



# MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING (MEL) PLAN

ARTISANAL MINING AND PROPERTY RIGHTS (USAID  
AMPR) TASK ORDER UNDER THE STRENGTHENING  
TENURE AND RESOURCE RIGHTS II (STARR II) IDIQ



Contract Number: 7200AA18D00003 / 7200AA18C00087

COR: Caleb Stevens

USAID Office of Land and Urban

Contractor Name: Tetra Tech

Author(s): Terah DeJong (Technical Advisor) and Scheller Hinkle (Home Office MEL Specialist)

**OCTOBER 2019**

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Tetra Tech.

**This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development by Tetra Tech, through USAID Contract No. 7200AAI8D00003 / 7200AAI8C00087, under the Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights (STARR) II Indefinite Delivery Indefinite Quantity Contract (IDIQ).**

Tetra Tech Contact(s): Mark Freudenberger, Project Manager  
159 Bank Street, Suite 300  
Burlington, VT 05402  
Tel: (802) 495-0282  
Fax: (802) 658-4247  
Email: [mark.freudenberger@tetrattech.com](mailto:mark.freudenberger@tetrattech.com)

Suggested Citation: DeJong, T., & Hinkle, S. (2018). *Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Plan*. Washington, DC: USAID Artisanal Mining and Property Rights Task Order under the Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights II (STARR II) IDIQ.

Cover Photos: Tetra Tech, Central African Republic.

# MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING (MEL) PLAN

ARTISANAL MINING AND PROPERTY RIGHTS (USAID  
AMPR) TASK ORDER UNDER THE STRENGTHENING  
TENURE AND RESOURCE RIGHTS II (STARR II) IDIQ

OCTOBER 2019

## **DISCLAIMER**

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| TABLE OF CONTENTS.....  | i  |
| LIST OF ACRONYMS.....   | ii |
| 1.0 OVERVIEW OF THE ARTISANAL MINING AND PROPERTY RIGHTS (USAID AMPR) PROJECT ..... | 1  |
| 1.1 PURPOSE .....   | 1  |
| 1.2 RESULTS FRAMEWORK .....   | 1  |
| 2.0 REVIEWING AND UPDATING THE MEL PLAN .....                                       | 3  |
| 3.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN .....  | 5  |
| 3.1 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS.....   | 5  |
| 3.1.1 Indicators.....   | 5  |
| 3.3 MANAGEMENT OF THE PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM .....                           | 9  |
| 3.3.1 Roles and Responsibilities .....  | 9  |
| 3.3.2 MEL and Sub-Contracts.....  | 10 |
| 3.3.3 Data Collection.....  | 10 |
| 3.3.4 Data Analysis .....   | 12 |
| 3.3.5 Data Management and Use .....   | 12 |
| 3.4 EVALUATIONS .....   | 12 |
| 3.5 DATA QUALITY .....  | 14 |
| 4.0 LEARNING AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN .....                                     | 15 |
| 4.1 CONCEPT .....   | 15 |
| 4.2 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND LEARNING QUESTIONS .....                                | 16 |
| ANNEX A: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS (PIRS) .....                        | 18 |

# LIST OF ACRONYMS

|        |   |
|--------|---|
| AMPR   | Artisanal Mining and Property Rights (USAID)  |
| ASM    | Artisanal and Small-Scale Mining  |
| BECDOR | <i>Bureau d'Évaluation et de Contrôle de Diamant et d'Or</i>                        |
| CAR    | Central African Republic  |
| CEL    | Communication, Evidence, and Learning Project                                       |
| CLPR   | <i>Comité Local de Paix et Réconciliation</i> (local peace-building committee)      |
| COP    | Chief of Party  |
| COR    | Contracting Officer's Representative  |
| DDL    | Development Data Library  |
| DQA    | Data Quality Assessment   |
| E3/LU  | Land and Urban Office in the Bureau for Economic Growth, Education, and Environment |
| GoCAR  | Government of the Central African Republic  |
| GPS    | Global Positioning System   |
| IDIQ   | Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity   |
| IPIS   | International Peace Information Service   |
| IR     | Intermediate Result   |
| LOP    | Life of project   |
| LRG    | Land and Resource Governance  |
| KAP    | Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices   |
| KP     | Kimberley Process   |
| KPPS   | Kimberley Process Permanent Secretariat   |
| M&E    | Monitoring and Evaluation   |
| MEL    | Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning  |
| MOV    | Means of Verification   |
| OF     | KP Operational Framework for CAR  |
| OU     | Operating Unit  |
| PIRS   | Performance Indicator Reference Sheet   |
| PM     | Project Manager   |

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| PRADD    | Property Rights and Artisanal Diamond Development  |
| STARR II | Strengthening Tenure and Resource Rights II        |
| USAID    | United States Agency for International Development |
| USG      | United States Government                           |
| USGS     | United States Geological Survey                    |
| ZEA      | <i>Zone d'Exploitation Artisanale</i>              |

# I.0 OVERVIEW OF THE ARTISANAL MINING AND PROPERTY RIGHTS (USAID AMPR) PROJECT

## I.1 PURPOSE

The USAID Artisanal Mining and Property Rights (USAID AMPR) Project's main purpose is to address land and resource governance challenges around the Artisanal and Small-Scale Mining (ASM) sector using a multi-disciplinary approach and incorporating appropriate and applicable evidence and tools, taking care to incorporate a gender lens throughout all activities. USAID AMPR serves as the United States Agency for International Development's (USAID's) only project for addressing the complex development challenges around the ASM sector in the Central African Republic (CAR), with a primary focus on diamonds and a secondary focus on gold. The project forms part of assistance provided to countries with challenges in implementing the Kimberley Process (KP), the international mechanism that sets rules and norms for the trade in conflict-free rough diamonds. Through its activities USAID AMPR promotes legal, responsible supply chains and strengthens social cohesion in mining areas. In addition, the project provides on-demand short-term technical assistance on development challenges associated with ASM to various USAID Operating Units (OUs) around the globe, with an emphasis on sub-Saharan Africa. The project supports the USAID Office of Land and Urban's overall objective of improving land and resource governance and strengthening property rights for all members of society, especially women.

For the purpose of data collection, monitoring, and evaluation, this Year II MEL plan (October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2020) parallels the Annual Work Plan submitted under separate cover. The monitoring period each year is from October 1 – September 30th.

## I.2 RESULTS FRAMEWORK

The project is designed around the following theory of change:

**IF** USAID AMPR strengthens the legal chain of custody for diamonds and gold through training and capacity-building, regulatory reform, empowerment of communities through land and resource planning, improving stakeholder coordination and supporting peace-building and reconciliation, **THEN** compliance with KP requirements will increase—which will promote licit economic opportunities, and enable community resilience and social cohesion to increase—allowing ASM stakeholders to respond to new opportunities;

**AND IF** successful approaches adopted for the diamond sector are extended to the gold sector, **AND IF** key linkages between ASM and complex development issues are addressed, **THEN** all stakeholders in the ASM sector worldwide stand to benefit from improved livelihoods, peace, and stability.

In order to progress through USAID AMPR's theory of change, USAID AMPR activities will be structured around four objectives:

- **Objective 1:** Assist the Government of CAR (GoCAR) to improve compliance with KP requirements to promote licit economic opportunities.

- **Objective 2:** Strengthen community resilience, social cohesion, and response to violent conflict in CAR.
- **Objective 3:** Increase awareness and understanding of the opportunities and challenges of establishing responsible gold supply chains in CAR.
- **Objective 4:** Improve USAID programming through increased understanding of linkages between ASM and key development issues.

For each objective, one or more Intermediate Results (IRs) define key activities and expected outcomes. These are:

- **IR 1.1:** Improve legal, policy, and institutional framework for conflict-free diamond production at domestic and regional levels;
- **IR 1.2:** Expand formalization of land and resource rights in artisanal diamond mining communities;
- **IR 1.3:** Increase awareness of KP requirements, inclusive of all points in the supply chain such as government actors, buying houses, collectors, pit owners, and diggers;
- **IR 1.4:** Strengthen capacity of GoCAR to manage and expand KP-compliant zones effectively;
- **IR 2.1:** Support inclusive community dialogue especially between different religious and ethnic groups to resolve conflict over land and natural resources;
- **IR 2.2:** Promote women's economic and social empowerment in ASM communities in furtherance of broad-based social and economic inclusion;
- **IR 2.3:** Strengthen cooperation between GoCAR ministries and agencies and other stakeholders on social cohesion and KP compliance;
- **IR 3.1:** Research and communicate recommendations for policy, legal, and institutional reforms at the national and regional levels to key stakeholders;
- **IR 4.1:** Assist relevant USAID OUs to assess the link between ASM and development issues; and
- **IR 4.2:** Strengthen knowledge sharing and understanding of USAID OUs and partners on the link between ASM and development issues.

All USAID AMPR activities have been designed under this framework. In addition, project performance indicators are designed to measure progress related to these IRs and their respective Objectives.



## 2.0 REVIEWING AND UPDATING THE MEL PLAN

The Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Plan serves as a tool to guide overall project performance. As such, the team will update it as necessary to reflect changes in USAID AMPR's strategy and ongoing tasks. Updates will also incorporate feedback from USAID as well GoCAR. Monitoring, evaluation, and learning are therefore not one-time occurrences, but rather part of an ongoing process of review, revision, and implementation. The MEL team will review the MEL Plan annually, update if necessary, and submit a revised version along with the proposed Annual Work Plan. For this purpose, the monitoring period each year is from October 1 – September 30.

The present document is the second version of the MEL Plan produced in September 2019 and submitted for USAID approval along with the second Annual Work Plan (2019-2020). The main revisions are in annual targets and some baseline values following the studies and data collection conducted in the first year of project implementation. The following table summarizes the changes made.

