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Objective

To understand Mission requirements for reporting and data quality
Why conduct DQAs

• To ensure that the Mission and Implementing Partner are aware of the strengths and weaknesses of the performance data.

• To ensure that the quality of data from USAID’s performance monitoring system is credible to support decision making.
USAID’s Standards of Data Quality

i. **Validity**: Data clearly & adequately represents the intended result.

ii. **Integrity**: Data collected has safeguards to minimize risk of transcription error or data manipulation.

iii. **Precision**: Data has sufficient level of detail to permit decision making.

iv. **Reliability**: Data reflects stable & consistent data collection processes and analysis methods.

v. **Timeliness**: Data is available at useful frequency / timely enough to influence decision-making.
What Affects Data Quality

- Low reliability of data collection and processing
- Poorly trained data collectors
- Lack of standard tools and process for data collection
- Manipulation of data collection instruments
- Insecure data transmission and storage facility
- Poor timing for data collection and report generation process
When should data quality be assessed

- DQA must be accomplished for all indicators which are reported to Washington.
- DQA should be conducted after data collection has started and within 12 months prior to reporting, thereafter once every 3 years.
Managing data quality

i) Select quality indicators & put in place a sound data collection process (tools and methods)
   - Poorly defined indicators produce poor data written procedures are in place for data collection
   - Safeguards put in place to prevent unauthorized changes

ii) Construct sound PIRS - a tool USAID uses to ensure indicator data quality & consistency.
Performance Indicator Reference Sheet (PIRS)

A PIRS is a document that clearly defines the indicator and its associated parameters. The PIRS is required for all performance indicators. It captures:

(a) indicator definition - so that all parties using the indicator have the same understanding of its content.
(b) Unit of measure & Disaggregation Elements
(c) Data source
(d) Methodology of data collection
(e) Reporting frequency
(f) Known data limitations
How to address data limitations

- Triangulate data or examine similar data
- Establish internal quality control measures (processes & procedures) e.g. random spot checks, develop standard operating procedures / protocols, verify data after a collection cycle
Performance Reporting System (PRS)

• As per ADS 201.3.5.7, performance indicators are also required to fulfill reporting requirements.

• IPs must submit Performance indicator data (consistent with Activity Monitoring and Evaluation Plan-AMELP) in the Mission’s monitoring information system referred to as “The USAID Uganda Performance Reporting System (PRS).”

• PRS is a web-based system (accessed at https://usaid-uganda-pmis.com) serves as a repository for all performance indicator data including baselines values, baseline timeframe, targets and rationale for targets and actual values.

• IPs upload data in the system regularly depending on the frequency of data collection for each indicator.

• The PRS is always open for data entry for one month after the end of the quarter, covering Quarterly, Semi Annual and Annual needs.
FFP Contribution to the CDCS

5 year goal:
Uganda’s systems are accelerating inclusive education, health and economic development

25 year goal:
Uganda-led inclusive and sustainable development

DO 1: Community and Household Resilience in select areas and target populations increased

1.1 Key drivers of vulnerability as identified by beneficiaries addressed
1.2 Capacity to manage risk increased
1.3 Enhanced prevention and treatment of HIV, malaria and other epidemics among the most vulnerable
1.4 Community and household assets increased and diversified

DO 2: Demographic drivers affected to contribute to long term trend shift

2.1 Adoption of healthy reproductive behaviors and practices increased
2.2 Child wellbeing improved
2.3 Girls’ education improved
2.4 Increased youth economic productivity

DO 3: Key systems more accountable and responsive to Uganda’s development needs

3.1 Leadership in Development supported
3.2 Citizens actively participate in development
3.3 Key elements of the systems strengthened
3.4 The enabling environment that supports functional systems improved
Mission Indicators

- Number of farmers/beneficiaries reached as a result of USG assistance (Custom) (By Age and Sex)
  - Perceived changes in community defined drivers of vulnerability as identified by beneficiaries
  - % of participants reporting increased agreement with the concept that males and females should have equal access to social, economic, and political resources and opportunities
  - Percent of target households that can provide at least one example of behavioral change related to community defined drivers of vulnerability
  - Percent of community drivers of vulnerability issues addressed by community platform(s)
  - Percent increase in value of assets, disaggregated by asset type and sex of target population
  - Diversity of sources of household income
  - Percent of households with any form of savings available to address typical shocks (disaggregated by type and sex)
  - Percent of communities sustainably managing community land
  - Percent of households adopting various tools & technology that reduce or mitigate shocks for specific vulnerabilities
Thank you.