



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



INDICADORES DAS RESEX DO RIO CAUTÁRIO

Elo da Cadeia	Indicador	Antes	Com Projeto
Produção nas Resex Rio Cautário Federal e Estadual	Número de famílias envolvidas em manejo coletivo	0	66
	Número de castanheiros aplicando boas praticas	0	93
	Número de picos manejados	00	69
Comercialização	Número de barracões	00	04
	Número de mesas de seleção e secagem	00	08
	Capacidade de armazenamento	150m ² ; 90 t	360 m ² ; 200 t
Envolvimento Organizacional	Produção anual	150 ton	30 ton
	Parcerias comerciais	00	03
	% Venda coletiva : % Venda individual	0% : 100%	40% : 60%
Envolvimento Organizacional	Preço		
	Captação de recursos do PAA pelas associações (RS) ; Outros recursos	R\$ 3.18/kg	R\$ 7 /kg
	Participação de mulheres e jovens na cadeia	0	200.000 ; 600.000
		Mínima	Alta

PACTO DAS ÁGUAS

Brazilian Amazon Monitoring & Evaluation Program

2017 Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Report

Submitted to:
Alexandre Mancuso, Contracting Officer's Representative
USAID/Brazil

Submitted by:
DevTech Systems, Inc.
Contract AID-520-TO-17-00002

DISCLAIMER:

This report is made possible by the support of the American People through the United State Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents of this report are the sole responsibility of DevTech and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
INTRODUCTION	3
The Data Quality Analysis (DQA) Process	3
The Partnership for the Conservation of the Brazilian Amazon (PCAB)	4
PCAB Program Implementing Partners and Components	4
PCAB Standard and Custom Indicators	6
METHODOLOGY	9
FINDINGS	10
General	10
Validity	11
Reliability	11
Timeliness	12
Precision	12
Integrity	13
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS	14
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USAID/BRAZIL	14
ANNEX A: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND PERSONS CONTACTED	15
ANNEX B: DQA STANDARD INDICATOR CHECK LISTS	17
DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-1	18
DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-2	22
DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-3	25
DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-4	28
DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-5	31
ANNEX C: USAID STANDARD INDICATOR PIRS	34
ANNEX D: MODIFIED DQA INTERVIEW FORM (PORTUGUESE)	35

ACRONYMS

ADS	Automated Directives System
AFALU	Agriculture, Forestry and Other Land Use
BAME	Brazil Amazonian Monitoring and Evaluation Project
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
COP	Chief of Party
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative (USAID)
DQA	Data Quality Analysis
DO	Development Objective (USAID)
ECAM	Equipe de Conservação da Amazônia
EG	Economic Growth (USAID)
FUNAI	National Indigenous Foundation
GCC	Global Climate Change Initiative (USG)
GHG	Green House Gas (emissions)
GOB	Government of Brazil
ICMBio	Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation
IEB	Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil
IP	Implementing Partner
IPE	Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas
NGO	Non-Government Organization
NRM	Natural Resources Management
OU	Operating Unit (e.g., USAID/Brazil Mission is an OU)
PCAB	Partnership for the Conservation of the Brazilian Amazon
PGTA	Management Plans of Indigenous Areas
PIRS	Performance Indicator Reference Sheet
PMP	Performance Monitoring Plan
PNGATI	Política Nacional do Brasil para a Gestão Territorial e Ambiental de Terras Indígenas
PPP	Public-Private Partnerships
PPR	Program Performance Report (USAID)
USFS	United States Forest Service
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USG	United States Government

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- This 2017 Data Quality Analysis (DQA) of the Partnership for Conservation of Amazonian Biodiversity (PCAB) Project reports on the quality of data used to measure five standard indicators of PCAB outputs or outcomes. This DQA report also includes recommendations for USAID and the PCAB implementing partners (IPs) to implement for improving procedures for standard indicator data collection and reporting.
- The BAME team administered the 2017 DQA using the revised USAID Checklist (per ADS 201.3.5.8). The BAME team employed an assessment methodology that included: (1) an examination of USAID/Brazil mission and PCAB IP project documentation provided by the USAID mission and by IPs; and (2) structured DQA Team interviews with current principal PCAB IP representatives involved in collecting and handling data to measure the standard indicators they report to the Mission.
- This 2017 PCAB DQA found that both USAID/Brazil and its PCAB IPs have taken steps to develop plans and processes for good PCAB indicator data collection and indicator reporting. The DQA also identifies areas of IP PCAB M&E Plans – particularly the Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS) – that need clarification and further information to assure high quality data collection and reporting.
- Overall, the PCAB standard indicator data are collected within acceptable time and resource constraints, particularly where local partner activity reports and administrative records can be consulted and used as resources and documentation.
- The PCAB IPs should be recognized for their timeliness in reporting and their integrity for safeguarding the indicator data they collect, manage and report. In particular, the 2017 DQA concludes that each of the PCAB IPs has in place practical data management systems with controls and safeguards against unauthorized access.
- Standard Indicator EG 10.2-4 (Number of people trained ...) is an example where PCAB data presented validity uncertainties because data collection methods appear to result in possible under-reporting of the impact of training activities. IPs report almost uniformly report the numbers of persons who successfully complete workshop training to measure this indicator. Limiting “people trained” strictly to workshop participation, however, overlooks the skills transfer and development that IPs are also providing to their local partners and beneficiary community organizations. This happens through on-the-job skills transfer when beneficiaries are working beside IP sponsored technicians, who are guiding them on the use of innovative technologies for habitat monitoring. As a result, standard indicator EG.10.2-4 may be under reported for some IP activities.
- The DQA team is main concerned about data validity with Indicator EG.10.2-2: “# of hectares of biologically significant areas under improved natural resource management (including broad management improvements, capacity building) as a result of USG assistance”. The indicator is valid to the extent that the work of the IPs in improving management does generally improve the management of the Conservation Units, though the linkage is not strong and clear. The USAID Mission appears to be aware of EG.10.2-2 issues because it has introduced a custom indicator whose validity linkage appears much stronger, that it calls a ‘subset of Indicator EG.10.2-2 “Number of hectares of biologically significant areas receiving direct application of improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance.”’
- Greatest confidence in data reliability exists for data measuring those PCAB indicators – particularly “EG.10.2-3 Number of people with improved economic benefits” EG.10.2-4 number of people trained....” which can be more closely tied to direct IP project interventions ... and USG support. Given the nature of the indicators covered in this DQA, the team believes that the processes employed are sufficiently reliable.

- Data precision largely applies only to PCAB Standard Indicator “*EG.10.2-1 # of hectares of biologically significant areas with improved biophysical conditions...*” Only one IP is explicitly employing sampling methods to measure this indicator for the entire area for which they are responsible under the PCAB program. The other IP uses official GOB statistics. PCAB reporting of this indicator may be somewhat constrained, as different methods are used, making it impossible to roll up indicator data for the IPs to produce one total PCAB program number.

DQA Recommendations for the PCAB Implementing Partners are:

- Revise and update their M&E plans with completed PIRS Annexes for each of the relevant indicators (among the 12 USAID/Brazil standard and custom indicators) that they are respectively required to report to the Mission. These updated M&E plans should document with sufficient detail how these indicators are defined and how data is collected to measure activity performance and impact. USAID’s Learning Lab can provide a template M&E plan as a model, and IPs should attempt to implement this as much as possible.
- Consider budgeting for at least one half-day IP staff orientation. This would introduce IPs to good indicator data collection practices, and would be facilitated by an outside expert. IPs could include this in their periodic or annual staff and local partner meetings. These M&E sessions should be targeted particularly at new staff members, given that all IPs have identified staff turn-over is an on-going reality of their work.

DQA recommendations for USAID/Brazil include:

- Move quickly to prepare complete PIRS for each of the mission’s required custom indicators. PIRS for these custom indicators involves the basic process of filling out the PIRS form for each indicator, providing basic information about how they are defined and measured, listing whom is responsible for reporting, and indicating when to report.
- Consider engaging a data systems specialist to better inform the Mission about the most cost-effective ways for implementing partners to collect standard and custom indicator data. This specialist should use this DQA as a base for assessing where existing, proven, innovative, and online-based monitoring and information communications technologies can be used for remote data entry by IPs. This would allow for real time data retrieval and visualization – both graphic and tabular – of indicator data by managers of USAID/B funded PCAB program activities.
- Consider engaging an M&E expert more directly in PCAB IP gatherings at least once annually. The expert would conduct half-day M&E workshops to build basic indicator data collection skills, foster feedback to USAID on data collection and reporting challenges, share experiences, and make suggestions on cost-effective data collection and measurement. The IP workshop could be based on findings about current standard indicator data procedures from this DQA Report.