**TABLE 1. CHANGES/CLARIFICATIONS TO INDICATORS**

| DATE           | INDICATOR  | CHANGE   |
|----------------|--|--|
| September 2019 | All indicators   | Annual targets were set for all indicators except those for which data will be unavailable, such as indicators that rely on the KAP survey, which is every other year.                         |
| September 2019 | 2. Percentage of major diamond-mining sub-prefectures in the Western part of the country authorized by the KP to export rough diamonds | The first-year target, which was erroneously set below the baseline, was changed from 25% to 50%.  |
| September 2019 | 3. Number of licensed (registered) artisanal miners  | The life of project (LOP) target was reduced from 5,000 to 3,000 following an analysis of historical trends. The target of 3,000 miners is a slight improvement over pre-crisis (2012) levels. |
| September 2019 | 4. Number of diamond buyers (collectors and buying houses) making purchases with official purchase slips                               | The LOP target was reduced from 500 to 300 following an analysis of historical trends. The target of 300 is a slight improvement over pre-crisis (2012) levels.                                |
| September 2019 | 5. Percentage of artisanal miners in project intervention zones with basic knowledge of KP and Mining Code                             | The baseline was changed from TBD to 35% based on KAP survey results. Intermediate targets were also adjusted to make a smooth progression to the LOP target of 75%.                           |
| September 2019 | 7. Number of adults who perceive their tenure rights to land or marine areas as secure as a result of                                  | Based on the KAP survey, the baseline was set at 1,800. This was derived by extrapolating from the   |

| DATE           | INDICATOR  | CHANGE   |
|----------------|--|--|
|                | United States Government (USG) assistance (Standard F Indicator EG.10.4-8)   | KAP survey: 75% of respondents perceived their tenure as secure, and the sampled population was 2,400. Targets assumed that by project end, that figure would rise to 85%, or 1,040 individuals. As such, the target is 240 additional adults perceiving their tenure as secure by the end of the project, or 10% of the target population of artisanal miners ( <i>chefs de chantier</i> ), plus those who already perceived their tenure as secure at the beginning of the intervention. |
| September 2019 | 8. Number of villages having formalized and strengthened their natural resource management capacity  | The LOP target was reduced from 25 to 20 to take into account a reduced number of villages where ZEAs or local pacts will be applied. This was based on first-year diagnostics that identified villages where the project will work on these activities, which ended up being less than the number of villages estimated before fieldwork began.   |
| September 2019 | 9. Number of USG supported events, trainings, or activities designed to build support for peace or reconciliation among key actors to the conflict (Standard F Indicator PS.6.2-3) | The LOP target was reduced from 60 to 50 to take into account revised assumptions as to the number of <i>Comité Local de Paix et Réconciliation</i> (CLPRs), notably the number of villages where CLPRs will be established, as well as the extent to which AMPR will subsidize events and training .  |
| September 2019 | 15. Number of gold mining sites integrated into the interactive mapping system   | The LOP target was increased from 100 to 300 to take into account the revised definition of “mine site,” which will result in the inclusion of smaller geographic entities than originally planned. The revision was based on field observations and recommendations from sub-contractor IPIS.   |

## 3.0 MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

### 3.1 PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

#### 3.1.1 INDICATORS

USAID AMPR's performance indicator table (Table I) presents a range of both custom and standard indicators at the output, outcome, and impact levels. The table also includes all the standard foreign assistance indicators ("standard indicators" or "F indicators") relevant to project activities. USAID AMPR will also track custom outcome indicators to measure the eight results listed in the contract plus several custom crosscutting indicators. The team will disaggregate indicator data reported by task/country and all person-level indicators by gender, except where government-provided data does not allow disaggregation.<sup>1</sup> The Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRSs) in Annex A contain full details for each indicator, including use of indicator, baseline procedures, data collection methodologies, data quality assurance measures, and justifications for proposed targets.

---

<sup>1</sup> This will be the case for data on numbers of licensed artisanal miners and buyers, which are not gender disaggregated.

**TABLE I. USAID AMPR INDICATOR TABLE**

N.B.: The monitoring period each year is from October 1 – September 30th. Q1 for Year 1 is considered October 1, 2018.

| N°  | PERFORMANCE INDICATOR<br>(AND TYPE)  | REPORTING<br>FREQUENCY | TARGETS            |         |       |       |       |                 |                 | LOP<br>TARGET <sup>2</sup> |
|---|--|------------------------|--------------------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
|   |  |                        | BASE-<br>LINE      | COUNTRY | Y1    | Y2    | Y3    | Y4 <sup>3</sup> | Y5 <sup>4</sup> |                            |
| Objective 1: Assist GoCAR to improve compliance with KP requirements to promote licit economic opportunities. |  |                        |                    |         |       |       |       |                 |                 |                            |
| 1   | Percentage of estimated rough diamond production in KP-compliant zones that is legally exported from CAR   | Annually               | 8% <sup>5</sup>    | CAR     | 15%   | 25%   | 40%   | 50%             | 60%             | 60%                        |
| 2   | Percentage of major diamond-mining sub-prefectures in the Western part of the country authorized by the KP to export rough diamonds <sup>6</sup> | Annually               | 31% <sup>7</sup>   | CAR     | 50%   | 50%   | 75%   | 100%            | 100%            | 100%                       |
| 3   | Number of licensed (registered) artisanal miners   | Annually               | 1,000 <sup>8</sup> | CAR     | 1,500 | 2,000 | 2,000 | 2,500           | 3,000           | 3,000                      |

<sup>2</sup> In the case that the two options years are not exercised by USAID, Year 3 targets will become Life of Project targets.

<sup>3</sup> Option Year.

<sup>4</sup> Option Year.

<sup>5</sup> The baseline of 8% is derived by dividing the exports from 2018 (approximately 13,000 carats) over the estimated production from the 5 KP-compliant zones in 2017 (164,000 carats). USGS did not estimate production for 2018 at the time of writing but there is no reason to believe that it decreased. On the contrary, PRADD II georeferencing in April and May 2018 showed mining at a constant intensity in all zones. The figure of 13,000 carats of exports does not include approximately 63,000 carats exported in early 2018 but which were held up from 2017 due to unanswered questions by the KP Monitoring Team.

<sup>6</sup> The project focuses only on the Western part of the country as it is mainly under government control and is where the project's interventions focus. The Eastern areas are still mostly under control of signatories to the Khartoum peace agreement, and unlikely to become compliant zones during the life of the project.

<sup>7</sup> USAID AMPR estimates that 32 of the country's 72 sub-prefectures have diamond mining or potential diamond mining. Of these, 16 are considered by experts and by the CAR government as concentrating the vast majority of the Western region's production and have been identified by the CAR government as *priority zones* for which approval from the KP is actively being sought. At the beginning of the project, 5 of these 16 are deemed compliant by the KP; the baseline is therefore 31%.

<sup>8</sup> This figure is an estimate based on available government data for the number of miners registered in 2018. Because this data is not fully centralized in Bangui, but remains in the provinces, an exact figure is not possible. In the first year, USAID AMPR built relationships with relevant services who keep track of this data, and is addressing data collection and management as part of its activities.

| N°   | PERFORMANCE INDICATOR<br>(AND TYPE)   | REPORTING<br>FREQUENCY | TARGETS            |         |     |     |      |                 |                 | LOP<br>TARGET <sup>2</sup> |
|--|---|------------------------|--------------------|---------|-----|-----|------|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
|  |   |                        | BASE-<br>LINE      | COUNTRY | Y1  | Y2  | Y3   | Y4 <sup>3</sup> | Y5 <sup>4</sup> |                            |
| 4  | Number of diamond buyers (collectors and buying houses) making purchases with official purchase slips   | Annually               | 200 <sup>9</sup>   | CAR     | 200 | 225 | 250  | 275             | 300             | 300                        |
| 5  | Percentage of artisanal miners in project intervention zones with basic knowledge of KP and Mining Code   | Annually               | 35%                | CAR     | N/A | N/A | 50%  | N/A             | 75%             | 75%                        |
| 6  | Number of specific pieces of land tenure and property rights legislation or implementing regulations proposed, adopted, and/or implemented positively affecting property rights of the urban and/or rural poor as a result of USG assistance (Standard F Indicator EG.10.4-1) | Annually               | 0                  | CAR     | 1   | 1   | 1    | 1               | 1               | 5                          |
| 7  | Number of adults who perceive their tenure rights to land or marine areas as secure as a result of USG assistance (Standard F Indicator EG.10.4-8)  | Annually               | 1800 <sup>10</sup> | CAR     | N/A | N/A | 1920 | N/A             | 2040            | 2,040                      |
| <b>Objective 2: Strengthen community resilience, social cohesion, and response to violent conflict in CAR.</b> |   |                        |                    |         |     |     |      |                 |                 |                            |
| 8  | Number of villages having formalized and strengthened their natural resource management capacity  | Annually               | 0                  | CAR     | 0   | 5   | 5    | 5               | 5               | 20 <sup>11</sup>           |
| 9  | Number of groups trained in conflict mediation/resolution skills or consensus-building techniques with USG assistance (Standard F Indicator DR.3.1-2)   | Annually               | 0                  | CAR     | 0   | 2   | 3    | 10              | 15              | 15                         |
| 10   | Number of USG supported events, trainings, or activities designed to build support for peace or   | Annually               | 0                  | CAR     | 0   | 10  | 15   | 15              | 10              | 50                         |

<sup>9</sup> The baseline figure shows the approximate number of registered dealers (collectors and buying houses), not the number of *active and legal* dealers. At present the government's data does not allow easy disaggregation of the number of actors versus the number of actors who are legally purchasing, a distinction that USAID AMPR capacity-building will make possible.

<sup>10</sup> The KAP survey in the first year found that 75% of mine managers perceived their tenure rights as secure. Based on a population estimate of 2,400, the baseline is therefore 1,800 people. The end-of-project target assumes a 5% increase (120 people) in each of the two remaining KAP surveys.

<sup>11</sup> This figure is an estimate of the number of villages that could be part of the *Zone d' Exploitation Artisanale* (ZEA) pilots or that sign formal land-use planning agreements related to natural resources.

| N°  | PERFORMANCE INDICATOR<br>(AND TYPE)   | REPORTING<br>FREQUENCY | TARGETS       |         |    |     |     |                 |                 | LOP<br>TARGET <sup>2</sup> |
|---|---|------------------------|---------------|---------|----|-----|-----|-----------------|-----------------|----------------------------|
|   |   |                        | BASE-<br>LINE | COUNTRY | Y1 | Y2  | Y3  | Y4 <sup>3</sup> | Y5 <sup>4</sup> |                            |
|   | reconciliation among key actors to the conflict<br>(Standard F Indicator PS.6.2-3)  |                        |               |         |    |     |     |                 |                 |                            |
| 11  | Number of local women participating in a substantive role or position in a peacebuilding process supported with USG assistance (Standard F Indicator GNDR-10)                     | Annually               | 0             | CAR     | 10 | 5   | 5   | 5               | 5               | 30                         |
| 12  | Number of consensus building forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and/or civil/political) held with USG Assistance (Standard F Indicator DR.3.1-3)                         | Annually               | 0             | CAR     | 2  | 3   | 5   | 5               | 5               | 20                         |
| 13  | Number of disputed land and property rights cases resolved by local authorities, contractors, mediators, or courts as a result of USG assistance (Standard F Indicator EG.10.4-3) | Annually               | 0             | CAR     | 5  | 10  | 15  | 10              | 10              | 50                         |
| 14  | Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training (Standard F Indicator EG.3.2-1)                       | Annually               | 0             | CAR     | 0  | 250 | 250 | 250             | 250             | 1,000                      |
| <b>Objective 3: Increase awareness and understanding of the opportunities and challenges of establishing responsible gold supply chains in CAR.</b> |   |                        |               |         |    |     |     |                 |                 |                            |
| 15  | Number of gold mining sites integrated into the interactive mapping system  | Annually               | 0             | CAR     | 0  | 300 | 0   | 0               | 0               | 300                        |
| <b>Objective 4: Improve USAID programming through increased understanding of linkages between ASM and key development issues.</b>                   |   |                        |               |         |    |     |     |                 |                 |                            |
| 16  | Number of activities benefitting USAID OUs aimed at improving the understanding of linkages between ASM and key development issues  | Annually               | 0             | Global  | 2  | 2   | 2   | 2               | 2               | 10                         |

### 3.3 MANAGEMENT OF THE PERFORMANCE MONITORING SYSTEM

#### 3.3.1 ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following people/entities will play key roles in USAID AMPR's performance monitoring system:

- **Project Manager.** The USAID AMPR Project Manager (PM) will be responsible for finalizing the indicator tables and narratives portions of the project's annual reports. The PM will also have overall responsibility for specific MEL-related reports, such as the outcomes of the Miner KAP Survey. The PM will coordinate with the USAID Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) on any specific indicator or MEL needs, including annual reporting for Standard F indicators, liaising with the CEL project, etc.
- **Home Office MEL Specialist.** Tetra Tech's Home Office MEL Specialist will provide technical backstopping for the MEL plan, including assistance in drafting the present plan and future amendments to it, ensuring compliance with relevant USAID regulations and best practices, assisting in the sampling methodology and survey instruments for miner KAP surveys, capacity building for local staff and preparing internal Data Quality Assessments (DQAs).
- **Chief of Party.** The Chief of Party will have overall responsibility for the implementation of MEL activities in the CAR. He will supervise the Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Coordinator, liaise with the Technical Deputy and Project Manager on MEL needs, assist in compiling indicators and spot-checking Means of Verification (MOVs) for annual reports, liaise with local government partners to ensure timely and quality data submission, and coordinate the execution of MEL activities in the annual work plan such as the Miner KAP Survey.
- **Technical Deputy.** The Technical Deputy will be the technical lead on developing and implementing the MEL plan, including facilitating discussions needed to define and refine indicators, reviewing terms of reference and technical documents for MEL activities like the Miner KAP Survey, liaising with technical partners like the United States Geological Survey (USGS) on key indicators, providing capacity-building to GoCAR data collection and management authorities, integrating MEL activities into the annual work planning drafting and review process, and training the M&E Coordinator and field agents in coordination with the COP and MEL Specialist.
- **M&E Coordinator.** The M&E Coordinator based in CAR will have day-to-day responsibility in data collection and analysis, including the preparation of indicator Means of Verification, the maintenance of an internal database of data, analysis of data for the annual reports, working with government counterparts (KP focal points, Kimberley Process Permanent Secretariat [KPPS], *Bureau d'Évaluation et de Contrôle de Diamant et d'Or* [BECDOR]) for data collection and quality assurance, maintenance of spatial data, identification of success stories and qualitative evidence of project impact, and facilitation of learning activities during staff retreats and annual work plan reviews in collaboration with the government.
- **Field Agents.** Field Agents will have day-to-day responsibilities for data collection and compilation for certain indicators, working in close coordination with the M&E Coordinator. For example, field agents will monitor that KP Focal Points and CLPRs are correctly recording data related to mining sites and conflicts. In addition, field agents will collect and compile data that is needed for reporting but may not be included in indicators, such as agricultural productivity of women's groups. Finally, field agents will, as part of periodic, reporting include qualitative information on project results and impact.
- **Component Coordinators.** Local Component Coordinators in charge of activities under each project Objective will ensure that the MEL plan is integrated into general activity implementation. For example, in the establishment of CLPRs, the Component 2 Coordinator will ensure that focal

points for each committee are trained in the use of the conflict register necessary for collecting data on conflicts resolved with USGS assistance. In addition, the Component I Coordinator will ensure that government counterparts have sufficient capacity and resources to collect data needed to measure USAID AMPR performance. The Coordinators will also take into account data and learning in the design of activities.

- **GoCAR.** GoCAR will have direct responsibility for the collection and transmission of key information related in particular to mining actor registration (buyers and miners) and production/export data. USAID AMPR will work with the relevant agencies, in accordance with its Memorandum of Understanding with the government, to ensure that data is collected in a timely manner and in compliance with data quality standards set in the PIRS. Specific actors with roles to play include the KP Focal Points in project intervention areas, Regional Mining Directors, the KPPS, BECDOR (for export statistics), and the General Director from the Ministry of Mines and Geology.
- **USGS.** USGS will liaise with USAID AMPR in estimating production levels, notably in identifying active mining quadrants to sample and in providing other contextual data on levels of mining activities. USAID AMPR will also share data collection results with USGS that are relevant to its monitoring role in the KP, including production data and results from Miner KAP Survey.
- **USAID CEL.** USAID AMPR will work with its COR to identify ways in which the Communication, Evaluation and Learning (CEL) project can assist and benefit from the project's activities. For example, USAID AMPR could assist CEL in developing and finalizing blogs or other communication and outreach materials. In addition, CEL could provide feedback on sampling methodologies for activities such as the Miner KAP Survey. USAID AMPR will work through the COR on any collaboration.
- **International Peace Information Service (IPIS).** Sub-contractor IPIS will be responsible for data collection for the indicator on mapping gold sites. The transmission and updating of this data will be integrated into the terms of reference of their sub-contract. In addition, USAID AMPR will endeavor to harmonize data collection instruments between IPIS, GoCAR and USAID AMPR. For example, an integrated questionnaire will be developed for both gold and diamond sites, which will allow integration into the public mapping interface of data collected by KP Focal Points and USAID AMPR from diamond mining areas.

### 3.3.2 MEL AND SUB-CONTRACTS

USAID AMPR will sub-contract Component 3 work to IPIS and RESOLVE with respect to gold. As such, IPIS will be responsible for collecting data on active gold mining sites and integrating into an interactive mapping system. The number of sites identified and integrated into this system will form the basis of one of USAID AMPR's indicators. As such, USAID AMPR will ensure that this obligation is integrated into the IPIS sub-contract and establish clear modalities for data-sharing and data quality assurance.

### 3.3.3 DATA COLLECTION

Data collection methods will vary by indicator and are described in detail in the PIRS for each indicator located in Annex A. Table 2 below offers a summary of major data collection tools.



**TABLE 2. DATA COLLECTION METHODS**

| DATA COLLECTION TOOL                                 | DESCRIPTION OF METHOD  |
|--|--|
| <b>Sampling of active production zones</b>           | <p>In order to determine the percentage of rough diamond production that is exported legally, USAID AMPR must estimate actual rough diamond production, which is the indicator's denominator. Estimating actual production levels is not straight forward as an infinitesimal portion is registered in official production notebooks. In the past under the USAID Property Rights and Artisanal Diamond Development I and II (USAID PRADD I and II) project, the government estimated production based on initial sales data in regional trading centers. However, with the expansion of smuggling, and the KP suspension applied to most zones, this method is no longer reliable. USAID AMPR will therefore collaborate with the USGS, who periodically identify active mining sites throughout the country through a square-kilometer grid and classification system using satellite images. USAID AMPR will work with USGS to develop a representative sample of sites that will then undergo ground-truthing by project and partner agents. Using an average productivity per square kilometer, USGS and USAID AMPR will then offer a rough estimate of actual production. USAID AMPR will also use data from Miner KAP Survey and other sources to refine this estimate and will document the methodology and its limitations.</p>   |
| <b>Miner KAP Surveys and site monitoring surveys</b> | <p>USAID AMPR will conduct the Miner KAP Survey at least three times. The surveys will target pit owners and not mining workers. Questions will cover a variety of topics including land tenure dynamics, perception of corruption and security, knowledge of the mining code and KP obligations, techniques, production, and sales prices. The surveys will be implemented mainly in project intervention zones but may also include some sites in nearby "priority zones." USAID AMPR will not conduct the KAP Survey in areas that are dangerous or under rebel control. Certain questions on the survey will be integrated into other data collection instruments, such as the monitoring questionnaires to be used by IPIS and KP Focal Points who survey a broader area (including gold mining and non-compliant zones). The KAP survey results will be used to measure the results of miner sensitization campaigns by compiling a score per surveyed miner based on the number of correct responses to knowledge questions. In addition, the KAP survey and site monitoring data will also be used to assess perceptions with respect to security, freedom of movement, corruption, and motivations for legal or illegal behavior. The information will therefore be vital for project and government learning, in addition to providing data for specific performance indicators.</p> |
| <b>Conflict registers</b>                            | <p>Each local peace and reconciliation committee (CLPR) will designate a person responsible for filling out conflict registers, which will be simple notebooks in which conflicts and actions aimed at their resolution will be documented. The notebooks will help assess the utility and activities of the CLPR. USAID AMPR will also use data from the notebooks to document the number of conflicts resolved with USGS assistance. Field agents will conduct due diligence on the data to ensure its accuracy before including in the project's database and reports to USAID. The project will also encourage the Ministry of Humanitarian Action and National Reconciliation to compile and use the data for its own reporting and learning.</p>   |
| <b>Data collection forms</b>                         | <p>USAID AMPR will develop data collection and documentation forms for each indicator. Field agents will fill out forms, attach relevant Means of Verification (MOVs). The M&amp;E Coordinator and relevant Component Coordinator will also sign the forms. The data will be integrated into the project's indicator database and scanned copies of the forms and MOVs will be kept on file. For example, for each instance of a peace-building or consensus-building forum, a form will be filled out to document the nature of the forum, the disaggregation of participants, the dates, the</p>   |

| DATA COLLECTION TOOL                     | DESCRIPTION OF METHOD  |
|--|--|
|  | results and other information. Terms of reference and attendance lists will then be attached to the form, and after validation, the form and attachments will form the MOV for that indicator. As such, the forms will be used for data collection but also quality assurance.   |
| <b>Government reports and statistics</b> | USAID AMPR will rely upon government agencies to provide data for several indicators, mainly: the number of registered miners, the number of active legal buyers, and the number of legal exports. In some instances, USAID AMPR will offer capacity building to ensure that data is reliably collected and maintained, such as the number of active legal buyers, which requires that the government digitize all sales slips and assign unique ID numbers to each buyer to avoid double-counting. USAID AMPR will also request supporting documentation for data but will likely be limited due to confidentiality concerns. For example, the government will not share the raw data behind all sales slips. As such USAID AMPR will have limited capacity for thorough MOV beyond the aggregate official reports and statistics provided by the government. That said, USAID AMPR will ensure data quality through cross-checking with data collected at the field level and analyzing anomalies. |

### 3.3.4 DATA ANALYSIS

The M&E Coordinator will compile data for all indicators into a Performance Monitoring Table, programmed to change colors if the target is met (green), unmet (red), or exceeded (blue) to facilitate monitoring of progress toward USAID AMPR results. In addition, the M&E Coordinator will prepare relevant graphs and charts of indicator disaggregates (such as training participants by location or gender) for annual reports.

### 3.3.5 DATA MANAGEMENT AND USE

All data related to performance indicators will be compiled in a spreadsheet that will disaggregate according to the PIRS. This master list of data will be stored on Tetra Tech's cloud-based file-sharing system to ensure security of the data but also the use of the data by all users despite geographic distance. In addition, the M&E Coordinator will ensure timely uploads of scanned copies of all MOVs organized by year and indicator onto the cloud-based file-sharing system. This will allow the monitoring of data quality and will facilitate compliance with DQAs.

In accordance with USAID's Open Data Policy, quantitative survey data as well as geographic data (shape files, etc.) will be uploaded onto the Development Data Library (DDL) online interface. All geographic data will comply with ADS 579saa with respect to geographic data quality requirements. In addition, indicator data will be reported as an integral part of annual reports submitted to USAID, and disaggregated data made available to USAID on an annual basis as well.

## 3.4 EVALUATIONS

USAID AMPR does not anticipate funds nor the need for an external independent evaluation. However, the project will conduct internal evaluations as part of learning activities. Specifically, the project will organize a participatory workshop with outside stakeholders at the end of each work plan year in order to present results and reflect upon reasons for successes or failures, so that the team can adapt accordingly to amplify USAID AMPR success. In addition, internal staff retreats will offer further grounds for evaluating progress. This will not preclude the option of organizing an external evaluation should circumstances change or should USAID decide that such an evaluation is necessary. In that case, the MEL Plan will be updated accordingly.

