



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

HAITI JUSTICE SECTOR STRENGTHENING PROGRAM

MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING PLAN

DISCLAIMER

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

DISCLAIMER

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

HAITI JUSTICE SECTOR STRENGTHENING PROGRAM (JSSP)

MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND LEARNING PLAN

FEBRUARY 7, 2021 - FEBRUARY 6, 2022

Contract No. AID-OAA-I-13-00032, **Task Order No.** AID-521-TO-16-00005

Date of Original AMEP: October 31, 2016

Date of Last Revision: August 14, 2020

Project Name: Justice Sector Strengthening Program

Project Address: IIG, Route Montagne Noire, Haiti

DISCLAIMER

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

CONTENTS

- I. Project Description
- II. Project Logic
- III. Monitoring System Description
 - A. MEL Staff Structure
 - B. MEL Approach
 - C. Data Collection and Analysis
 - D. Data Management
 - E. Reporting
 - F. Baseline Data Collection Plan
- IV. Data Quality Assessment Plan and Procedures
- V. Evaluation
- VI. Learning Plan

Annex I: Performance Indicator Tracking Table

Annex II: Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)

Annex III: Learning Plan

August 14, 2020

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

ACRONYMS

CMIS	Case Management Information System
COP	Chief of Party
COR	Contract Officer's Representative
CSPJ	<i>Conseil Supérieur du Pouvoir Judiciaire</i> – High Judicial Council
DCOP	Deputy Chief of Party
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
GOH	Government of Haiti
JIU	Judicial Inspection Unit
JSSP	Justice Sector Strengthening Program
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEL	Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning
PIRS	Performance Indicator Reference Sheets
PITT	Performance Indicator Tracking Table
PMU	Project management unit
TOCOR	Task Order Contracting Officer's Representative
USG	United States government

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

USAID's Justice Sector Strengthening Program's (JSSP) goal is to support the Government of Haiti (GOH) and civil society in expanding access to quality justice for Haitian citizens. The project supports the professionalization, independence, and efficiency of the Haitian justice sector, advancing core justice system strengthening while building the foundations of judicial reform, fostering political support, and addressing relevant justice issues in the short to medium term. To accomplish this, JSSP has four overarching objectives: (1) improving the legal, policy, and regulatory framework, (2) strengthening the judiciary as an independent, credible, and effective authority, (3) improving access to justice and protection of rights, and (4) strengthening civil society constituencies for reform.

II. PROJECT LOGIC

JSSP is contributing to the achievement of the "Post-Earthquake USG Haiti Strategy Toward Renewal and Economic Opportunity," under Pillar D, Governance and Rule of Law. Pillar D's specific objectives include Intermediate Result 2, Rule of Law and Human Rights strengthened, with its sub-intermediate results 2.1 "Improve access to and delivery of justice services," as well as 2.2 "Improve security and strengthen the protection of human rights." The project contributes to the second objective of the 2015 U.S. government's (USG) Quadrennial Diplomacy and Development Review by promoting the rule of law, enhancing access to justice, and defending human rights and the inclusion of marginalized and vulnerable groups. It also contributes to the 2016-2019 USG Integrated Country Strategy for Haiti by supporting the draft objective "Efforts to comprehensively modernize the justice system, the civil service, and local governance are increased, so that public institutions can better perform their legally mandated functions and promote civil freedoms and internationally recognized human rights."

The project's development hypothesis is that if the enabling environment for justice is modernized and improved, justice sector institutions are strengthened, pathways to justice services for protection of human rights are expanded, and civil society groups can mobilize constituencies for reform, then Haitian citizens will be more able to access quality justice services. The project's theory of change is that by engaging project counterparts in planning and having them identify the resources and commitments they will bring to the effort and providing phased assistance in stages based on counterpart demonstration of participation, project resources will be maximized, and interventions sustained.

