



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

ERC PLANS FOR COLLECTION AND USE OF CLPP M&E DATA

OCTOBER 7, 2016

Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) data provides important information for midline data collection, analyses planning, and to better inform the interpretation of results. The data establish how the Community Land Protection Program (CLPP) intervention is proceeding in practice, relative to how the program was planned, and enable the evaluation team to verify the nature and timing of the different program stages.

The data also make it possible for the evaluation team to identify any major variations in program implementation across communities and detect any potential outlier cases or issues that could influence results.¹ Based on the M&E analysis, the research team will make appropriate updates to the planned midline evaluation as needed. The evaluation team will use the M&E data to:

- Gain a better understanding of implementation and context processes that may moderate program impacts;
- Assess whether and how program implementation and context variation should be incorporated into the midline analysis, if the M&E data indicates that doing so will likely strengthen the identification of program impacts;
- Construct indicator variables for such potential moderators in the midline analysis, as determined necessary;
- Determine additional questions that should be added to the midline survey to better clarify key outcomes or control variables. And, ensure these questions will be structured appropriately and include relevant response choices (for example, the possible addition of questions in the leader survey about knowledge and awareness of the different community institutions created during the course of the program);
- Provide rich descriptive and supporting program implementation and context information to enable better interpretation of the evaluation results.

IMPLEMENTER DATA

ERC received the following datasets or information from CLPP's designing organization, Namati, and from CLPP's implementing organization, the Sustainable Development Institute (SDI), in June 2016:

- Overview of Namati M&E forms
- SDI-CLPP Process flowchart
- Blank M&E forms (logbooks and stage² assessments)

¹ This evaluation assesses program performance across three distinct counties – Lofa, River Gee and Maryland – and differences are expected across the counties, especially in Lofa county, which is geographically separated from the other two study counties. M&E data will help the evaluation team to assess when county-level variation merits more detailed analysis of effects in a geographic subset of communities (for example, removing communities in Lofa county).

² The Namati/SDI community land protection process is broken into five distinct stages of intervention: 1) Laying the groundwork; 2) Strengthening community governance; 3) Harmonizing boundaries and documenting lands; 4) Pursuing legal recognition; and 5) Preparing communities to prosper. During the course of the program in Lofa, Maryland and River Gee counties, communities are expected to be exposed to the first four program stages, though the possibility for successful legal recognition of community lands (stage 4) in Liberia is unclear at this time

- Lofa County activity logbook

ERC has requested that the following datasets or information be shared when they become available, which is expected to be the summer or fall of 2016:

- River Gee and Maryland County activity logbooks
- Draft bylaws
- Sketch maps³ (images)
- Initial stage assessments (Stage I)

ERC is also interested in receiving the following datasets or information whenever they become available, recognizing that this may not occur until after midline data collection:

- Adopted bylaws
- Final boundary maps⁴ (GIS files, associated metadata and attributes, and methodology documentation)
- Final stage assessments (Stages II, III, IV)

The **activity logbooks** provide qualitative description and assessment of program meetings and activities, including stories of impact and quotes from community members, for clusters of towns (for large clans) and for the entire clan (in small clans). Based on the initial analysis of the Lofa County activity logbook, the information demonstrates fairly strong similarity in implementation processes across the different towns, but also highlights some potentially important differences, such as prior training in some communities by SDI in community land protection that was interrupted by the Ebola crisis in 2014. The logbook data may be useful for midline results interpretation and to provide additional rich contextual information around implementation processes in the program area.

The **bylaws** are a key product generated during Stage 2 of CLPP, strengthening community governance. Obtaining these documents allows the research team to use them as a primary source of data and analyze differences in their content between communities.

Initial **sketch** and then **final boundary maps** are a key product generated during Stage 3 of CLPP, harmonizing boundaries and documenting lands. Obtaining these documents once again allows the research team to use them as a primary data source, and it may also augment the specificity of the geospatial analysis that can be undertaken by the evaluation team if the data produced is of sufficiently high quality.

The **stage assessments** are completed by field staff after the conclusion of each stage of the program. These short assessments are specific to each stage of the community land protection approach. The questions are slightly different depending on which stage is being assessed. These questions reflect on all of the activities completed during the stage and prompt review by field staff of products created by the community (for example, various drafts of by-laws, valuation worksheet, etc.). These assessments, especially the content review of program products such as the bylaws, are an important detailed record

due to the continued delay in passage of Liberia's Land Rights Act. Completing all four stages is considered a "full victory" of the program, and "partial victories" of the program occur when a community is able to complete some, but not all, stages.

³ This is the product of the initial boundary mapping exercise.

⁴ This is the final, digitized boundary map that is produced.

of the progress made in each community and an important source of subjective assessment by field staff, who are most knowledgeable about the specific program context in each community.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

ERC designed two rapid assessment Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) data collection tools in July 2016, to obtain additional program implementation information about CLPP implementation from SDI. The first round of data collection with these tools will take place in fall 2016. The M&E data collection tools consist of a short structured survey and a short open-ended qualitative questionnaire that are administered to implementers of the CLPP intervention. This information will be used to construct midline questions that appropriately capture these distinctions, provide context information to better interpret results, and allow the study to construct variables to control for variations in implementation and community characteristics.

The quantitative survey collects basic community and implementation information, including the capacity and program engagement of leaders and community groups, as perceived by field staff. This will allow the midline analysis team to more accurately analyze and interpret reasons for impact variation. If relevant, it also makes it possible to create indicator variables that can be used in the midline analyses to analyze how program implementation differences might moderate effects.

The qualitative tool is designed to elicit detailed description of implementation activities, including information about selection into the community groups who drove different stages of the program, the presence and possible explanations for variations in program implementation, other community factors, and open-ended feedback on the program. This description will be used, for example, for stronger identification of selection factors for the CLPP intervention that the evaluation team will account for in the midline analysis.