Plan
	+ ADS 201.3.4.10 – Monitoring in the Activity MEL Plan
	+ ADS 201.3.5 – ADS 201.3.5.8 – Monitoring policy and requirements, generally
	+ [Mandatory Reference ADS 201 maf, Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS) Guidance & Template](http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201maf)

# III. DEFINITIONS

Please see [ADS 201](http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201).6 for definitions of key terms related to monitoring.

Significant terms from the ADS for this Mission Order (MO) are:

* Performance Monitoring (**ADS 201.3.5.5**)
* Mission-wide Performance Management Plan (PMP) (**ADS 201.3.2.16**)
* Development Objective (DO) (**ADS 201.3.2.7**)
* Project MEL Plan (**ADS 201.3.3.13**)
* Activity MEL Plan (**ADS 201.3.4.10**)
* Project (**ADS 201.3.3**)
* Activity/Implementing Mechanism (**ADS 201.3.3**)
* Project Manager (**ADS 201.3.3.14**)
* Data Quality Assessment (**ADS 201.3.5.8**)

Other terms include:

* Program Office (PO) Performance Monitoring Points of Contact (PMPOC): Per **ADS 201.3.5.4**, each Mission must designate a performance monitoring point of contact (PMPOC throughout this MO). USAID/Azerbaijan will designate a project development specialist from PO to serve as the PMPOC and ensure compliance with performance monitoring across the breadth of the Mission’s portfolio, and he/she will collaborate with the DO team staff in the Mission.
* Performance monitoring information system: A data system that serves as a repository for all performance indicators (at the strategy, project, and activity/IM levels), including baseline values and timeframes, targets and rationales for targets, and actual values. The system stores tabular data and is updated regularly as baselines are measured, actuals are collected, and changes are made to performance indicators as laid out below.
* Contracting Officer’s Representative (COR)/Agreement Officer’s Representative (AOR)/Activity Manager (AM): For Mission awards, monitoring responsibilities fall to the COR/AOR; for awards made in Washington (field support, Food for Peace, etc.), monitoring responsibility falls to the Project Manager.

# IV. ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

All Mission offices are responsible for the implementation of this policy and adherence to the Agency guidance and principles on performance monitoring. See **ADS 201 Additional Help: Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Staff Roles and Responsibilities** for respective roles of these offices across various monitoring tasks. Technical Office and PO are central to successful Mission performance monitoring. PO is responsible for overseeing the quality of the Performance Monitoring process as outlined in **ADS 201.3.5.4,** for updating this Mission Order, and maintaining the Mission PMP up to date. Per **ADS 201 .3.5.4**, Missions must designate a performance monitoring point of contact (PMPOC) within the Mission program office. This individual will ensure compliance with performance monitoring across the breadth of the Mission’s portfolio, and will collaborate with the other staff in the Mission, including Technical Office, Project Managers, and COR/AORs. It is the primary responsibility of COR/AORs and Project Managers to maintain Activity MEL Plans and Project MEL plans up to date.

# V. PROCEDURES

## A. Overview

Performance monitoring is a data-intensive, and detailed endeavor. Given the sheer volume of data and number of changes – from adding, refining, and dropping indicators to updating targets and actuals – maintaining a current and authoritative PMP can be challenging. Under the Program Cycle, performance monitoring systems are inter-connected, from the Mission-wide PMP to the Project MEL Plan to the Activity MEL Plan – a change in one ripples across the others. As such, it is important to ensure that Activity MEL Plans are consistent with the Project MEL Plan and the Mission-wide PMP.

Performance monitoring is critical to the Mission’s ability to track progress toward the results identified in the CDCS Results Framework. The Mission-wide PMP serves as a tool to measure achievement of the CDCS Results Framework; the Project MEL Plan measures achievement of the project logic model (which is aligned by the Project Purpose to the CDCS Results Framework). Activity MEL Plans contribute to a Project MEL Plan, and ultimately to the PMP, and measure achievement of portions of the project logic model.

Information pertinent for performance monitoring will be refined through the project design process and updated during the course of the strategy as projects and activities are designed. Beyond the set of issues in establishing the PMP and Project and Activity MEL Plans, portfolio reviews and learning may result in adding, subtracting, or revising indicators and targets in the PMP and other MEL plans mid-implementation.