**TABLE 3. SCHEDULE OF MEL ACTIVITIES**

N.B.: The monitoring period each year is from October 1 – September 30th. Q1 for Year 1 is considered October 1, 2018.

| TASKS   | YEAR 1 |    |    |    | YEAR 2 |    |    |    | YEAR 3 |    |    |    | YEAR 4<br>(OPTION YEAR) |    |    |    | YEAR 5<br>(OPTION YEAR) |    |    |    | RESPONSIBLE PARTY                              |
|---|--------|----|----|----|--------|----|----|----|--------|----|----|----|-------------------------|----|----|----|-------------------------|----|----|----|--|
|   | Q1     | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1     | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1     | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1                      | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 | Q1                      | Q2 | Q3 | Q4 |  |
| Submit MEL Plan for USAID approval  | •      |    |    |    |        |    |    |    |        |    |    |    |                         |    |    |    |                         |    |    |    | Technical Deputy, Home Office MEL Specialist   |
| Set up M&E system and train staff and government partners                                       | •      | •  |    |    |        |    |    |    |        |    |    |    |                         |    |    |    |                         |    |    |    | Home Office MEL Specialist                     |
| Conduct Miner KAP Survey  |        | •  |    |    |        | •  |    |    |        | •  |    |    |                         | •  |    |    |                         | •  |    |    | USAID AMPR staff and grantees                  |
| Submission to DDL   |        |    |    |    |        |    |    |    |        |    |    |    |                         |    |    |    |                         |    |    | •  | Home Office MEL Specialist                     |
| Collect routine performance data  |        | •  | •  | •  | •      | •  | •  | •  | •      | •  | •  | •  | •                       | •  | •  | •  | •                       | •  | •  | •  | M&E Coordinator, USAID AMPR staff and grantees |
| Conduct quality control   |        |    | •  | •  | •      | •  | •  | •  | •      | •  | •  | •  | •                       | •  | •  | •  | •                       | •  | •  | •  | M&E Coordinator                                |
| Hold collaborating, learning, and adapting management meetings                                  |        |    | •  |    | •      |    | •  |    | •      |    | •  |    | •                       |    | •  |    | •                       |    |    |    | COP  |
| Hold annual review and pause-and-reflect session with government and other project stakeholders |        |    |    | •  |        |    |    | •  |        |    |    | •  |                         |    |    | •  |                         |    |    | •  | COP, M&E Coordinator                           |
| Conduct internal DQA for larger tasks   |        |    |    |    |        | •  |    |    |        |    |    |    |                         |    |    |    | •                       |    |    |    | Home Office MEL Specialist                     |
| Draft MEL section of annual report  |        |    |    | •  |        |    |    | •  |        |    |    | •  |                         |    |    | •  |                         |    |    | •  | M&E Coordinator                                |
| Revise MEL Plan as needed   |        |    |    | •  |        |    |    | •  |        |    |    | •  |                         |    |    | •  |                         |    |    |    | Home Office MEL Specialist                     |
| Draft M&E and lessons learned sections of final report  |        |    |    |    |        |    |    |    |        |    | •  | •  |                         |    |    |    |                         |    | •  | •  | COP and Key Personnel                          |

*Year 4 and 5 activities are contingent on approval of option years. If option years are not exercised, final MEL events will be pushed back.*

### 3.5 DATA QUALITY

Although the M&E Coordinator will be ultimately responsible for ensuring data quality, the entire USAID AMPR team, including sub-contractors and government partners, will play a critical role in providing quality controls with any data they gather or handle. To ensure quality, accuracy, and objectiveness of data used for management purposes and for submission to USAID, USAID AMPR will employ proven practices at the project level, systematic data quality assurance measures unique to each indicator, and internal DQAs in Year 2 of the project.

**Project-Wide Quality Control Procedures.** The team will provide overall data quality through proven practices, including clear procedures for challenging data collection tools, thorough training and support to enumerators and government partners, piloting tools where appropriate, spot checks for certain data points, and a thorough and timely review of incoming data. The project will build web-based forms with validation rules to guide enumerators with data collection requirements for the KAP surveys, so that data fall within anticipated ranges, digits or characters are entered, and fields are not left incomplete. The M&E Coordinator and Technical Deputy will be able to view all data collected on tablets, questioning unclear or insufficient data and requesting that the entry be amended.

**Indicator-Specific Procedures.** The PIRSs in Annex A describe actions to address constraints to the validity, integrity, reliability, precision, and timeliness of each specific indicator. As teams are trained on data collection, the project will highlight these specific concerns.

**Capacity Building.** Because some data is collected by government partners, the project will ensure that relevant agencies have the tools and capacity needed to collect and compile quality information. As such, capacity-building activities, notably with respect to mining production and export statistics, will serve the dual purpose of helping compliance with the KP Operational Framework (OF) but also in providing quality data for the project's performance indicators. For example, the project will review the system for digitizing sales slips, and will train government authorities on how to use simple Excel techniques (like pivot tables and conditional formatting) to disaggregate and reveal errors/anomalies in sales data. In addition, the project will assess the pilot use of tablets for data collection under PRADD II. The diagnostic on the KP OF planned for February (see Annual Work Plan) will touch upon these questions and include data collection and management as a key point of discussion at the workshop.

**Internal DQAs.** The Home Office MEL Specialist will lead two internal DQAs over the course of the project to evaluate the limitations to data quality for each of the project's indicators. The DQA will include a review of documents and data collection practices, and interviews with key individuals contributing to data collection. Tetra Tech's internal process complements but does not substitute for USAID's formal DQA – allowing the project to address data validity issues proactively. The MEL Specialist will prepare a report with findings as well as recommendations for improved data collection and revised tools or procedures where needed. Where possible, indicator-specific procedures will account for, mitigate, or minimize these data quality concerns. The internal DQA process will serve to identify the effectiveness of data quality improvement strategies and additional data quality issues observed during project implementation.

The timeline of quality control procedures and internal DQAs is outlined in Table 3. Dates for indicator-specific procedures are noted in each PIRS.

## 4.0 LEARNING AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN

### 4.1 CONCEPT

Participatory learning and adaptive management are at the heart of USAID AMPR's implementation strategy. Without an accurate understanding of social and institutional dynamics, and without putting that understanding to good use, outcomes related to mining governance, local development, and peace and reconciliation cannot be achieved. USAID AMPR will emphasize participatory approaches to activity design, implementation, learning, and adaptation. This is crucial as the project involves multiple stakeholders working on sensitive issues like corruption, land conflicts, and resource management. Without collaborative and participatory approaches, at best the activities will suffer from a lack of ownership and at worst the project could fail in its mandate to do no harm, stoking rather than resolving conflicts.

As such the project's first year activities will emphasize participatory diagnostics prior to activity implementation. For example, before identifying specific actions to strengthen capacity of the KP authorities to better implement the OF, a participatory field diagnostic and national workshop will be organized in order to create the process and space for developing a shared understanding of the key problems, their causes and potential solutions. Similarly, the activities aimed at promoting women's economic and social inclusion will not begin until a participatory diagnostic is completed. The diagnostic will employ tried and tested Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) tools (like historical and seasonal matrices, participatory mapping, Venn diagrams, among other tools) that will allow the team to identify real needs and activities that stand a chance of having a lasting impact. In this way, learning and adaption will be incorporated from the very beginning of project implementation.

The project will take full advantage of the annual work planning process to make necessary adjustments. Throughout the year, learning will take place through a number of ways: weekly staff meetings, weekly reports (both from the field and those submitted to USAID and USG stakeholders), bi-annual staff retreats, and annual pause-and-reflect sessions. The latter will be organized at multiple levels. In the field, the project will organize focus group discussions with women's groups, and/or elicit feedback from local peace committees and KP monitoring committees. The results will then be transmitted back to Bangui where a national workshop with key government stakeholders will help take stock of the project's progress and shortcomings. This will then directly influence the following year's work plan and the key lessons to be highlighted in the annual progress report. In these ways, the project will continue a participatory approach to capture perspectives and information, creating spaces for discussion and dialogue, and adapting the project's activities accordingly.

## 4.2 ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT AND LEARNING QUESTIONS

The tables below are summary lists of preliminary learning questions that USAID AMPR will refine further through discussions with activity managers, USAID, and USAID AMPR partners. The team will use these questions as a reference for the activity's adaptive management and thematic learning.

**TABLE 4. PRELIMINARY LIST OF LEARNING QUESTIONS**

| COMPONENT  | KEY OUTCOMES   | LEARNING QUESTIONS   |
|--|--|--|
| KP Compliance and Licit Economic Activities          | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved local and national policy and institutional framework for KP</li> <li>Formalization of land and property rights</li> <li>Increased awareness of KP requirements by all supply chain actors</li> <li>Strengthened capacity of GoCAR to manage additional compliant zones</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>What institutional changes have helped or could help improve the implementation of the OF?</li> <li>Do all actors have the necessary resources, and clear roles/responsibilities, with respect to KP compliance?</li> <li>Who have been the spoilers and champions for improved KP implementation?</li> <li>To what extent has the need to promote local development and involve local land owners been fully understood?</li> <li>What aspects of KP requirements have been well understood by miners, buyers, and other stakeholders? What aspects need more work?</li> </ul> |
| Community Resilience and Capacity to Manage Conflict | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sustained community dialogue and peace-building through CLPRs</li> <li>Improved economic and social inclusion of women</li> <li>Strengthened coordination and communication among ministries</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>How have the CLPRs been perceived by community members in terms of efficacy and legitimacy?</li> <li>What have been the big lessons learned, both positive and negative, stemming from the social dialogue exercises?</li> <li>How have the activities supporting women's livelihoods been perceived by other community members, notably men and traditional leaders, and are they leading to changes in social inclusion?</li> <li>Are there examples of improved or worsening coordination across ministries and government bodies?</li> </ul>                                |

| COMPONENT  | KEY OUTCOMES   | LEARNING QUESTIONS  |
|--|--|---|
| Opportunities and Challenges on ASM Gold   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Baseline understanding of ASM gold dynamics in CAR</li> </ul>   | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has the identification of gold mining sites and mining dynamics been perceived by government stakeholders?</li> <li>• What are some of the key similarities and differences uncovered between gold and diamond mining production and sales systems, and how should those differences be taken into account in national regulations?</li> </ul> |
| Improving USAID Programming through Understanding of ASM Linkages to Development | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Supported USAID OUs to assess link between ASM and development issues</li> <li>• Improved knowledge sharing and understanding by USAID OUs on ASM and development issues</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How has ASM been perceived by non-mining development specialists as part of support to OUs? How have those perceptions changed?</li> <li>• What are some surprising or new linkages uncovered between ASM and other development challenges / programs?</li> </ul>  |