Data Quality Assessment (DQA)

USAID/Brazil

Partnership for the Conservation of the Brazilian Amazon (PCAB)

INTRODUCTION

The Data Quality Analysis (DQA) Process

USAID requires that field missions complete periodic data quality analyses (DQAs) for standard indicators reported externally, i.e., USAID/Washington. These DQAs should be conducted for all development assistance activities over a certain annual funding level at least every three years. To be useful for monitoring, and credible for reporting program performance and impact, data should reasonably meet these five quality criteria:

- **Validity** – Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result.
- **Reliability** – Data should reflect stable and consistent data collections processes and analysis methods over time.
- **Timeliness** – Data should be available at a useful frequency, should be current, and should be timely enough to influence management decision making.
- **Precision** – Data should have a sufficient level of detail to permit management decision making.
- **Integrity** – Data collected should have safeguards to minimize the risk of transcription error or data manipulation.

USAID ADS 201 guidance provides a DQA Checklist for assessing data used to measure performance (output) and impact (outcome) indicators using these five quality standards. This USAID/Brazil 2017 Data Quality Assessment (DQA) follows revised USAID ADS 201.3.5.8 guidance both in the collection of information from IPs in the field as well as in the structure and content of this report. Specifically,

- Information for this report was collected and compiled using the revised DQA Checklist.
- This DQA report also follows the “Template for the DQA Report” contained in the USAID “Methods and Processes for Conducting Data Quality Assessments, December 2014 (located on the USAID.gov website and which supplements ADS guidance).

As part of its Development Objective Grant Agreement (DOAG) with the Brazilian Government, USAID/Brazil has a draft mission-wide Evaluation and Monitoring Plan and Results Framework that identify the data sources to be used for tracking and reporting the performance and impact of the development assistance activities per the USAID ADS 210.3.5.8, “To ensure that the quality of evidence from a performance monitoring system is sufficient for decision making...”

The Partnership for the Conservation of the Brazilian Amazon (PCAB)

This report summarizes an analysis of the quality of the data used to measure five standard performance (output) and impact (outcome) indicators of the Partnership for the Conservation of the Brazilian Amazon (PCAB) activity. The scope of this DQA is limited to these standard indicators and does not include additional custom indicators that PCAB IPs have agreed with USAID to report as well. These custom indicators may be part of a second stage DQA in 2018. This DQA took place during the month of December 2017 and follows information provided in the draft “PCAB Performance Monitoring Plan” September 2016, covering the implementation period Spring 2016 to Fall 2017.

The PCAB contributes to the Mission’s Development Objective Agreement (DOAG) goal of “*Enhanced biodiversity conservation of the Brazilian Amazon protected area system.*” To achieve this goal, PCAB grant component activities contribute to one or more of three sub-purposes or results:

- Result (Purpose) 1: Biodiversity conservation efforts strengthened in the overall protected areas system and in priority protected areas;
- Result (Purpose) 2: Indigenous communities and other key actors better protect indigenous lands and natural resources
- Result (Purpose) 3: Government, academia and other key partners apply science, technology and innovation to improve conservation.

The PCAB provides assistance through cooperative agreements to a series of activities aimed at achieving these PCAB results under a USAID and GOB strategic partnership – the PCAB. The PCAB is a five-year (2016-2021), \$53 million agreement with the Government of Brazil’s Ministry of Environment, the Chico Mendes Institute for Biodiversity Conservation (ICMBio), and National Indigenous Foundation (FUNAI) to strengthen priority protected areas, which includes both indigenous territories, as well as the National System of Units of Conservation (*Sistema Nacional de Unidades de Conservação*, SNUC). USAID implements the partnership jointly with ICMBio, FUNAI, Brazilian NGOs, the private sector, and the U.S. Forest Service.

Specifically, through PCAB the USAID/Brazil mission is working to:

- 1) Improve biodiversity conservation in selected protected areas in the Amazon by strengthening protected area management and implementation, in particular expanding public use and tourism in key PAs and strengthening sustainable value chains in others;
- 2) Support indigenous communities and other local Amazonian actors to manage indigenous lands and natural resources through implementation support of Brazil’s National “Policy for Territorial and Environmental Management of Indigenous Lands” (PNGATI);
- 3) Partner with Government, academia and others to apply science, technology, innovation and partnerships to improve conservation in the Brazilian Amazon region.

PCAB Program Implementing Partners and Components

Four principal IPs currently implement components of the PCAB program in various areas of the Brazilian Amazon. Along with these four IPs, other Brazilian organizations are in the early stages of their PCAB participation. Recommendations in this document will be particularly relevant for them as they build their M&E systems. The USAID BAME project M&E specialists support PCAB data collection to measure performance and impact

indicators used by the Mission to track and report results achieved by each of the current principle PCAB IPs.

Equipe de Conservação da Amazonia (ECAM) - ECAM implements a PCAB component designed to introduce digital technologies as tools to support the management of selected Amazonian Indigenous Territories and their natural resources. The project reaches three distinct publics: 1) indigenous peoples and *quilombola* communities; 2) institutions such as FUNAI and NGOs; and 3) small producers. The formal partners are: FUNAI, Fundação Palmares and other NGOs, who will receive training to use the project technologies; Imaflora and Natura are trained to use tools with small producers; and ISA receives training and qualification of the project technologies.

The project's expectation is that by 2020 the beneficiaries of the program will be able to use state-of-the-art digital technologies to manage the territorial areas where they live. In the medium term, it is expected that there will be an increase in the participation of indigenous communities the use of IT tools to increase the opportunities for communities living in protected areas to access markets through improved data sharing.

ECAM component activities impact the conservation of biodiversity in an indirect way. With the use of the project tools the management capacity of the beneficiary public will improve and with that it will be possible to make use of natural resources without negatively affecting biodiversity. The project itself already has a very strong character of knowledge production, in view of the work done for the use of technologies. In addition, there is the idea of registering stories of project participants and disseminating these stories on the internet, with the location of the actors being georeferenced.

Support for the quilombolas is a central activity of the ECAM grant. Young *quilombolas* were trained to carry out socio-economic surveys and collect information needed to plan future communities. There is also assistance in the development and implementation of PGTAs (Management Plans of Indigenous Areas) which in turn should positively affect socioeconomic development. The communities benefited by the component are equipped to collect socioeconomic data for use in the internal planning of each territory. The collaboration of the project takes place through training in the use of the technological tools. This generates information that can be used by *quilombolas* for policy and legal (including land) reform advocacy.

Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil (IEB) - The main objective is to implement PNGATI in the southern region of Amazonas state, through the strengthening of indigenous associations. The IEB component includes advisory help for indigenous communities to implement PGTAs in TIs. IEB will help indigenous associations to implement the PNGATIs independently and foster spaces for dialogue between residents of PAs and indigenous peoples, as well as FUNAI and ICMBio.

Expected results include: policy implementation (PNGATI); institutional strengthening of indigenous associations; income generation through the PGTAs in the Tis; and, finally, a stronger alliance between indigenous peoples and those who extract forest resources so that they can jointly combat deforestation in the southern Amazon. IEB has a formal partnership as leader with OPAN and informal partnerships through a network of seven indigenous associations, partnerships with FUNAI, ICMBio, and 10 other extractive associations. The component supports production and commercialization of *pirarucu* fish, Brazil nut, and also non-timber products.

Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas (IPE) – The IPE component promotes social involvement in protected areas through local community participation in biodiversity conservation management. The component generates information that can serve as inputs for decision making in management actions within the PAs. The component fosters local monitoring of

biodiversity and natural resources in a participatory manner. Formal partnerships are only recently being signed. Institutions that contribute to the project activities: WCS, IMPA, Projeto Pé de Pincha of UFAM, State Secretariat of the Environment of Amazonas and ICMBio. The most important partnership is with ICMBio that participates in all relevant decisions.

United States Forest Service Reciprocal Agency Service Agreement (RASA) - The USFS

RASA includes four component activities:

- Strengthening value chains for selected Brazilian Amazon products;
- Improve the management of selected Protected Areas;
- Develop sustainable public use plans for selected protected areas – e.g., eco-tourism
- Improved GOB forest fire management capacity

An innovative face of the USFS project is its partnership with the Brazilian government that can provide the sharing of USFS knowledge through participatory workshops and courses. One objective is to improve the organization of production and the retention of a larger share of the revenues by participants in Amazon product value chains and incorporation, into the ICMBio, of the knowledge shared and developed in the project. USFS partners are the Brazilian Forestry Institute, OPAN, Imaflora, IEB, three American universities and Conservation Strategy Fund (CSF).

The four components of the project contribute to biodiversity, conservation, and socio-economic development. USFS component activities help increase participants' incomes as well as strengthen social organization. An example is community value chain associations creating access to working capital, which makes it possible to organize production and marketing. These lower cost-saving technologies, and the higher sales prices from better quality products sold raise participants' incomes

PCAB Standard and Custom Indicators

The DQA Team has identified 12 standard and custom indicators that USAID/Brazil requires IPs – where relevant for a particular IP's components –to collect to measure and report the performance and impact of their grant activities. Of those 12 indicators, IPs are currently collecting data to measure five standard indicators and seven custom indicators.