These procedures are designed around three major areas of navigating this complex system: good performance monitoring planning; clear, efficient procedures during implementation when data are collected; and planning and integrating learning to improve development impact, while maintaining documentation.

## B. Performance Monitoring Planning

### Formulation of Mission-wide PMP

Within 6 months of CDCS approval, the Mission develops and approves a Mission-wide PMP (see **ADS 201.3.2.16**). Upon approval, this initial PMP must be uploaded on ProgramNet. The PMPOC and other staff from PO will work with technical staff to ensure that indicators for the IRs, sub-IRs, and any other indicators identified are defined using Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS). Prior to PMP approval, each performance indicator for each IR and sub-IR requires:

* + Baseline data to be collected, or a plan to collect baseline data to be documented.
	+ End-of-CDCS targets to be set along with a rationale for these targets, or a plan to set targets and provide a rationale to be documented.
* Within 6 months of the CDCS approval, the Mission PMPOC leads a portfolio alignment process in which he/she works with relevant technical staff to ensure that information for relevant existing indicators are included in the Mission’s new PMP and those indicators that are no longer needed are archived and efforts to collect those data cease.
* The PMPOC should also ensure that other sections of the PMP are up to date, including that any currently planned evaluations are incorporated into the PMP Evaluation Plan.
* The Mission Director approves the initial Mission-wide PMP, which will then serve as a basis to build Project and Activity MEL Plans. The Mission-wide PMP will frequently be modified by project designs, partner feedback, portfolio reviews, etc. (see “Modifying/Updating Different Types of MEL Plans” below). Mission Director Approval is required only for the initial approval of the Mission-wide PMP, and generally not on the iterative updates made to the PMP throughout its life. PMP changes are approved through other approval processes, such as Project Appraisal Document (PAD) approval, Portfolio Review decisions, strategy modification review, etc.
* The DO Team Leader is ultimately responsible for the achievement of the targets for the high-level indicators for his/her DO.
* The PMPOC helps determine which indicators will be disaggregated by geographic location and to define a minimum geographic scale at which the PMP indicators will be collected. See ADS 201.3.57G Indicator Disaggregation and ADS 201 Additional Help: Data Disaggregation by Geographic Location.
* .

See **ADS 201.3.2.16** and **PMP How-To Note** for additional details.

### Formulation/Approval of Project MEL Plans

* Project Design Teams develop the initial Project MEL Plan which is approved as part of the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) and ensures that progress will be monitored against the results specified in the project logic model.
* During the PAD input and clearance process, PO confirms that the Project MEL Plan is aligned with the project logic model and other aligned result(s) in the CDCS Results Framework.
* The PMPOC updates the Mission-wide PMP to reflect the performance indicators (including baselines and targets), evaluation details, and any relevant learning questions included in the Project MEL Plan. If changes are made from the original PMP based on the Project MEL Plan (e.g., original IR or sub-IR indicators dropped, new indicators added), the relevant field of the PIRS for the changed indicator must also be modified. If changes are made from the original PMP based on the Project MEL Plan (e.g., original IR or sub-IR indicators dropped, new indicators added), the relevant field of the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet for the changed indicator must also be modified.

See **ADS 201.3.3.13** regarding Project MEL Plans and the **Project Design MO** for more details.

### Formulation/Approval of Activity MEL Plans

All new activities must be designed using the Activity Design and Implementation guidance (see **ADS 2013.4**). Existing activities must be aligned with the project logic model (as included in the PAD) and CDCS Results Framework through the portfolio alignment process which begins during the CDCS and continues later during project design. These steps ensure alignment of monitoring, evaluation, and learning among activities, projects, and the Mission-wide PMP.

