



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

| **ACCESO**

USAID ACCESO PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN



September 2011

This publication was prepared by Fintrac Inc. for review by the United States Agency for International Development.

CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	1
3. PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS.....	6
1. Number of rural households living in poverty moved above the poverty line	7
2. Number of rural households living in extreme poverty moved above the poverty line.....	10
3. Value of new net income of participating rural farmers and MSMEs.....	13
4. Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation.....	15
5. Value of incremental sales (collected at farm/firm level) attributed to FTF implementation.....	17
6. Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation.....	20
7. Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	22
8. Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	26
9. Number of Local Municipal Governments effectively implementing natural resources management policies	30
10. Number of companies (including farms) that have made conservation-friendly changes in their business practices	32
11. Number of MSMEs implementing sound business management practices	35
12. Number of brokers providing market linkages to MSMEs	37
13. Number of MSMEs that have been verified to meet market standards for their products	39
14. Number of MSMEs accessing market-based financing as a result of USG-assistance	41
15. Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans made to MSMEs	43
16. Number of value chain/sector constraints identified and resolved	45
17. Number of policy reforms, regulations, administrative procedures passed for which implementation has begun with USG assistance.....	47
18. Prevalence of households with moderate to severe hunger	49
19. Prevalence of underweight children under 5.....	52
20. Prevalence of stunted children under 5.....	55
21. Percent of children 6-23 months that received a minimum acceptable diet.....	58
22. Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months	61
23. Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age	63
24. Prevalence of anemia in children 6-59 months	66
25. Womens’s dietary diversity: mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age	69
26. Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition	72
27. Modern contraceptive prevalence rate.....	74
28. Number of communities in high vulnerability municipalities with adequate disaster prevention and mitigation capacity	76

29. Number of rural micro-generation clean/renewable energy projects established ...	78
30. Number of organizations / companies providing business development / extension services to MSMEs	80
31. Number of producers organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance	82
32. Number of public-private partnerships formed	84
33. Number of private sector alliances developed	87
4. FEE CALCULATIONS FOR SELECT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS	89

1. INTRODUCTION

The USAID ACCESO Project is a 47 month initiative supported by the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) to raise rural Honduran households out of extreme poverty and under-nutrition by increasing their incomes. The project will directly benefit more than 30,000 families by engaging them in improved agricultural and agro-processing practices, linking them to sustainable markets, providing employment opportunities, and ensuring the provision of health services. ACCESO will contribute to USAID/Honduras's Assistance Objective 2 through activities that directly impact on agricultural sector productivity and income and employment generation.

Immediately after award of the contract, the USAID ACCESO management, along with the Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) team, has held a series of meetings with USAID/Honduras to discuss and finalize the project's main indicators and targets. This document presents:

- The list of indicators to report in the performance management plan (PMP);
- The expected targets for each year and the length of project;
- The Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS) for each of the indicators; and,
- The method of calculation for the performance fee for select indicators.

It is important to note that, upon joint discussions and analysis between USAID/Honduras and the USAID ACCESO Project, that some of the activities included in the original PMP have been moved to the work plan given the nature of the particular activity and tracking requirements. USAID ACCESO will present a separate Work Plan where these activities will be reported on a quarterly basis.

2. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Indicators are selected from the pool of Standard Foreign Assistance Indicators (as stipulated by US State Department and USAID) common to most USAID agriculture development projects, newly established Feed the Future initiative indicators and custom indicators that are tailored to measure the impact of interventions specific to the ACCESO Project.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR SUMMARY TABLE

A list of illustrative indicators was provided in the RFTOP. Each indicator included a detailed description as well as annual and length-of-project (LOP) targets which have been discussed with USAID/Honduras. The PMP table below presents the agreed upon indicators and the LOP targets. It is important to note that despite a shorter period of implementation due to a delay in the award and start-up, Fintrac did not reduce the expected LOP targets for the indicators reflected in this final document. Projected Year to Year targets were modified to reflect a) a 3 month delay from the expected start-up date and b) Annual YTY indicators were brought forward from the year ending in December to year ending in September, to match USAID/Honduras' Fiscal Year calendar.

The columns labelled RFTOP and FTF indicate the indicator source, while the column labelled "GEN" indicates whether the indicator can be disaggregated by sex. Where required households are classified by the head of household: Male and Female (M&F), Male No Female (MNF) and Female No Male (FNM). For sex disaggregated indicators, targets will be set for men and women after baselines data collection and analysis.

The last two columns of the table provide the percentage and corresponding values of performance fees that will be applied upon successful achievement of the specified targets.

Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS), providing additional details on indicator source, calculation methodology, justification, etc., are provided for each of the indicators in the PMP table.

USAID ACCESO Performance Management Plan

		RFT/OP	FTF	Targets						Units	SEX	Data Sources/ Collection Methodologies
				Year 1 4/11 - 9/11	Year 2 10/11 - 9/12	Year 3 10/12 - 9/13	Year 4 10/13 - 9/14	Year 5 10/14 - 2/15	LOP			
GOAL: Increased Rural Household Incomes												
1	Number of households living in poverty moved above the poverty line	x		-	6,000	18,150	27,550	30,000	30,000	Households	x	Cumulative. Random stratified surveys of beneficiary households
2	Number of rural households living in extreme poverty moved above the poverty line ¹	x	x	-	4,500	12,150	17,550	18,000	18,000	Households	x	Cumulative. Random stratified surveys of beneficiary households
3	Value of new net income of participant rural farmers and MSMEs	x	x	-	14.79	36.98	66.55	73.95	73.95	US\$ Million	x	Cumulative. Change measured annually on all income generating activities, net income for targeted project beneficiaries
4	Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation	x	x	-	2,085	5,213	9,383	10,425	10,425	FTEs	x	Cumulative. Change in employment positions (expressed in full-time equivalent (FTE) over baseline) generated through project interventions (of targeted project beneficiaries)
Increased Agricultural Productivity												
5	Value of incremental sales (collected at farm/firm level) attributed to FTF implementation	x	x	-	26.73	66.83	120.28	133.65	133.65	US\$ Million	x	Cumulative. Change in sales over base line data, separating local from export
6	Value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation	x	x	-	4.32	10.80	18.36	21.60	21.60	US\$ Million		Cumulative. Sum of new investments as a result of program interventions, collected from MSMEs
Increased Adoption of NRM & GAPS												
7	Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	x	x	-	4,410	11,025	18,743	22,050	22,050	MSMEs	x	Cumulative. Sum of assisted MSMEs implementing one or more recommended inputs, technologies and/or practices
8	Number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance		x	-	2,981	7,452	12,668	14,904	14,904	Hectares	x	Cumulative. Sum of hectares under improved technologies or management practices
9	Number of Local Municipal Governments effectively implementing natural resource management policies	x		-	7	14	20	20	20	Municipalities		Cumulative. Sum of municipalities implementing/engaged in NRM policies
10	Number of companies (including farms) that have made conservation-friendly changes in their business practices	x		-	4,410	11,025	18,743	22,050	22,050	Companies/ Farms		Cumulative. Sum of companies implementing/engaged in conservation friendly practices

USAID ACCESO Performance Management Plan

	RPT/OP	FTF	Targets						Units	SEX	Data Sources/ Collection Methodologies	
			Year 1 4/11 - 9/11	Year 2 10/11 - 9/12	Year 3 10/12 - 9/13	Year 4 10/13 - 9/14	Year 5 10/14 - 2/15	LOP				
Improved Business Practices												
11	Number of MSMEs implementing sound business management practices	x		-	1,696	4,241	8,058	8,482	8,482	MSMEs	x	Cumulative. Sum of MSMEs implementing sound business management practices
Expanded Market Access												
12	Number of brokers providing market linkages to MSMEs	x		25	150	350	485	500	500	Brokers		Cumulative. Diversified buyer networks developed for main crops and products measured through broker lists distributed to producers
13	Number of MSMEs that have been verified to meet market standards for their products	x		-	300	1,000	1,900	2,000	2,000	MSMEs		Cumulative.
Expanded Access to Credit												
14	Number of MSMEs accessing market-based financing as the result of USG assistance	x	x	215	1,078	2,372	4,098	4,314	4,314	MSMEs	x	Cumulative. Sum of MSMEs benefiting from financial products, collected from MSMEs
15	Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans made to MSMEs		x	0.32	1.58	3.48	6.01	6.33	6.33	US\$ Million	x	Cumulative. Sum of loans granted to MSMEs, collected from assisted financial institutions
Policy Barriers Eliminated												
16	Number of value chain / sector constraints identified and resolved	x			15	30	40	40	40	Constraints		Cumulative. Sum of constraints resolved
17	Number of policy reforms, regulations, administrative procedures passed for which implementation has begun with USG assistance	x	x	1	2	3	4	4	4	Policies Passed		Sum of policy passed
Improved Household Nutrition												
18	Prevalence of households with moderate to severe hunger		x			-10%		-20%	-20%	% reduction from baseline		Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities
19	Prevalence of underweight children under 5	x	x		-5%	-10%	-15%	-20%	-20%	% reduction from baseline	x	Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities
20	Prevalence of stunted children under 5	x	x			-10%		-20%	-20%	% reduction from baseline	x	Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities
21	Percent of children 6-23 months that received a Minimum Acceptable Diet		x			20%		30%	30%	% increase over baseline	x	Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities
22	Prevalence of exclusive breast feeding of children under 6 months		x		5%	10%	15%	20%	20%	% increase over baseline		Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities
23	Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age		x			-2.5%		-5%	-5%	% reduction from baseline		Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities
24	Prevalence of anemia in children 5 - 59 months		x			-10%		-20%	-20%	% reduction from baseline		Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities
25	Women's dietary diversity: mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age	x				20%		30%	30%	% Change in HDDS		Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities

USAID ACCESO Performance Management Plan

		RFT/OP	FTF	Targets					Units	SEX	Data Sources/ Collection Methodologies
				Year 1 4/11 - 9/11	Year 2 10/11 - 9/12	Year 3 10/12 - 9/13	Year 4 10/13 - 9/14	Year 5 10/14 - 2/15			
Expanded Access to Health Services											
26	Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition		x			10	10		20	Health facilities	Sum of health facilities with established capacity
Improved Family Planning											
27	Modern contraceptive prevalence rate	x		2.5%	5.0%	7.5%	10%	10%	% Increase over baseline	x	Cumulative. surveys of health centers in targeted communities
Cross Cutting Themes											
28	Number of communities in high vulnerability municipalities with adequate disaster prevention and mitigation capacity	x		15	30	40	40	40	Communities		Cumulative. Sum of communities with disaster capacity
29	Number of rural micro-generation clean/renew able energy projects established	x		10	361	671	890	890	890	Projects	Cumulative. Sum of projects established
30	Number of organizations / companies providing business development / extension services to MSMEs	x		23	93	233	442	465	465	Organizations/ Companies	Cumulative. Sum of organizations/ companies providing service
31	Number of producers organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOs) receiving USG assistance		x	20	90	160	210	210	210	Groups	Cumulative. Sum of groups receiving assistance
32	Number of public-private partnerships formed	x		10	35	50	50	50	50	Partner funds	Cumulative. Sum of PPP formed
33	Number of private sector alliances developed	x		2	10	15	15	15	15	Alliances developed	Cumulative. Sum of alliances developed
1. This indicator is a subgroup of indicator #1. It specifically reports rural households that were moved from extreme poverty .											

3. PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS

The performance indicator reference sheets (PIRS) are included below to provide clear definitions of proposed indicators, justifications of their utility, means of verification, data sources and collection methodologies to establish sound data management procedures for tracking and reporting. These PIRS have been completed to accurately measure the intended results and to ensure compliance with the data management guidance set forth in ADS Chapters 200-203.

ACCESO will provide technical assistance and training to at least 30,000 households. Profiles will be obtained for all ACCESO beneficiary households which provides the complete name, national ID#, household head type (M&F, Male no Female and Female no Male), the number and age of each of the household family members, address, GPS, ethnic group, their income in the previous 12 months and their income group classification.

As there will be a minimum of 30,000 project households, ACCESO will impact on approximately 180,000 total beneficiaries in the six departments where the project will be implemented (out of a total population of 1.64 million). Full baseline data, and selected indicator results and impact will be determined through sampling systems, with the procedures designed to ensure a 95% confidence level.

Full baseline data will be collected in September and October, 2011 through a survey of randomized ACCESO beneficiary households. This randomized survey will be repeated mid-way through the Project implementation on households not included in the first survey. Surveys will be stratified based on the poverty categorization obtained in the initial household profiles. As the sample will represent the entire beneficiary population, the results and impact of ACCESO interventions, identified in the sample, will be applicable to all the beneficiaries. Where appropriate, averages calculated from the survey will be extrapolated against the full client household base (eg. sales income and net income). The methodology will include oversampling in anticipation of attrition or invalid data.

Data collection to determine results for selected indicators will also be carried out through a survey of randomized ACCESO beneficiary households. These will be carried out in August and September 2012, 2014 and 2014 and include indicators such as incomes, sales, employment, the number of clients with new technologies and the number of hectares under new technologies.

Selected indicators will be tracked on an on-going basis as specific activities are carried out and implemented, including the number of brokers providing market linkages, number of value chain constraints resolved, number of clients accessing credit and the loan value, number of health facilities established, and the number of renewable energy projects.

Data for the activities previously mentioned will be collected by ACCESO staff and related directly to the 30,000 household beneficiaries.

Most of the health and nutrition indicators will be tracked using data provided by the Ministry of Health and their representatives in the field. These will be analysed by ACCESO staff and correlated with ACCESO beneficiaries, activities and results prior to presentation to USAID. During the development of the PMP and these PIRS, USAID indicated that selected health and nutrition indicators are to be applied to the entire population of the municipalities where ACCESO is providing technical assistance to the 30,000 households. Selection criteria for the beneficiary households and communities include the level of poverty, underweight children and malnutrition.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A	
ACCESO Indicator:	
1. NUMBER OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS LIVING IN POVERTY MOVED ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE	
Name of Assistance Objective: <i>AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth</i>	
Name of Intermediate Result: N/A	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: N/A	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Barbara, Copan, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i>	
FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	
<p>Precise Definition(s): The number of households living below the extreme poverty threshold at baseline and whose incomes are increased above the poverty line. Only households who are above the poverty line can be counted for this indicator (For example, a family who was moved above poverty in Year 2 and falls back into poverty and year 3 or 4 cannot be counted as moved out of poverty for those years). According to the Honduran National Statistics Institute (INE), the poverty line is defined as the cost of a basic package of goods per day per person in rural Honduras and satisfies basic health, transportation, education, food and housing needs. Households whose income is greater than the cost per day of the basic package of goods are above the poverty line. The basic package of foods per day per person satisfies basic nutritional requirements, and is the threshold for extreme poverty. Households are below the poverty line when they have an income that satisfies their basic package of foods but cannot afford the basic package of goods. Households with an income which does not even satisfy the cost per person per day of the basic package of foods are in extreme poverty. The thresholds of extreme poverty and poverty are currently \$1.81/person/day and \$2.42/person/day respectively for Honduras; these poverty thresholds will change based on annual updates carried out by the Honduran National Statistics Institute (INE). Households who have received USG assistance from previous projects for more than two production cycles cannot be counted towards this indicator. A sample survey will be applied to measure this indicator.</p>	
Unit of Measure: households	
<p>Method of Calculation: Method of Calculation: Annual household income will be calculated by surveying beneficiary households at baseline to determine those that are below the extreme poverty threshold. Subsequent annual income surveys of beneficiary households will determine the number of households that has moved from extreme poverty to above the poverty line.</p> <p>USAID Honduras has advised that under FTF this indicator should be calculated using a survey which measures expenditures over the last 24 hours from the time of survey, divided by the number of household members. This includes expenditures on food stuffs and estimated value of household consumption of items that they grew. This survey form is to be provided by USAID. Project beneficiary profiles that have been collected so far (May to August 2011) have used the annual household income methodology. When this expenditure form is provided by USAID, ACCESO will use the expenditure form to collect client profiles from all clients and for sampling to determine any change in poverty categories.</p>	
Disaggregated by: household type (M&F, MNF, FNM), department, municipality	
<p>Justification & Management Utility: This measures the first goal of the Feed the Future Initiative as well as a Millennium Development Goal. Poverty reduction is the main purpose of the Project. Ensuring that the beneficiary households are lifted above the poverty line is the minimum target for providing food security.</p>	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
ACCESO Indicator:
1. NUMBER OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS LIVING IN POVERTY MOVED ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
<p>Data Collection Method: Annual household income sample surveys; supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of select household income generating activities. A household profile will be collected by the project’s M&E unit through an interview process for all beneficiary households joining the program. This profile captures the initial baseline income and total family members, from which a categorization is made (extreme poverty, poverty, other), based on the poverty thresholds established by the GOH for that particular year. When USAID provides the household expenditure form, ACCESO will use it to determine the level of poverty of each beneficiary household as part of the initial profile.</p> <p>Subsequent annual income sample surveys of beneficiary households will determine the number of households that have moved from extreme poverty or poverty to above the poverty line. These surveys will be conducted to a statistically representative sample at the same time of the year the first one was collected. Annually, a representative stratified sample of the families reported as moved out of poverty will be surveyed to assure that they continue at this level during LOP. When USAID provides the household expenditure form, ACCESO will use it as part of the sample survey to determine the level of poverty.</p>
Data Source(s): Beneficiary households
Method of Acquisition by USAID: Data will be collected and analyzed by the implementer
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual, corresponding to the close of the fiscal year
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database; supplemental survey database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Income surveys - sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures to be agreed with USAID COTR to minimize error. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re assessed / validated.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files
Review of Data: Review of household survey results by Project management; comparison to ongoing performance monitoring information
Reporting of Data: Annual reports
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline will be collected through a sample survey once households become beneficiaries of the project. Data collection issues section will be updated and completed once the baseline has been finished. Although reports will be disaggregated at the Department level, the database will be able to generate reports at the municipal level.
Other Notes:

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A

ACCESO Indicator:

1. NUMBER OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS LIVING IN POVERTY MOVED ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Households)

Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	0	0			
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	6,000	6,000			
Sept. 2013	12,150	18,150			
Sept. 2014	9,400	27,550			
Feb. 2015	2,450	30,000			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
USAID RF: Percentage of rural households above the extreme poverty line (National Statistics Institute food basket definition) as a result of USG assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 2. NUMBER OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS LIVING IN EXTREME POVERTY MOVED ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: n/a FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): The number of households living below the extreme poverty threshold at baseline and whose incomes are increased above the poverty line. Only households who are above the poverty line can be counted for this indicator (For example, a family who was moved above poverty in Year 2 and falls back into poverty and year 3 or 4 cannot be counted as moved out of poverty for those years). According to the Honduran National Statistics Institute (INE), the poverty line is defined as the cost of a basic package of goods per day per person in rural Honduras and satisfies basic health, transportation, education, food and housing needs. Households whose income is greater than the cost per day of the basic package of goods are above the poverty line. The basic package of foods per day per person satisfies basic nutritional requirements, and is the threshold for extreme poverty. Households are below the poverty line when they have an income that satisfies their basic package of foods but cannot afford the basic package of goods. Households with an income which does not even satisfy the cost per person per day of the basic package of foods are in extreme poverty. The thresholds of extreme poverty and poverty are currently \$1.81/person/day and \$2.42/person/day respectively for Honduras; these poverty thresholds will change based on annual updates carried out by the Honduran National Statistics Institute (INE). Households who have received USG assistance from previous projects for more than two production cycles cannot be counted towards this indicator. A sample survey will be applied to measure this indicator.</p>
Unit of Measure: Households
<p>Method of Calculation: Annual household income will be calculated by surveying beneficiary households at baseline to determine those that are below the extreme poverty threshold. Subsequent annual income surveys of beneficiary households will determine the number of households that has moved from extreme poverty to above the poverty line.</p> <p>USAID Honduras has advised that under FTF this indicator should be calculated using a survey which measures expenditures over the last 24 hours from the time of survey, divided by the number of household members. This includes expenditures on food stuffs and estimated value of household consumption of items that they grew. This survey form is to be provided by USAID. Project beneficiary profiles that have been collected so far (May to August 2011) have used the annual household income methodology. When this expenditure form is provided by USAID, ACCESO will use the expenditure form to collect client profiles from all clients and for sampling to determine any change in poverty categories.</p>
Disaggregated by: household type (M&F, MNF, FNM), department, municipality
<p>Justification & Management Utility: This measures the first goal of the Feed the Future Initiative as well as a Millennium Development Goal. Poverty reduction is the main purpose of the Project. Ensuring that the beneficiary households are lifted above the poverty line is the minimum target for providing food security.</p>