USAID/Brazil also reports a sixth standard indicator, *“EG.13-6 Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, estimated in metric tons of CO² equivalent, reduced, sequestered, or avoided through sustainable landscapes activities supported by USG assistance.* At present, the Mission calculates the results of this indicator, and none of the IPs is collecting data specifically to measure it, so it is not included in this DQA at this time. Calculations are made in the USAID AFOLU tool based on the sizes and types of protected areas and the type of protection or conservation or development activities taking place on them. BAME has put in place a procedure to document how USAID calculated this in 2016 and 2017. When USAID/Brazil provides this information it will be included in the DQA Report.

This 2017 DQA Report covers five standard indicators included in the *PCAB Monitoring and Evaluation Plan* and required by USAID/Brazil to be tracked, measured and reported when applicable. The PIRS descriptions of the PCAB USAID standard indicators were employed. The five required standard indicators covered in this DQA Report are listed in Table 1 and the DQA Checklists for these are included in Annex C of this report and their corresponding PIRS are included by reference in Annex B.

1. EG.10.2-1: Number of hectares of biologically significant areas showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (*Outcome Indicator*)
2. EG.10.2-2: Number of hectares of biologically significant areas under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance (including broad management improvements, capacity building/) (*Output Indicator*)
3. EG.10.2-3: Number of people with improved economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and/or biodiversity conservation as a result of USG assistance (*Outcome Indicator*)
4. EG.10.2-4: Number of people trained in sustainable natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation as a result of USG assistance (*Output Indicator*)
5. EG.10.2-5: Number of laws, policies, or regulations that address biodiversity conservation and/or other environmental themes officially proposed, adopted, or implemented as a result of USG assistance (*Output Indicator*)

Each of the four PCAB IPs included here is responsible for collecting and reporting data on one or more of the standard indicators covered in this DQA as relevant to their program (See Table 1) as well as on selected custom indicators. The standard indicators, for which this DQA analysis is conducted, along with the reporting IPs are listed in Table 1. The entire list of 12 indicators is included in Table 2.

Table 1: PCAB Standard Results Indicators & Reporting Implementing Partners				
Standard Results Indicators*	Implementing Partner			
	ECA M	IEB	IPE	USFS
<u>EG.10.2-1</u> : Number of hectares of biologically significant areas showing improved biophysical conditions		X	X	X
<u>EG.10.2-2</u> : # of hectares of biologically significant areas under improved natural resource management (NRM)	X	X	X	X
<u>EG.10.2-3</u> : # of people with improved economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and/or biodiversity conservation	X	X		X
<u>EG.10.2-4</u> : # of people trained in sustainable natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation	X	X	X	X
<u>EG.10.2-5</u> : Number of laws, policies, or regulations that address biodiversity conservation and/or other environmental themes officially proposed, adopted, or implemented			X	
<u>EG. 13-6</u> : (formerly 4.8-7b) Greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, estimated in metric tons of CO ² equivalent, reduced, sequestered, or avoided through sustainable landscapes activities	X**	X**	X**	X**
* PCAB standard indicators for which one or more of the IPs has reporting responsibility. ** Calculated by USAID after IP results are reported for Indicator EG.10.2.2; USAID/B to be consulted for final assessment of this indicator.				

All PCAB indicators examined here are used by the USAID/Brazil Mission in its Program Performance Report (PPR). Some of the indicator data that the Mission reports to USAID/Washington are 'rolled up' with data from other USAID country programs to report progress toward the Agency's goals at the global level.

Table 2: PCAB Results Indicators Required by USAID/Brazil		
PCAB Indicator	Type	Observation
Standard Indicators – Covered in this DQA (EG 13.6 in final version)		

<u>EG.10.2-1</u> : Number of hectares of biologically significant areas showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	Included in this DQA; PIRS available
<u>EG.10.2-2</u> : Number of hectares of biologically significant areas under improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance (including broad management improvements, capacity building) as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	Included in this DQA; PIRS available
<u>EG.10.2-3</u> : Number of people with improved economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and/or biodiversity conservation as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	Included in this DQA; PIRS available
<u>EG.10.2-4</u> : Number of people trained in sustainable natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation as a result of USG assistance	Output	Included in this DQA; PIRS available
<u>EG.10.2-5</u> : Number of laws, policies, or regulations that address biodiversity conservation and/or other environmental themes officially proposed, adopted, or implemented as a result of USG assistance	Output	Included in this DQA; PIRS available
<u>EG 13-6</u> : Amount of CO ² emissions reduced as a result of USG assistance (Not included here - to be included in a later DQA)	Outcome	Included in final DQA version; PIRS available; IPs not collecting data
Custom Indicators – to be included in a future DQA (N/N = no number)		
<u>N/N</u> : Number of hectares of biologically significant areas receiving direct, measurable, application of improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance	Outcome	Custom subset of EG.10.2-2
<u>N/N</u> : Number of people applying improved technologies, methodologies, processes and/or management tools	Outcome	PIRS & data collection guidance needed
<u>N/N</u> : Number of associations, groups or organizations trained in sustainable natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation, including organizational capacity building for improved management, as a result of USG assistance	Output	PIRS & data collection guidance needed
<u>N/N</u> : Number of associations, groups, organizations or institutions applying improved technologies, methods, process and/or science for sustainable natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation, as a result of USG assistance	Output	PIRS & data collection guidance needed
<u>EG 6.2</u> : PPP3 (partnerships) Number of organizations (for and not-for-profit, and government) that have applied new technologies and/or management	Outcome	PIRS & data collection guidance needed
<u>N/N</u> : Number of people benefitting from USG-supported Public-Private Partnerships (PPP) (e.g. same as people trained for ECAM, Natura)	Output	PIRS & data collection guidance needed
<u>EG 6.2</u> : custom (partnerships) Amount of investment mobilized/leveraged (in USD) for improved natural resource management, biodiversity conservation, climate, sustainable livelihoods, and/or other environmental themes as supported by USG assistance	Outcome	PIRS & data collection guidance needed

METHODOLOGY

The BAME Task Order 2017 Work Plan includes a 2017 DQA for PCAB Indicator reporting. BAME started this process in June 2017 with visiting the IP offices and conducting an in-depth review of their M&E systems. Material from this review is used in this DQA report, particularly in the program descriptions. Following that, in October and November, when the IP schedules allowed, BAME team members went directly to IPs to give more in-depth M&E training. This training included discussions of the required qualities of good performance and impact indicator data – Validity, Integrity, Precision, Reliability and Timeliness (VIPRT) – as well as the place and importance of preparing and following guidance documented in Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS). The training also included a presentation of the components and characteristics of a good M&E Plan, as well as what would be expected for the five DQA VIPRT criteria.

During the month of December 2017 BAME DQA team members conducted documentation reviews and PCAB staff interviews for the first stage of the 2017 DQA. Prior to conducting interviews, the BAME DQA team first reviewed the USAID handbook PIRS descriptions of the standard indicators as well as PCAB activity documentation including the draft PCAB M&E Plan, and other documentation listed in Annex A of this report. The BAME DQA team also obtained and reviewed the new USAID ADP 201 Data Quality Guidance and DQA checklist to conduct interviews. The DQA team used the USAID DQA checklist interview to produce an interview protocol to record PCAB IP staff responses to questions related to the five data quality criteria. (See Annex D)

The specific steps that the BAME DQA team followed in December 2017 were:

- Pre-DQA Planning: Conduct an initial launch meeting with the PCAB implementing partner M&E specialists to discuss the DQA goals and scope and to arrange the interview schedule and logistics.
- DQA Assessment Preparation: Develop a form to guide the gathering and recording information; and use the form to carry out technical interviews with implementing partners' staff and key informants – and, where possible, review documentation on indicator data collection and reporting procedures.
- Implementing Partner Engagement: Conduct interview with key M&E and data reporting staff of the PCAB activity in their places of work to assess how their data collection, handling, and reporting processes conform to the DQA checklist criteria.
- Assessment and Reporting: Review field notes for completeness and accuracy, and analyze information and evidence obtained from interviews to complete the DQA Checklist, including a summary discussion of major findings and recommendations.

Each of these steps was followed for analyzing the quality of data collection and reporting for each of the standard indicators in this DQA Report.

FINDINGS

General

The DQA Team found that PCAB standard indicator data sufficiently meet all five data quality criteria to be used with confidence by USAID/Brazil for reporting changes in results indicators. Generally, PCAB IPs are following USAID approved data collection and indicator measurement methodologies as part of their required M&E processes. The IP's M&E Plans – along with their respective standard indicators to be tracked - generally contain sufficient levels of detail to be able to document the data collection, management, and indicator measurement and reporting procedures used. The M&E Plans examined by the DQA Team, however, do not contain copies of the USAID approved PIRS as annexes either in English or Portuguese but refer to these only by reference. Therefore the DQA Team could not find evidence that these PIRS were sufficiently distributed to or used by IP M&E staffs and their local partners collecting and reporting indicator data.