* The COR/AOR is responsible for the quality of Activity MEL Plans submitted by implementing partners, and works with implementing partners to ensure that plans are consistent with and meet the data collection needs of the Project MEL Plan and the PMP, as well as the Performance Plan and Report (PPR). This includes working with RCO (or other responsible offices in the case of G2G) to ensure that relevant indicators are included in solicitation documents, negotiations with host government entities, etc. before awards are made, and working closely with implementing partners during Activity MEL formulation.
* Project Managers ensure that activities include relevant project indicators and that use of the same indicator across different activities is consistent in definition and data collection methodology (this should be documented in the indicator’s PIRS). They also ensure data collection for appropriate initiative indicators and coordinate, as needed, with other USG agencies on indicators related to presidential initiatives, earmarks, and/or PPR reporting.
* The PMPOC assists in this process by providing advice, official guidance and best practice, sharing information, and providing early review and advice. They use their “bird’s eye view” of performance indicators and data collection across the Mission to ensure consistency and efficiency. They also ensure the collection of any indicators that cut across offices or DOs.
* The COR/AOR approves the Activity MEL Plan submitted by the implementer. The Project Manager and PMPOC clear Activity MEL Plans.
* Upon approval, the COR/AOR is responsible for filing the Activity MEL Plan electronically on the shared drive (P:\4. Program Project Office\Monitoring PPO) within one month. The PMPOC uses Activity MEL Plans stored on the shared drive to populate the performance monitoring information system.

See **ADS 201.3.4.10** for more details.

### Collecting Baselines

The collection of baseline data should begin as soon as possible after the approval of the Project or Activity MEL Plans (note that, in cases where third party data collection is involved, it may be possible to move ahead on some aspects of establishing the collection implementing mechanism prior to approval). Baseline data should be used to establish performance targets (or revise initial targets) and used as a reference point to monitor progress toward the results outlined in the PMP and/or Project and Activity MEL Plans.

* Given the need to rationalize data collection, the COR/AOR should coordinate with the PMPOC and Project Manager to minimize baseline data collection time and cost. The Schedule of Performance Management Tasks and Responsibilities in the PMP can assist in this coordination.
* The PMPOC must ensure cross-office coordination for the collection of data shared by different projects to minimize costs and rationalize efforts.
* COR/AOR, Project Managers, PMPOCs, or others responsible for a performance indicator as described in a PIRS should file baseline data and new/revised targets electronically on the shared drive (P:\4. Program Project Office\MonitoringPPO). The PMPOC uses baseline data and new/revised targets stored on the shared drive to populate the performance monitoring information system.

See **ADS 201.3.5.7** for more details.

### Modifying/Updating the PMP and Project and Activity MEL Plans

As outlined above in the Overview, as projects and activities/IMs are approved, learning occurs, and context changes, monitoring plans (such as the PMP and Project and Activity MEL Plans) can change as well.[ADS 201](http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201) grants broad authority to Missions to make needed changes. When doing so, the following principles will apply:

* Visibility and transparency in making changes, while delegating authority responsibly.
* Ability to trace back a rationale for changes, particularly to indicators and targets, through thorough documentation to ensure that changes will be fully understood by incoming staff, auditors, other personnel, and new partners.
* As a general principle, targets should not be updated more frequently than annually to incentivize good planning and analysis prior to target setting.

The following procedures will guide changes for each of the following plans. The appropriate staff member (as laid out below) should review the plan to ensure that appropriate updates have been made at least annually or more frequently as modifications are needed.

* Mission-wide PMP:
	+ The PMPOC will make all modifications to the Mission-wide PMP, as a way to ensure consistency and quality.
	+ Decision-making for PMP modifications will be inclusive, transparent, and coordinated, as outlined in the two bullets below:
		- Substantial modifications are those that occur because of a change to the Results Framework, or learning and adapting during program implementation. These changes will be decided through the process outlined for strategy modifications (see **Strategy MO**), or in a formal decision-making forum, such as a portfolio review and approved by the Mission Director.
		- Routine modifications (such as the updates needed after approval or modification of a Project MEL Plan) should be made by the PMPOC in collaboration with project teams as updated information becomes available, documenting the rationale for the change in the PIRS and the Mission’s performance monitoring information system.
* Project MEL Plans:
	+ The Project Manager, or a designee, will make changes to an existing Project MEL Plan. Such changes require clearance of the Project Manager, Program Office and other staff as designated. Substantial changes should be decided in a formal decision-making forum, such as a portfolio review or project review.
	+ Once cleared and approved, the Project Manager or designee will file the modified Project MEL Plan electronically on the shared drive (P:/shared/PPO/Monitoring), documenting the rationale for the change. The Project Manager will use the modified Project MEL Plans stored on the shared drive to enter changes into the performance monitoring information system as guided by the PMPOC*.* These changes may come from a substantial change decided per above or from changes from the activity (see below).
* Activity MEL Plan:
	+ The COR/AOR will approve changes to the Activity MEL Plan. Such changes require clearance from the Project Manager and, depending on the nature of the change (i.e., whether it affects an indicator reported to Washington or one included in the Mission-wide PMP), the PMPOC. Changes to the Activity MEL Plan that are approved by the COR/AOR must be within the scope and terms and conditions of the award, and must not serve to modify the award (consult RCO if in doubt).
	+ Once approved, the COR/AOR will file the modified Activity MEL Plan electronically on the shared drive (P:/shared/PPO/Monitoring), documenting the rationale for the change. The PMPOC will use the modified Activity MEL Plans stored on the shared drive to enter changes into the performance monitoring information system.