The project is targeting the following jurisdictions: Port-au-Prince, Croix-des-Bouquets, Saint-Marc, Cap-Haitien, and Fort-Liberte. The CMIS is a nationwide activity that JSSP expanded in FY2019 and FY2020 to 6 other jurisdictions: Grande-Riviere-du-Nord, Hinche, Mirebalais, Gonaives, Petit-Goave and Jacmel. In Y5, JSSP will expand the CMIS into two additional jurisdictions most probably in Aquin and Les Cayes, final decision will be taken by the national Committee on CMIS.

The project's logic is demonstrated through its results framework, Exhibit 1 below. The project goal is directly linked with the USG's foreign assistance objective of governing

justly and democratically. The results framework demonstrates the logical, causal relationships between the different levels of anticipated results.

Exhibit 1. Results Framework



III. MONITORING SYSTEM DESCRIPTION

Effective monitoring, evaluation, and learning (MEL) requires that project results and indicators be set early and tracked and analyzed consistently to determine whether goals are being met and, if not, to provide sufficient information to understand why and correct the course of action. The purpose of this MEL plan is therefore not to simply collect data, but to also accurately assess the impact of JSSP and its goal. The JSSP team will continue to use data collected to determine whether the project is meeting its performance requirements, inform decision-making, and improve management and implementation. The MEL plan describes JSSP’s methodology for monitoring and evaluation and will be used to plan and manage the collection of performance data and measure the success of the project in expanding Haitian citizens’ access to quality justice services. The performance indicator tracking table (PITT) includes performance indicators, targets, data sources and collection methods, frequency of data collection, and disaggregation. The MEL plan results will be used to regularly update and collaborate with relevant stakeholders, including USAID, to analyze change and learn from our data and adapt future activities to ensure achievement of results.

On August 7, 2020, USAID granted a twelve-month cost extension to JSSP, extending the new project end date to February 6, 2022. Considering this extension, JSSP added Targets for the Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) in Annex 1 and 2. LOP Targets were also modified accordingly.

A. MEL Staff Structure

Deputy Chief of Party. Our Deputy Chief of Party (DCOP), Mr. Jacques Miguel Sanon, has the responsibility for the implementation of the MEL plan. He will continue to supervise our project MEL team, review and approve all reports that include data and findings, as well as leads the staff in interpreting data for activity management and learning.

Monitoring, evaluation, and learning team. Our project M&E Advisor, Ms. Christelle Safi, will continue to have primary responsibility for overseeing the identification, collection, and analysis of data, tools, and methods. She will lead the technical staff, grantees, and implementing partners in developing the necessary tools and systems and provide training for quality data collection. She will have primary responsibility for the quality of data entered into the JSSP's data management system, such as checking documentation and data records and performing a data quality assessment (DQA) annually in coordination with home-office staff. Working closely with JSSP technical staff and the DCOP, she will review the MEL plan annually and make necessary changes to the existing indicators and targets with USAID approval.

Technical staff members. Data collection is a team effort and will continue to be built into the responsibilities of technical staff. Technical team members – including Port-au-Prince team members and field coordinators – will continue to be responsible for front-line data collection within their respective roles and activities.

Project partners. Our project partners, including subcontractors and grantees, will assist in collecting data within their spheres of intervention, such as conducting pre- and post-training testing from training sessions.

Home office support. Chemonics' home office MEL department will support the JSSP MEL staff with assistance as needed, included providing templates, tools, regular training via webinars for all Chemonics MEL specialists, and updates on emerging methods and tools.

B. MEL Approach

Collaboration: Performance management is most effective when it involves the entire program team and relevant stakeholders. Technical staff will continue to be involved in the finalization of indicators, data collection, analysis, and learning. It is also important to obtain stakeholders' buy-in into the anticipated program results and critical indicators, and include them as partners in collecting, analyzing, disseminating, and employing information about program results.