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
USAID RF: Percentage of rural households above the extreme poverty line (National Statistics Institute food basket definition) as a result of USG assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 2. NUMBER OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS LIVING IN EXTREME POVERTY MOVED ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Annual household income sample surveys; supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of select household income generating activities. A household profile will be collected by the project’s M&E unit through an interview process for all beneficiary households joining the program. This profile captures the initial baseline income and total family members, from which a categorization is made (extreme poverty, poverty, other), based on the poverty thresholds established by the GOH for that particular year. When USAID provides the household expenditure form, ACCESO will use it to determine the level of poverty of each beneficiary household as part of the initial profile.
Subsequent annual income sample surveys of beneficiary households will determine the number of households that have moved from extreme poverty or poverty to above the poverty line. These surveys will be conducted to a statistically representative sample at the same time of the year the first one was collected. Annually, a representative stratified sample of the families reported as moved out of poverty will be surveyed to assure that they continue at this level during LOP. When USAID provides the household expenditure form, ACCESO will use it as part of the sample survey to determine the level of poverty.
Data Source(s): Beneficiary households
Method of Acquisition by USAID: Data will be collected and analyzed by the implementer
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual, corresponding to the close of the fiscal year
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database; supplemental survey database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Income surveys - sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures to be agreed with USAID COTR to minimize error. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re assessed / validated.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files
Review of Data: Review of household survey results by Project management; comparison to ongoing performance monitoring information
Reporting of Data: Annual reports
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline will be collected through a sample survey once households become beneficiaries of the project. Data collection issues section will be updated and completed once the baseline has been finished. Although reports will be disaggregated at the Department level, the database will be able to generate reports at the municipal level.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
USAID RF: Percentage of rural households above the extreme poverty line (National Statistics Institute food basket definition) as a result of USG assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 2. NUMBER OF RURAL HOUSEHOLDS LIVING IN EXTREME POVERTY MOVED ABOVE THE POVERTY LINE					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Households)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	4,500	4,500			
Sept. 2013	7,650	12,150			
Sept. 2014	5,400	17,550			
Feb. 2015	450	18,000			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET - IR 2.1
Program Area 4.5 Agriculture INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-1 Per Capita expenditures of rural households (proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries
ACCESO Indicator: 3. VALUE OF NEW NET INCOME OF PARTICIPATING RURAL FARMERS AND MSMEs
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): For productive operations and other rural enterprises, net income is the difference between the total value of sales of on- and off-farm items or services provided and the cost of producing or providing them. Input costs included will be those that are easily ascertained. These are likely to be the cash costs. All costs estimated to be at least 5% of the total input cost will be included. Most likely items are: purchased seed, feed, fertilizer, pesticides, hired labor, and hired machine/veterinary services for agricultural products and required inputs and labor for other MSMEs. New net income will also be obtained through increased employment (labor). Reporting of current-year results from farmers and MSMEs who have benefited in previous years will be included along with current-year results of beneficiaries currently participating. Participating means having been selected using project beneficiary selection criteria and having received at least 6 months of USG assistance.
Unit of Measure: US Dollars
Method of Calculation: Annual survey applied to a statistically representative sample of beneficiary households. The total net income of participating rural farmers and MSMEs will be subtracted from total net income reported as baseline on those who have received at least one production cycle of assistance to determine the change on all income-generating activities. The total net income of participating rural farmers and MSMEs will be subtracted from total net income reported in the previous year for those who have received two or more years of assistance to determine the change on all income generating activities.
Disaggregated by: household type (M&F, MNF, FNM), sector (value chain, producer, processor, etc.), on and off-farm department and municipality
Justification & Management Utility: Increasing the net income for on- and off- farm MSMEs contributes to increasing household income and thus directly contributes to the Goal indicator of reducing poverty.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Annual household income/expenditure surveys; supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of selected household income generating activities.
Data Source(s): Beneficiary households, project clients
Method of Acquisition by USAID: Data will be collected by the implementer
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually corresponding to the close of the fiscal year
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET - IR 2.1					
Program Area 4.5 Agriculture INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Inclusive Agricultural Sector Growth INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5-1 Per Capita expenditures of rural households (proxy for income) of USG targeted beneficiaries					
ACCESO Indicator: 3. VALUE OF NEW NET INCOME OF PARTICIPATING RURAL FARMERS AND MSMES					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database; supplemental survey database					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures to be agreed with USAID COTR to minimize error. Surveys with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re assessed / validated.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Review of household survey results by project management; comparison to ongoing performance monitoring information					
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through beneficiary household survey.					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (US\$ Millions)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	\$14.79	\$14.79			
Sept. 2013	\$22.19	\$36.98			
Sept. 2014	\$29.57	\$66.55			
Feb. 2015	\$7.40	\$73.95			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
USAID RF: New employment created in participating rural MSME (Full Time Equivalents - FTEs) as a result of USG assistance
ACCESO Indicator:
4. NUMBER OF JOBS ATTRIBUTED TO FTF IMPLEMENTATION
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i>
FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Number of new positions created in this year in enterprises that have received technical assistance within six months of their participation in USG funded programs. New positions are those that are a result of USG in the last three years. Jobs are all types of employment opportunities created by Project assisted rural farming and non-farm MSMEs (including paid on-farm employment). Only jobs lasting more than one continuous month or more than 60 full days per year will be counted in order to emphasize that jobs should provide a significant improvement in household income. Emphasis will be placed on creating employment opportunities for women, under the assumption that doing so is consistent with the achievement of other objectives in the Project. The USAID definition for micro, small, medium enterprises will be used for determining enterprise size.
Unit of Measure: FTEs (Full-Time Equivalent);
Method of Calculation: the number of person days will be converted to FTEs at a rate of 260 days/year for each FTE eg. a job that lasts 130 days in a year will be counted as 0.5 FTE. A representative sample of household clients and businesses (MSMSs, processors, exporters) will be surveyed annually to determine each year's FTE labor utilized by assisted rural farm and off farm MSMEs. This will be subtracted from FTE labor reported at baseline to determine the amount of new employment created.
Disaggregated by: Sex of jobholder, enterprise size, value chain and department (note: if one FTE is split by a male and a female, then it would be 0.5 FTE for females and 0.5 FTE for males).
Justification & Management Utility: This is a direct measure of enterprise growth as enterprises normally need more human capital to meet increased demand for their products (once the updated technologies are being implemented). It also improves the livelihoods at the household level due to increased and more consistent income. The indicator will also assist in identifying the employment contribution to economic growth and gender opportunities and equality.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Annual sample surveys for farm and non-farm MSMEs employment
Data Source(s): Beneficiary households, MSMEs and other Project clients
Method of Acquisition: Annual sample survey
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS database; baseline survey database, annual sample survey database

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: New employment created in participating rural MSME (Full Time Equivalent - FTEs) as a result of USG assistance					
ACCESO Indicator:					
4. NUMBER OF JOBS ATTRIBUTED TO FTF IMPLEMENTATION					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: Beginning of 2012					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries; the data collected will report the number of new FTE positions created but will not specify the number of persons in employment.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures to be agreed with USAID COTR to minimize error. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re assessed / validated. Reports of each surveyed enterprise will include statistics on permanent and temporary employment.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug./Sept. 2013), near end (Jan./Feb. 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end.					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Review of household survey and MSME results by project management; comparison to ongoing performance monitoring information.					
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through beneficiary survey. Annual targets are cumulative					
Other Notes: For each FTE the size of enterprises creating the jobs will be recorded in the database for analysis as needed. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (FTEs)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	2,085	2,085			
Sept. 2013	3,128	5,213			
Sept. 2014	4,170	9,383			
Feb. 2015	1,042	10,425			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
USAID RF: New net sales of participating rural MSMEs as a result of USG assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 5. VALUE OF INCREMENTAL SALES (COLLECTED AT FARM/FIRM LEVEL) ATTRIBUTED TO FTF IMPLEMENTATION
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1: Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a Result of USG Assistance
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): The value of new net sales indicates the value of the total amount of farm and firm level / services sold by households relative to a base year and will be calculated based on the total quantity sold of a product/service times the product/service price. Pre-existing sales should not be counted; only the incremental sales facilitated by the project. Participating means the enterprise had received direct assistance from USAID in the reporting period. Direct assistance means implementing a TA package pre-approved by the COTR. The USAID definition for micro, small, medium enterprises will be used. This value is cumulative, the higher the increase in sales the better. This indicator will be reported in dollars (formula A) and in sales volume change (formula B) with regards to the baseline year.</p> <p>Formula A: New net sales (\$) = (sales \$ Y1 – baseline sales \$ Y0) Formula B: New sales volume (unit) = (volume Y1 – baseline volume Y0)</p>
Unit of Measure: US\$ Millions and Sales Volume
Method of Calculation: Value of incremental sales in current year = [quantity or volume (units depend of the product or service) sold multiplied by the crop, item or service average price during the period] – [quantity or volume (units depend of the product or service) sold multiplied by the crop, item or service price in previous year]. These will be determined and calculated from annual sample surveys of beneficiary clients (farmers, MSMEs, exporters, etc.).
Disaggregated by: sectors, enterprise size, sex, department, on-farm and off-farm sales.
Justification & Management Utility: An increase in sales will show the enterprises' improved ability to access new market opportunities and to meet the demands of those markets. It will also increase profitability and growth. Increased quantity or volume and value (in US dollars) of enterprise sales of targeted products and services are a measure of the competitiveness of those smallholders/firms. Improving sales will contribute to the Key Objective of increased agricultural productivity and production, which in turn will contribute to the goal of poverty reduction.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
USAID RF: New net sales of participating rural MSMEs as a result of USG assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 5. VALUE OF INCREMENTAL SALES (COLLECTED AT FARM/FIRM LEVEL) ATTRIBUTED TO FTF IMPLEMENTATION
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Baseline data will be collected through a sample survey. Where possible, beneficiaries' bookkeeping records will be used to determine initial baseline figures; where records are not available or insufficient the survey will determine the baseline sales. To guarantee the quality of the data in the survey, responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed and/or validated. Sales surveys will be carried out on an annual basis. The value of new sales will be deflated to remove the impact of inflation on the results. The attribution element is defined as including the new sale where USG assisted the individual farm or company directly, assisted in improving seed or other input availability, farming techniques, or other activities that benefited farmers, processors, traders or businesses in the area. The COTR will be responsible for approval of the survey.
Data Source(s): Beneficiary households and MSMEs and other Project clients
Method of Acquisition: Annual sample survey
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year supplemented by bi-annual sales tracking of selected beneficiaries
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS database; supplemental survey database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries; accuracy of information when there is no bookkeeping.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures to be agreed with USAID COTR to minimize error. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re assessed / validated.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), near end (Jan / Feb 2015)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files
Review of Data: Review of household survey results by project management; comparison to ongoing performance monitoring information.
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through beneficiary surveys.
Other Notes: Differentiated targets will be established for on-farm and off-farm sales to facilitate the diversification into off-farm businesses; this will be guided by market opportunities, competitiveness and beneficiary interest. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: New net sales of participating rural MSMEs as a result of USG assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 5. VALUE OF INCREMENTAL SALES (COLLECTED AT FARM/FIRM LEVEL) ATTRIBUTED TO FTF IMPLEMENTATION					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (US\$ Millions)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	\$26.73	\$26.73			
Sept. 2013	\$40.1	\$66.83			
Sept. 2014	\$53.45	\$120.28			
Feb. 2015	\$13.37	\$133.65			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1	
USAID RF: US\$ New MSME Investment as a result of USG assistance	
ACCESO Indicator:	
6. VALUE OF NEW PRIVATE SECTOR INVESTMENT IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR OR FOOD CHAIN LEVERAGED BY FTF IMPLEMENTATION	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs' Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.5.2 Agriculture Sector Capacity 4.6.1 Business Enabling Environment	
FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	
<p>Precise Definition(s): The amount of US dollars that were mobilized annually from the MSME's as a result of USG programs to be invested in productive assets. Investment is defined as any use of resources intended to increase future production output or income. Participating means the enterprises had received direct assistance from USAID within six months of their participation in USG funded technical assistance programs. The USAID definition for micro, small, medium enterprises will be used.</p> <p>The “food chain” includes both upstream and downstream investments. Upstream investments include any type of agricultural capital used in the agricultural production process such as animals for traction, storage bins, and machinery. Downstream investments could include capital investments in equipment, etc. to do post-harvest transformation/processing of agricultural products as well as the transport of agricultural products to markets.</p> <p>“Private sector” includes any privately-led agricultural activity whether it is managed by an individual / household or a formal company. A CBO or NGO may be included if they engage in for-profit agricultural activity. “Leveraged by FTF implementation” indicates that the new investment was directly or indirectly encouraged or facilitated by activities funded by USG. Investments reported will not include funds received by the investor from USG as part of any grant or other award.</p>	
Unit of Measure: US\$ Millions	
Method of Calculation: Sum of new investments	
Disaggregated by: Investment type, sector, enterprise size, department and municipality.	
Justification & Management Utility: Increased investment is the predominate source of economic growth in the agricultural and other economic sectors. Private sector investment is critical as it indicates that the investment is perceived to provide a positive financial return and necessary to meet market demands and requirements. It is also expected to lead to sustainable increases in agricultural production or other commercial activities.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data Collection Method: Annual sample survey for beneficiaries; regular partner reporting	
Data Source(s): Beneficiary households, MSMEs and other Project clients	
Method of Acquisition: Data collection surveys obtained through partners and project staff	
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly from MSMEs; annually from beneficiaries	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: US\$ New MSME Investment as a result of USG assistance					
ACCESO Indicator:					
6. VALUE OF NEW PRIVATE SECTOR INVESTMENT IN THE AGRICULTURE SECTOR OR FOOD CHAIN LEVERAGED BY FTF IMPLEMENTATION					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September /October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Surveys with extreme values (higher than normal investments) will be filtered and re assessed / validated.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Quarterly review of investments by ACCESO M&E Manager, meetings with ACCESO field managers, partner audits and random surveys of beneficiaries.					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 5					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Any investment made after six months of intervention is considered new. Targets are cumulative.					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (US\$ Millions)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	\$4.32	\$4.32			
Sept. 2013	\$6.48	\$10.80			
Sept. 2014	\$7.56	\$18.36			
Feb. 2015	\$3.24	\$21.60			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1	
USAID RF: Number of MSMEs that have successfully adopted new inputs, technologies and practices as a result of USG assistance	
ACCESO Indicator: 7. NUMBER OF FARMERS AND OTHERS WHO HAVE APPLIED NEW TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs' Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.5.2 Agricultural Sector Capacity	
FTF indicator: No ___ Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1

USAID RF: Number of MSMEs that have successfully adopted new inputs, technologies and practices as a result of USG assistance

ACCESO Indicator:

7. NUMBER OF FARMERS AND OTHERS WHO HAVE APPLIED NEW TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE

Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the total number of farmers, herders, livestock producers, ranchers and other primary sector producers (food and non-food crops, livestock products, fisheries, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included), individual processors (not firms), rural entrepreneurs, managers and traders, natural resource managers, fishers and others employed in cultivating and harvesting food resources from salt and fresh waters, individuals who cultivate trees and shrubs and harvest non-timber forest products, as well as the processors, managers, teachers, extension specialists, researchers, policymakers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed, and fiber system and its relationships to natural resources etc. that are applying new technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USG assistance.

Technologies and management practices to be counted here are agriculture and non-agriculture-related technologies, innovations and management practices. The definition of agriculture is, per the Agency strategy, a food and fiber system stretching from input supply and production through marketing and processing to domestic consumption and exports. Food and non-food crops, livestock products, fisheries, agro-forestry, and natural resource-based products are included. Thus technologies and management practices may relate to any of these products at any point on the supply chain. They may include improved practices such as sustainable land or water management.

Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted. In the case where, for example, a farmer applies several innovation practices as a result of USG assistance, they are still only counted once. Practices are defined as those that most effectively contribute to achieving the higher level IR indicators (sales/employment). They will be oriented towards improving productivity, profitability, and meeting market requirements. The package of minimum inputs, technologies, and practices to be adopted by any particular type of firm to be counted towards this indicator must be approved by the COTR. “Applied” is considered as the implementation of the package while the farmer is receiving USG assistance.

This includes innovations in productivity, value-addition, post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest and water management, managerial practices, input supply delivery .

Any technology that was first adopted in a previous year should not be included. Example technologies may include (but are not limited to):

- Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, planting, irrigation, fertilization methods, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including packaging;
- Biological: New germplasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines;
- Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides;
- Management and cultural practices: Information technology, improved agricultural production and marketing practices.

NRM practices related to the indicator “*Number of companies (including farms) that have made conservation-friendly changes in their business practices*” are not included in this definition to avoid double counting.