To ensure visibility and transparency throughout these processes:

* The PMPOC will establish a common location for all Project MEL Plans and Activity MEL Plans to electronically store the most current version (P:/shared/PPO/Monitoring). The PMPOC will establish naming conventions and practices to make it easy to find the latest version of each plan.
* The PMPOC will ensure the most current Mission-wide PMP is stored in that common location (P:/shared/PPO/Monitoring); the Project Manager or designee will ensure that latest Project MEL Plan is stored there; COR/AOR will ensure that latest Activity MEL Plan is stored there.

### Develop Data Quality Assurance Plan

Once the Mission has selected its indicators for monitoring various levels of program performance, the next step is to verify the quality of the indicator data collected. The procedures below are based on the principles that analysis of data quality should be performed by the individual closest to management while following common procedures to ensure consistency and efficiency.

COR/AOR is responsible for conducting the data quality assessments (DQAs) for indicators in their Activity MEL Plan that will be reported externally. This includes all the indicators reported in the PPR. If the COR/AOR does not conduct the DQA, he/she is responsible for certifying the DQA, once done. The COR/AOR is also responsible for addressing the DQA findings with the implementer or government partner and ensuring that any corrective actions are taken. The COR/AOR is assisted by the PMPOC and/or Project Manager who provides guidance on formats, best practice, and Agency and Mission requirements. Activity implementers, as part of their awards, can conduct DQAs, provided that the relevant COR/AOR/AM reviews and verifies. This process may entail site visits to physically inspect records maintained by implementing partners.

* The DQA must occur after data has been collected on a new indicator and within 12 months prior to the new indicator data being reported. A DQA must be conducted every three years thereafter.
* Project Managers or their designees are responsible for ensuring the comparability of data for the same indicator collected by different mechanisms and performing DQAs for indicators in the Project MEL Plan that will be reported externally that are not collected by activities (e.g. data from third-party sources, host country government, etc.). They should ensure that the COR/AOR is on track for conducting DQAs and following up on corrective actions.
* The PMPOC is responsible for conducting DQAs of indicators in the Mission-wide PMP that are not also contained in any Project and/or Activity MEL Plan, and will be reported externally. The PMPOC is also responsible for ensuring that the Mission has documented a Mission standard-operating-procedure for conducting a DQA. The documentation includes the following information: 1) common Mission formats for DQAs (see [ADS 201sae, USAID Recommended DQA checklist](http://www.usaid.gov/ads/policy/200/201sae)), 2) a common location to store approved DQA reports (P:/Shared/PPO/Monitoring), and 3) Mission-specific procedures and best practices for conducting DQAs (see **How-To Conduct a DQA**). The PMPOC has the responsibility to ensure that the Mission tracks important findings and follow-up actions from DQAs.

See **ADS 201.3.5.8** for more details regarding when DQAs are required and filing requirements. Annex 3 of the MO provides the DQA checklist template and recommended procedures.

## C. Data Collection, Oversight, and Quality Assurance

### Conduct Activity/IM Oversight

COR/AOR, in coordination with Project Managers, should plan for ongoing and systematic monitoring and oversight of activities. Routine Activity/IM oversight includes:

* Site Visits.
	+ The COR/AOR should perform site visits as part of his/her contract and grant oversight, but also to learn, verify data, and other purposes. Site visits should be planned at least every three months and a schedule should be maintained by the Project Manager (see Mission Notice on Site Visits).
	+ The COR/AOR should complete the standard site visit report in Annex 1 following every site visit, and keep a copy in the official activity management files with an explanation of both positive and negative findings and any required follow-up actions.
	+ During site visits, the COR/AOR should conduct data verification. They should select one indicator (or more) on which the partner has reported, and check the partner’s understanding of the indicator, data collection methodology, reporting chain, and supporting documentation. The COR/AOR should also take this opportunity to ask the partner whether there are any observations, findings, or concerns beyond what the data capture that should be discussed at this time. For activities/IMs that have environmental mitigation measures, the COR/AOR should verify that these are being carried out correctly.
	+ The COR/AOR should note any performance problem pertaining to schedule, cost, quality and/or non-compliance, as well as any other significant issues. The COR should bring any significant performance problem to the immediate attention of RCO to discuss resolution, and should also inform the Project Manager to discuss potential impact to the project.
	+ The COR/AOR should also note any new information or learning that could usefully be shared within the Mission and/or with other partners within the project. Where monitoring and oversight suggest that implementation is yielding different results than anticipated, the COR/AOR should initiate discussions with implementing partners (in the case of A&A awards such discussions must include the CO/AO) and USAID staff to analyze this divergence for what can be learned and for indications that course correction in implementation may be necessary to yield better results. For A&A Actions only the CO/AO is authorized to approve any course correction in implementation that goes beyond the scope, and other terms and conditions of the award.
* Meeting with Stakeholders:
	+ COR/AOR and Project Managers should also meet with partner(s), sector experts, donors, host government to triangulate and share information as well as review activity level progress.

### Collect and Record Data

Indicator data, which may come from implementing partners as well as through primary data collection or secondary sources, must be updated in the Mission’s performance monitoring information system.

* COR/AOR is responsible for ensuring timely collection of performance data along the schedule outlined in the award agreement and Activity MEL Plan (quarterly, semi-annual, or annual), as well as for verifying implementing partner performance reports and working with implementing partners, and others in the Mission as needed, to resolve data collection or quality issues.
* The COR/AOR, upon reviewing the data in implementing partner reports or third-party sources and deeming the data to be of acceptable quality, should save performance indicator actual values on the shared drive (P:/Shared/PPO/Monitoring).
* Project Managers should periodically review project performance data, checking for consistency and quality across activities.
* PO is responsible for ensuring that Project Managers and COR/AORs collect, review, and save on the shared drive indicator data consistently, and that these data are entered in the performance monitoring information system on a timely basis. PO will periodically review all indicator data to ensure data quality and consistency. PO may also engage in data collection as needed and appropriate (e.g., indicators collected directly by Mission staff or third-party data in the PMP).
* By relying on GIS data reported by implementing partners, PO will track the geographic location of each activity/IM at least at the Administrative 2 level (municipality), but preferable at Administrative 3 level (town/village). This data will be stored in a template (See Annex 2).
* For select PMP indicators (as identified in PIRS), USAID/Azerbaijan will disaggregate data by geographic location at Administrative 3 (preferable) or Administrative 2 levels (at a minimum). The Mission will utilize GIS capabilities to present, analyze and model key performance data, which will serve as a decision-making tool to inform project design and work-planning processes, identify and adjust overlapping programs, manage donor activity coordination, and evaluate the programmatic impact.

## D. Performance Data Analysis, Utilization, and Learning

Monitoring data is used to understand performance, test development hypotheses, question assumptions and cause and effect relationships, and ultimately, manage for results and learning. To ensure that data analysis and learning occur, it is important to plan for it effectively. Data analysis and learning should be planned, participatory, and transparent. The following procedures operationalize these principles.

### Activity/IM, Project, and Portfolio Reviews

Periodic reviews of the Mission portfolio are necessary for the Mission to understand its progress toward the desired results outlined in its CDCS Strategy and Project logic models. Such reviews are where all of the effort to collect and maintain performance data pay off, as these reviews should be intensively informed by such data. These reviews include:

* Activity Reviews: The COR/AOR, once they have verified implementing partner periodic reports (quarterly/semi-annual/annual), should analyze the information, and determine if any changes are necessary to workplans, budgets, and/or schedules. These analyses can be done informally, in collaboration with the relevant stakeholders such as the implementer, host government staff, other COR/AOR, PMPOC or other M&E specialists, as desired. Such reviews are part of the due diligence of a COR/AOR’s duties. This could be as informal as a phone call to follow-up on questions after reading a quarterly report, to a more formal meeting to coordinate with the partner and other actors. The Activity MEL Plan should be updated to reflect findings or conclusions made during the activity review. Any changes to workplans, budget and/or schedules for A&A awards must be within the terms and conditions of the award. Only the CO/AO is authorized to make changes that result in modifications of the award.
* Project Reviews: The Project Manager should conduct project reviews with COR/AORs, in collaboration with the project’s implementing partners, the Mission’s M&E POC(s), initiative managers, and PO. Such reviews should be held at least annually. Missions should consider timing to inform the Mission’s strategic portfolio review, Quarterly Financial Reviews, or the PPR. The Project Manager should update the Project MEL Plan and document project performance relative to the Results Framework, any uncovered issues (e.g., budget, performance, or otherwise), successes/failures/lessons learned, and next steps.
* Stakeholder, Host Government, and Sectoral Reviews: As needed, the PO and/or project teams should conduct reviews with stakeholders, host government partners, or technical sectors. Such reviews improve communication, and can strengthen the quality of collaboration and ultimately development impact.
* Portfolio Reviews: PO, at least annually, will coordinate a Mission-wide review of the CDCS Results Framework, specifically addressing progress toward each DO (see **Portfolio Reviews MO** and **ADS 201.3.2.18** for more details). Following the portfolio review, the Program Office updates the Mission-wide PMP to document any findings, conclusions, lessons learned, or to revise any aspects of the DO Monitoring Plans (including any indicator changes), Evaluation Plan, or the CLA Plan as determined during the portfolio review.

If any of the reviews triggers a change in the performance monitoring information system, see section above regarding modifying performance monitoring plans.

# VI. EFFECTIVE DATE AND CANCELLATION

This Mission Order is effective March 31, 2017 and will remain in force until cancelled or amended.

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Mikaela Meredith

Mission Director

USAID/Azerbaijan

Date: March 31, 2017

**Annex 1 – Site Visit Report Template**

**MEMORANDUM TO FILE**

**TO:** Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) File for [Name of instrument]

**FROM:** [Name of person preparing this memo], AOR/COR

**CC:** [Name of the Project Manager and/or DO Team Leader]

**DATE:**

**SUBJECT:** Record of Site Visit

On [insert date] I conducted a site visit to [name site and name of organization]. The purpose of this memo is to document the findings from this site visit.

**Purpose of Site Visit**

[ ]  Take part in an activity event (*Describe the activity and persons involved. Who was present from partner staff, how many participants – gender disaggregated)*

[ ]  Meet with project beneficiaries *(Describe who you met with, what was discussed)*

[ ]  Meet with other activity stakeholders *(Describe who you met with, what was discussed)*

[ ]  Conduct a spot check of USAID-purchased commodities or equipment (*Describe equipment/commodities type, location, serial #, etc.)*

[ ]  Conduct performance data verification (*Describe the indicator(s) you selected for verification, who you met with and what was discussed regarding the data quality standards, collection methodology, reporting chain, and supporting documentation)*

[ ]  Assess compliance with environmental mitigationmeasures *(Describe environmental measures, location, who you met with, what you observed, what was discussed)*

[ ]  Other (*Describe.)*

**Findings, Conclusions & Recommended Follow-up Actions**

*Include both negative and positive findings, conclusions and recommended follow-up actions. This includes performance problem encountered (if any) pertaining to schedule, cost, quality and/or non-compliance, as well as any other significant issues.*

**Annex 2 – Geographic information system (GIS) Data Collection Template**

**Annex 3 – Data Quality Assessment Checklist and Recommended Procedure**

This Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Checklist is provided as a recommended tool that an operating unit (OU) may use to complete its DQAs. If the OU prefers or has successfully used a different tool for conducting and documenting its DQAs in the past, they are free to continue the use of that tool instead. The checklist below is intended to assist in assessing each of the five aspects of data quality and provide a convenient manner in which to document the OU’s DQA findings.