# ANNEX A: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEETS (PIRS)

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator I:</b> Percentage of estimated rough diamond production from KP-compliant zones that is legally exported from CAR</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator</p>  |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator reports the percentage of all rough diamonds produced in the KP-compliant zones of CAR which are legally exported from CAR. This includes data at the national level from all regions, not just data from USAID AMPR-supported prefectures.</p> <p><i>Numerator:</i> volume exported (in carats)</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> estimated rough production in carats from KP-compliant zones</p> <p>(Percent should be presented as a whole number.)</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Outcome</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Percentage of carats</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> This is the desired long-term goal which will result from the assistance provided to GoCAR to improve governance and control of mineral resources in compliance with the OF.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator will be reported on an annual basis to USAID.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 8%</p>  |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION  |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Official GoCAR records</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> For the numerator, Objective I&amp;3 Coordinator will request updated export figures from the GoCAR. For the denominator, USAID AMPR will estimate actual production from KP compliant zones relying primarily on data from the KAP survey. This will be corroborated and possibly refined using USGS estimations, where available. Indeed, the KAP survey will help USGS refine its production estimation methodology by providing updated field data to improve their satellite image interpretation model. Finally, should the government improve its ability to collect production data from mine sites using either production notebooks or periodic site surveys by local informants, this data would provide additional corroboration of AMPR estimates.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Objective I&amp;3 Coordinator will supervise data collection and provide data to M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p> |



| DATA QUALITY ISSUES  |
|--|
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> The estimation of actual diamond production is highly unreliable. As in most ASM producing countries, miners do not record their production regularly, and those who do represent a very small percentage of total diggers. Moreover, diamonds are not distributed regularly and vary in size, meaning that there is very high variance for average concentration per square meter of gravel. These challenges make it difficult to reliably measure actual rough diamond production. USAID AMPR will have to provide caveats to data reported under this indicator, including a potential margin of error.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> USAID AMPR will be transparent in how it is estimating this actual rough production and will seek to engage government partners and other stakeholders to improve estimation methodologies.</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>  |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING  |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> None</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&amp;E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.</p> <p><b>Reporting Frequency:</b> Annual</p> <p><b>Storage of Data:</b> Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.</p>   |
| OTHER NOTES  |
| <p><b>Notes on Targets:</b> Based on experience with PRADD I and II, there will always be a level of smuggling from ASM-producing countries because diamonds are small and high value. As a rule of thumb, USAID AMPR estimates that this basic level of smuggling is between a quarter and a third of production. As such the maximum possible result for this indicator will be 66% of production exported legally, which was the figure obtained in Côte d'Ivoire under PRADD II. In CAR we are assuming that by the end of the project, all major production zones in the West (16 compliant and priority sub-prefectures) will become KP-compliant zones, meaning that all exports from the western region can resume. However, external analyses have shown that KP compliance does not mean that production is being exported legally. Indeed, AMPR's baseline is only 8% of real production in KP-compliant zones exported legally. This is derived from USGS estimates for production from KP-compliant zones (164,000 carats) and the latest national exports from that zone in 2018 (13,000 carats). There is therefore a long way to go to achieve the end of project target of 60%. USAID AMPR will also provide contextual information on production estimates from the eastern regions based on USGS and/or IPIS information, but the indicator will focus on the western KP-compliant areas where the project will have a greater influence due to field activities.</p> <p><b>Changes to Indicator:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Other Notes:</b> None</p> |
| THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019   |

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator 2:</b> Percentage of major diamond-mining sub-prefectures in the West authorized by the KP to export rough diamonds</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator</p>  |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator reports the percentage of major diamond-producing sub-prefectures which are authorized by the KP to export rough diamonds. Sub-prefectures are not limited to those supported by USAID AMPR.</p> <p><i>Numerator:</i> Number of sub-prefectures which are authorized by the KP to export rough diamonds</p> <p><i>Denominator:</i> Number of sub-prefectures with major diamond mining (16<sup>12</sup>)</p> <p>(Percent should be presented as a whole number.)</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Outcome</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Percentage of sub-prefectures</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b></p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator will be reported on an annual basis to USAID.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 31%</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION  |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Official GoCAR records</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Objective 1 Coordinator will request updated figures from the GoCAR.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Objective 1 Coordinator will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>  |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES  |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> As this data is gathered through secondary data from the GoCAR, USAID AMPR has limited ability to verify the figures.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Triangulation of data to ensure that the estimation is within a plausible range.</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>   |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING  |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> None</p>  |

<sup>12</sup> The 16 zones are: Berberati, Carnot, Nola, Gadzi, Boda, Gamboula, Bouar, Bozoum, Boganagone, Boganda, Amada-Gaza, Dede-Mokouba, Sosso-Nakombo, Mbaiki, Baoro, Abba. Several other sub-prefectures in the West theoretically could produce diamonds but there is little evidence from the USGS and field observations that they do currently.

**Presentation of Data:** Quantitative

**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### **OTHER NOTES**

**Notes on Targets:** The USAID AMPR target of 100% is assuming that by the end of the project, thanks in part to USAID AMPR support, that the KP will deem all zones in the Western areas of the country as compliant. According to USGS figures, this would mean that around 65% of national production would be taking place in compliant zones. There are several sub-prefectures in the West that theoretically have diamonds, but they have not been included on the list as there is no observed active diamond mining in those areas. Therefore the 16 zones chosen as the denominator reflect the main diamond mining areas as defined by GoCAR.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019**

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET   |
|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 3:</b> Number of licensed (registered) artisanal miners</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator</p>   |
| DESCRIPTION   |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator reports the total number of artisanal miners which are licensed by the National Government with the <i>patente</i> or the artisanal miner card (for ZEAs). The <i>patente</i> will be the most common measure. However, should the government approve the implementation of artisanal mining zones (ZEAs), then per the mining code these miners do not require a <i>patente</i> but rather an ASM worker card. USAID AMPR will count those miners with cards along with those with <i>patentes</i>, as both cases are forms of licensed (registered) mining.</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Outcome</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of licensed miners</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> USAID AMPR's behavior change campaigns will lobby for the importance of licensing. The result of that will be an increase in number of licensed miners, which is a bellwether of the extent of formalization within the mining system. In addition, USAID AMPR posits that the ZEA approach will help increase formalization. By counting the miner worker cards delivered under ZEA pilots, USAID AMPR will also be able to measure and communicate if this approach helps increase the number of formalized miners.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator will be reported on an annual basis to USAID.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 1,000</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION   |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Official GoCAR records</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Objective 1 Coordinator will request updated figures from the GoCAR.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Objective 1 Coordinator will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>   |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES   |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> As this data is gathered through secondary data from the GoCAR, USAID AMPR has limited ability to verify the figures.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Triangulation of data to ensure that the estimation is within a plausible range.</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>  |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING   |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> None</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p>  |

**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Targets:** The targets are based on the assumption of a progressive increase in the number of registered miners over time. The final target is based on an estimate of artisanal miners in the Western regions, meaning that we are aiming at 100% registration by the end of the project, which is an ambitious target. However, this may need to be updated over time should the actual number of miners increase or decrease.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** 02/26/2019

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator 4:</b> Number of diamond buyers (collectors and buying houses) making purchases with official purchase slips</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator</p>   |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator tracks the total number of actors who purchase diamonds with the sales slips called <i>bordereaux d'achat</i>. This list will be produced each year. The same actor should not be counted twice within the same year but repeat actors can be counted again the following year. Annual totals will not be aggregated with prior years. The indicator combines both buying houses and collectors. In addition, the indicator will not count buyers who are registered on paper but who have no legal sales purchase records.</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Outcome</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of buyers</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> This indicator demonstrates a change in behavior surrounding an appreciation for Mining Code.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator will be reported on an annual basis to USAID.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 200</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION  |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Table of Actors from GoCAR</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> After the slips are gathered by the National Government, and the records are digitized, the Objective I Coordinator will request updated the table of actors.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Objective I Coordinator will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>   |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES  |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> As this data is gathered through secondary data from the GoCAR, USAID AMPR has limited ability to verify the figures. In addition, USAID AMPR is proposing to count only active buyers and not just registered ones. This will require the digitization of all sales slips and an assignment of a unique ID to each buyer, both of which are not done consistently by CAR authorities at present. USAID AMPR will strive towards supporting the government make this possible, but if not, will revised the indicator to count only registered buyers and not registered active buyers.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> Triangulation of data to ensure that the estimation is within a plausible range.</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>   |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING  |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p>   |

**Disaggregated by:** ~~None.~~ collectors and buying houses

**Presentation of Data:** Quantitative

**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Targets:** The target assumes a progressive increase in the number of active diamond buyers as the number of compliant zones increases.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** 02/26/2019

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator 5:</b> Percentage of artisanal miners in project intervention zones with basic knowledge of KP and Mining Code</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator</p>   |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator reports the change in percentage of artisanal miners in USAID AMPR-supported sites who demonstrate basic knowledge of the KP and Mining Code. Artisanal miners are defined as <i>chef de chantier</i> who are the claim holders, who may or may not be the land owners, and who may or may not be the financiers, of a mining site with one or more teams of diggers. These will be the target population for the Miner KAP Survey. Basic knowledge is defined as having a score of 50% or higher on a knowledge test included in the Miner KAP Survey.</p> <p>Numerator: Number of survey respondents who score 50% or above</p> <p>Denominator: Total number of surveyed miners</p> <p>(Percent should be presented as a whole number.)</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Outcome</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Percentage of artisanal miners</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> Increased knowledge is the platform essential to change behavior surrounding mining practices. The long-term outcome desired is that the increased knowledge of the KP and Mining Code will increase adherence to the KP and Mining Code.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator will be reported on an annual basis to USAID.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> TBD</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION  |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Miner KAP Survey</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> USAID AMPR staff will survey a random selection of miners in a random selection of KP compliant and priority zones.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Objective I Coordinator will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>   |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES  |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> None known.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>  |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING  |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals. Data will also be analyzed by each disaggregate to see if there are any differences between.</p>  |



**Disaggregated by:** Sex

**Presentation of Data:** Quantitative

**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### **OTHER NOTES**

**Notes on Targets:** The target is based on PRADD II Côte d'Ivoire where the KAP survey was similarly used to monitor progress in miner awareness-raising.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** 02/26/2019

## PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET

**Indicator 6:** Number of specific pieces of land tenure and property rights legislation or implementing regulations proposed, adopted, and/or implemented positively affecting property rights of the urban and/or rural poor as a result of USG assistance

☐ Custom Indicator    ☒ Standard Indicator: EG.10.4-I

### DESCRIPTION

**Precise Definition(s):** Number of specific pieces of legislation or implementing regulations proposed, adopted, and implemented that positively affect the land or property rights of the urban and/or rural poor. A policy/law/regulation/administrative procedure should be reported if it – directly or indirectly – strengthens the land tenure and property rights of the poor, as defined by national poverty statistics, whether in urban and/or rural areas. This could include, for example, a land policy that seeks to proactively strengthen the rights of the poor and/or an urban zoning regulation that allows for residents to access services on the basis of legitimate property rights, whether or not they are formally recorded.

If the target population is expected to include the poor but is not limited to poor people, as measured by national statistics, the measure should still be reported here. Similarly, if the targeted geographic area is not specified, but the measure is expected to affect urban and/or rural areas, it should be reported.

The indicator measures the number of land policies/regulations/administrative procedures in the various stages of progress towards an improved land management process at the national and/or subnational level. Each new or revised law or regulation should be counted as one unit. Multiple amendments to the same law should not be counted separately.

Please count the highest stage completed during the reporting year.