For the standard indicators examined in this report, the PCAB IPs have submitted to USAID their methodologies for data collection and indicator calculation as part of their respective PCAB M&E Plans. However, an analysis of those M&E plan versions that were available to the DQA team reveal different degrees of detail and completeness, and, in some cases, inconsistencies in measurement methods for the same indicator to be reported. In most cases these plans follow USAID's PIRS guidance.

It is noteworthy that the DQA team could not find comparable PIRS for the custom indicators that IPs collect data to report. In some cases, the DQA team learned that similar methods and procedures are followed for collecting and handling custom indicator data, which may themselves be subsets or variations of standard indicator. At present, it is expected that a second stage of DQA will be undertaken to cover these custom indicators. General findings for the five standard indicators in this DQA report are summarized in Table 3.

Standard Results Indicators	Quality of the Data Collected
<u>EG.10.2-1</u> : Number of hectares of biologically significant areas showing improved biophysical conditions	<u>Acceptable</u> – Use of the same data sources or sampling procedures would enable the mission to roll up totals for this indicator across IPs.
<u>EG.10.2-2</u> : # of hectares of biologically significant areas under improved natural resource management (NRM)	<u>Acceptable</u> – Reliability can be enhanced by using more uniform definitions by all IPs for key terms and similar procedures for reporting data.
<u>EG.10.2-3</u> : # of people with improved economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and/or biodiversity conservation	<u>Acceptable</u> – This indicator conforms with the PIRS but counting is challenged by the range of economic activities in which PCAB beneficiaries are engaged.
<u>EG.10.2-4</u> : # of people trained in sustainable natural resources management and/or biodiversity conservation	<u>Acceptable</u> – This indicator conforms with the PIRS but does not include people trained through one-on-one on the job training with IP technicians which results in under-reporting.
<u>EG.10.2-5</u> : Number of laws, policies, or regulations that address biodiversity conservation and/or other environmental themes officially proposed, adopted, or implemented	<u>Acceptable</u> – This indicator conforms with the PIRS and employs over time a uniform source of official information for objective reporting.

Clear indicator definitions and data collection procedures are extremely important for standard USAID/Brazil reporting. This is because the Agency seeks to 'roll up' measures of these standard indicators from the Brazil PCAB, along with similar activity indicator data from other USAID country programs around the world, to report global figures. For example,

indicator data on areas with improved bio-physical conditions or reductions in CO² emissions. Data quality is particularly important in these cases, with regards to ensuring uniformity in collection and measurement methodologies, to permit reliable aggregation of data reported by IPs to national, regional, and global levels.

Validity - Data should clearly and adequately represent the intended result.

This DQA validity criteria is particularly important because each of the current four PCAB implementing partners has its own reporting staff and follows distinct calendars for different populations of activity beneficiaries, in different locations of the Brazilian Amazon. As a result, it is unlikely that all PCAB IPs use the same data collection procedures when compiling data for the same standard indicator. The PIRS provide general indicator definitions and describe options for collecting indicator data, but IPs often adopt and adapt this guidance to meet their individual requirements.

Standard Indicator *EG 10.2-4 "Number of people trained ..."* is an example where PCAB data present validity uncertainties because data collection methods appear to result in possible under-reporting the impact of training activities. IPs correctly and uniformly collect data on the numbers of persons who successfully complete workshop training to measure this indicator, as defined by the indicator PIRS. However, limiting "people trained" strictly to workshop participation overlooks the skills transfer and development that IPs are also providing to their local partners and beneficiary community organizations.

The IPs do this through on-the-job skills transfer when beneficiaries are working beside IP sponsored technicians, who are guiding them on the use of innovative technologies for habitat monitoring. As a result, USAID/Brazil most likely under-reports the total number of persons with increased skills as an output of PCAB activities when only using this indicator.

Among the DQA team's greatest concerns about data validity is Indicator *EG.10.2-2: "# of hectares of biologically significant areas under improved natural resource management (including broad management improvements, capacity building) as a result of USG assistance."* The indicator is valid to the extent that the work of the IPs does improve the management of the Conservation Units generally, though the linkage is not strong and clear. The USAID Mission appears to be aware of EG.10.2-2 issues because it has introduced a custom indicator which it calls a *'Subset of Indicator EG.10.2-2 "Number of hectares of biologically significant areas receiving direct application of improved natural resource management as a result of USG assistance,"* whose validity appears much stronger.

Reliability - Data should reflect stable and consistent data collections processes and analysis methods over time.

The DQA Team finds that all IP's have in place methods for collecting data that they are following, although the PCAB has not been functioning long enough to determine if this will be kept up during future reporting periods. Equally important, IPs employ similar methods across the sites for which they are responsible. It is important to note that not all IPs have formalized these methods in writing, but there was unambiguous willingness from all IPs to work with the BAME team to develop written protocols.

Generally, IPs employ similar procedures to assure uniformity among them in data collection methods over time and between locations where IPs are implementing activities. The DQA Team had access to very limited available documentation of guidance provided their local partners and staffs for measuring the PCAB indicators for which they were responsible, though the IPs did indicate they would provide copies of the protocols they use to the DQA

Team for review. The DQA team has the most confidence in data reliability for measuring those PCAB indicators – particularly “EG.10.2-3 Number of people with improved economic benefits” *EG.10.2-4 number of people trained,*” – which can be more closely tied to direct IP project interventions.

The DQA team also learned from interview respondents that staff turn-overs, particularly among their local sub-grantee partner staffs, which requires results in new staff taking up data collection without having had sufficient guidance or orientation to the processes to follow and the definitions to use. IPs attempt to address this turn-over problem with periodic M&E trainings for local partner staffs; but that these trainings do not always include all those in need of M&E orientation.

Timeliness - Data should be available at a useful frequency, should be current, and should be timely enough to influence management decision making.

All the PCAB indicator data are currently being collected within acceptable time and resource constraints, particularly where local partner activity reports and administrative records are used as data resources and to document indicators reported to USAID/Brazil.

The 2017 DQA concludes that all PCAB IPs have in place adequate schedules and procedures for prompt reporting of standard indicators from data collected from their own programs and from their local partners. This is true for current levels of PCAB program activities. However, this may be more challenging if IPs projects expand to cover more areas and beneficiaries. In such a situation an Internet-based online platform for handling this added level of data reporting will be critical to continued timely reporting.

In most instances, IPs collect and compile indicator data on a quarterly basis and report that updated indicators to the Mission within the same quarter. This frequency is considered adequate to support decision-making of the type necessary for management of PCAB activity components. For some selected (output) indicators – for example, “*EG.10.1-4: Number of people trained...*” – data are collected on a schedule that is planned around the training periods of each IP and those programs each have their own calendars and completion dates. Measures of these indicators are updated and reported within weeks after data are collected at the training events and reported in time for meeting the next PCAB report submission deadline.

Precision - Data should have a sufficient level of detail to permit management decision making.

Generally, for the standard indicators being measured the units of measure are precise enough to capture change and measure results, particularly for individuals trained and laws, etc. promoted, etc. The nature of the indicator of people with improved economic benefits is that it is subject to interpretation where units could be either families or individuals or individuals and their families directly benefitting from participation. But this difference in interpretation does not appear significant enough to affect decision-making. For those indirectly benefitting, such as family members or other members of a cooperative receiving the benefits of higher process or new techniques, it is less precise. As long as there is a consistent and justifiable definition, this is acceptable.

Data precision is a concern for PCAB Standard Indicator “*EG.10.2-1: # of hectares of biologically significant areas with improved bio-physical conditions....*” which is the only indicator reviewed in this DQA for which statistical sampling occurs. The sources of data for areas showing improved biophysical conditions vary among the two IPS reporting this

indicator. One IP uses official GOB statistics that employ sampling that follows the best possible accepted scientific methods. The other IP takes a 20% sample of the entire area for which it is responsible under the PCAB program. The DQA team could find no reports that these procedures adversely decision-making processes. PCAB reporting of this indicator may be somewhat constrained, however, because it is not possible to perfectly roll up indicator data for the IPs to produce one total PCAB program number, as each IP uses different statistical sampling methods.

Integrity - Data collected should have safeguards to minimize the risk of transcription error or data manipulation.

All PCAB implementing partners have in place measures for handling and controlling the current level of data resources they manage and use for indicator measurement and reporting. To ensure data integrity, the IP's use reporting protocols and forms that assure standard responses and facilitate the accurate transcription of data from paper to electronic formats. IPs also employ ground truthing protocols to verify accuracy and reliability of local partner reporting. This ground truthing includes, for example, copies of actual signed workshop registration and attendance forms, for individuals trained and copies of official documents where proposed, or approved laws etc. have been published.