Capacity Building: M&E is a key management skill for JSSP's partners. By being involved in M&E, technical team members can transfer M&E skills to our government counterparts and grantees. JSSP will continue to provide technical assistance to grantees and counterparts to strengthen their M&E capabilities by helping them follow up on JSSP M&E requirements, and by strengthening their data collection capacities to measure their efforts, analyze data, and learn from the process.

C. Data Collection and Analysis

Indicators. Our indicators include 23 at the objective and Intermediate result's level that measure activity interventions, including 4 U.S. State Department Foreign Assistance Framework (F) indicators, and 1 at the project objective level that measures the higher results of those actions. This two-tiered approach ensures that both activity process and activity design are measured to assess the validity of the activity's development hypothesis and our compliance with the design in implementation of the design.

We have included USAID/Haiti required indicators from the Mission's performance monitoring plan, F indicators, and our own custom indicators that reflect our interventions and their results.

We are using a mix of both quantitative and qualitative indicators; we know that quantitative data can tell us *what* has changed, but qualitative data is needed to help us understand *why* changes have occurred and thus better tailor our interventions.

Disaggregation of data: All person-level indicators are disaggregated by sex. Other disaggregation includes geographic location, job position, type of infraction, outcome of assistance etc. as appropriate to specific indicators. The disaggregated data provides us with detailed information that allows us to examine the effectiveness of activity interventions and better tailor our plans to ensure equity in activity outcomes across sex, locale and ethnic divides.

Baselines and Targets. Baselines are established using these methodologies: structured interviews, surveys, open databases, court registries, grantee's records, JSSP supported entities' records, national and regional focus groups. Targets are finalized in collaboration with USAID upon completion of baseline data collection and approval of annual work plan. We will work with USAID to agree on aggressive but realistic annual and life-of-activity targets for all indicators; proposed targets are in Annex I, the PITT. We will continue to review the targets annually to determine if they are realistic, and if not, propose adjustments to them during our annual MEL plan review at work planning in consultation with USAID. Baseline data collection is described in further detail in section F. below.

Data sources and collection methods. To the extent possible, we will collaborate to use data from reliable, trusted secondary sources such as other donors, counterparts, and proven GOH data to maximize cost efficiencies. Where possible, we will collaborate with other USAID projects to pool resources for data collection to maximize cost effectiveness. In many instances, however, the activity will collect its own primary data. We plan to use a variety of collection methods such as surveys; interviews and focus groups; and document review of government records; activity records and documents (such as training sign-in sheets, reports, and subcontractor/grantee records). If there is a particularly successful or unsuccessful intervention, we can do an in-depth case study to learn more about the circumstances and outcomes. The MEL advisor will oversee the design and wording of all survey, focus group, and interview questions, and will pretest and adjust all data collection tools before their use.

D. Data Management

Chemonics used DevResults software for data storage and management, which is designed to accommodate users with low bandwidth and poor connections to the internet. Its web-based interface can be accessed from any internet-enabled device (tablet, mobile phone, desktop). Where internet access is unavailable or inconsistent, data can be captured via formatted Excel spreadsheets and other offline tools and later uploaded. Features include data visualizations, results dashboards, and document and photo storage capabilities. Differing levels of access to data and results can be provided to different users.

E. Reporting

JSSP will provide USAID with data updates in quarterly and annual reports. These reports will present a table of indicator values and a narrative on notable progress toward each expected result. Annual and quarterly reports will illustrate progress toward targets, challenges, strategies for overcoming challenges, and key successes. Quantitative data will be supplemented with narratives to help the reader understand the numbers' context. Success stories and other communication materials will blend data with personalized stories to personify and illustrate the program's activities, outcomes, and overall impact. The final report will contain an analysis of project results, a discussion of best practices and lessons learned, and presentation of success stories as reported over the life of the project.

Project data will be used not only for reporting but also to inform project information, education, communication and outreach, such as publications and media campaigns. JSSP will share data regularly on annual basis (in accordance with U.S. government fiscal intervals) or, depending on the data type, on an ad hoc basis. Data analytic results and conclusions will be included in periodic reports to USAID. Depending on the nature of data, it will be shared in standard formats (e.g., reports, maps, tables, graphs, and narrative).