- **Stage 1, Analyzed:** Underwent the first stage of the policy reform process i.e. analysis (review of existing land policies/ regulations/ administrative procedures).
- **Stage 2, Drafted:** Underwent the second stage of the land policy reform process. The second stage includes public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders on the proposed new or revised land policy/ regulation/ or administrative procedure.
- **Stage 3, Revised:** Underwent the third stage of the policy reform process. Land policy/regulation revised based on public debate and/or consultation with stakeholders.
- **Stage 4, Introduced/Presented:** Underwent the fourth stage of the policy reform process (policies were presented for legislation/decreed to improve the policy environment for smallholder-based agriculture.)
- **Stage 5, Approved:** Underwent the fifth stage of the land policy reform process (official approval (legislation/decreed) of new or revised policy/ regulation/ administrative procedure by relevant authority).
- **Stage 6, Implemented:** Completed the land policy reform process (implementation of new or revised policy/ regulation/ administrative procedure by relevant authority).

Replaces "number of improvements in laws and regulations" as "improvements" can be interpreted differently (i.e. an entire policy or specific provisions within the policy). The revised language corresponds with MCC Standard Indicator L-1. This indicator is easily aggregated upward from all operating units. These are 5 different indicators, each measuring a successive stage in the progression from analysis to implementation of land formalization processes.

The definition for this indicator has been clearly operationalized, enabling implementing partners and missions to easily determine between stages. These definitions will remain consistent over collection periods.

*USAID AMPR Operational Definition: Regulations in respect to mining will be considered a category of land tenure and property rights. USAID AMPR will only count documents that substantively change the overall regulatory framework. For example, a ministerial decree that creates a ZEA will not be counted. However, a decree that clarifies the process of designating and managing all ZEAs will be counted. In the life of the project, AMPR expects legislation formalizing the KP Secretariat, the revision of the mining code, the adoption of a national ASM policy, and regulations with respect to how ZEAs will function.*

**Indicator type:** Stages 1, 2 & 3 = Output; Stages 4, 5, & 6 = Outcome

**Unit of Measure:** Number of pieces of legislation

**Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:** Legal and policy reforms that strengthen property rights increase the security of tenure over the land, which in turn increases the security of durable capital investments in the land that can have significant positive impact on economic growth. Entities are more likely to invest in productivity enhancing durable capital investments when they have greater security of tenure. Data for this indicator represent the intended results of supporting land policy reforms.

**Use of Indicator:** Information will be used by central bureau (USAID/E3) to monitor performance, decide budget allocations, and report to key stakeholders, including the G7 Land Transparency Initiative. Missions should closely assess reported values against indicator definitions of the five stages and periodically review data collection process to ensure accurate reporting. Annual reporting allows missions and bureaus to use data for annual portfolio reviews. Data are useful to track performance of implementing partners working on land formalization; however, the outcomes for this indicator are greatly dependent on host country will and processes. Decision-makers should look at country context when using data for performance decisions.

**Baseline:** 0

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Source(s) of Data:** Implementing partners, whose programs target land formalization, will report on this indicator based on their engagement with land stakeholders.

**Data Collection Method:** The Objective I Coordinator will gather supporting documentation for each piece of regulation as it progresses.

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** The Objective I Coordinator will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.

#### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** None known.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** N/A

**Date of Future DQA:** March 2020

#### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals. Data will also be analyzed by each disaggregate to see where the greatest impact is taking place.

**Disaggregated by:** (1) Number out of total reported related specifically to guaranteeing women's equal rights to land ownership and control as a primary objective; and (2) Stage:

- Stage 1: Analyzed
- Stage 2: Drafted and presented for public/stakeholder consultation
- Stage 3: Reanalyzed/drafted based on the results of public/stakeholder consultation
- Stage 4: Presented for legislation/decreed
- Stage 5: Passed/approved
- Stage 6: Passed for which implementation has begun

**Presentation of Data:** Quantitative

**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Targets:** The target assumes that several pieces of legislation or regulations will be adopted during the life of the project with USAID AMPR support, especially with respect to mining.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019**

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator 7:</b> Number of adults who perceive their tenure rights to land or marine areas as secure as a result of USG assistance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator: EG.10.4-8</p>  |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator measures the number of adults participating in a USG-funded activity designed to strengthen land or marine tenure rights who perceive their tenure rights as secure as a direct result of USG assistance.</p> <p>Tenure refers to how people have access to land or marine areas, what they can do with the resources, and how long they have access to said resource. Tenure systems can range from individual property rights to collective rights, whether legally recognized or informal. What is included in the bundle of rights within each system varies.<sup>13</sup></p> <p>This is a snapshot indicator, which is designed to only capture adults who perceive their tenure as secure only in the reporting year. Adults who perceived their tenure as secure before the intervention constitute the baseline. After the intervention has begun individuals that continue to perceive their tenure as secure, or individuals that newly perceive their tenure as secure, should be counted. This also means that yearly totals <b>CANNOT</b> be summed to count the total number of individuals that perceive their tenure as secure over the life of the project.</p> <p>In alignment with the definition in the SDG indicator 1.4.2, Proportion of total adult population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure, by sex and by type of tenure, tenure is perceived to be secure if: 1) an individual believes that he/she will not involuntarily lose their use or ownership rights to land or marine areas due to actions by others (e.g. governments or other individuals), and 2) the landholder reports a right to bequeath the land. The reported right to bequeath is particularly important for gender equity, as women's ability to influence intergenerational land transfers is an important aspect of female empowerment.</p> <p>Survey modules established as part of the SDG reporting process and agreed to by the Global Donor Working Group on Land and leading experts on land governance, are available upon request to assist projects in reporting on this indicator. These modules cover different scenarios, depending on what is most appropriate for the project: 1) one person (proxy) responds on behalf of other household members or each adult within a household is asked specifically about his or her land tenure rights, 2) data is collected at household or parcel level. Although the preferable approach in principle is to have parcel-level data and a self-respondent approach, this may not be possible in light of time and budget constraints.<sup>14</sup></p> <p>Given the time and expense involved in collect tenure security perception data, this data may not be available on an annual basis. Projects and activities that expect to generate results measurable with</p> |

<sup>13</sup> For more information about tenure rights and the bundle of rights for the purposes of this indicator please refer to the metadata for SDG indicator 1.4.2, available here: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/iaeg-sdgs/metadata-compilation/>

<sup>14</sup> The survey module and more extensive guidance is available upon request by contacting USAID's Bureau for Economic Growth, Education & Environment, Land and Urban Office at [landmatters@usaid.gov](mailto:landmatters@usaid.gov) or Caleb Stevens at [castevens@usaid.gov](mailto:castevens@usaid.gov).

this indicator should set targets for outgoing years and report on an annual basis even if those targets and annual results are zero for the first years of the program.

*USAID AMPR Operational Definition: Number of land-owning artisanal miners (chefs de chantier) who respond affirmatively to two questions in the KAP survey related to bequeathing their sites to children and avoiding expropriation by external actors. The first KAP survey will provide a baseline figure and in each year when the KAP survey is conducted the indicator will report an absolute number of respondents who meet the above criteria. As per the guidelines above, results from each year will not be added together for life-of-project reporting. In light of this definition, the disaggregation categories listed in the PIRS below are not relevant and will not be applied in reporting.*

**Indicator type:** Outcome

**Unit of Measure:** Land-owning artisanal miners perceiving tenure security

**Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:** Secure tenure, as measured by formalization, contributes to USG development objectives in several ways. Secure tenure promotes vibrant markets primarily by incentivizing productivity-enhancing and resilient investments and facilitating credit access where other enabling conditions are present. Where property rights are ill defined or cannot be enforced at minimal cost, farmers, fishers, small business owners, and others who seek to invest productively must spend scarce resources defending their land and/or resources, whether by building fences or defending court cases, thus diverting valuable resources from investments that enhance productivity, such as soil and water conservation. Secure rights to land and resources also allow for land and resources to be transferred at low cost through rentals and/or sales, which allows the most productive land users to acquire additional land while enabling those who wish to pursue other income strategies to transfer the value of their assets to other sectors. Where fiscal systems are established, transparent, and equitable, land and resource governance can also have a positive impact on domestic resource mobilization. Moreover, where financial markets are accessible, secure tenure can also enable rights holders to access credit towards additional investments and also act as an insurance substitute in case of shocks.

Measuring formalization, through legally recognized documentation, is complementary to tenure security perception. Tenure may be perceived as secure, although rights are not formally documented. Alternatively, tenure may be perceived as insecure even when there is a high degree of formal documentation. Both measures are needed in order to measure project performance and track progress in achieving development objectives.

Legal and policy reforms that strengthen property rights increase the security of tenure over the land, which in turn increases the security of durable capital investments in the land that can have significant positive impact on economic growth. Entities are more likely to invest in productivity enhancing durable capital investments when they have greater security of tenure. Data for this indicator represent the intended results of supporting land policy reforms.

**Use of Indicator:** This indicator is used to measure project performance and progress. The indicator will also be used for the Office of Land & Urban and other OU portfolio reviews. The same indicator as part of the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) MEL will be used for Bureau for Food Security/Feed the Future portfolio reviews.

**Baseline:** TBD

#### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Source(s) of Data:** Miner KAP survey

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> The KAP survey will identify miners who meet two criteria: (1) report owning a mine site; (2) report tenure security as defined above.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The M&amp;E Coordinator will supervise data collection in coordination with the MEL Specialist and the Technical Deputy.</p>  |
| <b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>   |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> None known.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>  |
| <b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>   |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals. Data will also be analyzed by each disaggregate to see where the greatest impact is taking place. Please note that none of these indicators are relevant to the USAID AMPR project.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b></p> <p>Land Type of Documentation: Individual/Household</p> <p>Land Type of Documentation: Community/Group</p> <p>Land Type of Documentation: Business/Commercial</p> <p>Land Type of Documentation: Other legal entity</p> <p>Land Document Holder Sex: Male</p> <p>Land Document Holder Sex: Female</p> <p>Land Location: Rural</p> <p>Land Location: Urban</p> <p>Marine Type of Documentation: Individual/Household</p> <p>Marine Type of Documentation: Community/Group</p> <p>Marine Type of Documentation: Business/Commercial</p> <p>Marine Type of Documentation: Other legal entity</p> <p>Marine Document Holder Sex: Male</p> <p>Marine Document Holder Sex: Female</p> <p>Marine Location: Freshwater</p> <p>Marine Location: Marine water</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> Raw survey data will be reviewed for quality by the M&amp;E Coordinator, MEL Specialist, Technical Deputy, and made available to USAID for additional verification and review.</p> <p><b>Reporting Frequency:</b> During year when KAP surveys are conducted</p> |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Storage of Data:</b> Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.  |
| <b>OTHER NOTES</b>  |
| <p><b>Notes on Targets:</b> The targets assume that 50 respondents on average per KAP survey will meet criteria to be counted for this indicator.</p> <p><b>Changes to Indicator:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Other Notes:</b> None</p> |
| <b>THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019</b>   |



| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator 8:</b> Number of villages having formalized and strengthened their natural resource management capacity</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator</p>  |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator counts villages which have strengthened their collective land and resource management capacity through participation in an artisanal mining zone (ZEA) or through having adopted local pacts with land use components. For all intents and purposes, the indicator will count the number of villages inside ZEAs and/or with local land/resource management agreements and systems.</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Outcome</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of villages</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> Supporting the formalization and strengthening of villages is intended to increase their capacity to manage and benefit from mineral resources in their territory. In addition, USAID AMPR will promote a partnership approach between villages and the government to co-manage mineral resources, and the ZEAs and local pacts are the mechanisms to formalize these partnership arrangements.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator will be reported on an annual basis to USAID.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION  |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Documentation of support activities by USAID AMPR and documentation of planning documents</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Activity lead will report progress to M&amp;E Coordinator when villages have formalized and strengthened their NRM</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Component 2 Lead will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>  |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES  |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> None.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>  |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING  |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> None</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p>   |