Local partners directly report on the relevant indicators using the reporting forms developed by their PCAB Implementing Partner. The local partners can thus upload the data from assessments, training reports, and capacity evaluations. Once data is sent to an IP's central office, IP M&E staff handling the data exercise password protected controls to preclude unauthorized access. Therefore, scope for abuse of PCAB data handling and reporting is minimal. All original data forms are available for later verification.

The DQA Team understands from its IP interviews that none of their staffs received sufficient training and orientation to indicator data collection and reporting procedures required of them by USAID/Brazil. While IP's records show that they conducted brief orientations to USAID/Brazil reporting requirements and deadlines, DQA IP interview respondents uniformly indicated that they could have benefitted from more orientation to the definitions of standard indicators and what data were required for their measurement.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS

DQA Recommendations for the PCAB Implementing Partners include:

- Based on monitoring experience gained so far in the PCAB activities, IPs should consider revising and updating their M&E plans with completed PIRS Annexes for each of the relevant indicators among the 5 USAID/Brazil standard indicators they are required to report to the Mission (where applicable). These updated PCAB M&E Plans should follow the provided standard document with sufficient detail on how these indicators are defined and how data are collected to measure activity performance and impact.
- Each IP should consider including at least one half-day IP staff orientation to Monitoring and Evaluation. This would introduce IPs to good indicator data collection practices, and would be facilitated by an outside expert. IPs could include this in their periodic or annual staff and local partner meetings. These M&E sessions should be designed both to review data collection procedures and include any revisions since the last meeting. These should be targeted particularly at new staff members, given that all IPs have identified staff turn-over is an on-going reality of their work.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR USAID/BRAZIL

DQA recommendations for USAID/Brazil include:

- Move quickly to prepare complete PIRS for each of the custom indicators for which it requires IP reporting. Custom indicators - not covered in this DQA - do not have the finalized PIRSSs. Preparing of PIRSSs for these custom indicators involves the straightforward process of filling out the PIRS form for each indicator, providing basic information about how they are defined and measured, listing whom is responsible for reporting, and describing when to report. Results of this DQA show that IPs do follow PIRSSs when available, and, therefore, quick completion of PIRSSs will help ensure better quality of data for the custom indicators.
- Consider engaging a data systems specialist to better inform the Mission about the most cost-effective ways for implementing partners to collect indicator data. This specialist should use this DQA as a base for assessing where existing, proven, innovative, and online-based monitoring and information communications technologies can be used for remote data entry by IPs. This would assure that data collection continues to be reliable when IP area coverage and reporting requirements increase. This would also allow for real time data retrieval and visualization – both graphic and tabular – of indicator data by managers of USAID/B funded PCAB program activities.
- Consider engaging M&E experts more directly in PCAB IP gatherings at least once annually. The expert would conduct half-day M&E workshops to build basic indicator data collection skills, foster feedback to USAID on data collection and reporting challenges, share experiences, and make suggestions on cost-effective data collection and measurement. The workshop could begin with a presentation of findings on current standard indicator data procedures from this DQA Report.

ANNEX A: DOCUMENTS REVIEWED AND PERSONS CONTACTED

PCAB and USAID Documentation Reviewed

Equipe de Conservação da Amazônia (ECAM). Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. February 2017

_____. Annual Report. 2017.

_____. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. February 2017.

_____. Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. July 2017.

_____. PCAB Indicators for Reporting. October 2017.

_____. PCAB Indicators for Reporting. November 2017.

Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas (IPÊ). Monitoring and Evaluation Plan. July 2017.

_____. Beatriz, Maria N. Ribeiro and Wadt, Lúcia H. O. PROTOCOLO DE MONITORAMENTO DO EXTRATIVISMO DA CASTANHA-DAAMAZÔNIA NA RESERVA EXTRATIVISTA DO CAZUMBÁ-IRACEMA. No date.

Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil (IEB). Project Nossa Terra: Indigenous Territorial Management in the South of Amazonas. Annual Report (October 2016 to September 2017), FY 2017-19. Agreement No. AID-512-A-17-00001. October 31, 2017.

_____. Our Land Project: Indigenous Territorial Management in the Southern Amazon State. Activity Monitoring & Evaluation Plan (FY 2017 – 2019). Including Annex 2 Table of Results Indicators

_____. M&E Plan FY17 for AID 512-A-16-0002

_____. Relatório Anual 1 2017 for AID-512-A-17-00001 October 31, 2017

Management Systems International (MSI). Data Quality Assessment, Final Report. Brazil Environment Program Assessment Services. Produced for USAID. August 22, 2012.

USFS. List of Protected Areas with Direct and Indirect Investments of PCAB.

_____. USFS FY 2016-17: USAID Standard Indicator Reporting Table. Nov 22, 2017

_____. Logic Trees: Public Use and Value Chains

_____. Theory of Change: Public Use and Value Chains;

USAID/Brazil. Brazil Development Objective Grant Agreement (DOAG). July 10, 2014.

_____. PCAB Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP). September 2016.

_____, PCAB THEORY OF CHANGE (Draft). October 16, 2017

_____. Theories of Change by Intermediate Result. May 2017.

_____. Partnership to Conserve Amazon Biodiversity, Project Appraisal Document (PAD). February 24, 2016.

_____. Brazil Development Objective Grant Agreement (DOAG). July 10, 2014.

_____. 1o Encontro Dos Parceiros do Programa do Meio Ambiente da USAID, Parceria Para a Conservação da Amazônia Brasileira (PCAB), May 25, 2017

USAID/W. Template for the DQA Report.

Organizations and Persons Contacted

Table A-1 Partnership for the Conservation of the Brazilian Amazon (PCAB) – Organizations and Persons Interviewed		
Implementing Partner (IP) Organization	Standard Indicators Reported	IP Interview Dates, Interview Participants and Participating DQA Team Members
ECAM	EG.10.2-2 EG.10.2-3 EG.10.2-4	<u>Interview Date:</u> December 13, 2017 <u>Interviewee:</u> Anthony Anderson, M&E Coordinator <u>Interviewers:</u> P. Church, J. Campari, D. Baker, T. Fernandes
IPE	EG.10.2-1 EG.10.2-2 EG.10.2-4 EG.10.2-5	<u>Interview Date:</u> December 14, 2017 <u>Interviewees:</u> Cristina Tofoli, Coordenadora Executiva do Projeto Pollyanda Figueira de Lemos, Coordenadora do Projeto Fabiana Proado, Gerente do Projeto Debora Lehmann, Assistente de Projetos <u>Interviewers:</u> P. Church, J. Campari, D. Baker, T. Fernandes
IEB	EG.10.2-1 EG.10.2-2 EG.10.2-3 EG.10.2-4	<u>Interview Date:</u> <u>Interviewees:</u> Cloude de Souza Correia, Indigenous Lands Coord. Magno de Lima dos Santos, Indigenous Lands Specialist <u>Interviewers:</u> P. Church, J. Campari, D. Baker, T. Fernandes
USFS	EG.10.2-2 EG.10.2-3 EG.10.2-4	<u>Interview Date:</u> December 18, 2017 <u>Interviewees:</u> Kirsten Silvius, M&E POC & VC and Sustainable Livelihoods Coordinator <u>Interviewers:</u> P. Church, J. Campari, D. Baker,
The DevTech BAME Brazil Office arranged all interview appointments for the DQA team.		

ANNEX B: DQA STANDARD INDICATOR CHECK LISTS

DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-1

Hectares of Biologically Significant Areas with Improved Biophysical Conditions

This Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Checklist is to assist in assessing each of the five data quality criteria and provide a convenient manner in which to document analysis findings.

USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name: USAID/BRAZIL	
Title of Performance Indicator:	EG.10.2-1: Number of hectares of biologically significant areas showing improved biophysical conditions as a result of USG assistance (Outcome Indicator)
Linkage to Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure, if applicable (i.e. Program Area, Element, etc.):	Supports USAID/Brazil Development Cooperative Agreement
Result This Indicator Measures:	PCAB Result (Purpose) 1: Biodiversity conservation efforts strengthened in the overall protected areas system and in priority protected areas
Data Source(s):	Sample surveys of 20% of targeted protected areas are used by IPE to track changes in biophysical conditions in the target areas for which they are responsible. IEB reports directly on the Number of hectares with areas of agriculture without fire (SAF) presenting better biophysical conditions. USFS reports only hectares of lakes under protection for pirarucu management, where data show increased fish populations.
Partner(s) or Contractor(s) Who Provided the Data:	IEB, Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil IPE, Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas USFS, US Forest Service
Period for Which the Data Are Being Reported:	Spring 2016 – Fall 2017
Is This Indicator a Standard or Custom Indicator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator <input type="checkbox"/> Custom (created by the OU; not standard)
Data Quality Assessment methodology:	BAME team review of relevant documentation and interviews with the PCAB implementing partner staffs responsible for collecting data to measure and report this indicator.
Date(s) of Assessment:	December 7-21, 2017
Assessment Team Members:	Phillip E. Church, DevTech Senior Economist and M&E Specialist Joao Campari, BAME Team Leader Doug Baker, DevTech Senior Director for Strategic Operations Tassila Fernandes, BAME M&E Specialist
<i>USAID Mission/OU Verification of DQA</i>	
Contracting Officer Representative approval	
X _____	