Unit of Measure: Number of farmers, processors and other actors in the agricultural supply chain

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
USAID RF: Number of MSMEs that have successfully adopted new inputs, technologies and practices as a result of USG assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 7. NUMBER OF FARMERS AND OTHERS WHO HAVE APPLIED NEW TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE
Method of Calculation: Count of farmers and others beneficiaries implementing new technologies or management practices
Disaggregated by: Sector, sex, department, municipality, type of beneficiary, new/continuing New = This reporting year if the first year the beneficiary applied the new technology or management practice Continuing = The beneficiary first applied the new technology or management practice in the previous year and continues to apply it
Justification & Management Utility: New inputs, technologies, and practices will improve MSMEs productivity, profitability and ability to meet market requirements, as well as create new employment. In addition, technological change and its adoption by different actors in the agricultural supply chain will be critical to increasing agricultural productivity and competitiveness. Assumes all directly supported households will adopt at least the minimum package of technologies.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Annual sample surveys of new technologies or practices in use; supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of selected households.
Data Source(s): Farmers, producer groups, processors and other Project beneficiaries
Method of Acquisition: Annual sample surveys
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database; supplemental survey database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The MSME's do not always give the correct information
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Survey to include examples of the new technologies and practices
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files
Review of Data: Review of household survey results by project management; comparison to ongoing performance monitoring information, Meetings with ACCESO field managers, partner audits and random beneficiary audits.
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: No baseline data; ACCESO will report only new improved technologies or practices that the beneficiaries implement.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: Number of MSMEs that have successfully adopted new inputs, technologies and practices as a result of USG assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 7. NUMBER OF FARMERS AND OTHERS WHO HAVE APPLIED NEW TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE					
Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (MSMEs)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	4,410	4,410			
Sept. 2013	6,615	11,025			
Sept. 2014	7,718	18,743			
Feb. 2015	3,307	22,050			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-2 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE
ACCESO Indicator: 8. NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs' Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-2 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE
ACCESO Indicator: 8. NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the area (in hectares) of land or water (for fisheries) first brought under new technology during the reporting year. New area for subsequent years will be added on an ongoing basis as technologies are being adopted by beneficiaries to provide cumulative figures. The annual figure for a particular year is calculated by subtracting the current year’s cumulative figure from the previous year’s final cumulative figure. Any technology that was first adopted in a previous reporting year should be marked as “continuing” (see disaggregation notes below). Technologies to be counted are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (e.g. carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture). Relevant technologies include, but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mechanical and physical: New land preparation, harvesting, processing and product handling technologies, including biodegradable packaging, • Biological: New germplasm (varieties, breeds, etc.) that could be higher-yielding or higher in nutritional content and/or more resilient to climate impacts; affordable food-based nutritional supplementation such as vitamin A-rich sweet potatoes or rice, or high-protein maize, or improved livestock breeds; soil management practices that increase biotic activity and soil organic matter levels; and livestock health services and products such as vaccines; • Chemical: Fertilizers, insecticides, and pesticides safe storage application and disposal of agricultural chemicals, effluent and wastes, and soil amendments that increase fertilizer-use efficiency (e.g. soil organic matter); • Management and cultural practices: Information technology, conservation agriculture, improved/sustainable agricultural production and marketing practices, increased use of climate information for planning disaster risk strategies in place, climate change mitigation and energy efficiency, and natural resource management practices that increase productivity (e.g. upstream watershed conservation or bio-diesel fueled farm equipment) and/or resilience to climate change including soil and water conservation and management practices (e.g. erosion control, water harvesting, low or no-till); sustainable fishing practices (eg. ecological fishery reserves, improved fishing gear, establishment of fishery management plans); Integrated Pest Management (IPM), Integrated Soil Fertility Management (ISFM), and Post-Harvest Handling (PHH) related to agriculture, can all be included as improved technologies or management practices. <p>Significant improvements to existing technologies will also be counted. The number of hectares will not be double counted.</p>
Unit of Measure: Number of hectares
Method of Calculation: Sum of area and count of farmers and other beneficiaries implementing improved technologies or management practices
Disaggregated by: sex; type of beneficiary, technology type, department, new/continuing New = This is the first year the hectare came under improved technologies or management practices Continuing = the hectare being counted continues to be under improved technologies or management practices from the previous year
Justification & Management Utility: Tracks successful adoption of technologies and management practices necessary to ensure improved agricultural productivity.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation					
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-2 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE					
ACCESO Indicator:					
8. NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE					
Data Collection Method: Annual sample surveys; supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of selected households.					
Data Source(s): Farmers, producer groups, processors and other Project beneficiaries, department and municipality.					
Method of Acquisition: Annual sample surveys					
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year					
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database; supplemental survey database					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries; inadequate land measurement equipment.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: random measurements of land for a sample of clients for validation; calculations based on plant density/planting distances.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Review of sample survey results by project management; comparison to ongoing performance monitoring information; meetings with ACCESO field managers, partner audits and random beneficiary audits.					
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline data is not applicable for this indicator.					
Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Hectares)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	2,981	2,981			
Sept. 2013	4,471	7,452			

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.2: Enhanced Technology Development, Dissemination, Management and Innovation					
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-2 NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE					
ACCESO Indicator:					
8. NUMBER OF ADDITIONAL HECTARES UNDER IMPROVED TECHNOLOGIES OR MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AS A RESULT OF USG ASSISTANCE					
Sept. 2014	5,216	12,668			
Feb. 2015	2,236	14,904			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.2	
Number of Local Municipal Governments Effectively Implementing Natural Resource Management Policies as a Result of USG Assistance	
ACCESO Indicator: 9. NUMBER OF LOCAL MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENTING NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT POLICIES	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.2 Honduran Biodiversity and Natural Resources Conserved as a result of USG assistance	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.2.2 Productive Landscape Conservation Promoted as a result of USG assistance	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.8.1. Natural Resources and Biodiversity	
FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Natural resources management policies refers to ordinances, municipal accords, watershed management plans, municipal programs, declaration of water sources protection, forest fire prevention, reforestation, etc. that have been approved by the Municipal Corporation as a result of direct TA from ACCESO. Effectively implementing refers to the enforcement of these policies after their approval by the Municipal Corporation. Implementation may include the application of fines and any other evidence that the regulations are actually being put into practice. The municipalities must be engaged in the implementation of natural resources management policies. For a municipality to be counted towards this indicator they should be implementing and enforcing at least 70 percent of the total number of policies/activities approved.	
Unit of Measure: Number of local municipalities	
Method of Calculation: Count of the municipalities effectively implementing NRM policies	
Disaggregated by: Department, municipality, type of policy.	
Justification & Management Utility: The indicator will show that as municipalities are implementing and enforcing natural resources management policies, and that natural resources and biodiversity are being conserved and protected. The conservation and protection of natural resources are key for the sustainability of the farmers’ production systems and family well-being. It contributes to longer-term economic viability – and reduces climate change vulnerabilities.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data Collection Method: Primary data collected semi-annually from Municipalities through partners and validated through a scorecard by project staff.	
Data Source(s): Municipalities and other Project beneficiaries	
Method of Acquisition: Data collection obtained through partners	
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal	
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO M&E Manager	
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs	
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS database	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.2					
Number of Local Municipal Governments Effectively Implementing Natural Resource Management Policies as a Result of USG Assistance					
ACCESO Indicator:					
9. NUMBER OF LOCAL MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS EFFECTIVELY IMPLEMENTING NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT POLICIES					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): none					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Semi-annually review by ACCESO M&E Manager, meetings with ACCESO field managers, random field audits					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual ACCESO reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets:					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Municipalities)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	7	7			
Sept. 2013	7	14			
Sept. 2014	6	20			
Feb. 2015	0	20			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.2
USAID RF: Number of Companies That Have Made Conservation Friendly Changes in Their Business Practices as a Result of USG Assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 10. NUMBER OF COMPANIES (INCLUDING FARMS) THAT HAVE MADE CONSERVATION-FRIENDLY CHANGES IN THEIR BUSINESS PRACTICES
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.2 Honduran Biodiversity and Natural Resources Conserved as a result of USG assistance
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.2.2 Productive Landscape Conservation Promoted as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.8.1. Natural Resources and Biodiversity
FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Precise Definition(s): Companies are farmers and MSMEs in the areas of intervention. Conservation-friendly changes are defined as the use of resources without risk of degradation and without compromising current and future natural resources, which are the base for economic activities (production, processing, etc.). Conservation-friendly changes consider mitigation measures required for the use of water of irrigation (such as water source protection, riparian buffers and reforestation); control of soil erosion (including the planting of permanent live barriers); waste and pollution management, recycling and re-use (including working with coffee growers/processors to avoid water pollution during coffee bean processing); and wildlife and conservation plans (that aim to enhance habitats and maintain biodiversity on-farm).</p> <p>A minimum package of conservation-friendly changes will be defined and approved by COTR. Companies (including farms) will be counted only once upon the adoption of the minimum package. To be counted, the companies must have received at least 6 months of assistance.</p> <p>Technologies related to the indicator “<i>Number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance</i>” are not included in this definition to avoid double counting.</p>
Unit of Measure: Number of companies (includes farms)
Method of Calculation: A count of the number of companies (including farms) that have made conservation-friendly changes in their business practices
<p>Disaggregated by: sector, technology type (eg. forestation, water source protection, riparian buffers and reforestation), department, sex, new/continuing</p> <p>New = This is the first year the company (including farms) used conservation-friendly technologies or management practices</p> <p>Continuing = the company (including farms) being counted continues to use conservation-friendly technologies or management practices</p> <p>Sex of the adopter/implementer of these new conservation-friendly technologies or management practices being counted: male. Female or association-applied.</p>

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.2					
USAID RF: Number of Companies That Have Made Conservation Friendly Changes in Their Business Practices as a Result of USG Assistance					
ACCESO Indicator:					
10. NUMBER OF COMPANIES (INCLUDING FARMS) THAT HAVE MADE CONSERVATION-FRIENDLY CHANGES IN THEIR BUSINESS PRACTICES					
<p>Justification & Management Utility: Long-term sustainable agricultural production depends on increased use of NRM practices to maintain or enhance soil fertility, improve crop quality and livestock fodder, and enhance soil and water management and conservation. Incorporating good environmental practices into agricultural production programs ensures soil and water conservation that contributes to longer-term economic viability – and also provides small farmers with adaptation techniques to reduce climate change vulnerabilities. In addition, companies (farmers and MSMES) will obtain higher revenues due to better use of resources (water, soil, energy, etc.), reducing costs and increasing productivity, a “win – win situation”. Higher levels of revenues will in turn improve the quality of life of people, and allow them to diversify their business and invest in conservation as part of their operation plan.</p>					
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION					
<p>Data Collection Method: Annual sample surveys; supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of beneficiaries. Once a minimum package is adopted the beneficiaries will be counted towards the target.</p>					
<p>Data Source(s): Farmers, producer groups, processors and other beneficiaries</p>					
<p>Method of Acquisition: Data collection surveys obtained through Project staff and partners</p>					
<p>Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual</p>					
<p>Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal</p>					
<p>Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR</p>					
<p>Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs</p>					
<p>Location of Data Storage: CIRIS database</p>					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
<p>Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)</p>					
<p>Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): while area (hectares) information will be presented for certain activities (eg. reforestation), it will not cover all the activities carried out at some will not be “area” related (eg. live barriers for erosion control, wildlife and conservation plans).</p>					
<p>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A</p>					
<p>Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)</p>					
<p>Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end</p>					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
<p>Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files</p>					
<p>Review of Data: Review of household survey results by project management; comparison to ongoing performance monitoring information, meetings with ACCESO field managers, random partner audits.</p>					
<p>Reporting of Data: Annual Reports</p>					
OTHER NOTES					
<p>Notes on Baselines/Targets:</p>					
<p>Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.</p>					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Companies/Farms)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.2					
USAID RF: Number of Companies That Have Made Conservation Friendly Changes in Their Business Practices as a Result of USG Assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 10. NUMBER OF COMPANIES (INCLUDING FARMS) THAT HAVE MADE CONSERVATION-FRIENDLY CHANGES IN THEIR BUSINESS PRACTICES					
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	4,410	4,410			
Sept. 2013	6,615	11,025			
Sept. 2014	7,718	18,743			
Feb. 2015	3,307	22,050			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1	
ACCESO Indicator:	
11. NUMBER OF MSMEs IMPLEMENTING SOUND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs' Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i>	
FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Business management practices include, but are not limited to: activities planning, business plan, budgets, record keeping, organization systems, human resources management, tax management, financial indicator analysis and MSMEs' legal documentation. A minimum set of practices will be defined and approved by COTR. MSMEs will be counted only once upon the implementation of the minimum set of practices consistently for at least 6 months.	
Unit of Measure: # of MSMEs	
Method of Calculation: Count of the number of MSMEs that have implemented the minimum package of sound business management practices	
Disaggregated by: Type of business management implemented practice; department, enterprise size, value chain	
Justification & Management Utility: Implementing sound businesses management practices is a way to promote productivity and sustainability for MSMEs and provides increased access to credit and markets.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data Collection Method: Annual sample surveys; primary data collected from direct and indirect beneficiaries through partners and project staff for validation.	
Data Source(s): Farmers, MSMEs and other Project clients	
Method of Acquisition: Data collection surveys	
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal	
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR	
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs	
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS database	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)	
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over-stated activities being carried out.	
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: survey questions and review of documents relating to the practices.	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)	
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
ACCESO Indicator: 11. NUMBER OF MSMEs IMPLEMENTING SOUND BUSINESS MANAGEMENT PRACTICES					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Quarterly review by ACCESO M&E Manager, Meetings with ACCESO field managers, random partner audits.					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets:					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (MSMEs)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	1,696	1,696			
Sept. 2013	2,545	4,241			
Sept. 2014	3,817	8,058			
Feb. 2015	424	8,482			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
USAID RF: Number of Brokers Providing Market Linkages to MSMEs as a result of USG assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 12. NUMBER OF BROKERS PROVIDING MARKET LINKAGES TO MSMEs
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.2 Rural MSMEs' Access to New Market Opportunities Increased as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Brokers are formal or informal persons or companies (small, medium or large sized), dedicated to buying and selling commercial goods for domestic and foreign markets. Market linkages are defined as the services provided by a broker that guarantee to MSMEs the sale of their products for profit. A market linkage will be counted only if a deal is executed. A broker may be an intermediary or an end market partner, as long as they provide services related to the wholesale or retail consolidation of the product. In order to be counted, a broker must provide at least 2 sales transactions to a minimum of 10 project-assisted MSMEs and have a permanent relationship with assisted MSMEs. ACCESO will evaluate the “quality” of the relationship between the MSME and the broker in order to ensure permanence and sustainability. In the tourism sector, brokers are travel agencies or tour operators. In forestry/agroforestry, they are wholesale buyers/sawmills. In agriculture, brokers include intermediaries, supermarkets, wholesale or retail markets, collection centers, exporters and processors.
Unit of Measure: Number of brokers
Method of Calculation: Count of the number of brokers providing market linkages
Disaggregated by: Market type, department, value chain
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator measures enhanced market access for MSMEs which is key to increase rural income
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Primary data collected through brokers and cross references with end-of-harvest surveys from MSMEs beneficiaries. In addition, a database will be developed which details all brokers and MSME's with market linkages in areas of intervention; this information will include the product(s) and the duration. The database will be updated every six months.
Data Source(s): MSME's and brokers
Method of Acquisition: Data collection surveys
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: ACCESO Intranet site, CIRIS Database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under reporting by Project beneficiaries

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: Number of Brokers Providing Market Linkages to MSMEs as a result of USG assistance					
ACCESO Indicator:					
12. NUMBER OF BROKERS PROVIDING MARKET LINKAGES TO MSMEs					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: cross check with brokers					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: List of brokers and linkage beneficiaries					
Review of Data: Monthly review by ACCESO M&E Manager, Meetings with ACCESO field managers, random partner audits.					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets:					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Brokers)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	25	25			
Sept. 2012	125	150			
Sept. 2013	200	350			
Sept. 2014	135	485			
Feb. 2015	15	500			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1	
USAID RF: Number of MSMEs that have been verified to meet market standards for their products as a result of USG assistance	
ACCESO Indicator: 13. NUMBER OF MSMEs THAT HAVE BEEN VERIFIED TO MEET MARKET STANDARDS FOR THEIR PRODUCTS	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.2 Rural MSMEs' Access to New Market Opportunities Increased as a result of USG assistance	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	FAF Program Element: 4.5.2 Agriculture Sector Capacity 4.6.1 Private Sector Competitiveness
FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Market standards refer to a set of precisely defined requirements of a product for a particular buyer or industry in either the local or international markets. This can include both private and international standards. A MSME will be reported as having achieved a particular standard during the reporting year once it enters the market. MSMEs will be counted once even if they have more than one type of certification. MSMEs achieving market standards in previous years will not be counted again if they re-certify. The MSMEs will have to implement practices such as sorting and packing fresh, unprocessed agricultural products into the appropriate sizes and containers and a myriad of other requirements such as sanitary registrations, business licenses, the Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point program, Good Agricultural Practices, pesticide handling and use, and product traceability systems. It can also include health certification for restaurants, FSC certification for forestry/agroforestry, or one of the sustainable tourism standards for hotels and tour operators. This indicator focuses on well-established standards in existing market opportunities rather than in compliance with standards for potential markets.	
Unit of Measure: MSMEs	
Method of Calculation: Count of MSMEs	
Disaggregated by: Type of MSMEs, market standard, department.	
Justification & Management Utility: Certification addresses many issues of productivity and market access. Achievement of market standards is an indicator of high levels of productivity, product quality, and competitiveness. Improving results for this indicator involves improving business and environmental management practices and identifying new investments necessary to meet the relevant requirements. In addition, focusing on market standards that are already well-established will avoid extra investment in potential markets that may have a higher risk of failure.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data Collection Method: Data collected from records from MSMEs, certification bodies and buyers	
Data Source(s): MSMEs, buyers and certification entities	
Method of Acquisition: Lists provided by certification bodies and buyers	
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Every six months	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal	
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR	
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: Number of MSMEs that have been verified to meet market standards for their products as a result of USG assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 13. NUMBER OF MSMES THAT HAVE BEEN VERIFIED TO MEET MARKET STANDARDS FOR THEIR PRODUCTS					
Location of Data Storage: Project files; CIRIS Database					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: December 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The certification process can be very expensive and can take a long time, sometimes upwards of two years. Results may therefore be delayed. A process indicator will be used for those with on-going certification activities.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: group certifications will be used where possible to facilitate data capture.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Review of lists with certification bodies; validation of certificates with farmers					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: All beneficiaries achieving new market standards are counted. Results will be reported at least bi-annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (MSMEs)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	300	300			
Sept. 2013	700	1,000			
Sept. 2014	900	1,900			
Feb. 2015	100	2,000			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
USAID RF: Number of MSMEs Accessing Market-Based Financing as a Result of USG Assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 14. NUMBER OF MSMEs ACCESSING MARKET-BASED FINANCING AS A RESULT OF USG-ASSISTANCE
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.3 Barriers to Competitiveness of Rural MSMEs Reduced as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.6.2 Private Sector Capacity
FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): MSMEs reported under this indicator are those that have access to credit and other financial services from both bank and non-bank entities. To be counted an MSME must have received USG assistance and have accessed bank loans or private equity. USG assistance may include partial loan guarantee programs or any support facilitating the receipt of a loan or other equity (e.g. an in-kind loan such as a tractor, plow or other equipment given as a loan). A bank is any registered financial institution including micro-finance institutions, commercial banks, and any other financial institution that makes loans. Loans could be given by informal lenders and in-kind lenders of equipment or other inputs (e.g., fertilizer, seeds) transport or food with repayment being in cash or in kind. Lenders do not have to be formalized or registered.</p> <p>The indicator does not measure the value of the loans, but the number of MSMEs who received USG assistance and accessed loans. MSMEs will only be counted once even if they receive multiple loans.</p> <p>Enterprise size will be measured based on the number of employees according to the following categories: enterprise size - total number of micro (1-5) small (6-50) and medium (51-100) (parenthesis = number of employees) enterprises (MSMEs). Number of employees refers to full time-equivalent workers during the previous month.</p>
Unit of Measure: MSMEs
Method of Calculation: Sum of MSMEs accessing bank loans or private equity
Disaggregated by: Sex; type of MSME (farming and non-farm business), department, enterprise size (Total number of micro (1-5) small (6-50) and medium (51-100) (parenthesis = number of employees) enterprises (MSMEs)).
Justification & Management Utility: By having access to financial services (loans, insurance, bank accounts) MSMEs will have the ability to grow their business. The lack of access to financial capital is frequently cited as a major impediment to the development of MSMEs, thus helping MSMEs access finance is likely to increase investment and the value of output (production in the case of farmers, value added for agricultural processing). This will directly contribute to the expansion of markets, increased agricultural productivity, and the reduction of poverty.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Baseline data collection will include information on project beneficiaries who already have access to credit. Annual sample surveys of project beneficiaries; data collection every six months from financial service providers. Supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of select firms.
Data Source(s): Project beneficiaries and financial partners

