**Data Quality Exercise**

Please read the following scenario. Upon finishing the scenario, use the Data Quality Assessment Checklist to identify potential problems with data quality using the five data quality standards. The PIRS for the indicator in question is included on the next page. Data Quality issues should be documented in the “Known Data Limitations” section of the PIRS.

\*\*\*

A USAID Mission received a semi-annual report from one of its implementing partners. In that report, the IP had reported data on “Number of farmers who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance.” USAID felt that the number seemed too high based on the expected target and available information and decided to conduct a data quality assessment on that indicator. In that process, USAID discovered the following:

* The IP had included several indirect beneficiaries even though the indicator definition in the PIRS stressed that only direct farmer beneficiaries would be counted.

* After visiting a few project sites, USAID staff discovered that the interview tool that was being used to collect data was not standardized across sites. Some sites used the standardized interview template that the IP had designed but other sites used their own abbreviated interview template or relied on informal discussions as they felt the standardized template was cumbersome and confusing.
* USAID further learned that the lead farmers who had the responsibility to collect data in their community had been told that their monthly allowance depended on how many beneficiaries reached they would report.
* The reported data was not disaggregated even though the Performance Indicator Reference Sheet clearly specified that data had to be disaggregated by sex and new management or technology type. Without sex disaggregated data, USAID will find it difficult to make decisions about how to allocate resources to reach female farmers.
* USAID received the IP’s report two months after it was due. USAID was going to use data from this report in the portfolio review that they held in in early October, but the report was received in late November.

|  |
| --- |
| **USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet** |
| **Name of Result Measured (Goal, DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Output, etc.):** IR 2.2 Agricultural Sector Productivity Improved |
| **Name of Indicator:** Number of farmers who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance |
| **Is this a Performance Plan and Report indicator?** No \_\_\_ Yes \_X\_, for Reporting Year(s) \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**If yes, link to foreign assistance framework:** 4.5.2 Agricultural Sector Capacity (Productivity) |
| **DESCRIPTION**  |
| **Precise Definition(s):** This indicator measures the total number of farmers that applied new technologies anywhere within the food and fiber system as a result of USG assistance. This includes innovations in post-harvest management, sustainable land management, forest and water management, managerial practices, input supply delivery. Any technology that was first adopted in a previous year should not be included. Technologies to be counted here are agriculture-related technologies and innovations including those that address climate change adaptation and mitigation (including, but not limited to, carbon sequestration, clean energy, and energy efficiency as related to agriculture).Significant improvements to existing technologies should be counted. In the case where, for example, a farmer applies more than one innovation as a result of USG assistance, they are still only counted once. Also, if more than one adult farmer in a household is applying new technologies, count all the adult farmers.This indicator is to count only direct farmer beneficiaries who applied new technologies, whereas indicator #4.5.2-28 is to count firms, associations, or other group entities applying new technologies. |
| **Unit of Measure:** Number  |
| **Disaggregated by:** * Sex
* New Management or Technology Type (Post-Harvest Management; Sustainable Land Management; Forest and Water Management; Managerial Practices; Input Supply Delivery; Climate Change Adaptation and Mitigation)
 |
| **Rationale or Justification for indicator *(optional)*:**  Technological change and its adoption by different actors in the in the agricultural supply change, including farmers, is critical to improving agricultural sector productivity, which is the intermediate result under which this indicator falls. |
| **PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION BY USAID**  |
| **Data Source:**  Implementing Partners will collect this data through interviews and direct observations during program implementation. |
| **Method of data collection and construction:**  Interviews and direct observations |
| **Reporting Frequency:**  Semi-Annual |
| **Individual(s) responsible at USAID:** Office of Agriculture (J. Doe) |
| **DATA QUALITY ISSUES** |
| **Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and name of reviewer:**  |
| **Date of Future Data Quality Assessments *(optional):***  |
| **Known Data Limitations:** |
| **TARGETS AND BASELINE** |
| **Baseline timeframe *(optional):***   |
| **Rationale for Targets *(optional):***  |
| **CHANGES TO INDICATOR** |
| **Changes to indicator:**  |
| **Other Notes *(optional):*** |
| **THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON:**  |