		Y	N	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.)	X		The DQA gives a qualified ‘Yes’ to this criterion. The DQA team could not find evidence of an identical definition of ‘biophysical conditions’ that IPs are using. Different measurement methods and possibly different key data definitions can limit data validity but variation is also according to the program activities.
2	Do results collected fall within a plausible range?	X		Likely improved areas reported appear reasonable given IP levels of engagement in the field.
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)?	X		One IP checks sample data provided by its local partners but challenges them to defend their numbers when asked. The other IP accepts GOB data as valid given its prior review.
4	Are sound research methods being used to collect the data?	X		IPs work with causal models relating their PCAB interventions to changed biophysical conditions.
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?	X		Generally, IPs employ similar data collection procedures but further guidelines would help assure uniformity in data collection methods over time and between locations where IP’s are implementing activities.
2	Are data collection and analysis methods documented in writing and being used to ensure the same procedures are followed each time?	X		This criterion requires a qualified ‘Yes.’ Documentation exists but is does not appear always complete or uniform for all IP staffs who are collecting and compiling this data.
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?	X		All data for this indicator are reported annually and after it is collected from the field or available from official sources.
2	Are the data reported the most current practically available?	X		Data available for the most recently completed year are submitted to USAID as soon as it is available.
3	Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X		When USAID reporting requirements for this indicator fall within the implementation year, IPs provide data for the previous completed year.

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.)			N/A - One IP uses statistical sampling and others direct observation in collecting data for this indicator.
2	Has the margin of error been reported along with the data? (Only applicable to statistical samples.)			N/A
3	Is the data collection method/tool being used to collect the data fine-tuned or exact enough to register the expected change?	X		The basic unit of measure is the hectare and is uniform across all PCAB sites and areas.
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?		X	There is no evidence that IPs employ data transcription verification practices such as double entry to check for possible data entry errors.
2	Is there independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	X		The IPs have in place protocols for limiting access to the data only by appropriate M&E staff.
3	Are mechanisms in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data	X		M&E staff are free to report freely the data they collect and compile for this indicator.

SUMMARY	
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The BAME team concludes that the quality of this indicator data is satisfactory, but could be improved by all IPs collecting data to report this indicator. IPs need to better document data collection procedures for both the data sources –IP administered sample surveys and direct observation.
Significance of limitations (if any):	For IP-collected sample survey data, the IPs and their local partners have limited staffs for conducting annual assessments of changes in bio-physical conditions in target PCAB biologically significant areas
Actions needed to address limitations prior to the next DQA (given level of USG control over data):	Needed are a centralized location for documentation of methods used to collect data and for defining key terms (e.g., bio-physical conditions). Regular IP staff orientation in these procedures and definitions, particularly where there is staff turn-over is also warranted.

IF NO DATA ARE AVAILABLE FOR THE INDICATOR	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	N/A – Data are available for those IPs reporting this indicator

DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-2

Hectares of Biologically Significant Areas Under Improved Management

This Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Checklist is to assist in assessing each of the five data quality criteria and provide a convenient manner in which to document analysis findings.

USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name: USAID/BRAZIL	
Title of Performance Indicator:	EG.10.2-2: Number of hectares of biologically significant areas under improved natural resources management as a result of USG assistance (Outcome Indicator)
Linkage to Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure, if applicable (i.e. Program Area, Element, etc.):	Supports USAID/Brazil Development Cooperative Agreement
Result This Indicator Measures:	PCAB Result (Purpose) 1: Biodiversity conservation efforts strengthened in the overall protected areas system and in priority protected areas
Data Source(s):	IP project records and reports from local partners
Partner(s) or Contractor(s) Who Provided the Data:	ECAM, Equipe de Conservação da Amazônia IEB, Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil IPE, Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas USFS, United States Forest Service
Period for Which the Data Are Being Reported:	Spring 2016 – Fall 2017
Is This Indicator a Standard or Custom Indicator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator <input type="checkbox"/> Custom (created by the OU; not standard)
Data Quality Assessment methodology:	BAME team review of relevant documentation and interviews with the PCAB implementing partner staffs responsible for collecting data to measure and report this indicator.
Date(s) of Assessment:	December 7-21, 2017
Assessment Team Members:	Phillip E. Church, DevTech Senior Economist and M&E Specialist Joao Campari, BAME Team Leader Doug Baker, DevTech Senior Director for Strategic Operations Tassila Fernandes, BAME M&E Specialist
<i>USAID Mission/OU Verification of DQA</i>	
Contracting Officer Representative approval	
X_____	

		Y	N	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.)	X		IPs use data supplied by USAID for the size of areas improved to comply with reporting this indicator. There is no standard definition of “improved” available beyond accepting that all areas that receive assistance will have improved.
2	Do results collected fall within a plausible range?	X		No evidence is available as to what should be a plausible range for the IPs other than the targets set in their M&E Plans based on their work plans.
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)?	X		At the end of the year, IPs can verify that they did work on or did provide assistance to the PAs or UCs planned.
4	Are sound research methods being used to collect the data?	X		IPs work with a causal model relating PCAB interventions to areas under improved NRM
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?	X		IPs employ somewhat dissimilar data collection procedures though most likely uniform over time and among the sites for which they are responsible
2	Are data collection and analysis methods documented in writing and being used to ensure the same procedures are followed each time?	X		This criterion requires a qualified ‘Yes.’ Documentation exists but is not uniform among the IPs.
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?	X		All data for this indicator are reported annually and within a reasonable time period after it is collected from the field.
2	Are the data reported the most current practically available?	X		Data available for the most recently completed year are submitted to USAID as soon as it is available.
3	Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X		When USAID reporting requirements for this indicator fall within the implementation year, IPs provide data for the previous completed year.
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?			N/A
2	Has the margin of error been reported along with the data? (Only applicable to statistical samples.)			N/A
3	Is the data collection method/tool being used to collect the data fine-tuned or exact enough to register the expected change?	X		The basic unit of measure is the hectare and is uniform across all PCAB sites and areas.
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?	X	X	IPs report on the total area of programming according to official sizes.
2	Is there independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	X		The IPs have in place protocols for limiting access to the data only by appropriate M&E staff.
3	Are mechanisms in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data	X		M&E staff are free to report freely the data they collect and compile for this indicator.

SUMMARY	
Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?	The BAME team concludes that the quality of this indicator data is satisfactory but could be improved by better documenting data collection procedures as well as better defining “improved NRM”.
Significance of limitations (if any):	For official GOB statistics there are always delays in the availability of most recent data. This constrains capacity for comprehensive coverage to measure this indicator, particularly as additional areas are incorporated into the PCAB program.
Actions needed to address limitations prior to the next DQA (given level of USG control over data):	Needed are a centralized location for documentation of methods used to collect data and for defining key terms (e.g., improved NRM). Regular IP staff orientation in these procedures and definitions, particularly where there is staff turn-over is also warranted.

IF NO DATA ARE AVAILABLE FOR THE INDICATOR	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	N/A – Data are available for those IPs reporting this indicator

DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-3

Hectares of Biologically Significant Areas Under Improved Management

This Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Checklist is to assist in assessing each of the five data quality criteria and provide a convenient manner in which to document analysis findings.

USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name: USAID/BRAZIL	
Title of Performance Indicator:	EG.10.2-3: Number of people with improved economic benefits derived from sustainable natural resource management and/or biodiversity conservation (Outcome Indicator)
Linkage to Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure, if applicable (i.e. Program Area, Element, etc.):	Supports USAID/Brazil Development Cooperative Agreement
Result This Indicator Measures:	PCAB Result (Purpose) 1: Biodiversity conservation efforts strengthened in the overall protected areas system and in priority protected areas
Data Source(s):	IPs use their records of activities in the target areas for which they are responsible.
Partner(s) or Contractor(s) Who Provided the Data:	ECAM, Equipe de Conservação da Amazônia IEB, Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil USFS, United States Forest Service
Period for Which the Data Are Being Reported:	Spring 2016 – Fall 2017
Is This Indicator a Standard or Custom Indicator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator <input type="checkbox"/> Custom (created by the OU; not standard)
Data Quality Assessment methodology:	BAME team review of relevant documentation and interviews with the PCAB implementing partner staffs responsible for collecting data to measure and report this indicator.
Date(s) of Assessment:	December 7-21, 2017
Assessment Team Members:	Phillip E. Church, DevTech Senior Economist and M&E Specialist Joao Campari, BAME Team Leader Doug Baker, DevTech Senior Director for Strategic Operations Tassila Fernandes, BAME M&E Specialist
<i>USAID Mission/OU Verification of DQA</i>	
Contracting Officer Representative approval	
X_____	

		Y	N	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.)	X		IPs have adopted very broad definitions of ‘economic benefits’ to include not just improved incomes but also better production process or lower costs of production. It does not appear that all three IPs are using the same definitions, partly because they particularly NRM and conservation activities differ among the areas where they conduct PCAB activities.
2	Do results collected fall within a plausible range?			N/A - This is a highly subjective measure for which a range is not possible to calculate.
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)?		X	More information is needed from each of the four IPs to explain how they measure “improved” and “economic benefits”. “People” also needs to be defined: whether all individual members of households with improved economic benefits which may be an imputed number or only household heads or direct participants.
4	Are sound research methods being used to collect the data?	X		IPs work with a causal model relating the impact of PCAB interventions on economic benefits.
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?	X		Generally, IPs employ similar data collection procedures but further guidelines would help assure uniformity in data collection methods over time and between locations where IPs are implementing activities.
2	Are data collection and analysis methods documented in writing and being used to ensure the same procedures are followed each time?	X		This criterion requires a qualified ‘Yes.’ Documentation exists but is does not appear always complete or uniform for all IP staffs who are collecting and compiling this data.
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?	X		All data for this indicator are reporting annually and within a reasonable time period after it is collected from the field.
2	Are the data reported the most current practically available?	X		Data available for the most recently completed year are submitted to USAID as soon as it is available.