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: Number of MSMEs Accessing Market-Based Financing as a Result of USG Assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 14. NUMBER OF MSMES ACCESSING MARKET-BASED FINANCING AS A RESULT OF USG-ASSISTANCE					
Method of Acquisition: Surveys					
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Bi-annual (financial service providers) and Annual MSMEs					
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS database, ACCESO Intranet					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal loans) will be filtered and re assessed / validated. When needed, information will be verified through on-site visits and review of logbooks or accounts. Targeted cross reference between lenders and loan recipients.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end.					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Quarterly meetings with ACCESO field managers, Business Skills/Finance specialists, and financial service providers; random field audits of farmers/firms.					
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets are cumulative					
Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (MSMEs)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	215	215			
Sept. 2012	863	1,078			
Sept. 2013	1,294	2,372			
Sept. 2014	1,726	4,098			
Feb. 2015	216	4,314			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY INITIATIVE AFFILIATION: FTF – Sub IR 2.7: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-29 Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans
ACCESO Indicator: 15. VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL LOANS MADE TO MSMES
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.3 Barriers to Competitiveness of Rural MSMEs Reduced
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator sums the value of loans made (i.e. disbursed during the reporting year as a result of USG assistance) to farmers, input suppliers, transporters, processors, as well as loans to MSMEs in rural areas that are in a targeted agricultural value chain as a result of USG assistance. The indicator counts loans disbursed to the recipient, not loans merely made (e.g. in process, but not yet available to the recipient). The loans can be made by any size financial institution from community based banks to formal national commercial bank and commercial companies such as input suppliers providing credit to MSME's.</p> <p>This indicator is directly linked to the indicator that measures the number of MSMEs accessing these rural loans.</p>
Unit of Measure: US\$ Millions (local currency will be converted to US\$ at the average market exchange rate for the reporting period); count of loans made.
Method of Calculation: Sum of value of Agricultural and Rural Loans
Disaggregated by: Continuing/New; type of loan recipient; sex of recipient person or organization: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuing/New: Recipients reported as benefiting will be those benefiting in the current reporting year. Any recipients that benefited in a previous year but not benefiting in the reporting year will not be included. Any recipient that benefited in the previous year and continues to benefit in the reporting year will be counted under "Continuing." If a recipient received a loan facilitated in the previous year under the Project and continued to benefit from that capital and/or continued to access credit with the same lender in the current (reporting) year, then that recipient will be counted. If the recipient accessed credit last year, e.g., as working capital, and repaid that loan and does not access credit facilitated by the project during the current (reporting) year, then the recipient will not be included. Any recipient that benefited for the first time during the current reporting year will be counted under "New." No recipient will be counted under both "Continuing" and "New." • Type of loan recipient: producers, MSMEs, local traders/assemblers, wholesalers/processors and others. • Sex of recipient person or organization: For producers, the sex of the person will be used to classify the recipient. For firms, if the enterprise is a single proprietorship, the sex of the proprietor will be used for classification. For larger enterprises, the majority ownership will be used. When this cannot be ascertained, the majority of the senior management will be used.
Justification & Management Utility: Access to finance is required to increase production, expand markets and increase incomes. Tracking the loans amounts and volumes will provide an indication as to whether access to financial services has improved.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY INITIATIVE					
AFFILIATION: FTF – Sub IR 2.7: Improved access to business development and sound and affordable financial and risk management services					
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-29 Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans					
ACCESO Indicator:					
15. VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL AND RURAL LOANS MADE TO MSMES					
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION					
Data Collection Method: Annual sample surveys of project beneficiaries; data collection every six months from financial service providers. Supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of select firms.					
Data Source(s): Project beneficiaries and financial partners					
Method of Acquisition: Annual survey and on-going from finance providers					
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annual					
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS database, USAID-ACCESO Intranet					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal loans) will be filtered and re assessed / validated. When needed, information will be verified through on-site visits and review of logbooks or accounts. Targeted cross reference between lenders and loan recipients.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Quarterly meetings with ACCESO field managers, Business Skills/Finance specialists, and financial service providers; random field audits of farmers/firms.					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (US\$ Millions)					
Year	Target (\$ millions)		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	\$0.32	\$0.32			
Sept. 2012	\$1.26	\$1.58			
Sept. 2013	\$1.90	\$3.48			
Sept. 2014	\$2.53	\$6.01			
Feb. 2015	\$0.32	\$6.33			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1	
USAID RF: Number of Value-Added Agriculture, Tourism and Forestry Value Chain/Sector Constraints identified and Resolved as a Result of USG Assistance	
ACCESO Indicator:	
16. NUMBER OF VALUE CHAIN/SECTOR CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED AND RESOLVED	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.3 Barriers to Competitiveness of Rural MSMEs Reduced as a result of USG assistance	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.6.2 Private Sector Capacity	
FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Constraints may be anticipated or unanticipated problems which if not resolved, could compromise the completion or impact of the Project. Priority constraints for agriculture include: lack of infrastructure, low level of technical skills, lack of good agricultural practices, etc. Value chains constraints can be identified and resolved at the input suppliers, producers, processors and buyers level; including business development service providers; and the final markets into which a product or service is sold, whether local, national, regional or global. An analysis of the entire value chain will be carried out per product/service in order to identify and document constraints. Those constraints will be the “identified” constraints. To be counted as resolved, the constraint must have been addressed by the implementation of specific actions and activities thorough which the constraint has been overcome and will require COTR approval.	
Unit of Measure: Number of value chain/sector constraints identified and resolved	
Method of Calculation: Count of constraints identified and resolved	
Disaggregated by: Sector, value chain.	
Justification & Management Utility: Identifying and resolving constraints is necessary for the sustainability and successful completion of projects and programs.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data Collection Method: Analyses will be carried out of selected value chains per product/service in order to identify constraints after which solutions will be implemented that have a direct impact on the competitiveness of the assisted MSMEs and the value-chains in which they are operating. The impact of the resolved constraints in the value chain will be monitored every six months.	
Data Source(s): Public sector and private sector partners organizations	
Method of Acquisition: Data collection surveys	
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Semi-annual and annually	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate	
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR	
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs	
Location of Data Storage: ACCESO Intranet Site	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: Number of Value-Added Agriculture, Tourism and Forestry Value Chain/Sector Constraints identified and Resolved as a Result of USG Assistance					
ACCESO Indicator:					
16. NUMBER OF VALUE CHAIN/SECTOR CONSTRAINTS IDENTIFIED AND RESOLVED					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Information or data needed from Government may be incomplete or delayed.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: work mainly with private sector.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Summary report of policy interventions					
Review of Data: Quarterly meetings with ACCESO Policy Analyst/Specialist, Field Managers, and partners					
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.					
Other Notes: Targeted constraints will be approved by the Buyer (COTR) prior to implementation (i.e. annual work plan approval). Successful resolution of constraint will require COTR approval prior to any associated fee being paid and every effort should be made not only to resolve a constraint but to also demonstrate the impact this has on the sector.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Constraints)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	15	15			
Sept. 2013	15	30			
Sept. 2014	10	40			
Feb. 2015	0	40			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1	
USAID RF: Number of Relevant Business Enabling Environment Legal and Institutional Reforms Implemented as a Result of USG Assistance	
ACCESO Indicator: 17. NUMBER OF POLICY REFORMS, REGULATIONS, ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES PASSED FOR WHICH IMPLEMENTATION HAS BEGUN WITH USG ASSISTANCE	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: 2.1.3 Barriers to Competitiveness of Rural MSMEs Reduced as a result of USG assistance	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.6.1 Business Enabling Environment	
FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	
<p>Precise Definition(s): Reforms include efforts to improve the “business enabling environment” by improving the process of registering businesses, assisting businesses to get titles for any property associated with the business, aid with paying their taxes and getting access to credit. Relevant is defined as reform aiding the MSMEs to reduce their barriers to competitiveness. Number of agricultural enabling environment policies, regulations, administrative procedures in the areas of agricultural resource, food, market standards & regulation, and public investment that completed the policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/regulation/ administrative procedure by relevant authority). To be counted as implemented, evidence will be provided to reflect the positive changes derived from the implementation of the reform. Requires COTR approval.</p> <p>It includes national and sub-national level policies, regulations, and administrative procedures.</p>	
Unit of Measure: Number of reforms	
Method of Calculation: Count of reforms	
Disaggregated by: Type of Reform	
Justification & Management Utility: The indicator measures the number of policies, regulations, administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for the MSMEs. Previously, little effort has been focused on trying to ensure that reformed policies are actually implemented by the MSMEs that need them, limiting the growth of these MSMEs.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data Collection Method: The key processes where reforms need to be implemented will be identified. The status of these processes prior to implementation will comprise the baseline. These processes will be reviewed and approved by the COTR and relevant reforms will be selected and supported. Implementation of these reforms with key stakeholders will be carried out and reform progress monitored every six months.	
Data Source(s): Public sector and private sector partners organizations	
Method of Acquisition: Meetings, reports, government statistics.	
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Bi-annual	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal	
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR	
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: Number of Relevant Business Enabling Environment Legal and Institutional Reforms Implemented as a Result of USG Assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 17. NUMBER OF POLICY REFORMS, REGULATIONS, ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES PASSED FOR WHICH IMPLEMENTATION HAS BEGUN WITH USG ASSISTANCE					
Location of Data Storage: ACCESO Intranet Site					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: beginning 2012					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): some reforms may require modifications to existing laws which might prolong the process and be difficult to quantify.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Focus efforts on the private sector.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Project end (Jan/Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: n/a					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Summary report of policy interventions					
Review of Data: Review of policy reforms by Policy Analyst/Specialist; meetings with ACCESO COP and DCOPs					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Policies)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	1	1			
Sept. 2012	1	2			
Sept. 2013	1	3			
Sept. 2014	1	4			
Feb. 2015	0	4			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF - IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households INDICATOR TITLE: 3--5 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger
ACCESO Indicator: 18. PREVALENCE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH MODERATE TO SEVERE HUNGER
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percent of households experiencing moderate or severe hunger, as indicated by a score of 2 or more on the household hunger scale (HHS). To collect data for this indicator, respondents are asked about the frequency with which three events were experienced by household members in the last four weeks: 1. no food at all in the house; 2. went to bed hungry, 3. went all day and night without eating. For each question, the following responses are possible: never (value=0), rarely or sometimes (value=1), often (value=2). Values for the three questions are summed for each household, producing a HHS score ranging from 0 to 6.</p> <p>The numerator for this indicator is the total number of households with a score of 2 or more on the HHS. The denominator is the total number of households in the sample with HHS data.</p>
<p>Unit of Measure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percent of households with moderate to severe hunger (to be carried out in sample of ACCESO beneficiaries by USAID ACCESO). 2. Percent of households with moderate to severe hunger in total population of households in zone of influence/targeted region (6 departments) (to be carried out by USAID M&E Contractor). <p>Note: Beneficiary selection will include a focus on municipalities with households with higher than average levels of poverty and malnutrition. ACCESO direct beneficiaries will receive project technical assistance and training to improve both the economic conditions and nutritional status of the households. Health and nutrition activities related to the overall population (which also includes ACCESO beneficiaries), will be provided through the continuous delivery of key messages and support to expand and improve the existing nutrition services of the Ministry of Health and other providers. Again, focus will be given to municipalities with higher than average levels of poverty and malnutrition. During project implementation, annual surveys will be carried out of ACCESO beneficiaries that will determine the on-going results for this indicator and enable any implementation adjustments to be made as required. It is expected that the overall population will show the same tendencies as the direct ACCESO beneficiaries, although due to the additional support with economic development and increased incomes, the ACCESO beneficiaries should show a faster and higher rate of improvement.</p>
<p>Method of Calculation: The numerator for this indicator is the total number of households with a score of 2 or more on the HHS. The denominator is the total number of households in the sample with HHS data.</p>
<p>Disaggregated by: Household Head Type (female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)), Department, Municipality</p>

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF - IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households INDICATOR TITLE: 3--5 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger
ACCESO Indicator: 18. PREVALENCE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH MODERATE TO SEVERE HUNGER
Justification & Management Utility: Measurement of household hunger provides a tool to monitor global progress of USG supported food security initiatives. A decrease in household hunger is also a reflection of improved household resilience.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For USAID ACCESO beneficiaries - Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys carried out annually. OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that was developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population is zone of influence.
Data Source(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For USAID ACCESO beneficiaries – sample surveys for Project beneficiaries 2. For total population - special study will be conducted by USAID-funded M&E contractor
Method of Acquisition: Surveys
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For USAID ACCESO beneficiaries – ACCESO COP/DCOPs 2. AID M&E Contractor
Location of Data Storage: Supplemental survey database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011, USAID ACCESO
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Seasonality - the time of year when the survey is applied is likely to provide significantly different results.
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Surveys will be applied at the same time of year.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files
Review of Data: Mid-term and final review of results by ACCESO project Nutrition and Health Manager and staff
Reporting of Data: ACCESO Quarterly and Reports
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF - IR 5: Increased resilience of vulnerable communities and households					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3--5 Prevalence of households with moderate or severe hunger					
ACCESO Indicator:					
18. PREVALENCE OF HOUSEHOLDS WITH MODERATE TO SEVERE HUNGER					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Reduction from Baseline)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	--	--			
Sept. 2012	--	--			
Sept. 2013	-10%	-10%			
Sept. 2014	--	--			
Feb. 2015	-20%	-20%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS Location OBJECTIVE: 3 Investing in People INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger INDICATOR TITLE: 3—1 Prevalence of underweight children under 5
ACCESO Indicator: 19. PREVALENCE OF UNDERWEIGHT CHILDREN UNDER 5
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): <i>Underweight children</i> is a weight-for-age measurement. Underweight is a reflection of acute and/or chronic under nutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children with 0-59 months who are underweight, as defined by a weight for age Z score < -2.</p> <p>The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months with a weight for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with weight for age Z score data.</p>
<p>Unit of Measure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percent of children < 2 who are underweight (to be carried out in sample of ACCESO beneficiaries by USAID ACCESO). 2. Percent of total population of children < 5, who are underweight, in zone of influence/targeted area (6 departments) (to be carried out by USAID M&E Contractor). <p>Note: Data on underweight children is available from the Ministry of Health/AIN-C for children up until two years of age. ACCESO has an agreement with the Ministry of Health to obtain this information throughout Project implementation. ACCESO will focus its activities and tracking of children up until two years of age as this is the key age range to ensure adequate development and nutrition over the longer term, including for children less than five years. Results obtained and tracked in children up until two years will be representative on Project completion in the population of children up to five years. Data analysis will be carried out during project implementation that will determine the on-going results for this indicator and enable any implementation adjustments to be made as required.</p>
<p>Method of Calculation: The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-24 months (USAID ACCESO) or 0-59 months (USAID M&E Contractor) with a weight for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-24 months of project-assisted households in the sample with weight for age Z score data (USAID ACCESO) or 0-59 months for the total population (USAID M&E Contractor).</p> <p>The percentages as listed on the reference indicators values represents the estimated percentage decrease in this prevalence rate (in percentage terms not percentage point terms).</p>
<p>Disaggregated by: Department, Municipality (for M&E contractor), sex and age of child</p>
<p>Justification & Management Utility: Reducing the prevalence of underweight children under 5 is a goal of the Feed the Future Initiative. Monitoring the percent of underweight children 0-59 months therefore allows USAID and its partners to show the contribution of FTF programs to the Millennium Development Goal to reduce by half the world's hunger.</p>

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS Location OBJECTIVE: 3 Investing in People INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger INDICATOR TITLE: 3—1 Prevalence of underweight children under 5
ACCESO Indicator: 19. PREVALENCE OF UNDERWEIGHT CHILDREN UNDER 5
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Annual Survey, data collected on ACCESO beneficiaries through Nutrition and Health partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers and project staff. USAID ACCESO will work with rural health centers to establish capacity to keep proper weight records on children 0-24 months. USAID ACCESO will collect weight records quarterly from various sources including the Hospital Materno Infantil, CESAMOs, CESARs and Community Volunteer Monitors, on a sample of the targeted households to determine underweight prevalence rates. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.
Data Source(s): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> USAID ACCESO: rural health centers and related Project partners in health and nutrition. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine source(s) for total population in zone of influence.
Method of Acquisition: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> USAID ACCESO: quarterly data collection from Health and Nutrition partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ACCESO – quarterly with presentation of data annually USAID and M&E Contractor - tbd
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: Supplemental survey database; MS Excel files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): poor quality / obsolete measurement equipment. (NOTE: Ministry of Health centers only collect weight data from 0 to 24 months. No data available from 25 to 50 months.)
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Calibration in health centers with irregular data; provision of weighing equipment to centers will be limited or no equipment.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files
Review of Data: Quarterly review of evaluation results by ACCESO Nutrition and Health Manager and staff
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS Location OBJECTIVE: 3 Investing in People					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF Goal: Sustainably Reduce Global Poverty and Hunger					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3—1 Prevalence of underweight children under 5					
ACCESO Indicator:					
19. PREVALENCE OF UNDERWEIGHT CHILDREN UNDER 5					
Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for males and females after baseline data collection and analysis.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Reduction from Baseline)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	--	--			
Sept. 2012	-5%	-5%			
Sept. 2013	-10%	-10%			
Sept. 2014	-15%	-15%			
Feb. 2015	-20%	-20%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children INDICATOR TITLE: 3—2 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age
ACCESO Indicator: 20. PREVALENCE OF STUNTED CHILDREN UNDER 5
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): Stunting is a height-for-age measurement that is a reflection of chronic nutrition. This indicator measures the percent of children from 0-59 months (i.e. under 5 years) who are stunted, as defined by a height for age Z score < -2. Children with a height for age Z score < -2 and >= -3 are classified as moderately stunted. Children with a height for age Z score < -3 are classified as severely stunted.</p> <p>This indicator will be a measurement of any stunting, i.e. both moderate and severe stunting combined. While stunting is difficult to measure in children 0-6 months and most stunting occurs in the -9-23 month range (1,000 days), this indicator data will still be reported for all children under 5 to align with DHS data and to capture the impact of interventions over time.</p> <p>The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months with a height for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-59 months in the sample with height for age Z score data.</p>
<p>Unit of Measure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percent of children < 2 who are stunted (to be carried out in sample of ACCESO beneficiaries by USAID ACCESO). 2. Percent of total population of children < 5, who are stunted, in zone of influence/targeted area (6 departments) (to be carried out by USAID M&E Contractor).
<p>Method of Calculation: This indicator will be a measurement of any stunting, i.e. both moderate and severe stunting combined. The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-59 months with a height for age Z score < -2. The denominator is the total number of children 0-24 months of project-assisted household in the sample with height for age Z score data (USAID ACCESO) or 0-59 months for the total population (USAID M&E Contractor).</p> <p>The percentages as listed on the reference indicators values represents the estimated percentage decrease in this prevalence rate from baseline (in percentage terms not percentage point terms).</p>
<p>Disaggregated by: Sex and age of child, department, municipality</p>
<p>Justification & Management Utility: Stunting is an indicator of linear growth retardation, most often due to prolonged exposure to an inadequate diet and poor health. Reducing the prevalence of stunting among children particularly 0-23 months is important because linear growth deficits accrued early in life are associated with cognitive impairments, poor educational performance and decreased work productivity among adults. Better nutrition leads to increased cognitive and physical abilities, thus improving individual productivity in general, including improved agricultural productivity.</p>

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children
INDICATOR TITLE: 3—2 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age
ACCESO Indicator:
20. PREVALENCE OF STUNTED CHILDREN UNDER 5
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Annual Survey, data collected on ACCESO beneficiaries through Nutrition and Health partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers and project staff. USAID ACCESO will work with rural health centers to establish capacity to keep proper records on children 0-24 months. USAID ACCESO will collect weight records quarterly from various sources including the Hospital Materno Infantil, CESAMOs, CESARs and Community Volunteer Monitors, on a sample of the targeted households to determine underweight prevalence rates. 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.
Data Source(s):
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID ACCESO: rural health centers and related Project partners in health and nutrition. 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine source(s) for total population in zone of influence.
Method of Acquisition:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID ACCESO: annual data collection from Health and Nutrition partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition:
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ACCESO – mid-term and final evaluation (results are not expected to be evident in Year 1 of implementation, given the time necessary for this indicator to change). 2. USAID and M&E Contractor – tbd
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs and M&E Contractor.
Location of Data Storage: Supplemental sample survey database; MS Excel files
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August / September 2011, USAID ACCESO
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): poor (limited) measurement equipment
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Calibration of equipment in select health centers reporting irregular (inconsistent) data.
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Presentation of Data: ACCESO Mid-term and Final Reports. Reports from M&E contractor to be determined with USAID.
Review of Data: Review of evaluation results by ACCESO Nutrition and Health Director and component staff
Reporting of Data: Mid-term and Final Reports
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through initial USAID M&E Contractor survey