**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Targets:** The target is an estimate of villages that will participate in the ZEA pilots but may need to be revised as the pilot zones are identified.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** 02/26/2019

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET   |
|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 9:</b> Number of groups trained in conflict mediation/resolution skills or consensus-building techniques with USG assistance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator: DR.3.1-2</p>   |
| DESCRIPTION   |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> “Groups” are entities (e.g. NGOs, government, women’s groups, political parties, civil society organizations, unions, employers, factions, media, ethnic or marginalized groups, or CLPRs) involved in, or planning to be involved in, conflict mediation or consensus-building processes.</p> <p>Training can be for any amount of time at a USG sponsored event, workshop or seminar. People attending the same type of training but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training (pre-service, in-service), who the training is for (community health worker, to upgrade a medical assistant to a nurse), level of training (basic, elementary, technical, university/certification), duration of training, what constitutes completion (for a short course, full attendance may be mandatory; for a longer course, there might be testing to ensure competencies are achieved; for certification, there may be a graduation). It is required that training follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies; all data be sex-disaggregated; and that where possible, training meets national or international standards.</p> <p><i>USAID AMPR Operational Definition:</i> Given the nature of the trainings and groups for this indicator, which do not target groups such as those working on LGBTI issues, the standard disaggregation categories below are not relevant and will therefore not be reported.</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Output</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of groups</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> Training groups in conflict mediation/resolution skills or consensus building techniques will increase the possibility that consensus-building processes will result in an agreement and promote social cohesion.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This data indicates level of effort and when compared at post to “number of groups that need training” will be useful for program planning and allocation of resources. Also, OUs that award CMM grants from the People-to-People reconciliation fund report on this indicator and it is one of the few ways to collectively capture results from this fund.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION   |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Agendas, attendance sheets, and photos</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Direct observation from USAID AMPR and implementing partners.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Component 2 Coordinator will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>  |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES   |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b></p>  |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A<br><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020  |
| <b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>   |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals. Data will also be analyzed by each disaggregate to see if there are any differences between... Please note that the indicators below are not relevant to USAID AMPR and will thus not be reported on.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Focus of group:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Number of women's rights groups</li> <li>• Number of groups working on LGBTI issues</li> <li>• Number of indigenous people's groups</li> <li>• Number of groups working on religious freedom</li> </ul> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&amp;E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.</p> <p><b>Reporting Frequency:</b> Annual</p> <p><b>Storage of Data:</b> Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.</p> |
| <b>OTHER NOTES</b>   |
| <p><b>Notes on Targets:</b> This target assumes at least one formal training per local peace and reconciliation committee (CLPR).</p> <p><b>Changes to Indicator:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Other Notes:</b> None</p>  |
| <b>THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019</b>  |

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator 10:</b> Number of USG supported events, trainings, or activities designed to build support for peace or reconciliation among key actors to the conflict</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator    <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator: PS.6.2-3</p>   |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator registers any USG funded activity – such as a training or event -- that aims to build support for peace and reconciliation among key actors of a conflict. Key actors are identified through assessments and include those individuals who individually or through an organization have or could soon have the capacity to mobilize others for violent action, peaceful intervention, or stabilization. To be counted, an activity, training, or event must be time-limited in duration (e.g., a two-day conflict mediation training, a community soccer game to promote social cohesion, or a community dialogue on managing resource-related conflict issues). If a broader activity includes a training (or an event of some kind), only the broader activity should be counted. The number of events, trainings or activities designed to build support for peace and reconciliation on a mass scale should be reported under indicators PS.6.2-2.</p> <p><i>USAID AMPR Operational Definition: The same event will be counted separately when conducted in separate villages.</i></p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Output</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of events (trainings or activities)</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> The long-term outcome desired is to build popular support for peace processes. Many theories of change posit that if there is more grassroots level support for a peace process, the potential for peace will increase. By creating activities that have these aims, projects contribute to these outcomes. Activities designed to reduce the frequency of sexual and gender-based violence or to help perpetrators and victims recover from the trauma of such violence, could fall under the definition.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator would be reported on a yearly basis by the USAID program office or whatever administrative organization is responsible for aggregating information for Missions and collected by the program management staff.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION  |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> activity records (agendas, terms of reference, attendance sheets, reports)</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> As programs conduct these activities, the information should be collected and reported through the USAID, or other USG, hierarchy. Primary data is generated by USG staff or implementing partners through observation and administrative records.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Objective 2 Coordinator will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>  |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES  |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> None known.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p>   |

|  |
|--|
| <b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020  |
| <b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>   |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> None</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&amp;E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.</p> <p><b>Reporting Frequency:</b> Annual</p> <p><b>Storage of Data:</b> Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.</p> |
| <b>OTHER NOTES</b>   |
| <p><b>Notes on Targets:</b> The target assumes at least 4 events per local committee (CLPR) or KP monitoring mechanism (ALS).</p> <p><b>Changes to Indicator:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Other Notes:</b> None</p>  |
| <b>THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:</b> 02/26/2019  |

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator 11:</b> Number of local women participating in a substantive role or position in a peacebuilding process supported with USG assistance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator: GNDR-10</p>  |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> For this indicator, a peacebuilding process refers to formal (diplomatic or official) or informal (grassroots, civil society) activities aimed at preventing or managing violent conflict, resolving conflict or the drivers of conflict, and to sustaining peace following an end to violent conflict.</p> <p>This indicator is intended to capture the participation of local women in peacebuilding processes; to be counted in this indicator, women should be from the relevant conflict country, area, or region. This indicator does not count the participation of women in U.S. or other third-party delegations to peace processes.</p> <p>To be counted in this indicator, participants should have a substantive role in the peacebuilding process or initiative, meaning a participant has realistic opportunities to share information and represent her own perspectives or those of a group she represents; to help define issues, problems, and solutions; and to influence decisions and outcomes associated with the process or initiative. To the extent practicable, individuals should be counted only once per fiscal year under this indicator.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• persons serving on a local peace committee</li> <li>• persons representing a group or organization with official consultative status to a peace negotiation</li> <li>• person serving as an official delegate to a peace process</li> </ul> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Output</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of women</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> Women’s participation in peacebuilding activities is posited as an important mechanism for increasing the gender-sensitivity of processes and outcomes, and for improving the overall strength and sustainability of such processes by ensuring focus on a broader set of issues relevant to preventing, managing, and resolving conflict and by bringing the skills and capacities of women to bear in these processes.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> Information generated by this indicator will be used to monitor and report on achievements linked to broader outcomes of gender equality and female empowerment and will be used for planning and reporting purposes by Agency-level, bureau-level and in-country program managers. Specifically, this indicator will inform required annual reporting or reviews of the USAID Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy; U.S. National Action Plan on Women, Peace, and Security; and the U.S. Strategy to Prevent and Respond to Gender-Based Violence Globally, as well as Joint Strategic Plan reporting in the APP/APR, and Bureau or Office portfolio reviews. Additionally, the information will inform a wide range of gender-related public reporting and communications products and facilitate responses to gender-related inquiries from internal and external stakeholders such as Congress, NGOs, and international organizations.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> |

| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION  |
|--|
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Meeting minutes and bylaws for the CLPR committees</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> The primary data for this indicator will be provided by implementing partners and collected through review of relevant project/program documents (e.g. quarterly and final reports, project monitoring records); however; analysis of secondary data (e.g. newspapers, records of proceedings) or direct observation of processes by post also may also be useful.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> The Objective 2 Lead will supervise data collection and provide data to the M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>   |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES  |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> Annual data should not be added to previous year's data. The same woman who holds multiple leadership positions in the same year should only be counted once.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> A register will be kept with the names and positions of women in leadership so that the M&amp;E Coordinator can report on the number of women who participate in leadership, not the number of leadership positions filled by women.</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>   |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING  |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> None</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&amp;E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.</p> <p><b>Reporting Frequency:</b> Annual</p> <p><b>Storage of Data:</b> Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.</p> |
| OTHER NOTES  |
| <p><b>Notes on Targets:</b> The target assumes at least one woman per CLPR and ALS.</p> <p><b>Changes to Indicator:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Other Notes:</b> None</p>  |
| THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019   |



| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET   |
|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 12:</b> Number of consensus building forums (multi-party, civil/security sector, and/or civil/political) held with USG Assistance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator: DR.3.1-3</p>   |
| DESCRIPTION   |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Multi-party, civil/military, civil /political forums are events, seminars, meetings, and conferences that bring together groups in tension or conflict in an effort to generate greater understanding and consensus. Civil in this sense means “public” and indicates a meeting, town hall, forum, etc. in which the public can communicate directly with representatives of parties (or government) or the security sector (military, police). For purposes of this indicator, a series of regularly-recurring meetings/events that are part of the same process are counted as one event: e.g. a series of municipal government hearings to get feedback on a three-year development plan should be counted as one event.</p> <p><i>USAID AMPR Operational Definition: Peace Building KP-related forums will be counted towards this.</i></p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Output</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of forums</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> Increased communication between groups in conflict or tension will enhance understanding and increase the possibility that consensus-building processes will result in an agreement. Contributes to peaceful agreement on democratic reform, rules, and frameworks.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This data indicates level of effort. DRL uses this indicator for internal learning to determine where current efforts are being supported and identify where there may be gaps in consensus-building programs. If there is a perceived need for consensus-building forums and this is a low number, then programmers might increase the number of consensus building forums they produce.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION   |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Attendance sheets, agendas</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Direct observation from post or implementing partners.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> Objective 2 Lead &amp; M&amp;E Coordinator</p>   |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES   |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> None known</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>  |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING   |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p>  |

**Disaggregated by:** None

**Presentation of Data:** Quantitative

**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### **OTHER NOTES**

**Notes on Targets:** The target is an estimate of various multi-stakeholder forums that can help lead to consensus including forums on implementing the OF, on national gold policy, etc.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** 02/26/2019