3	Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X		When USAID reporting requirements for this indicator fall within the implementation year, IPs provide data for the previous completed year.
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?			N/A - IPs report this data for all beneficiaries in their programs; they do not use sampling.
2	Has the margin of error been reported along with the data? (Only applicable to statistical samples.)			N/A
3	Is the data collection method/tool being used to collect the data fine-tuned or exact enough to register the expected change?	X		The basic unit of measure is economic benefits which are difficult to measure and more difficult to capture change that can be attributed to IP activities.
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?		X	There is no evidence that IPs employ data transcription verification practices such as double entry to check for possible data entry errors.
2	Is there independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	X		The IPs have in place protocols for limiting access to the data only by appropriate M&E staff.
3	Are mechanisms in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data	X		M&E staff are free to report freely the data they collect and compile for this indicator.

SUMMARY

Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?

The BAME team concludes that the quality of this indicator data is satisfactory but could be improved by the three IPs collecting data to report this indicator. IPs need to clearly define what is meant by economic benefits and what units are used to measure these benefits and any changes in them.

Significance of limitations (if any):

Not all IPs and their local partners have sufficient staffs and staff skills for measuring economic benefits in target PCAB biologically significant areas. Sustainable livelihood value chains also differ for each product and each region where IPs are conducting programs. This makes for challenges in defining and measuring their economic benefits.

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?

**N/A – Data are available for those
IPs reporting this indicator**

DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-4

Hectares of Biologically Significant Areas Under Improved Management

This Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Checklist is to assist in assessing each of the five data quality criteria and provide a convenient manner in which to document analysis findings.

USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name: USAID/BRAZIL	
Title of Performance Indicator:	EG.10.2-4: Number of people trained in sustainable natural resources management or biodiversity conservation (Output Indicator)
Linkage to Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure, if applicable (i.e. Program Area, Element, etc.):	Supports USAID/Brazil Development Cooperative Agreement
Result This Indicator Measures:	PCAB Result (Purpose) 1: Biodiversity conservation efforts strengthened in the overall protected areas system and in priority protected areas
Data Source(s):	Project records maintained by each IP and their local partners.
Partner(s) or Contractor(s) Who Provided the Data:	ECAM, Equipe de Conservação da Amazônia IEB, Instituto Internacional de Educação do Brasil IPE, Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas USFS, United States Forest Service
Period for Which the Data Are Being Reported:	Spring 2016 – Fall 2017
Is This Indicator a Standard or Custom Indicator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator <input type="checkbox"/> Custom (created by the OU; not standard)
Data Quality Assessment methodology:	BAME team review of relevant documentation and interviews with the PCAB implementing partner staffs responsible for collecting data to measure and report this indicator.
Date(s) of Assessment:	December 7-21, 2017
Assessment Team Members:	Phillip E. Church, DevTech Senior Economist and M&E Specialist Joao Campari, BAME Team Leader Doug Baker, DevTech Senior Director for Strategic Operations Tassila Fernandes, BAME M&E Specialist
<i>USAID Mission/OU Verification of DQA</i>	
Contracting Officer Representative approval	
X_____	

		Y	N	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.)	X		In most cases yes, if EG.10.2-4 PIRS guidance is strictly followed, which is the criteria employed here. However, that guidance does not include one-on-skills transfer that occurs with beneficiary staffs working alongside IP technicians or even beneficiaries through on-the-job training that is not structured workshop training as indicated in the PIRS. Additionally, USFS reports that they receive a report from each partner. Upon receipt, USFS talks with partners to validate the responses and only approves and includes those that have stated learning objectives and related organization.
2	Do results collected fall within a plausible range?	X		Numbers of trainees are reasonable for the nature of IP activities
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)?	X		IPs check the data provided by their local partners and seek clarification or justification of numbers provided before it is reported.
4	Are sound research methods being used to collect the data?			N/A
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?	X		Generally, IPs employ similar data collection procedures but further guidelines would help assure uniformity in data collection methods over time and between locations where IP's are implementing activities.
2	Are data collection and analysis methods documented in writing and being used to ensure the same procedures are followed each time?	X		This criterion requires a qualified 'Yes.' Documentation exists but is does not appear always complete or uniform for all IP staffs who are collecting and compiling this data.
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?	X		All data for this indicator are reported quarterly and within a reasonable time period after it is collected from the field.
2	Are the data reported the most current practically available?	X		Data available for the most recently completed quarter or year are submitted to USAID as soon as it is available.

3	Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X		When USAID reporting requirements for this indicator fall within the implementation year, IPs provide data for the previous completed year.
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?			N/A – All trainees are counted, there is no sampling.
2	Has the margin of error been reported along with the data? (Only applicable to statistical samples.)			N/A
3	Is the data collection method/tool being used to collect the data fine-tuned or exact enough to register the expected change?	X		The basic unit of measure is the trainee, and is uniform.
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?		X	There is no evidence that IPs employ data transcription verification practices such as double entry to check for possible data entry errors. However, IPS have provided training participation sheets and other documentation that allow for subsequent verification.
2	Is there independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	X		The IPs have in place protocols for limiting access to the data only by appropriate M&E staff.
3	Are mechanisms in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data	X		M&E staff are free to report freely the data they collect and compile for this indicator.

SUMMARY

Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?

Satisfactory to good. Data measurement follows PIRS guidance but as a result may not capture additional on-the-job training which may be significant for some IPs, their local partners and field locations.

Significance of limitations (if any):

None, other than limitations imposed by the USAID PIRS definition of ‘training’.

Actions needed to address limitations prior to the next DQA (given level of USG control over data):

USAID/Brazil might consider a more generic definition of ‘training’ aimed at capturing all skills transfers that are PCAB funded where it does not conflict with standard definitions.

IF NO DATA ARE AVAILABLE FOR THE INDICATOR	COMMENTS
If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?	N/A – Data are available for those IPs reporting this indicator

DQA Standard Indicator EG 10.2-5

NRM AND CONSERVATION LAWS, POLICIES AND REGULATIONS

This Data Quality Assessment (DQA) Checklist is to assist in assessing each of the five data quality criteria and provide a convenient manner in which to document analysis findings.

USAID Mission or Operating Unit Name: USAID/BRAZIL	
Title of Performance Indicator:	EG.10.2-5: Number of laws, policies or regulations that address biodiversity conservation and/or other environmental themes officially proposed, adopted or implemented as a result of USG assistance (Output Indicator)
Linkage to Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure, if applicable (i.e. Program Area, Element, etc.):	Supports USAID/Brazil Development Cooperative Agreement
Result This Indicator Measures:	PCAB Result (Purpose) 1: Biodiversity conservation efforts strengthened in the overall protected areas system and in priority protected areas
Data Source(s):	ICMBio publications.
Partner(s) or Contractor(s) Who Provided the Data:	IPE, Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas
Period for Which the Data Are Being Reported:	Spring 2016 – Fall 2017
Is This Indicator a Standard or Custom Indicator?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Foreign Assistance Indicator <input type="checkbox"/> Custom (created by the OU; not standard)
Data Quality Assessment methodology:	BAME team review of relevant documentation and interviews with the PCAB implementing partner staffs responsible for collecting data to measure and report this indicator.
Date(s) of Assessment:	December 7-21, 2017
Assessment Team Members:	Phillip E. Church, DevTech Senior Economist and M&E Specialist Joao Campari, BAME Team Leader Doug Baker, DevTech Senior Director for Strategic Operations Tassila Fernandes, BAME M&E Specialist
<i>USAID Mission/OU Verification of DQA</i>	
Contracting Officer Representative approval	
X _____	

		Y	N	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.)	X		Because there is to be attribution to USG assistance, the IP limits its measurement of this indicator to just those laws, policies and regulations which it has had some role in advancing. The status of these laws, policies and regulations is less clear. The IP declares that they only count those that are officially published and does not count those in process. As “officially proposed” is a very unclear term, it is more precise to limit this in this way.
2	Do results collected fall within a plausible range?	X		Likely proposed, adopted or implemented laws, policies or regulations reported are reasonable given the IPs work.
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)?	X		IP collects and reports this data itself; it does not rely on its local partners for anything other than clarifying information, of when a law, policy or regulation is officially published.
4	Are sound research methods being used to collect the data?			N/A
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?	X		The IP uses a standard criterion – official publications – on which to base its identification of laws, policies or regulations to count for this indicator.
2	Are data collection and analysis methods documented in writing and being used to ensure the same procedures are followed each time?	X		Guidance is contained in IP project and grant agreement records.
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?	X		All data for this indicator are reported within a reasonable time period after it is collected from sources.
2	Are the data reported the most current practically available?	X		Data available for the most recently completed year are submitted to USAID as soon as it is available.
3	Are the data reported as soon as possible after collection?	X		When USAID reporting requirements for this indicator fall within the implementation year, IPs provide data for the previous completed year.