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Objective 3 Investing in People					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Key Objective: Improved Nutritional Status Especially of Women and Children					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3—2 Prevalence of stunted children under five years of age					
ACCESO Indicator:					
20. PREVALENCE OF STUNTED CHILDREN UNDER 5					
Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for male and female after baseline data collection and analysis. Results are not expected to be evident in Year 1 of implementation, given the time necessary for this indicator to change.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Reduction from Baseline)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	--	--			
Sept. 2012	--	--			
Sept. 2013	-10%	-10%			
Sept. 2014	--	--			
Feb. 2015	-20%	-20%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 6 Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-2 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet
ACCESO Indicator: 21. PERCENT OF CHILDREN 6-23 MONTHS THAT RECEIVED A MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE DIET
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the proportion of children 6-23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD), apart from breast milk. A “minimum acceptable diet” consists of measuring both the minimum feeding frequency and minimum dietary diversity, as appropriate for various age groups. If a child meets the minimum feeding frequency and minimum dietary diversity for their age group, then they are considered to receive a minimum acceptable diet.</p> <p>Tabulation of the indicator requires that data on breastfeeding, dietary diversity, number of semi-solid/solid feeds and number of milk feeds be collected for children 6-23 months the day preceding the survey. The indicator is calculated from the following two fractions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Breastfed children 6-23 months of age who had at least the minimum dietary diversity and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day / Breastfed children 6-23 months of age and, 2. Non-breastfed children 6-23 months of age who received at least 2 milk feedings and had at least the minimum dietary diversity not including milk feeds and the minimum meal frequency during the previous day / Non-breastfed children 6-23 months of age <p>Minimum dietary diversity for breastfed children 6-23 months is defined as four or more food groups out of the following 7 food groups (refer to the WHO IYCF operational guidance document cited at bottom):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grains, roots and tubers 2. Legumes and nuts 3. Dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese) 4. Flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats) 5. Eggs 6. Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables 7. Other fruits and vegetables <p>Minimum meal frequency for breastfed children is defined as two or more feedings of solid, semi-solid, or soft food for children 6-8 months and three or more feedings of solid, semi-solid or soft food for children 9-23 months.</p> <p>Minimum dietary diversity for non-breastfed children is defined as four or more food groups out of the following six food groups:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grains, roots and tubers 2. Legumes and nuts 3. Flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 6 Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-2 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet
ACCESO Indicator: 21. PERCENT OF CHILDREN 6-23 MONTHS THAT RECEIVED A MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE DIET
4. Eggs 5. Vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables 6. Other fruits and vegetables Minimum meal frequency for non-breastfed children is defined as four or more feedings of solid, semi-solid, soft food, or milk feeds for children 6-23 months, with at least two of these feedings being milk feeds
Unit of Measure: 1. Percent of children in sample receiving a minimal acceptable diet (to be carried out in sample of ACCESO beneficiaries by USAID ACCESO). 2. Percent of total population of children receiving a minimal acceptable diet, in zone of influence/targeted area (6 departments) (to be carried out by USAID M&E Contractor).
Method of Calculation: Percentage
Disaggregated by: sex, department
Justification & Management Utility: Appropriate feeding of children 6-23 months is multidimensional. The minimum acceptable diet indicator combines standards of dietary diversity (a proxy for nutrient density) and feeding frequency (a proxy for energy density) by breastfeeding status; and thus provides a useful way to track progress at simultaneously improving the key quality and quantity dimensions of children's diets
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: 1. Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually. OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that was developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data. 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence
Data Source(s): 1. USAID ACCESO: sample surveys of project beneficiaries. 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine source(s) for total population in zone of influence.
Method of Acquisition: DHS survey;
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: 1. ACCESO – Bi-annually 2. USAID and M&E Contractor – tbd
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO M&E Manager
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs and USAID M&E Contractor
Location of Data Storage: Supplemental survey database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Poor knowledge of food groups from surveyed households

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 6 Improved Access to Diverse and Quality Foods					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-2 Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet					
ACCESO Indicator:					
21. PERCENT OF CHILDREN 6-23 MONTHS THAT RECEIVED A MINIMUM ACCEPTABLE DIET					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Recall of irregular surveys / validation					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Review of results by project team ACCESO Nutrition and Health Manager and component staff					
Reporting of Data: Annual report for FY 2013, and Final report					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey.					
Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Increase over Baseline)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	--	--			
Sept. 2012	--	--			
Sept. 2013	+20%	+20%			
Sept. 2014	--	--			
Feb. 2015	+30%	+30%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 7: Improved nutrition-related behaviors INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months
ACCESO Indicator: 22. PREVALENCE OF EXCLUSIVE BREASTFEEDING OF CHILDREN UNDER 6 MONTHS
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percent of children from 0-5 months of age who were exclusively breastfed during the day preceding the survey. Exclusive breastfeeding means that the infant received breast milk (including milk expressed or from a wet nurse) and may have received ORS, vitamins, minerals and/or medicines, but did not receive any other food or liquid.</p> <p>The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children 0-5 months exclusively breastfed in the day preceding the survey. The denominator is the total number of children 0-5 months.</p>
<p>Unit of Measure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Percent of children 0-5 months who are exclusively breast fed (to be carried out in sample of ACCESO beneficiaries by USAID ACCESO). Percent of total population of children 0-5, exclusively breast fed, in zone of influence/targeted area (6 departments) (to be carried out by USAID M&E Contractor).
<p>Method of Calculation:</p> <p>The numerator for this indicator is the total number of children from 0-5 months exclusively breastfed in the day preceding the survey. The denominator is the total number of children 0-5 months for project-assisted households in the sample (USAID ACCESO) or for the total population (USAID M&E Contractor).</p> <p>The percentages as listed on the reference indicators values represents the estimated percentage increase in this prevalence rate from baseline (in percentage terms not percentage point terms).</p>
Disaggregated by: Department
<p>Justification & Management Utility: Exclusive breastfeeding for 6 months provides children with significant health and nutrition benefits, including protection from gastrointestinal infections and reduced risk of mortality, due to infectious disease. It also helps mother's reduction of breast and ovaries cancer illness.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
<p>Data Collection Method:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> USAID ACCESO: survey with data collected direct from ACCESO beneficiaries through Nutrition and Health partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers and project staff. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.
<p>Data Source(s):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> USAID ACCESO: sample survey. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine source(s) for total population in zone of influence.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 7: Improved nutrition-related behaviors					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-4 Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months					
ACCESO Indicator:					
22. PREVALENCE OF EXCLUSIVE BREASTFEEDING OF CHILDREN UNDER 6 MONTHS					
Method of Acquisition:					
1. USAID ACCESO: Annual survey obtained through Nutrition and Health partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers.					
2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.					
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually					
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO M&E Manager					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs and USAID M&E Contractor.					
Location of Data Storage: Supplemental sample survey database					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2012 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Midterm (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Report					
Review of Data: Review of results by project team ACCESO Nutrition and Health Manager and staff					
Reporting of Data: Annually					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey.					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Increase over Baseline)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	--	--			
Sept. 2012	+5%	+5%			
Sept. 2013	+10%	+10%			
Sept. 2014	+15%	+15%			
Feb. 2015	+20%	+20%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age
ACCESO Indicator: 23. PREVALENCE OF ANEMIA AMONG WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE AGE
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Anemia is measured by hemoglobin concentration in the blood and, for this indicator, is collected among women of reproductive age (15-49 years). Non pregnant women (NPW) with a hemoglobin concentration less than 12g/dl and Pregnant women (PW) with a hemoglobin concentration less than 11g/dl are classified as anemic. The numerator for this indicator is the total number of anemic women 15-49 years. The denominator is the total number of women 15-49 years in the sample with hemoglobin data.
Unit of Measure: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Percent of women in sample with anemia (to be carried out in sample of ACCESO beneficiaries by USAID ACCESO). NOTE: data available and collected only for pregnant women. 2. Percent of total population of women in sample with anemia, in zone of influence/targeted area (6 departments) (to be carried out by USAID M&E Contractor).
Method of Calculation: The numerator for this indicator is the total number of anemic women 15-49 years. The denominator is the total number of women 15-49 years in the sample with hemoglobin data of project-assisted households in the sample (USAID ACCESO) or for the total population (USAID M&E Contractor).
Disaggregated by: Pregnant Women; Non-pregnant Women
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator emphasizes the importance of women’s micronutrient nutrition both pre-pregnancy and during pregnancy for the growth and development of the child in-utero and for a safe delivery and positive birth outcome. Maternal anemia during pregnancy is associated with increased risk of hemorrhage, sepsis, maternal mortality, perinatal mortality, and low birth weight. Maternal micronutrient nutrition (including adequate iron stores) is also necessary to support optimal maternal care for the child, including nutrient content of breast milk fed to the child, during infancy and early childhood. This IR emphasizes use of nutrition services with the assumption that if people use the health and nutrition services, anemia in women of reproductive age will drop. Note that while there are cut-offs for severity of anemia, FTF will be reporting on women with any anemia. For NPW, the cut-offs for mild, moderate and severe anemia are 10-11.9 g/dl, 7-9.9 g/dl and <7 g/dl, respectively. For PW, the cut-offs are 10-10.9 g/dl, 7-9.9 g/dl and <7 g/dl, respectively.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age					
ACCESO Indicator:					
23. PREVALENCE OF ANEMIA AMONG WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE AGE					
Data Collection Method:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Data collected where available on ACCESO beneficiaries through Nutrition and Health partners. 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence. 					
Data Source(s):					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID ACCESO: rural health centers and related Project partners in health and nutrition. 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine source(s) for total population in zone of influence. 					
Method of Acquisition:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID ACCESO: data collection from Health and Nutrition partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers 2. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence. 					
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition:					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. USAID ACCESO: Mid-term and end of Project 2. USAID and M&E Contractor: Mid-term and Final evaluation 					
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: High					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs; USAID M&E Contractor					
Location of Data Storage: Survey files & MS Excel reports; USAID M&E Contractor					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August / September 2013, USAID -ACCESO					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): data is not collected by the Ministry of Health on non-pregnant women; lack of proper laboratory analysis equipment; high cost.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Coordination with MOH and AIN-C					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Annual report for 2013 and Final report					
Review of Data: ACCESO management team, Nutrition and Health Managers					
Reporting of Data: Mid-term and Final					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets:					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Increase over Baseline)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline					
Sept. 2011					
Sept. 2012					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-6 Prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age					
ACCESO Indicator:					
23. PREVALENCE OF ANEMIA AMONG WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE AGE					
Sept. 2013	-2.5%	-2.5%			
Sept. 2014					
Feb. 2015	-2.5%	-5.0%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A			
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION			
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services			
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-9 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months			
ACCESO Indicator: 24. PREVALENCE OF ANEMIA IN CHILDREN 6-59 MONTHS			
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth			
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a			
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a			
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)			
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i>			
FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): Anemia is the condition of having less than the normal number of red blood cells or less than the normal quantity of hemoglobin in the blood. The measurement of hemoglobin is recognized as the key criterion for testing of anemia in women and children. Hemoglobin, a banded iron-containing protein is produced in red blood cells and its deficiency states, in principle; there is a deficiency of iron . While there have identified many causes of anemia, nutritional deficiency due to a lack of specific amounts of iron in the daily diet is more than half the total number of cases of anemia. Thus, the hemoglobin test can be accepted as a proxy for nutritional status of women and children.			
Anemia is measured by hemoglobin concentration in the blood and, for this indicator, is collected among children 6-59 months. Children with a hemoglobin concentration less than 11g/dl are classified as anemic.			
The numerator for this indicator is the total number of anemic children 6-59 months. The denominator is the total number of children 6-59 months in the sample with hemoglobin data.			
Unit of Measure: Percent of total population of children 6-59 months with anemia, in zone of influence/targeted area (6 departments) (to be carried out by USAID M&E Contractor).			
Method of Calculation: To determine the prevalence of anemia in children between 6 and 59 months a sample of blood using a hemoglobin meter will be taken. Anemia is classified as mild, moderate and severe, depending on the levels of hemoglobin found (grams / deciliter):			
Age in months:	Mild g/dl	Moderate	Severe
7-23	10.9	8.9	5.9
24+	11.4	9.4	6.4
All children between 6 and 59 months with any type of anemia according to age group are placed in the numerator and divide by the total number of children who were tested.			
The percentages as listed on the reference indicators values represents the estimated percentage increase in this indicator rate (in percentage terms not percentage point terms).			
Disaggregated by: Sex			

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-9 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months
ACCESO Indicator: 24. PREVALENCE OF ANEMIA IN CHILDREN 6-59 MONTHS
Justification & Management Utility: <p>This indicator highlights the importance of micronutrients (iron status, in particular) for child health and development. Child anemia is associated with adverse consequences for child growth and development, including increased morbidity and impaired cognitive development.</p> <p>Iron Deficiency Anemia (also called IDA) is currently the most frequent nutritional deficiency found in less developed areas. It is the last stage of a relatively long process of deterioration of body iron levels and influences motor development and immune systems of children under 59 months, perhaps even in the sub-clinical phase, causing irreversible damage. Anemia is a condition in which blood lacks enough red blood cells, hemoglobin, or less in total volume. According to ENDESA (2005-2006) a little more than a third of children 6 to 5 months in Honduras have some form of anemia.</p>
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Mid Term and Final Evaluation
Data Source(s): Households beneficiaries, DHS and M&E contractor
Method of Acquisition: to be determined by USAID and M&E Contractor.
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: to be determined by USAID and M&E Contractor.
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: High
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: M&E Contractor
Location of Data Storage: M&E Contractor
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: August / September 2013
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Ministry of Health does not carry out anemia tests on children; lack of laboratory testing equipment; high cost
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Coordination with MOH and AIN-C implementers
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING
Presentation of Data: to be presented by M&E Contractor
Review of Data: Review by project team ACCESO Nutrition and Health Manager and staff
Reporting of Data: Mid-term and Final reports
OTHER NOTES
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected by M&E Contractor. Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative
Other Notes: Separate targets will be set for male and female after baseline data collection and analysis.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-9 Prevalence of anemia among children 6-59 months					
ACCESO Indicator:					
24. PREVALENCE OF ANEMIA IN CHILDREN 6-59 MONTHS					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Reduction from Baseline)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	--	--			
Sept. 2012	--	--			
Sept. 2013	-10%	-10%			
Sept. 2014	--	--			
Feb. 2015	-20%	-20%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 6: Improved access to diverse and quality foods INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-12 Women’s Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age
ACCESO Indicator: 25. WOMENS’S DIETARY DIVERSITY: MEAN NUMBER OF FOOD GROUPS CONSUMED BY WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE AGE
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No ___ Yes ___ FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No ___ Yes <u>X</u>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): This indicator aims to measure micronutrient sufficiency obtained through diet, and reports the mean number of food groups consumed in the previous day.</p> <p>To calculate this indicator, nine food groups are used:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Grains, roots and tubers; 2. Legumes and nuts; 3. Dairy products (milk, yogurt, cheese); 4. Organ meat; 5. Eggs; 6. Flesh foods and other misc. small animal protein; 7. Vitamin A dark green leafy vegetables; 8. Other vitamin A rich vegetables and fruits; 9. Other fruits and vegetables <p>From the collected data, the following are calculated: 1) <i>Number and % of women of reproductive age consuming each food group</i>; 2) <i>Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age</i>. The indicator is tabulated by averaging the number of food groups consumed (out of the nine food groups above) across all women of reproductive age in the sample with data on dietary diversity.</p>