ADS 579 Compliance

JSSP anticipates the development of datasets that contribute both to baselines and to ongoing indicators. Within 30 days of reporting data, the raw data sets will be presented to USAID in a nonproprietary format and stripped of personally identifiable information in accordance with USAID's ADS 579.

F. Baseline Data Collection

In FY2017 JSSP completed key program baseline data collection such as the number of days for case processing, the number of GBV, TIP or other vulnerable group cases adjudicated in target jurisdictions, the number of disputes resolved in remote jurisdictions, the percentage of citizens who report greater trust in justice sector institutions and the average CSO scores in the advocacy index. Methodology to collect the baseline is described in detail in the PIRS.

IV. DATA QUALITY ASSESSMENT (DQA) PLAN AND PROCEDURES

Since USAID requires a DQA once every three years, the home office project management unit (PMU) director conducted in FY2018, the first internal data quality control assessments to ensure that data collected are reliable, precise, and valid. In FY2020 Ms. Safi will continue to conduct the DQA on indicators where she does not have front-line data collection responsibility, and the home office will assist with the DQA for indicators where Ms. Safi has been the person collecting the data. The home office assistance will come from the Chemonics Home Office MEL Department and/or the PMU director. In consultation with the technical team and the DCOP, the home office will review the validity, reliability, precision, timeliness, and integrity of JSSP data, identify any data limitations, unexpected trends, outliers, look for errors such as double-counting, and recommend solutions.

Ms. Safi, the DCOP, and the technical team will continue revisiting this MEL plan annually to review its appropriateness and adapt indicators and targets as needed. The MEL plan is a living document and necessary modifications can be made at any time. All changes will be well documented and recorded in JSSP MEL files.

V. EVALUATION

Internal Performance Evaluations: Because of the rapidly changing environment in Haiti and the uncertainty of code reform passage, fraught with uncontrolled and uncontrollable variables, it may be difficult to draw a linear connection between project activities and results. For example, as justice sector institutions begin to learn their roles under the new codes, service delivery may initially be less efficient or effective as entities figure out how to modify or create practices to implement these codes. With support from home office Ms. Safi will lead the technical team in use of low-cost, effective, and scientifically validated methods to provide supplemental data for JSSP.

Cooperation with USAID external evaluators. JSSP will continue to coordinate closely with any third-party external evaluators engaged by USAID. JSSP will help them arrange site visits as appropriate and participate in synchronization meetings. JSSP's internal data management system will facilitate easy data sharing, cost data, and performance monitoring information sharing with external evaluation groups.

VI. LEARNING PLAN

At work planning, the JSSP team created its own individual learning plan to ensure that data is used for adaptive management. The Learning Plan is described in further detail in Annex III below

The Performance Indicator Tracking Table presented below identifies the USAID F Indicators and custom project indicators, units of measure, percentage formula, disaggregation, data sources, baselines, Actual figures achieved in previous years, Targets from FY2017 to February 2022 and Life of Project (LOP); and Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS) for each of the project's F and custom indicators.

Annex I: Performance Indicator Tracking Table

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
Project Objective: Access to quality justice for Haitian citizens improved																			
A.1	Percent of justice system users who report that they have increased access to quality justice as a result of USG support	outcome	%	Numerator: Number of users who report increased access to quality justice Denominator: Number of citizens who had service delivery provided with USG support	Location and sex	Justice system users	Survey	Annual	N/A	N/A	N/A	40%	68%	50%	52.3%	55%	55%	55%	55%
Objective 1: Legal, policy, and regulatory framework improved																			
1	Number of new penal code that	output	Code		Code	Legislative records	Document review	Quarterly	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	1	0	1