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.)			N/A
2	Has the margin of error been reported along with the data? (Only applicable to statistical samples.)			N/A
3	Is the data collection method/tool being used to collect the data fine-tuned or exact enough to register the expected change?	X		Yes, but only in part. The basic units of measure are laws, policies and regulations and status proposed, adopted and implemented which are all open to interpretation without greater guidance than what is currently available.

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?	X		The IP has official documentation to support the numbers it reports.
2	Is there independence in key data collection, management, and assessment procedures?	X		The IP has in place protocols for limiting access to the data only by appropriate M&E staff.
3	Are mechanisms in place to prevent unauthorized changes to the data	X		M&E staff are free to report freely the data they collect and compile for this indicator.

SUMMARY

Based on the assessment relative to the five standards, what is the overall conclusion regarding the quality of the data?

The BAME team concludes that the quality of this indicator data is satisfactory but could be improved by better defining the key terms – laws, policies and regulations – and conditions – proposed, adopted and being implemented.

Significance of limitations (if any):

There are volumes of ‘proposed’ policies, laws and regulations at the local, regional, and national levels. The USAID PIRS needs to be more closely consulted – and followed for this indicator to assure uniformity and consistency over time.

Actions needed to address limitations prior to the next DQA (given level of USG control over data):

Needed also are archives of relevant policies, laws and regulations that can document the numbers used to measure this indicator

IF NO DATA ARE AVAILABLE FOR THE INDICATOR

COMMENTS

If no recent relevant data are available for this indicator, why not?

**N/A – Data are available for those
IPs reporting this indicator**

ANNEX C: USAID STANDARD INDICATOR PIRS

Note: USAID/W Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS) for the five PCAB Standard Indicators are included by reference. They may be located in USAID ADS Annex guidance and in USAID/Brazil Program Office files.

ANNEX D: MODIFIED DQA INTERVIEW FORM (PORTUGUESE)

Análise Qualitativa dos dados (AQD) da PCBA

QUESTIONÁRIO

Este Questionário da Parceria para a Conservação da Biodiversidade na Amazônia (PCBA) foi concebido para reunir informações sobre os parceiros implementadores responsáveis pela coleta de dados de forma a mensurar e produzir relatórios sobre os indicadores incluídos na Análise Qualitativa dos Dados (AQD). Favor indicar os casos em que a resposta se aplica a mais de um indicador, ou a todos eles.

DADOS PESSOAIS – Instruções: esta página deverá ser preenchida ANTES da entrevista, e o(a) entrevistador(a) deverá verificar se as respostas fornecidas estão corretas e completas.
Nome e função (cargo) do(a) entrevistado(a)
Nome e endereço da organização
Área geográfica de execução da PCBA
Local e data da entrevista
Membro(s) do Programa BAME que conduziram a entrevista
Informações logísticas e adicionais sobre a entrevista (local da entrevista; e-mail e telefone de contato do(a) entrevistado(a); data e hora agendadas para a entrevista etc.)

Indicadores da AQD. Instruções: leia esta lista de indicadores da PCBA para o(a) entrevistado(a) e pergunte em relação a quais deles o(a) entrevistado(a) coleta, analisa, gerencia ou relata dados.		
Indicadores da PCBA em relação aos quais o(a) entrevistado(a) recolhe/relata dados	Si m	Não
<u>EG.10.2-1</u> : Número de hectares de áreas de importância biológica que demonstraram melhorias em suas condições biofísicas.		
<u>EG.10.2-2</u> : Número de hectares de áreas de importância biológica que se beneficiaram de melhorias na gestão de recursos naturais (GRN).		
<u>EG.10.2-3</u> : Número de pessoas cujos benefícios econômicos melhoraram graças à gestão sustentável de recursos naturais e/ou conservação da biodiversidade.		
<u>EG.10.2-4</u> : Número de pessoas capacitadas em gestão sustentável de recursos naturais e/ou conservação da biodiversidade.		
<u>EG.10.2-5</u> : Número de leis, políticas ou regulamentos que abordam a conservação da biodiversidade e/ou outros temas ambientais oficialmente propostos, adotados ou implementados como resultado da assistência do Governo dos EUA (indicador de resultados).		

Instruções: Registre as respostas dos(as) entrevistados(as) às cinco perguntas seguintes sobre a qualidade dos dados. Se a pergunta não for aplicável (por exemplo, se houver sido realizada uma pesquisa por amostragem, mas não uma coleta de dados, indicar "Não Aplicável" ou "N/A" no campo fornecido.

VALIDADE DOS DADOS – Qual é o grau de clareza e adequação dos dados em relação ao resultado pretendido?	
1	Quais fontes de dados foram utilizadas para medir o indicador? Quem fornece esses dados?
2	Quais garantias existem de que os métodos utilizados para a coleta de dados não geram dados sistematicamente tendenciosos (por exemplo, consistentemente acima ou abaixo da contagem adequada)?
3	Se aplicável, quais métodos de pesquisa vêm sendo adotados para coletar os dados?
CONFIABILIDADE DOS DADOS – Os dados refletem processos de coleta e métodos de análise estáveis e consistentes ao longo do tempo?	
1	Compartilhe com a equipe da AQD (ou apresente a ela) uma cópia das instruções relativas à mensuração e observação dos resultados de cada indicador. Como essas instruções foram concebidas e comunicadas aos responsáveis pela coleta de dados?
2	Descreva como os métodos de coleta e análise de dados são documentados em instruções escritas ou outros formulários, e como eles estão sendo utilizados para garantir que sempre os mesmos procedimentos sejam adotados?
PONTUALIDADE DOS DADOS – Os dados são disponibilizados com frequência e pontualidade suficientes para subsidiar tomadas de decisão pela equipe de gestão?	
1	Com que frequência são coletados os dados relativos a este indicador?
2	Os dados relatados são os mais atuais possíveis? Favor explicar.

PRECISÃO DOS DADOS – Os dados de pesquisa apresentam um nível suficiente de detalhes para permitir tomadas de decisão por parte da equipe de gestão (por exemplo, a margem de erro é inferior à alteração prevista)? (Obs.: esta seção da AQD aplica-se apenas a dados coletados em pesquisas por amostragem aleatória. Se não for esse o caso, passe para a próxima seção.)	
1	Somente para dados de pesquisa por amostragem: a margem de erro é inferior à alteração prevista que está sendo mensurada?
2	A margem de erro foi relatada juntamente com os dados? (Esta questão aplica-se somente a dados de indicadores coletados por meio de procedimentos de amostragem estatística.)
3	Os métodos e ferramentas adotados para a coleta de dados foram calibrados ou são suficientemente sensíveis para registrar a alteração prevista? (Por exemplo, um metro de carpinteiro pode não oferecer a precisão necessária para medir alterações de poucos milímetros.)
INTEGRIDADE DOS DADOS – Foram adotadas salvaguardas para minimizar o risco de erros de transcrição ou manipulação de dados?	
1	Descreva os procedimentos ou salvaguardas vigentes para minimizar erros de transcrição de dados.
2	Como é mantida a independência nos procedimentos-chave de coleta e manuseio de dados?
3	Quais mecanismos estão em vigor para impedir alterações não autorizadas de dados?

RESUMO	
Descreva quaisquer limitações ou dificuldades enfrentadas por você na coleta, compilação, análise, gestão ou relato dos dados de indicadores?	
Que ações você recomendaria para superar essas limitações antes da próxima AQD?	

FORMULÁRIO DE ENTREVISTA DE AQD DA PCBA 07deZ2017

For more information, contact:

DevTech Systems, Inc.
1700 North Moore St.
Suite 1720
Arlington, Virginia 22209
703-312-6038
www.devtechsys.com