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 6: Improved access to diverse and quality foods INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-12 Women’s Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age
ACCESO Indicator: 25. WOMENS’S DIETARY DIVERSITY: MEAN NUMBER OF FOOD GROUPS CONSUMED BY WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE AGE
Unit of Measure: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mean number of food groups consumed by women (to be carried out in sample of ACCESO beneficiaries by USAID ACCESO). 2. Total population of women in zone of influence/targeted area (6 departments) (to be carried out by USAID M&E Contractor). <p>Note: Beneficiary selection will include a focus on municipalities with households with higher than average levels of poverty and malnutrition. ACCESO direct beneficiaries will receive project technical assistance and training to improve both the economic conditions and nutritional status of the households. Nutrition activities related to the overall population (which also includes ACCESO beneficiaries), will be provided through the continuous delivery of key messages and support to expand and improve the existing nutrition services of the Ministry of Health and other providers. Again, focus will be given to municipalities with higher than average levels of poverty and malnutrition. During project implementation, a mid-term survey will be carried out of ACCESO beneficiaries that will determine the on-going results for this indicator and enable any implementation adjustments to be made as required. It is expected that the overall population will show the same tendencies as the direct ACCESO beneficiaries, although due to the additional support with economic development and increased incomes, the ACCESO beneficiaries should show a faster and higher rate of improvement.</p>
Method of Calculation: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The numerator for this indicator is the mean number of food groups.
Disaggregated by: Gendered Household Head Type (female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)), Department.
Justification & Management Utility: Women of reproductive age are at risk for multiple micronutrient deficiencies, which can jeopardize their health and ability to care for the children and participate in income generating activities. Maternal micronutrient deficiencies during lactation can directly impact child growth and development but the potential consequences of maternal micronutrient deficiencies are especially severe during pregnancy, when there is greatest opportunity for nutrient deficiencies to cause long term, irreversible development consequences for the child in-utero. Dietary diversity (assessed here as the number of food groups consumed) is a key dimension of a high quality diet with adequate micronutrient content; and thus, important to ensuring the health and nutrition of both women and their children.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Annual sample surveys.
Data Source(s): Households beneficiaries
Method of Acquisition: Annual sample survey
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO M&E Manager
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database
DATA QUALITY ISSUES
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 3.1.9 NUTRITION					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 6: Improved access to diverse and quality foods					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-12 Women’s Dietary Diversity: Mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age					
ACCESO Indicator: 25. WOMENS’S DIETARY DIVERSITY: MEAN NUMBER OF FOOD GROUPS CONSUMED BY WOMEN OF REPRODUCTIVE AGE					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): lack of knowledge of food groups					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Validation of surveys with irregular results					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables and graphs					
Review of Data: Annual review by project team ACCESO Nutrition and Health Manager and staff					
Reporting of Data: Annual reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey. Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Change)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	0	0			
Sept. 2013	20%	20%			
Sept. 2014	0	0			
Feb. 2015	30%	30%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program 3.1.9 NUTRITION INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-7 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition
ACCESO Indicator: 26. NUMBER OF HEALTH FACILITIES WITH ESTABLISHED CAPACITY TO MANAGE ACUTE UNDER-NUTRITION
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: /a FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): A health facility may include government health clinics, private clinics as well as clinics run by community-based organizations or local NGOs located in the six departments. An “established capacity to manage acute under nutrition” indicates the organization has a program with established procedures, methods and appropriate materials to address acute under nutrition. An example of this could be a facility that meets the criteria on the Basic Procedures Manual for ambulatory Management of Moderate and Acute Malnutrition from the Honduras Ministry of Health. This indicator is asking how many health facilities [in the six departments] have this type of management capacity.
NOTE: This indicator should include all currently capable health facilities, and not only those who achieved the capability during this fiscal year. The intention is to reflect the current coverage of capable health facilities during each given fiscal year.
Unit of Measure: Health Facilities
Method of Calculation: Count of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition based on the established criteria. The health facilities are selected based on the level of services provided to project assisted households within its geographical working area.
Disaggregated by: department, municipality
Justification & Management Utility: Improving health facilities will help women and children to prevent from other forms of under nutrition with severe consequences (acute and global under-nutrition). A key objective of FTF is the “Improved nutritional status, especially of women and children”. Assistance to poor via health facilities that treat under-nutrition is a key component to achieving this objective.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Data collected through capacity assessment/criteria audit implemented by Nutrition and Health project staff through visits to health facilities.
Data Source(s): Rural health centers and related Project partners in health and nutrition
Method of Acquisition: Data collection surveys of health facilities.
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Program 3.1.9 NUTRITION					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 8: Improved utilization of maternal and child health and nutrition services					
INDICATOR TITLE: 3.1.9-7 Number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition					
ACCESO Indicator: 26. NUMBER OF HEALTH FACILITIES WITH ESTABLISHED CAPACITY TO MANAGE ACUTE UNDER-NUTRITION					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: Supplemental capacity assessment/criteria audit database					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end.					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/graphs					
Review of Data: Semi-annual review by project team ACCESO Nutrition and Health Manager and component staffs					
Reporting of Data: Annual reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Sum of <u>additional</u> health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition – with USG assistance.					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Health Facilities)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011					
Sept. 2012	10	10			
Sept. 2013	10	20			
Sept. 2014					
Feb. 2015					
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A	
ACCESO Indicator: 27. MODERN CONTRACEPTIVE PREVALENCE RATE	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No ___ Yes ___ (not known) FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <u>X</u> Yes ___	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Modern contraceptive method includes: female and male sterilization, intrauterine devices (IUDs), hormonal methods (oral pills, injections, and hormone-releasing implants, skin patches and vaginal rings), condoms and vaginal barrier methods (diaphragm, cervical cap and spermicidal foams, jellies, creams and sponges).	
Unit of Measure: Percent	
Method of Calculation: Contraceptive prevalence rate is the proportion of women between 15-49 years old from project target region who are using (or whose partner is using) a modern contraceptive method at a given point in time. $\frac{\# \text{ of women ages between 15-49 from target region (married or in union) using a contraceptive method}}{\text{Total \# of women of reproductive age from target region (married or in union)}} \times 100$ The percentages as listed on the reference indicators values represents the estimated percentage increase in this prevalence rate from baseline (in percentage terms not percentage point terms).	
Disaggregated by: Household method of contraception used, department, and age of user female or male beneficiary	
Justification & Management Utility: Contraceptive prevalence rate serves as a proxy measure of access to reproductive health services that are essential to improve family planning to reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, and promote gender equality.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data Collection Method: Annual sample surveys	
Data Source(s): Household beneficiaries	
Method of Acquisition: Annual sample survey	
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate	
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR	
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs	
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS database	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)	
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): Failure to provide accurate information given the sensitivity of the survey questions	
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Validation and data recall for irregular surveys	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
ACCESO Indicator: 27. MODERN CONTRACEPTIVE PREVALENCE RATE					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Review of results by project team ACCESO Nutrition and Health Manager and component staff					
Reporting of Data: Annual Report					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Percent Increase over Baseline)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	+2.5%	+2.5%			
Sept. 2013	+5.0%	+5.0%			
Sept. 2014	+7.5%	+7.5%			
Feb. 2015	+10%	+10%			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.3
USAID RF: Percentage of Communities in High Vulnerability Municipalities with Adequate Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Capacity as a Result of USG Assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 28. NUMBER OF COMMUNITIES IN HIGH VULNERABILITY MUNICIPALITIES WITH ADEQUATE DISASTER PREVENTION AND MITIGATION CAPACITY
Name of Assistance Objective: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: IR 2.3 Capacity to Mitigate and Adapt to Climate Change Strengthened as a result of USG assistance
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: IR 2.3.3 Disaster Vulnerability Reduced as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.8.2. Clean Productive Environment
FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Disaster prevention and mitigation capacity means that the community has the capacity to understand risk maps, prepare contingency plans, design and apply early-warning systems, respond to emergencies (shelters, provision of basic equipment, training of community volunteers, and running simulation drills). Adequate Disaster and Prevention and Mitigation Capacity is when a community can carry out more than 75% of the TA package by themselves (for example, can prepare and update their contingency plans, etc.). COTR will approve the TA package and the end results expected (clear target results). A tool will be developed to measure competencies among people trained.
Unit of Measure: Number of communities in high vulnerability municipalities with adequate disaster prevention and mitigation capacity
Method of Calculation: Count the number of communities in high vulnerability municipalities that are managing disaster prevention and mitigation plans in coordination with local authorities, communities and rural household.
Disaggregated by: municipality, department
Justification & Management Utility: By implementing an adequate disaster prevention and mitigation plan, future impact on the poor would be reduced and communities will learn management practices for sustainable natural resources and use of agricultural, forestry and fishery mitigation measures
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: A technical package will be prepared considering COPECO and OFDA disaster prevention and mitigation information. The COTR will review and approve the training package and will select which capabilities represent the 75% of the technical package. Communities will be identified giving preference to those located in the municipalities within and around protected areas and those of higher vulnerability. Implementation will start in those communities with highest vulnerability; nevertheless, the work will be carried out in all the municipalities identified.
Data Source(s): CODELS (Local emergency teams), COPECO and Municipalities
Method of Acquisition: Data collection surveys
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Moderate
Individual Responsible at USAID: USAID ACCESO M&E COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.3					
USAID RF: Percentage of Communities in High Vulnerability Municipalities with Adequate Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Capacity as a Result of USG Assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 28. NUMBER OF COMMUNITIES IN HIGH VULNERABILITY MUNICIPALITIES WITH ADEQUATE DISASTER PREVENTION AND MITIGATION CAPACITY					
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database, USAID – ACCESO Intranet Site					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): If there is personnel rotation, the achieved capacity on disaster prevention and mitigation of the municipality is decreased and can no longer be counted as adequate.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: review plans and implementation annually.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Summary report of communities in high vulnerability municipalities with adequate disaster prevention and mitigation capacity					
Review of Data: Semi-annual meetings with ACCESO Natural Resources Management staff					
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Communities)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	0	0			
Sept. 2012	15	15			
Sept. 2013	15	30			
Sept. 2014	10	40			
Feb. 2015	10	40			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.3	
USAID RF: Number Of Rural Community Micro-Generation Clean/Renewable Energy Projects Established as a Result of USG Assistance	
ACCESO Indicator: 29. NUMBER OF RURAL MICRO-GENERATION CLEAN/RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS ESTABLISHED	
Name of Assistance Objective: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth	
Name of Intermediate Result: IR 2.3 Capacity to Mitigate and Adapt to Climate Change Strengthened as a result of USG assistance	
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: IR 2.3.2 Clean/Renewable Energy Adopted as a result of USG assistance	
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)	
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: 4.8.2. Clean Productive Environment	
FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Micro-generation projects of 0-3 Megawatts or minimal electrical service (lights, cell phone charging, emergency radios, etc.) from renewable sources established with USAID assistance. Clean and renewable energy may include Household Solar system, Small Scale Biodigestors, Solar/Wind/Hybrid System for Schools, Clinics & Shelters, Solar/Wind/Hybrid System for Productive Enterprises, Fuel Efficient Stoves, Solar Dryers for Coffee, Zero Energy Cool Huts. Small scale micro-generation projects with minimal electrical service (lights, cell phone charging, emergency radios, etc.) from renewable sources established with USAID assistance. Small rural communities are those with less than 5,000 inhabitants that are not connected to the national electric grid and are located around the targeted protected areas. Micro generation clean/renewable energy projects may be micro-hydro generators, solar panel based systems or windmill based depending on the local circumstances. Efficient wood burning stoves and bio-digester based cooking gas systems may also be supported. For those energy projects requiring implementation at household or small scale level (for example Fuel efficient stoves, Solar dryers, and Zero energy cool huts) the number of units per project will be proposed for COTR approval based on amount of energy saved/generated. Established means they are currently generating energy for the communities. To be counted as USG assisted the projects must have been part of the small grants mechanism.	
Unit of Measure: Number of micro-generation clean/renewable energy projects	
Method of Calculation: Count of micro-generation clean/renewable projects established	
Disaggregated by: Energy project type, department	
Justification & Management Utility: Renewable sources which include wind, hydroelectric, and solar have a high potential in rural areas to improve quality of life and make both farm and off-farm activities more efficient. If renewable energy projects are provided to the communities that currently do not have access to energy, the quality of their life will be improved. In addition, energy can (in some cases) improve the productivity of their crops if the energy is used in irrigation systems.	
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION	
Data Collection Method: Data collected through partners and project staff	
Data Source(s): Project staff and partners	
Method of Acquisition: Data collection surveys	
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Quarterly	
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.3					
USAID RF: Number Of Rural Community Micro-Generation Clean/Renewable Energy Projects Established as a Result of USG Assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 29. NUMBER OF RURAL MICRO-GENERATION CLEAN/RENEWABLE ENERGY PROJECTS ESTABLISHED					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: ACCESO Intranet Site					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): information is coming from small projects and it may therefore be hard to be precise. An error will probably be estimated and accepted.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Calculate measurement error (no correction needed if small)					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Summary report of micro-generation clean/renewable projects established					
Review of Data: Quarterly meetings with ACCESO Natural Resources Management staff and random field audits of partners					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Projects)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	10	10			
Sept. 2012	351	361			
Sept. 2013	310	671			
Sept. 2014	219	890			
Feb. 2015	0	890			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
USAID RF: Number of Organizations/Companies Providing Business Development/Extension Services to MSMEs as a result of USG assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 30. NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS / COMPANIES PROVIDING BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT / EXTENSION SERVICES TO MSMEs
Name of Assistance Objective: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: IR 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs' Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved as a result of USG assistance
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No ___ Yes <u>X</u> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <u>X</u> Yes ___
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Organizations/Companies are those that are legally established, implementing under an operational plan, and have had a proven track record in business development and extension services for at least the previous year. Business development and extension services are considered technical assistance that aid MSMEs in improving productivity, accessing financing, etc. A business development/extension service provider is any company or organization providing a business development/extension service in a commercial (unsubsidized) manner. This term may include, but is not limited to universities, private sector consulting firms, private sector input and equipment companies, processors, input suppliers, lead firms providing linkages and backstopping etc. To be counted, organization/companies must be providing the business development/extension services unsubsidized or provided on a cost-recovery basis. Each organization/company will be counted only once even if they provide different services.
Unit of Measure: Organizations/companies
Method of Calculation: Count of organizations/companies
Disaggregated by: Type of organization/company and type of service provided, department
Justification & Management Utility: This indicator tracks growth in the number of business services providers in the market. Greater participation by organizations/companies development/extension service providers in the market leads to a more cost-effective delivery due to increased competition. An increased number of business service providers are used as a proxy indicator for cost-effective service delivery. Increased entry of development/extension service providers in the market leads to a more cost-effective delivery and quality of services due to competition.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Annual Sample survey, data collected through partners and project staff
Data Source(s): local municipalities for local registered operations; Project staff, partners and the providers themselves for the rest.
Method of Acquisition: Annual survey
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Annually
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
USAID RF: Number of Organizations/Companies Providing Business Development/Extension Services to MSMEs as a result of USG assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 30. NUMBER OF ORGANIZATIONS / COMPANIES PROVIDING BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT / EXTENSION SERVICES TO MSMES					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): The local municipalities may not have registered information for organizations/companies working in business development and extension services.					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: Interviews of secondary actors to validate the information where necessary.					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Quarterly meetings with ACCESO Field Managers; random field audits of producer					
Reporting of Data: Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Organizations/Companies)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	23	23			
Sept. 2012	70	93			
Sept. 2013	140	233			
Sept. 2014	209	442			
Feb. 2015	23	465			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.5: Agricultural producer organizations strengthened INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-11 NUMBER OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISES, PRODUCERS ORGANIZATIONS, WATER USERS ASSOCIATIONS, TRADE AND BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS, AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (CBOS) RECEIVING USG ASSISTANCE
ACCESO Indicator: 31. NUMBER OF PRODUCERS ORGANIZATIONS, WATER USERS ASSOCIATIONS, TRADE AND BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS, AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (CBOS) RECEIVING USG ASSISTANCE
Name of Assistance Objective: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
Precise Definition(s): Total number of farmers’ associations, cooperatives, producers’ organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations and community-based organizations receiving USG assistance. Organizations can be only counted once but must be reported as continuing receiving assistance after being reported the first time. This assistance includes support that aim at organization functions, such as member services, storage, processing and other downstream techniques, and management, marketing and accounting. “Organizations assisted” does not include those merely contacted or touched by an activity through brief attendance at a meeting or gathering by one or more employees. In the case of training or assistance to farmer’s association or cooperatives, individual farmers are not counted separately, but as one entity. This indicator counts the number of groups trained, e.g. a company training or association training. Some outcomes of this indicator (implementation of the training received) should be reported under the indicator <i>Number of MSMES Implementing Sound Business Management Practices</i>
Unit of Measure: Producers organizations, water users associations, etc.
Method of Calculation: Count of private enterprises/organizations/associations
Disaggregated by: Type of organization, New/Continuing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New= this is the first year the producers organization, water users associations, trade and business associations and community-based organization are receiving USG assistance • Continuing= producers organization, water users associations, trade and business associations and community-based organization continue receiving USG assistance from the previous year
Justification & Management Utility: Tracks civil society capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Data collected through partners and project staff
Data Source(s): Project staff and partners
Method of Acquisition: Data collection from project staff and partners
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Beneficiary information is acquired on an ongoing basis, as new beneficiaries enter the Project; TA and Training are updated continuously.
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR 2.1					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR PRODUCTIVITY					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – Sub IR 1.5: Agricultural producer organizations strengthened					
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-11 NUMBER OF PRIVATE ENTERPRISES, PRODUCERS ORGANIZATIONS, WATER USERS ASSOCIATIONS, TRADE AND BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS, AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (CBOS) RECEIVING USG ASSISTANCE					
ACCESO Indicator: 31. NUMBER OF PRODUCERS ORGANIZATIONS, WATER USERS ASSOCIATIONS, TRADE AND BUSINESS ASSOCIATIONS, AND COMMUNITY-BASED ORGANIZATIONS (CBOS) RECEIVING USG ASSISTANCE					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO M&E Manager					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: CIRIS Database					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Tables/Graphs; MS Excel or MS Access files					
Review of Data: Quarterly meetings with ACCESO Field Managers; Random field audits of producer organization/ associations					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Groups)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	20	20			
Sept. 2012	70	90			
Sept. 2013	170	160			
Sept. 2014	50	210			
Feb. 2015	0	210			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR CAPACITY INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 3: Increased private sector investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FtF assistance
ACCESO Indicator: 32. NUMBER OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FORMED
Name of Assistance Objective: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): Number of public-private partnerships in agriculture or nutrition formed (i.e. agricultural or nutrition activity, as described below). A public-private alliance (partnership) is considered formed when there is a clear agreement, usually written, to work together to achieve a common objective. There must be either a cash or in-kind significant contribution to the effort by both the public and the private entity. USAID must be one of the public partners. USAID is almost always represented in the partnership by its implementing partner. For-profit enterprises and NGOs are considered private. A public entity can be national or sub-national government as well as a donor-funded implementing partner. It could include state enterprises which are non-profit. A private entity can be a private company, a community group, or a state-owned enterprise which seeks to make a profit (even if unsuccessfully).</p> <p>More than one partnership with the same entity can be formed, but this is likely to be rare. In counting partnerships we are not counting transactions with a partner entity; we are counting the number of partnerships formed during the reporting year. New public-private partnerships counted will only be those formed during the current reporting year. Any partnership that was formed in a previous year will not be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, agricultural processing, transportation or marketing. • A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers. <p>Note: Each partnership's formation should only be reported once in order to add the total number of partnerships across the years.</p>
Unit of Measure: Public-private partnerships
Method of Calculation: Count of the number of partnerships formed with signed agreements
Disaggregated by: Type of partnership (refer to the primary focus of the partnership) agricultural production; agricultural post-harvest transformation; nutrition; other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships); multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership)

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR CAPACITY					
INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 3: Increased private sector investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities					
INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FtF assistance					
ACCESO Indicator: 32. NUMBER OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FORMED					
Justification & Management Utility: The assumption is that if more partnerships are formed there is likelihood that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities. This will contribute to achieve agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, and will contribute to a reduction in poverty.					
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION					
Data Collection Method: Data collected through Small grant and alliances staff					
Data Source(s): Project staff and partners					
Method of Acquisition: Partnership signed agreements report					
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Ongoing as new partnerships are developed					
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal					
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO COTR					
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs					
Location of Data Storage: ACCESO Intranet Site					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Summary report of partnership signed agreements					
Review of Data: Quarterly meetings with ACCESO Small Grants and Alliances staff					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly and Annual Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Partner Funds)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	10	10			
Sept. 2012	25	35			
Sept. 2013	15	50			
Sept. 2014	0	50			
Feb. 2015	0	50			

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A

SPS LOCATION: Program Element 4.5.2 AGRICULTURAL SECTOR CAPACITY

INITIATIVE AFFILIATION?: FTF – IR 3: Increased private sector investment in agriculture and nutrition related activities

INDICATOR TITLE: 4.5.2-12 Number of public-private partnerships formed as a result of FtF assistance

ACCESO Indicator:

32. NUMBER OF PUBLIC-PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS FORMED

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A
ACCESO Indicator: 33. NUMBER OF PRIVATE SECTOR ALLIANCES DEVELOPED
Name of Assistance Objective: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth
Name of Intermediate Result: n/a
Name of Sub-Intermediate Result: n/a
Geographic Focus: Six departments of Western Honduras (Santa Bárbara, Copán, Ocotepeque, Lempira, Intibucá and La Paz)
Is this a Standard indicator? No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> FAF Program Element: <i>n/a</i> FTF indicator: No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/>
DESCRIPTION
<p>Precise Definition(s): “Private sector” includes any privately-led farming or non-farm activity whether it is managed by an individual, household, a community group, or a formal company. A CBO or NGO may be included if they engage in for-profit agricultural or nutrition related activities.</p> <p>A private alliance (partnership) is considered developed when there is evidence of implementation of the commitments/activities agreed in written form, to work together to achieve a common objective.</p> <p>Private alliances counted will be those formed during the current reporting year. Any alliance that was formed in a previous year will not be included.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An agricultural activity is any activity related to the supply of agricultural inputs, production methods, agricultural processing or transportation. • A nutritional activity includes any activity focused on attempting to improve the nutritional content of agricultural products as provided to consumers. <p>Note: Each alliance will be only be reported once in order to add the total number of alliances across the years.</p>
Unit of Measure: Private alliances in agriculture or nutrition developed.
Method of Calculation: addition
Disaggregated by: Type of alliances (refer to the primary focus of the alliance) (agricultural production; agricultural post harvest transformation; nutrition; other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships); multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership)
Justification & Management Utility: The assumption is that if more alliances are developed there is likelihood that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities. This will contribute to achieve agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, and will contribute to a reduction in poverty.
PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION
Data Collection Method: Data collected through Small grant and alliances staff
Data Source(s): Project staff and partners
Method of Acquisition: Alliances agreements report
Frequency & Timing of Data Acquisition: Ongoing, as new partnership alliances are developed.
Estimated Cost of Data Acquisition: Minimal
Individual Responsible at USAID: ACCESO M&E Manager
Individual Responsible for Providing Data to USAID: ACCESO COP/DCOPs
Location of Data Storage: ACCESO Intranet Site

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET – IR N/A					
ACCESO Indicator:					
33. NUMBER OF PRIVATE SECTOR ALLIANCES DEVELOPED					
DATA QUALITY ISSUES					
Date of Initial Data Quality Assessment: September / October 2011 (USAID ACCESO)					
Known Data Limitations and Significance (if any): N/A					
Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations: N/A					
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments: Mid-term (Aug / Sept, 2013), Near end (Jan / Feb 2015)					
Procedures for Future Data Quality Assessments: DQA will be conducted twice during LOP, once at mid-term and once near project end					
PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING					
Presentation of Data: Summary report of Alliances agreements					
Review of Data: Quarterly meetings with ACCESO Small Grants and Alliances staff					
Reporting of Data: Quarterly Reports					
OTHER NOTES					
Notes on Baselines/Targets: Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative					
Other Notes:					
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUES (Alliances Developed)					
Year	Target		Actual		Notes
	Annual	Cumulative	Annual	Cumulative	
Baseline	n/a	n/a			
Sept. 2011	2	2			
Sept. 2012	8	10			
Sept. 2013	5	15			
Sept. 2014	0	15			
Feb. 2015	0	15			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: September 20, 2011					

USAID ACCESO

Data Quality Assessment Worksheets (October 2011)