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET   |
|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 13:</b> Number of disputed land and property rights cases resolved by local authorities, contractors, mediators, or courts as a result of USG assistance</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator: EG 10.4-3</p>   |
| DESCRIPTION   |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Land and property rights disputes are defined as disagreements between two or more parties*, whether or not they have been reported to a formal court or administrative dispute resolution institution, that require adjudication by a third party and pertain to one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overlapping or contradictory claims over a particular area of land,</li> <li>• Disagreements over the authority to assign property or adjudicate disputes in a particular area,</li> <li>• Disagreements related to inheritance or other transfers of land,</li> <li>• Violation of property rights, such as unauthorized access or use, damage, etc.</li> <li>• Unauthorized encroachment onto designated for other purposes such as livestock corridors, or protected areas.</li> </ul> <p>WOG: MCC Standard Indicator L-4. These disputes are resolved formally, either in writing or otherwise documented in a locally-appropriate manner.</p> <p><i>USAID AMPR Operational Definition: conflicts registered in the CLPR conflict registers between parties that may be at the individual or collective level. Disputes may be major or minor.</i></p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Outcome</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of cases</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> Property rights disputes are a common occurrence in many developing countries and often represent well over half of all formal court cases. At best, conflicts over property rights can result in idle land that could be used more productively; at worst, they can be a source of underlying grievances that leads to broader conflict. Although the resolution of property rights cases, whether formal or informal, often presents particular challenges, it is typically a prerequisite for the achievement of long-term impacts toward many other development outcomes, including peace and stability, good governance, and economic growth.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> Operating unit-level planners and in-country program managers will use the data generated by this indicator for the purposes of program planning, making adjustments to USAID strategy, programs, making budget decisions, and reporting to Congress and other external stakeholders, including the G7 Land Transparency Initiative.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION   |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> Conflict Registers</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> USAID AMPR Field Agents will gather data from the registries of each Peace and Reconciliation Committee supported by USAID AMPR.</p>  |

|   |
|---|
| <b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> Field Agents will collect data. M&E Coordinator will review and aggregate data.  |
| <b>DATA QUALITY ISSUES</b>  |
| <b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> None known.<br><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A<br><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020  |
| <b>PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, &amp; REPORTING</b>  |
| <b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals. Data will also be analyzed by each disaggregate to see if there are any differences between the entity which resolved the dispute, to see where USAID AMPR is having the greatest success and where there is more opportunity for support.<br><b>Disaggregated by:</b> Disputes resolved by [local authorities/contractors/mediators/courts]<br><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative<br><b>Review of Data:</b> For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.<br><b>Reporting Frequency:</b> Annual<br><b>Storage of Data:</b> Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location. |
| <b>OTHER NOTES</b>  |
| <b>Notes on Targets:</b> USAID AMPR assumes that around 100 conflicts will be registered over the life of the project of which half will be resolved with CLPR / village support. This figure may be revised depending on the realities on the ground as the committees begin recording.<br><b>Changes to Indicator:</b> N/A<br><b>Other Notes:</b> None  |
| <b>THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019</b>   |

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET  |
|--|
| <p><b>Indicator 14:</b> Number of individuals who have received USG-supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator: EG.3.2-1</p>  |
| DESCRIPTION  |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> This indicator counts the number of individuals to whom significant knowledge or skills have been imparted through interactions that are intentional, structured, and purposed for imparting knowledge or skills. The indicator includes farmers, ranchers, fishers, and other primary sector producers who receive training in a variety of best practices in productivity, post-harvest management, linking to markets, etc. It also includes rural entrepreneurs, processors, managers and traders receiving training in application of improved technologies, business management, linking to markets, etc. Finally, it includes training to extension specialists, researchers, policymakers and others who are engaged in the food, feed and fiber system and natural resources and water management.</p> <p>There is no pre-defined minimum or maximum length of time for the training; what is key is that the training reflects a planned, structured curriculum designed to strengthen capacities, and there is a reasonable expectation that the training recipient will acquire new knowledge or skills that s/he could translate into action. However, Operating Units may choose to align their definition of short-term training with the TrainNet training definition of 2 consecutive class days or more in duration, or 16 hours or more scheduled intermittently.</p> <p>Count an individual only once, regardless of the number of trainings received during the reporting year and even if the trainings covered different topics. Do not count sensitization meetings or one-off informational trainings.</p> <p>In-country and off-shore training are included. Training should include food security, water resources management/IWRM, sustainable agriculture, and climate change risk analysis, adaptation, mitigation, and vulnerability assessments as they relate to agriculture resilience, but should not include nutrition-related trainings, which should be reported under indicator #3.1.9(1) instead.</p> <p>Delivery mechanisms can include a variety of extension methods as well as technical assistance activities. An example is a USDA Cochran Fellow.</p> <p>This indicator counts individuals receiving training, for which the outcome, i.e. individuals applying improved practices, might be reported under EG3.1-17.</p> <p>In FTFMS, partners should enter the number of individuals trained disaggregated first by Type of Individual then by Sex. For example, partners should enter for the total number of Male producers trained and the total number of Female Producers trained. FTFMS will automatically calculate the total number of Producers trained. Partners should then enter the total number of Males in Private Sector Firms trained and the total number of Females in Private Sector Firms trained. FTFMS will automatically calculate the total number of people in Private Sector Firms trained. And so on for the other Type of Individual disaggregate categories. FTFMS will then automatically calculate the total number of individuals who received short-term training by summing across the Type of Individual disaggregate.</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Output</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of individuals</p> |

**Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:** Measures enhanced human capacity for improving agriculture productivity, food security, policy formulation and implementation, which is key to transformational development. In the Feed the Future (FTF) results framework, this indicator measures Intermediate Result (IR) 1: Improved Agricultural Productivity and Sub IR 1.1: Enhanced Human and Institutional Capacity Development for Increased Sustainable Agriculture Sector Productivity.

**Use of Indicator:** This indicator is used to report progress in the FTF/BFS portfolio reviews, the FTF Progress Report and Country Pages, and the U.S. International Food Assistance Report (IFAR).

**Baseline:** 0

### PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION

**Source(s) of Data:** Training records

**Data Collection Method:** Staff will submit curricula and attendance information for each relevant training activity.

**Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:** Technical staff responsible for training implementation. M&E Coordinator will review and aggregate data.

### DATA QUALITY ISSUES

**Known Data Limitations and Significance:** This indicator does not identify increased ability or changed behaviors/actions as a result of the training. Potential risk for double counting individuals which have attended multiple trainings.

**Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:** A register of participants will be kept to ensure that repeat individuals are identified.

**Date of Future DQA:** March 2020

### PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING

**Data Analysis:** Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals. Data will also be analyzed by each disaggregate to see if there are any differences between types of individuals trained.

**Disaggregated by:** Type of Individual: Producers (e.g. farmers, fishers, pastoralists, ranchers); people in government (e.g. policy makers, extension workers); people in private sector firms (e.g. processors, service providers, manufacturers); people in civil society (e.g. NGOs, CBOs, civil society organizations, research and academic organizations). Note: While producers are included as MSMEs under indicator EG.3.2-3, only count them under the Producers and not the Private Sector Firms disaggregate to avoid double-counting. While private sector firms are considered part of civil society more broadly, only count them under the Private Sector Firms and not the Civil Society disaggregate to avoid double-counting.

Sex: Male, Female

**Presentation of Data:** Quantitative

**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is

supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Targets:** The target assumes that approximately 1,000 women will receive some form of training as part of agricultural / entrepreneurship support program. This target may need to be revised after the diagnostic in early 2019 to identify appropriate activities to promote women's social and economic inclusion.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:** 02/26/2019

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET   |
|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 15:</b> Number of gold mining sites integrated into the interactive mapping system</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator</p>  |
| DESCRIPTION   |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Gold mining sites are defined as a group of pits and washing / processing equipment that form part of a coherent geographical and management unit. Individual pits will not be counted as separate sites. Pits that are at least 500 meters apart can be counted separately. The methodology will be furthered refined as the field teams led by sub-contractor IPIS travel to the field to conduct a census on sites.</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Output</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of sites</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> The long-term outcome desired is increased transparency and accountability in gold mining sites. The more sites integrated into the interactive mapping system, the more sites will be able to be monitored for international standards and the KP enforced.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator will be reported on an annual basis to USAID.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION   |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> GPS coordinates through mobile data collection.</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> USAID AMPR field agents work with govt officials to act as enumerators</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> Technical Deputy will supervise data collection and provide data to M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>   |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES   |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> The definition of a gold mining site may cause problems as there are borderline cases for any definition. In addition, USAID AMPR will rely on IPIS field researchers and not satellite images for site identification. As such it is possible that sites may be missed if hidden from the field researchers. Regardless all mapped sites will be verified using satellite image base maps as part of the interactive mapping system.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>   |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING   |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> None</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p>  |



**Review of Data:** For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.

**Reporting Frequency:** Annual

**Storage of Data:** Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.

#### OTHER NOTES

**Notes on Targets:** The target is a rough estimate of the number of gold mining sites in the country, but as little information exists at this time it may need to be revised after initial field data collection by sub-contractor IPIS.

**Changes to Indicator:** N/A

**Other Notes:** None

**THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019**

| PERFORMANCE INDICATOR REFERENCE SHEET   |
|---|
| <p><b>Indicator 16:</b> Number of activities benefitting USAID Operating Units aimed at improving the understanding of linkages between ASM and key development issues</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Custom Indicator   <input type="checkbox"/> Standard Indicator</p>  |
| DESCRIPTION   |
| <p><b>Precise Definition(s):</b> Activities are not limited to specific USAID Operating Units, but must be intentional, structured, and purposed for improving the understanding or linkages between ASM and key development issues. This may include, but is not limited to, studies and trainings.</p> <p><b>Indicator type:</b> Output</p> <p><b>Unit of Measure:</b> Number of activities</p> <p><b>Linkage to Long-Term Outcome or Impact:</b> The long-term outcome desired is to improve USAID programming through an improved integration of sound ASM understanding and best practices into other development interventions in which ASM plays a direct or indirect role.</p> <p><b>Use of Indicator:</b> This indicator will be reported on an annual basis to USAID.</p> <p><b>Baseline:</b> 0</p> |
| PLAN FOR DATA ACQUISITION   |
| <p><b>Source(s) of Data:</b> For trainings: training materials (agenda and attendance records); for other activities: activity reports or documents</p> <p><b>Data Collection Method:</b> Activity leads will gather documentation and provide to the M&amp;E Coordinator.</p> <p><b>Responsible Individual(s) at the Project:</b> Activity leads will supervise data collection and provide data to M&amp;E Coordinator who will review and aggregate data.</p>  |
| DATA QUALITY ISSUES   |
| <p><b>Known Data Limitations and Significance:</b> None.</p> <p><b>Actions Taken or Planned to Address Data Limitations:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Date of Future DQA:</b> March 2020</p>   |
| PLAN FOR DATA ANALYSIS, REVIEW, & REPORTING   |
| <p><b>Data Analysis:</b> Actual numbers will be compared against targets to ensure timely progress toward project goals.</p> <p><b>Disaggregated by:</b> None</p> <p><b>Presentation of Data:</b> Quantitative</p> <p><b>Review of Data:</b> For each data point reported to USAID, supporting documentation will be identified and reviewed. The USAID AMPR M&amp;E Coordinator will ensure that each data point is supported with documentation and that data are assessed against data integrity standards. The COP will provide an additional review before submission in reports.</p>  |

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>Reporting Frequency:</b> Annual</p> <p><b>Storage of Data:</b> Documentation will be stored in the office in Bangui, with summary tables uploaded to a secure cloud-based location.</p>   |
| <b>OTHER NOTES</b>  |
| <p><b>Notes on Targets:</b> The target is an estimate of the number of interventions, but the actual number will vary depending on demand and budget resources.</p> <p><b>Changes to Indicator:</b> N/A</p> <p><b>Other Notes:</b> None</p> |
| <b>THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 02/26/2019</b>   |

**U.S. Agency for International Development**

1300 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW

Washington, DC 20523

Tel: (202) 712-0000

Fax: (202) 216-3524

**[www.usaid.gov](http://www.usaid.gov)**