|  |
| --- |
| USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name: |
| Title of Performance Indicator:*[Indicator should be copied directly from the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet]* |
| Linkage to Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure, if applicable (i.e. Program Area, Element, etc.): |
| Result This Indicator Measures *[For USAID only]* (i.e., Specify the Development Objective, Intermediate Result, or Project Purpose, etc.):  |
| Data Source(s):*[Information can be copied directly from the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet]* |
| Partner or Contractor Who Provided the Data: *[It is recommended that this checklist is completed for each partner that contributes data to an indicator– it should state in the contract or grant that it is the prime’s responsibility to ensure the data quality of sub-contractors or sub grantees.]* |
| Period for Which the Data Are Being Reported: |
| Is This Indicator a Standard or Custom Indicator? | \_\_\_\_ Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator\_\_\_\_ Custom (created by the OU; not standard) |
| Data Quality Assessment methodology: *[Describe here or attach to this checklist the methods and procedures for assessing the quality of the indicator data. E.g. Reviewing data collection procedures and documentation, interviewing those responsible for data analysis, checking a sample of the data for errors, etc.]* |
| Date(s) of Assessment: |
| Assessment Team Members: |
| *USAID Mission/OU Verification of DQA*Team Leader Officer approvalX\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | YES | NO | COMMENTS |
| VALIDITY – Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result. |
| 1 | Does the information collected measure what it is supposed to measure? (E.g. A valid measure of overall nutrition is healthy variation in diet; Age is not a valid measure of overall health.) |  |  |  |
| 2 | Do results collected fall within a plausible range? |  |  |  |
| 3 | Is there reasonable assurance that the data collection methods being used do not produce systematically biased data (e.g. consistently over- or under-counting)? |  |  |  |
| 4 | Are sound research methods being used to collect the data? |  |  |  |
| RELIABILITY – Data should reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time. |
| 1 | When the same data collection method is used to measure/observe the same thing multiple times, is the same result produced each time? (E.g. A ruler used over and over always indicates the same length for an inch.) |  |  |  |
| 2 | Are data collection and analysis methods documented in writing & being used to ensure same procedures are followed each time? |  |  |  |
| TIMELINESS – Data should be available at a useful frequency, should be current, and should be timely enough to influence management decision making. |
| 1 | Are data available frequently enough to inform program management decisions? |  |  |  |
| 2 | Are the data reported the most current practically available? |  |  |  |
| 3 | Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection? |  |  |  |
| PRECISION – Data have a sufficient level of detail to permit management decision making; e.g. the margin of error is less than the anticipated change. |
| 1 | Is the margin of error less than the expected change being measured? (E.g. If a change of only 2% is expected and the margin of error in a survey used to collect the data is +/- 5%, then the tool is not precise enough to detect the change.)  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Has the margin of error been reported along with the data? (Only applicable to results obtained through statistical samples.) |  |  |  |
| 3 | Is the data collection method/tool being used to collect the data fine-tuned or exact enough to register the expected change? (E.g. A yardstick may not be a precise enough tool to measure a change of a few millimeters.) |  |  |  |
| INTEGRITY – Data collected should have safeguards to minimize the risk of transcription error or data manipulation. |
| 1 | Are procedures or safeguards in place to minimize data transcription errors? |  |  |  |
| 3 | Is there independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures? |  |  |  |
| 3 | Are mechanisms in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data? |  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| SUMMARY |
| Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data? |
| Significance of limitations (if any): |
| Actions needed to address limitations prior to the next DQA (given level of USG control over data): |
| IF NO DATA ARE AVAILABLE FOR THE INDICATOR | COMMENTS |
| If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not? |  |
| What concrete actions are now being taken to collect and report these data as soon as possible? |  |
| When will data be reported? |  |

**Recommendations for Conducting Data Quality Assessments**

1. Data Quality (DQ) assessor should make sure that they understand the precise definition of the indicator by checking the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet. Please address any issues of ambiguity before the DQA is conducted.
2. DQ assessor should have a copy of the methodology for data collection in hand before assessing the indicator. For USAID Missions, this information should be in the PMP’s Performance Indicator Reference Sheets for each indicator. Each indicator should have a written description of how the data being assessed are supposed to be collected.
3. Each implementing partner should have a copy of the method of data collection in their files and documented evidence that they are collecting the data according to the methodology.
4. DQ assessor should record the names and titles of all individuals involved in the assessment.
5. Does the implementing partner have documented evidence that they have verified the data that has been reported? Partners should be able to provided USAID with documents (process/person conducting the verification/field visit dates/persons met/activities visited, etc.) which demonstrates that they have verified the data that was reported. Note: Verification by the partners should be an ongoing process.

The DQ assessor should be able to review the implementing partner files/records against the methodology for data collection laid out in the PMP (for USAID Missions only). Any data quality concerns should be documented.

1. 7.

The DQ should include a summary of significant limitations found. A plan of action, including timelines and responsibilities, for addressing the limitations should be made.