Indicator: Number of Rural Households Living in Poverty Moved Above the Poverty Line	2
Indicator: Number of Rural Households Living in Extreme Poverty Moved Above the Poverty Line	4
Indicator: Value of New Net Income of Participating Rural Farmers and MSMES.....	6
Indicator: Value of Incremental Sales (Collected at Farm/Firm Level) Attributed to FTF Implementation.....	8
Indicator: Value of New Private Sector Investment in the Agriculture Sector or Food Chain Leveraged by FTF Implementation.....	10
Indicator: Number of Farmers and Others Who Have Applied New Technologies or Management Practices as a Result of USG Assistance	11
Indicator: Number of Additional Hectares Under Improved Technologies or Management Practices as a Result of USG Assistance.....	12
Indicator: Number of Local Municipal Governments Effectively Implementing Natural Resources Management Policies	13
Indicator: Number of Companies (Including Farms) That Have Made Conservation-Friendly changes in Their Business Practices.....	14
Indicator: Number of MSMES Implementing Sound Business Management Practices.....	16
Indicator: Number of Brokers Providing Market Linkages to MSMES.....	17
Indicator: Number of MSMS That Have Been Verified to Meet Market Standards for Their Products	18
Indicator: Number of MSMES Accessing Market-based Financing as a Result of USG-Assistance	19
Indicator: Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans Made to MSMES.....	20
Indicator: Number of Value Chain/Sector Constraints Identified and Resolved.....	21
Indicator: Number of Policies Reforms, Regulations, Administrative Procedures Passed For Which Implementation Has Begun With USG Assistance.....	22
Indicator: Prevalence of Households With Moderate to Severe Hunger	23
Indicator: Prevalence of Underweight Children Under 5	24
Indicator: Prevalence of Stunted Children Under 5	25
Indicator: Percent of Children 6-23 Months That Received a Minimum Acceptable Diet	26
Indicator: Prevalence of Exclusive Breastfeeding of Children Under 6 Months	27
Indicator: Prevalence of Anemia Among Women of Reproductive Age.....	28
Indicator: Prevalence of Anemia in Children 6-59 Months.....	29
Indicator: Women's Dietary Diversity: Mean Number of Food Groups Consumed by Women of Reproductive Age.....	30
Indicator: Number of Health Facilities with Established Capacity to Manage Acute Under-Nutrition	31
Indicator: Modern Contraceptive Prevalence Rate	32
Indicator: Number of Communities in High Vulnerability Municipalities With Adequate Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Capacity	33
Indicator: Number of Rural Micro-Generation Clean/Renewable Energy Projects Established..	34
Indicator: Number of Organizations / Companies Providing Business Development / Extension Services to MSMES.....	35
Indicator: Number of Producers Organizations, Water Users Associations, Trade and Business Associations, and Community-Based Organizations (CBOS) Receiving USG Assistance	36
Indicator: Number of Public-Private Partnerships Formed.....	37
Indicator: Number of Private Sector Alliances Developed.....	38

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Number of Rural Households Living in Poverty Moved Above the Poverty Line

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Beneficiary households

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? NO

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through annual household income sample surveys and supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of select household income generating activities. A household profile will be collected by the project's M&E unit through an interview process for all beneficiary households joining the program. This profile captures the initial baseline income and total family members, from which a categorization is made (extreme poverty, poverty, other), based on the poverty thresholds established by the GOH. USAID will provide a household expenditure form, which will be used by the M&E Contractor to determine the level of poverty of each beneficiary household as part of the initial profile. Subsequent annual income sample surveys of beneficiary households will determine the number of households that have moved from extreme poverty or poverty to above the poverty line. These surveys will be conducted on a statistically representative sample at the same time of the year the first one was collected. Annually, a representative stratified sample of the families reported as moved out of poverty will be surveyed to assure that they continue at this level during LOP. Data will be disaggregated by household type (M&F, MNF and FNM), department and municipality. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	<p>Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?</p>	Y	<p>Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner. Data collection could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries. To minimize error, income surveys - sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures will be agreed upon with USAID COTR. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated.</p>
3. Precision	<p>Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?</p>	Y	<p>Data will be collected and analyzed by the implementer. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated in order to minimize margin of error.</p>
4. Reliability	<p>Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?</p>	Y	<p>Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.</p>
5. Timeliness	<p>Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in</p>	Y	<p>Data acquisition will be annual, corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of</p>

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Number of Rural Households Living in Poverty Moved Above the Poverty Line

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Beneficiary households

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? NO

	terms of frequency and currency)?		the total number of rural households living in poverty moved above the poverty line within the fiscal year.
--	-----------------------------------	--	---

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline will be collected through a sample survey once households become beneficiaries of the project. Data collection issues section will be updated and completed once the baseline has been finished. Although reports will be disaggregated at the Department level, the database will be able to generate reports at the municipal level. USAID Honduras has advised that under FTF this indicator should be calculated using a survey which measures expenditures over the last 24 hours from the time of survey, divided by the number of household members. This includes expenditures on food stuffs and estimated value of household consumption of items that they grew. This survey form is to be provided by USAID and data collected by the M&E contractor. Project beneficiary profiles that have been collected so far (May to August 2011) have used the annual household income methodology.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Number of Rural Households Living in Extreme Poverty Moved Above the Poverty Line

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Beneficiary households

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>Overall, this indicator is a valid measure of the intended result.</p> <p>Data will be collected through annual household income sample surveys and supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of select household income generating activities. A household profile will be collected by the project's M&E unit through an interview process for all beneficiary households joining the program. This profile captures the initial baseline income and total family members, from which a categorization is made (extreme poverty, poverty, other), based on the poverty thresholds established by the GOH. USAID will provide a household expenditure form, which the M&E Contractor will use to determine the level of poverty of each beneficiary household as part of the initial profile.</p> <p>Subsequent annual income sample surveys of beneficiary households will determine the number of households that have moved from extreme poverty or poverty to above the poverty line. These surveys will be conducted to a statistically representative sample at the same time of the year the first one was collected. Annually, a representative stratified sample of the families reported as moved out of poverty will be surveyed to assure that they continue at this level during LOP.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by household type (M&F, MNF and FNM), department and municipality.</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	<p>Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?</p>	Y	<p>Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner. Data collection could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries. To minimize error, income surveys - sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures will be agreed upon with USAID COTR. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated.</p>
3. Precision	<p>Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?</p>	Y	<p>Data will be collected and analyzed by the implementer. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated in order to minimize margin of error.</p>
4. Reliability	<p>Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?</p>	Y	<p>Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.</p>
5. Timeliness	<p>Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in</p>	Y	<p>Data acquisition will be annual, corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of</p>

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Number of Rural Households Living in Extreme Poverty Moved Above the Poverty Line

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Beneficiary households

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

	terms of frequency and currency)?		the total number of rural households living in extreme poverty moved above the poverty line within the fiscal year.
--	-----------------------------------	--	---

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline will be collected through a sample survey once households become beneficiaries of the project. Data collection issues section will be updated and completed once the baseline has been finished. Although reports will be disaggregated at the Department level, the database will be able to generate reports at the municipal level. USAID Honduras has advised that under FTF this indicator should be calculated using a survey which measures expenditures over the last 24 hours from the time of survey, divided by the number of household members. This includes expenditures on food stuffs and estimated value of household consumption of items that they grew. This survey form is to be provided by USAID and data collected by the M&E Contractor. Project beneficiary profiles that have been collected so far (May to August 2011) have used the annual household income methodology.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, And Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased

Indicator: Value of New Net Income of Participating Rural Farmers and MSMEs

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Beneficiary households and Project clients

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through annual survey applied to a statistically representative sample of beneficiary households. The total net income of participating rural farmers and MSMEs will be subtracted from total net income reported as baseline on those who have received at least one production cycle of assistance to determine the change on all income-generating activities. The total net income of participating rural farmers and MSMEs will be subtracted from total net income reported in the previous year for those who have received two or more years of assistance to determine the change on all income-generating activities. Data will be disaggregated by household type (M&F, MNF, FNM), sector (value chain, producer, processor, etc.), on- and off-farm, department and municipality.</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	<p>Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?</p>	Y	<p>Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner. Data collection could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries. To minimize error, sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures will be agreed upon with USAID COTR. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated.</p>
3. Precision	<p>Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?</p>	Y	<p>Data will be collected and analyzed by the implementer. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated in order to minimize margin of error.</p>
4. Reliability	<p>Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?</p>	Y	<p>Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.</p>
5. Timeliness	<p>Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?</p>	Y	<p>Data acquisition will be annual, corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the total value of new net income of participating rural farmers and MSMEs within the fiscal year.</p>

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline will be collected through beneficiary household survey.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, And Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased

Indicator: Number of Jobs Attributed to FTF Implementation

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Beneficiary households, MSMEs and other Project clients

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through annual sample surveys for farm and non-farm MSMEs. The number of person days will be converted to FTEs at a rate of 260 days/year for each. A representative sample of household clients and businesses (MSMEs, processors, exporters) will be surveyed annually to determine each year's FTE labor utilized by assisted rural farm and off farm MSMEs. This will be subtracted from FTE labor reported at baseline to determine the amount of new employment created. If one FTE is split by a male and a female, then it would be considered as 0.5 FTE for females and 0.5 FTE for males. Data will be disaggregated by sex of jobholder, enterprise size, value chain and department. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	<p>Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?</p>	Y	<p>Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner. Collection data could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries; the data collected will report the number of the new FTE positions created but will not specify the number of persons in employment. To minimize error, sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures will be agreed upon with USAID COTR. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated. Reports of each surveyed enterprise will include statistics on permanent and temporary employment.</p>
3. Precision	<p>Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?</p>	Y	<p>Data will be collected and analyzed by the implementer. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated in order to minimize margin of error.</p>
4. Reliability	<p>Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?</p>	Y	<p>Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.</p>
5. Timeliness	<p>Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?</p>	Y	<p>Data acquisition will be annual, corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the total number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation within the fiscal year.</p>

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline will be collected through beneficiary survey. Annual targets are cumulative. For each FTE the size of enterprises creating the jobs will be recorded in the database for analysis as needed. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, And Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased

Indicator: Value of Incremental Sales (Collected at Farm/Firm Level) Attributed to FTF Implementation

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Beneficiary households and MSMEs and other Project clients

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Baseline data will be collected through a sample survey. Where possible, beneficiaries' bookkeeping records will be used to determine initial baseline figures; where records are not available or insufficient the survey will determine the baseline sales. Sales surveys will be carried out on an annual basis. The value of new sales will be deflated to remove the impact of inflation on the results. The attribution element is defined as including the new sale where USG assisted the individual farm or company directly, assisted in improving seed or other input availability, farming techniques, or other activities that benefited farmers, processors, traders or businesses in the area. The value of incremental sales in current year = [quantity or volume (units depend of the product or service) sold multiplied by the crop, item or service average price during the period] – [quantity or volume (units depend of the product or service) sold multiplied by the crop, item or service price in previous year]. These will be determined and calculated from annual sample surveys of beneficiary clients (farmers, MSMEs, exporters, etc.). Data will be disaggregated by sectors, enterprise size, sex, department, and on-farm and off-farm sales. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	<p>Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?</p>	Y	<p>Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner. Collection data could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries and/or accuracy of information when there is no bookkeeping. To minimize error, sample surveys, sampling methodology and other procedures will be agreed upon with USAID COTR. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated.</p>
3. Precision	<p>Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?</p>	Y	<p>Data will be collected and analyzed by the implementer. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal yields, prices, areas, investments, etc.) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated in order to minimize margin of error.</p>
4. Reliability	<p>Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?</p>	Y	<p>Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.</p>
5. Timeliness	<p>Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in</p>	Y	<p>Data acquisition will be annual, corresponding to the close of the fiscal year supplemented by bi-annual sales</p>

	terms of frequency and currency)?	tracking of selected beneficiaries. This final indicator is a result of the value of incremental sales (collected at farm/firm level) attributed to FTF implementation within the fiscal year.
--	-----------------------------------	--

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline will be collected through beneficiary surveys. Differentiated targets will be established for on-farm and off-farm sales to facilitate the diversification into off-farm businesses; this will be guided by market opportunities, competitiveness and beneficiary interest. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, And Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased, Sub IR 2.1.1 Rural MSME's Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved

Indicator: Value of New Private Sector Investment in the Agriculture Sector or Food Chain Leveraged by FTF Implementation

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Beneficiary households, MSMEs and other Project clients

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through annual sample survey for beneficiaries and regular partner reporting. The value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain will be calculated by the sum of new investments. Data will be disaggregated by investment type, sector, enterprise size, department and municipality. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner. Collection data could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries. To minimize error, surveys with extreme values (higher than normal investments) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Data collection surveys will be obtained through partners and project staff and analyzed by the implementer. Surveys with extreme values (higher than normal investments) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be quarterly from MSMEs and annually from beneficiaries. This final indicator is a result of the value of new private sector investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by FTF implementation within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Any investment made after six months of intervention is considered new. Targets are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs' Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved

Indicator: Number of Farmers and Others Who Have Applied New Technologies or Management Practices as a Result of USG Assistance

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Farmers, producer groups, processors and other Project beneficiaries

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through annual sample surveys of new technologies, and practices in use; also with supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of selected households. The value will be obtained by the calculation of the count of farmers and other beneficiaries implementing new technologies or management practices. Data will be disaggregated by Sector, sex, department, municipality, and type of beneficiary, new/continuing. Where:</p> <p>New = This reporting year if the first year the beneficiary applied the new technology or management practice. Continuing = The beneficiary first applied the new technology or management practice in the previous year and continues to apply it.</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	The MSME's do not always give the correct information. A survey to include examples of the new technologies and practices will be conducted.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual data collection surveys will be obtained through farmers, producer groups, processors and other Project beneficiaries.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of farmers and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance within the fiscal year. Supplemental information obtained through ongoing monitoring of selected households.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

No baseline data. ACCESO will report only new improved technologies or practices that the beneficiaries implement. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis. NRM practices related to the indicator "Number of companies (including farms) that have made conservation-friendly changes in their business practices" are not included in this definition to avoid double counting.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased, Sub IR 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs’ Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved

Indicator: Number of Additional Hectares Under Improved Technologies or Management Practices as a Result of USG Assistance

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Farmers, producer groups, processors and other Project beneficiaries, department and municipality.

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through annual sample surveys and with supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of selected households. The value of the number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices will be calculated by the Sum of area and count of farmers and other beneficiaries implementing improved technologies or management practices. Data will be disaggregated by sex; type of beneficiary, technology type, department, new/continuing.</p> <p>New = This is the first year the hectare came under improved technologies or management practices</p> <p>Continuing = the hectare being counted continues to be under improved technologies or management practices from the previous year</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner. Collection data could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries. To minimize error, random measurements of land for a sample of clients for validation and calculations based on plant density/planting distances will be conducted.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual data collection surveys will be obtained through Farmers, producer groups, processors and other Project beneficiaries, department and municipality.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of additional hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance within the fiscal year. Supplemental information obtained through ongoing monitoring of selected households.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline data is not applicable for this indicator. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.2 Honduran Biodiversity and Natural Resources Conserved as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.2.2 Productive Landscape Conservation Promoted as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Local Municipal Governments Effectively Implementing Natural Resources Management Policies

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Municipalities and other Project beneficiaries

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Primary data will be collected semi-annually from Municipalities through partners and validated through a scorecard by project staff. The value will be obtained by the calculation of the count of the municipalities effectively implementing NRM policies. Data will be disaggregated by department, municipality and type of policy. Only municipal governments being assisted by the Project in NRM will be counted.
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Semi-annual data collection obtained through partners. The indicator will show that as municipalities are implementing and enforcing natural resources management policies, and that natural resources and biodiversity are being conserved and protected. The conservation and protection of natural resources are key for the sustainability of the farmers' production systems and family well-being. It contributes to longer-term economic viability – and reduces climate change vulnerabilities.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be semi-annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of local municipal governments effectively implementing natural resources management policies within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.2 Honduran Biodiversity and Natural Resources Conserved as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.2.2 Productive Landscape Conservation Promoted as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Companies (Including Farms) That Have Made Conservation-Friendly changes in Their Business Practices

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Farmers, producer groups, processors and other beneficiaries

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through annual sample surveys and supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of beneficiaries. Once a minimum package is adopted the beneficiaries will be counted towards the target. The value will be obtained by establishing the count of the companies (including farms) that have made conservation-friendly changes in their business practices. Data will be disaggregated by sector, technology type (eg. forestation, water source protection, riparian buffers and reforestation), department, sex, new/continuing. Only changes made with the support of the Project will be counted.</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>New = This is the first year the company (including farms) used conservation-friendly technologies or management practices</p> <p>Continuing = the company (including farms) being counted continues to use conservation-friendly technologies or management practices</p> <p>Sex of the adopter/implementer of these new conservation-friendly technologies or management practices being counted: male, female or association-applied.</p>
2. Integrity	<p>Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?</p>	Y	<p>While area (hectares) information will be presented for certain activities (eg. reforestation), it will not cover all the activities carried out and some will not be “area” related (eg. live barriers for erosion control, wildlife and conservation plans).</p>
3. Precision	<p>Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?</p>	Y	<p>Semi-annual data collection obtained through project staff and partners. Long-term sustainable agricultural production depends on increased use of NRM practices to maintain or enhance soil fertility, improve crop quality and livestock fodder, and enhance soil and water management and conservation. Incorporating good environmental practices into agricultural production programs ensures soil and water conservation that contributes to longer-term economic viability – and also provides small farmers with adaptation techniques to reduce climate change vulnerabilities. In addition,</p>

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.2 Honduran Biodiversity and Natural Resources Conserved as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.2.2 Productive Landscape Conservation Promoted as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Companies (Including Farms) That Have Made Conservation-Friendly changes in Their Business Practices

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Farmers, producer groups, processors and other beneficiaries

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

			companies (farmers and MSMEs) will obtain higher revenues due to better use of resources (water, soil, energy, etc.), reducing costs and increasing productivity, a “win – win situation”. Higher levels of revenues will in turn improve the quality of life of people, and allow them to diversify their business and invest in conservation as part of their operation plan.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be semi-annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of companies (including farms) that have made conservation-friendly changes in their business practices within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs' Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved

Indicator: Number of MSMEs Implementing Sound Business Management Practices

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Farmers, MSMEs and other Project clients

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through annual sample surveys, primary data collected from direct and indirect beneficiaries through partners and project staff for validation. The value will be obtained by the calculation of the count of the number of MSMEs that have implemented the minimum package of sound business practices. Data will be disaggregated by type of business management implemented practice; department, enterprise size and value chain.</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Collection data could include under or over-stated activities being carried out. Survey questions and review of documents relating to the practices will be carried out.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual data collection surveys obtained through farmers, MSMEs and other Project clients. Implementing sound businesses management practices is a way to promote productivity and sustainability for MSMEs and provides increased access to credit and markets. Sound business practices are detailed and adequately defined.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of MSMEs implementing sound business management practices within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.1.2 Rural MSMEs' Access to New Market Opportunities Increased as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Brokers Providing Market Linkages to MSMEs

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: MSME's and brokers

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Primary data will be collected through brokers and cross references with end-of-harvest surveys from MSMEs beneficiaries. In addition, a database will be developed which details all brokers and MSME's with market linkages in areas of intervention; this information will include the product(s) and the duration. The database will be updated every six months. Data will be disaggregated by market type, department and value chain. Only linkages facilitated by the Project are counted.
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Collection data could include under reporting by Project beneficiaries.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Quarterly data collection surveys obtained through MSME's and brokers. This indicator measures enhanced market access for MSMEs which is key to increase rural income.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be quarterly; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of brokers providing market linkages to MSMEs within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.1.2 Rural MSMEs' Access to New Market Opportunities Increased as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of MSMEs That Have Been Verified to Meet Market Standards for Their Products

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: MSME's, buyers and certification entities

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected from records from MSMEs, certification bodies and buyers. Data will be disaggregated by type of MSMEs, market standard and department. Only MSMEs entering markets that have been provided Project support will be counted.
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	A process indicator will be used for those with on-going certification activities. Group certifications will be used where possible to facilitate data capture. MSMEs will only be counted once they enter the market.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Semi-annual lists provided by certification bodies and buyers will be obtained. Certification addresses many issues of productivity and market access. Achievement of market standards is an indicator of high levels of productivity, product quality, and competitiveness. Improving results for this indicator involves improving business and environmental management practices and identifying new investments necessary to meet the relevant requirements. In addition, focusing on market standards that are already well-established will avoid extra investment in potential markets that may have a higher risk of failure.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be semi-annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of MSMEs that have been verified to meet market standards for their products within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.1.3 Barriers to Competitiveness of Rural MSMEs Reduced as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of MSMEs Accessing Market-based Financing as a Result of USG-Assistance

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Project beneficiaries and financial partners

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected from surveys through Project beneficiaries and financial partners. Data will be disaggregated by sex; type of MSME (farming and non-farm business), department, enterprise size (Total number of micro (1-5), small (6-50), and medium (51-100) (parenthesis = number of employees) enterprises (MSMEs)).</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	<p>Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?</p>	Y	<p>Collection data could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal loans) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated. When needed, information will be verified through on-site visits and review of logbooks or accounts. Targeted cross reference between lenders and loan recipients.</p>
3. Precision	<p>Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?</p>	Y	<p>Bi-annual surveys through Project beneficiaries and financial partners will be obtained. By having access to financial services (loans, insurance, bank accounts) MSMEs will have the ability to grow their business. By obtaining information from both loan recipients and lenders, the Project will be able to obtain precise data.</p>
4. Reliability	<p>Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?</p>	Y	<p>Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.</p>
5. Timeliness	<p>Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?</p>	Y	<p>Data acquisition will be bi-annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of MSMEs accessing market-based financing as a result of USG-assistance within the fiscal year.</p>

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets are cumulative. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased, Sub IR 2.1.3 Barriers to Competitiveness of Rural MSMEs Reduced

Indicator: Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans Made to MSMEs

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Project beneficiaries and financial partners

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected from surveys of Project beneficiaries and data collection every six months from financial service providers. Supplementary information provided through ongoing monitoring of select firms. Data will be disaggregated by continuing/new; type of loan recipient; sex of recipient person or organization. MSMEs will only be counted if they have been assisted in obtaining agricultural and rural loans. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Collection data could include under or over reporting by Project beneficiaries. Survey responses with extreme values (higher than normal loans) will be filtered and re-assessed / validated. When needed, information will be verified through on-site visits and review of logbooks or accounts. Targeted cross reference between lenders and loan recipients.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual survey and on-going monitoring from finance providers will be performed. Access to finance is required to increase production, expand markets and increase incomes. Tracking the loans amounts and volumes will provide an indication as to whether access to financial services has improved.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the value of agricultural and rural loans made to MSMEs within the fiscal year. Supplemental information will be obtained through on-going monitoring of selected firms.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.1.3 Barriers to Competitiveness of Rural MSMEs Reduced as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Value Chain/Sector Constraints Identified and Resolved

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Public sector and private sector partners and organizations

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Analyses will be carried out of selected value chains per product/service in order to identify constraints after which solutions will be implemented that have a direct impact on the competitiveness of the assisted MSMEs and the value-chains in which they are operating. The impact of the resolved constraints in the value chain will be monitored every six months. Data will be disaggregated by sector and value chain. Only the constraints identified and resolved with Project support will be counted.
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Support documentation on resolved constraints will be presented.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Semi-annual and annual data collection surveys will be obtained. Identifying and resolving constraints is necessary for the sustainability and successful completion of projects and programs.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be semi-annual and annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of value/chain constraints identified and resolved within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative. Targeted constraints will be approved by the COTR prior to implementation (i.e. annual work plan approval). Successful resolution of constraint will require COTR approval prior to any associated fee being paid and every effort should be made not only to resolve a constraint but to also demonstrate the impact this has on the sector.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.1.3 Barriers to Competitiveness of Rural MSMEs Reduced as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Policies Reforms, Regulations, Administrative Procedures Passed For Which Implementation Has Begun With USG Assistance

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Public sector and private sector partners organizations

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. The key processes where reforms need to be implemented will be identified. The status of these processes prior to implementation will comprise the baseline. These processes will be reviewed and approved by the COTR and relevant reforms will be selected and supported. Implementation of these reforms with key stakeholders will be carried out and reform progress monitored every six months. Data will be disaggregated by type of reform.
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Support documents will be provided for each.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Meetings, reports and government statistics will be used to collect data. The indicator measures the number of policies, regulations, administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an enhanced enabling environment for the MSMEs.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be bi-annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of policies reforms, regulations, administrative procedures passed for which implementation has begun with USG assistance within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR

Indicator: Prevalence of Households With Moderate to Severe Hunger

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: ACCESO beneficiaries and rest of population in zone of influence

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. For USAID ACCESO beneficiaries - Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys carried out annually. OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that was developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data.</p> <p>USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by household head type (female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)), department and municipality.</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	The time of year when the survey is applied is likely to provide significantly different results. Surveys will be applied at the same time of year.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	USAID standard surveys will be used to measure the hunger index.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the prevalence of households with moderate to severe hunger within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Prevalence of Underweight Children Under 5

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Rural health centers, related Project partners in health and nutrition and M&E contractor source yet to be determined

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Annual Survey, data collected on ACCESO beneficiaries through Nutrition and Health partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers and project staff. USAID ACCESO will work with rural health centers to establish capacity to keep proper weight records on children 0-24 months. USAID ACCESO will collect weight records quarterly from various sources including the Hospital Materno Infantil, CESAMOs, CESARs and Community Volunteer Monitors, on a sample of the targeted households to determine underweight prevalence rates. The Project will focus activities and tracking of children up until two years of age as this is what is done locally and is the key age range to ensure adequate development and nutrition up to five years, and over the longer term. Data will be disaggregated by department, municipality (for M&E contractor), sex and age of child. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p> <p>USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Poor quality / obsolete measurement equipment. (NOTE: Ministry of Health centers only collect weight data from 0 to 24 months. No data available from 25 to 50 months). Calibration in health centers with irregular data will be performed; provision of weighing equipment to centers with limited or no equipment.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Quarterly data collection from Health and Nutrition partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers will be performed for USAID ACCESO clients. A methodology will be determined by USAID and M&E Contractor for total population in zone of influence.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition for USAID ACCESO clients will be quarterly with annual presentation data; to be established for USAID M&E contractor. This final indicator is a result of the prevalence of underweight children under 5 within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey. Separate targets will be set for males and females after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Prevalence of Stunted Children Under 5

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Rural health centers, related Project partners in health and nutrition, and M&E contractor source yet to be determined

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Annual Survey, data collected on ACCESO beneficiaries through Nutrition and Health partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers and project staff. USAID ACCESO will work with rural health centers to establish capacity to keep proper records on children 0-24 months. USAID ACCESO will collect weight records quarterly from various sources including the Hospital Materno Infantil, CESAMOs, CESARs and Community Volunteer Monitors, on a sample of the targeted households to determine underweight prevalence rates. The Project will focus activities and tracking of children up until two years of age as this is what is done locally and is the key age range to ensure adequate development and nutrition up to five years, and over the longer term. Data will be disaggregated by sex and age of child, department and municipality.</p> <p>USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Poor (limited) measurement equipment. Calibration of equipment in select health centers reporting irregular (inconsistent) data will be performed.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	<p>Annual data collection from Health and Nutrition partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers will be performed for USAID ACCESO clients.</p> <p>A methodology will be determined for USAID and M&E Contractor for total population in zone of influence.</p>
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition for USAID ACCESO clients will be on mid-term and a final evaluation (results are not expected to be evident in Year I of implementation, given the time necessary for this indicator to change); for USAID and M&E contractor it will be determined. This final indicator is a result of the prevalence of stunted children under 5 within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline to be collected through USAID M&E Contractor survey. Separate targets will be set for male and female after baseline data collection and analysis. Results are not expected to be evident in Year 1 or 2 of implementation, given the time necessary for this indicator to change.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Percent of Children 6-23 Months That Received a Minimum Acceptable Diet

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Sample surveys of Project beneficiaries and M&E contractor source yet to be determined

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Use Outcome Monitoring (OM) Surveys bi-annually. OM Surveys are a methodology for data collection that was developed as a rapid and low cost method to be carried out on a yearly basis. The analysis of OM Surveys is based on Lot Quality Assurance Sampling (LQAS) principles, which allows a considerable reduction in the sample size needed to derive statistically reliable data.</p> <p>USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence. Data will be disaggregated by sex and department. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Poor knowledge of food groups from surveyed households. Recall of irregular surveys / validation.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Limited knowledge of food groups in surveyed households could give a margin of error, although this is expected to be within acceptable limits.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition for USAID ACCESO clients will be bi-annually; for USAID and M&E contractor it will be determined. This final indicator is a result of the percent of children 6-23 months that received a minimum acceptable diet within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey. Separate targets will be set for men and women after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Prevalence of Exclusive Breastfeeding of Children Under 6 Months

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Sample survey and M&E contractor source yet to be determined

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. For USAID ACCESO clients, a survey with data collected direct from ACCESO beneficiaries through Nutrition and Health partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers and project staff will be obtained.</p> <p>USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by department. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual survey obtained through Nutrition and Health partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers for USAID ACCESO clients. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition for USAID ACCESO clients will be annually; for USAID M&E contractor it will be determined. This final indicator is a result of the prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under 6 months within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Prevalence of Anemia Among Women of Reproductive Age

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Rural health centers, related Project partners in health and nutrition and M&E contractor source yet to be determined

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data collected where available on ACCESO beneficiaries will be obtained through Nutrition and Health partners.</p> <p>USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population is zone of influence.</p> <p>Equipment readings may result in errors; where possible the Project will enforce regular calibration of kits.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by pregnant women and non-pregnant women.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Data is not collected by the Ministry of Health on non-pregnant women; there is lack of proper laboratory analysis equipment and high costs involved. Coordination with MOH and AIN-C will be required.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	For USAID ACCESO clients, data collection from Health and Nutrition partners including Rural Health Centers and Community health volunteers will be obtained. USAID and M&E Contractor to determine methodology for total population in zone of influence.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition for USAID ACCESO clients will be on mid-term and by the end of Project; for USAID M&E contractor to be determined. This final indicator is a result of the prevalence of anemia among women of reproductive age within the fiscal year.
A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:			

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Prevalence of Anemia in Children 6-59 Months

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Households beneficiaries, DHS and M&E contractor

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Mid Term and Final Evaluation data collection will be performed for household's beneficiaries.</p> <p>To determine the prevalence of anemia in children between 6 and 59 months a sample of blood using a hemoglobin meter will be taken.</p> <p>Equipment readings may result in errors; where possible the Project will enforce regular calibration of kits.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by sex. Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Ministry of Health does not carry out anemia tests on children; there is lack of laboratory testing equipment and high costs involved. Coordination with MOH and AIN-C implementers is required.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Method of acquisition is to be determined by USAID and M&E Contractor.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition is yet to be determined. This final indicator is a result of the prevalence of anemia in children 6-59 months within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline to be collected by M&E Contractor. Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative. Separate targets will be set for male and female after baseline data collection and analysis.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Women’s Dietary Diversity: Mean Number of Food Groups Consumed by Women of Reproductive Age

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Households beneficiaries

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Annual sample surveys will be performed for household’s beneficiaries.</p> <p>The numerator for this indicator is the mean number of food groups.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by gendered household head type (female no male (FNM); male no female (MNF); male and female (M&F)) and department.</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Lack of knowledge of food groups. Validation of surveys with irregular results.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual sample survey will be obtained. Women of reproductive age are at risk for multiple micronutrient deficiencies, which can jeopardize their health and ability to care for the children and participate in income generating activities. Maternal micronutrient deficiencies during lactation can directly impact child growth and development but the potential consequences of maternal micronutrient deficiencies are especially severe during pregnancy, when there is greatest opportunity for nutrient deficiencies to cause long term, irreversible development consequences for the child in-utero. Dietary diversity (assessed here as the number of food groups consumed) is a key dimension of a high quality diet with adequate micronutrient content; and thus, important to ensuring the health and nutrition of both women and their children.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the women’s dietary diversity: mean number of food groups consumed by women of reproductive age within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey. Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Number of Health Facilities with Established Capacity to Manage Acute Under-Nutrition

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Rural health centers and related Project partners in health and nutrition

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through capacity assessment/criteria audit implemented by Nutrition and Health project staff through visits to health facilities.</p> <p>Count of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition based on the established criteria. The health facilities are selected based on the level of services provided to project assisted households within its geographical working area.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by department and municipality.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual data collection surveys of health facilities will be obtained. Improving health facilities will help women and children to prevent from other forms of under nutrition with severe consequences (acute and global under-nutrition). A key objective of FTF is the “Improved nutritional status, especially of women and children”. Assistance to poor via health facilities that treat under-nutrition is a key component to achieving this objective. Health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under nutrition will be documented.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Sum of additional health facilities with established capacity to manage acute under-nutrition – with USG assistance.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO2 – Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Modern Contraceptive Prevalence Rate

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Households beneficiaries

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Annual sample surveys will be performed for household's beneficiaries.</p> <p>Contraceptive prevalence rate is the proportion of women between 15-49 years old from project target region who are using (or whose partner is using) a modern contraceptive method at a given point in time.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by household method of contraception used, department, and age of user female or male beneficiary.</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Failure to provide accurate information given the sensitivity of the survey questions. Validation and data recall for irregular surveys.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual sample survey will be obtained. Contraceptive prevalence rate serves as a proxy measure of access to reproductive health services that are essential to improve family planning to reduce child mortality, improve maternal health, and promote gender equality.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the modern contraceptive prevalence rate within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Baseline to be collected through initial beneficiary survey. Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.3 Capacity to Mitigate and Adapt to Climate Change Strengthened as a result of USG assistance, Sub IR 2.3.3 Disaster Vulnerability Reduced as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Communities in High Vulnerability Municipalities With Adequate Disaster Prevention and Mitigation Capacity

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: CODELS (Local emergency teams), COPECO and municipalities

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. A technical package will be prepared considering COPECO and OFDA disaster prevention and mitigation information. The COTR will review and approve the training package and will select which capabilities represent the 75% of the technical package. Communities will be identified giving preference to those located in the municipalities within and around protected areas and those of higher vulnerability. Implementation will start in those communities with highest vulnerability; nevertheless, the work will be carried out in all the municipalities identified. The calculation method will be to count the number of communities in high vulnerability municipalities that are managing disaster prevention and mitigation plans in coordination with local authorities, communities and rural household.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by municipality and department.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	If there is personnel rotation, the achieved capacity on disaster prevention and mitigation of the municipality is decreased and can no longer be counted as adequate. ACCESO will review plans and implementation annually.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual data collection surveys will be obtained. By implementing an adequate disaster prevention and mitigation plan, future impact on the poor would be reduced and communities will learn management practices for sustainable natural resources and use of agricultural, forestry and fishery mitigation measures.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of communities in high vulnerability municipalities with adequate disaster prevention and mitigation capacity within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.3 Capacity to Mitigate and Adapt to Climate Change Strengthened as a result of USG assistance, IR 2.3.2 Clean/Renewable Energy Adopted as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Rural Micro-Generation Clean/Renewable Energy Projects Established

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Project staff and partners

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data will be collected through partners and project staff.</p> <p>The calculation method will consist on the count of micro-generation clean/renewable projects established.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by energy project type and department.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Random site visits will be conducted for verification of completion.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Quarterly data collection surveys will be obtained. Renewable sources which include wind, hydroelectric, and solar have a high potential in rural areas to improve quality of life and make both farm and off-farm activities more efficient. If renewable energy projects are provided to the communities that currently do not have access to energy, the quality of their life will be improved. In addition, energy can (in some cases) improve the productivity of their crops if the energy is used in irrigation systems.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be quarterly; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of rural micro-generation clean/renewable energy projects established within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance, IR 2.1.1 Rural MSMEs' Access to Inputs, Practices, and Technology for Market Participation Improved as a result of USG assistance

Indicator: Number of Organizations / Companies Providing Business Development / Extension Services to MSMEs

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Local municipalities for local registered operations, Project staff, partners and providers

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Annual Sample survey, data collected through partners and project staff.</p> <p>The calculation method will consist on the count of organizations/companies.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by type of organization/company and type of service provided and department.</p> <p>Sampling will ensure a 95% confidence level.</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	The local municipalities may not have registered information for organizations/companies working in business development and extension services. Interviews of secondary actors to validate the information where necessary.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Annual data collection surveys will be obtained. This indicator tracks growth in the number of business services providers in the market. Greater participation by organizations/companies development/extension service providers in the market leads to a more cost-effective delivery due to increased competition. An increased number of business service providers are used as a proxy indicator for cost-effective service delivery. Increased entry of development/extension service providers in the market leads to a more cost-effective delivery and quality of services due to competition.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be annual; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of organizations / companies providing business development / extension services to MSMEs within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth, IR 2.1 Rural Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise (MSME) Growth Increased as a result of USG assistance,

Indicator: Number of Producers Organizations, Water Users Associations, Trade and Business Associations, and Community-Based Organizations (CBOS) Receiving USG Assistance

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Project staff and partners

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error. Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data collected through partners and project staff.</p> <p>The calculation method will consist on the count of private enterprises/organizations/associations.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by type of organization, New/Continuing. Where:</p> <p>New= this is the first year the producers organization, water users associations, trade and business associations and community-based organization are receiving USG assistance</p> <p>Continuing= producers organization, water users associations, trade and business associations and community-based organization continue receiving USG assistance from the previous year</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Beneficiary information is acquired on an ongoing basis, as new beneficiaries enter the Project; TA and Training are updated continuously. Annual data collection surveys will be obtained. This indicator tracks civil society capacity building that is essential to building agricultural sector productivity.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be on an ongoing basis; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of producers organizations, water users associations, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations (CBOS) receiving USG assistance within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Number of Public-Private Partnerships Formed

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Project staff and partners

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? Yes

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data collected through partners and project staff.</p> <p>The calculation method will be the count of the number of partnerships formed with signed agreements.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by type of partnership (refer to the primary focus of the partnership) agricultural production; agricultural post-harvest transformation; nutrition; other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships); multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership).</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Partnership signed agreements report will be obtained. The assumption is that if more partnerships are formed there is likelihood that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities. This will contribute to achieve agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, and will contribute to a reduction in poverty.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be on an ongoing basis; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of public-private partnerships formed within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.

Data Quality Assessment Worksheet

AO or IR: AO 2 Poverty Reduced through Sustainable Broad-Based Economic Growth

Indicator: Number of Private Sector Alliances Developed

Date Reviewed: September 2011

Data Source: Project staff and partners

Is the Indicator Reported to USAID/W? No

Criterion	Definition	Y/N	Explanation
1. Validity	<p>Do the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result? Some issues to consider are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Face Validity: Would an outsider or an expert in the field agree that the indicator is a valid and logical measure for the stated result? • Attribution: Does the indicator measure the contribution of the project? • Measurement Error: Are there any measurement errors that could affect the data? Both sampling and non-sampling error should be reviewed. 	Y	<p>This indicator is a valid measure of the intended result. Data collected through small grant and alliances staff.</p> <p>The calculation method will be the count of private alliances in agriculture or nutrition developed.</p> <p>Data will be disaggregated by type of alliances (refer to the primary focus of the alliance) (agricultural production; agricultural postharvest transformation; nutrition; other (do not use this for multi-focus partnerships); multi-focus (use this if there are several components of the above sectors in the partnership).</p>
2. Integrity	Do the data collected, analyzed and reported have established mechanisms in place to reduce manipulation or simple errors in transcription?	Y	Overall, the integrity of data for this indicator is maintained in a satisfactory manner.
3. Precision	Are data sufficiently precise to present a fair picture of performance and enable management decision-making at the appropriate levels?	Y	Alliances agreement report will be obtained. The assumption is that if more alliances are developed there is likelihood that there will be more investment in agriculture or nutrition-related activities. This will contribute to achieve agriculture sector growth. The improvement in growth will increase the incomes of all, and will contribute to a reduction in poverty.
4. Reliability	Do data reflect stable and consistent data collection processes and analysis methods over time?	Y	Consistent methods and processes exist to collect and analyze the data. Spot checks, reviews and data comparisons over time help maintain consistency.
5. Timeliness	Are data timely enough to influence management decision-making (i.e. in terms of frequency and currency)?	Y	Data acquisition will be on an ongoing basis; corresponding to the close of the fiscal year. This final indicator is a result of the number of private sector alliances developed within the fiscal year.

A Summary of Key Issues and Recommendations:

Targets will be reported annually and are cumulative.