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
	is adopted (Contract)																		
<i>IR 1.1: Through multi-stakeholder advocacy, new and improved criminal and human rights laws and policies passed</i>																			
2	Number of USG-supported public sessions held regarding changes to the country's legal framework (Contract)	output	Public session		Location	Project records	Document review	Quarterly	0	3	13	2	4	2	2	1	0	3	11
3	Number of civil society advocacy initiatives conducted to support the code reform process (Contract)	output	Initiative		Location and type of initiative	Project records	Document review	Quarterly	0	3	29	2	3	1	12	1	0	2	9
<i>IR 1.2: Implementation of new and existing criminal codes improved in target jurisdictions</i>																			
D	Number	output	Individual		Sex	Sign-in	Document	Annual	0	200	290	300	491(385)	300	629(47)	300	100	250	1,450

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
R. 1. 3-1	of judicial personnel trained with USG assistance	t	al			sheets	ent review	I			(238M, 52F)		M, 106F)		9M, 150F)				
4	Percent of higher education entities that have integrated trainings on the revised criminal code into their formal core curriculum in a sustainable manner (Contract)	outcome	%	Numerator: Number of higher education entities that have integrated trainings on the revised criminal code into their formal core curriculum in a sustainable manner Denominator: Total number of higher	Location and entity	Entity leadership	Review of curriculum and Interview	Annual	0	N/A	N/A	10%	N/A	30%	N/A	75%	75%	30%	75%

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
				education entities															
Objective 2: The independence, credibility, and effective authority of the judiciary strengthened																			
5	Percent decrease in case processing time as a result of USG assistance	outcome	%	Numerator: Baseline value minus Year actual Denominator: Year actual	Location	Court records	Document review	Annual	PAP : 265days CDB: 291days SM: 63 days CH: 298days FL: 12days	2% from baseline	PAP : -161% CDB : -88% SM:-222% CH:19% FL: -31%	5% from baseline	PAP : -74% CDB : -46% SM:-75% CH:13% FL : -95%	10%from baseline	PAP: N/ACD B: -72% SM : N/A CH: -44% FL: -96%	10%from baseline	10% from baseline	10% from baseline	10% from baseline
IR 2.1: Court case administration improved																			
D R. 1. 5-1	Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management systems	outcome	Court		Location	Project records	Site visit and interview	Annual	0	2	4	6(cumulative)	5	8(cumulative)	8	11(cumulative)	11(cumulative)	13(cumulative)	13
6	Number of coordination mechanisms at the community	output	Coordination mechanism		Type of mechanism	Project staff and community personnel	Document review	Quarterly	0	4	7	5	8	5	7	5	2	2	23

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
	y level to help improve working relationships, information sharing, and case administration between judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and police (Contract)																		
<i>IR 2.2: Human resources effectively developed and managed</i>																			
7	Number of judicial and court personnel trained to perform their duties effectively and efficiently (Contract)	output	Individual		Sex	Training records and sign-in sheets	Document review	Quarterly	0	150	270 (189M, 81W)	150	501(387 M, 114F)	150	672(494M, 178F)	250	50	250	1,000

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
8	Percent of USG trainees who report that the training has improved their job skills	outcome	%	Numerator: Number of USG trainees who say that training improved their job skills Denominator: Number of respondents by jurisdiction	Location and sex	USG trainees	Survey	Annual	0	60%	Port-au-Prince : 100% Saint-Marc : 97% Cap-Haitien 86% Fort-Liberté 93%	60%	96%(Port-au-Prince ;6M, 2F)	60%	92% 63 (56M, 7F)	75%	75%	75%	75%
9	Number of performance monitoring and oversight of court personnel that are performed according	output	Inspection		Location	JIU records	Document review	Annual	6	8	9	6	11	5	1	3	2	2	26

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
	to the law / international standards (Contract)																		
<i>IR 2.3: Accountability and oversight strengthened</i>																			
10	Number of judges fully vetted by the CSPJ in accordance with procedures	output	Judge		Location and sex	CSPJ records	Document review	Annual	0	55	40	100	42	100	39	50	30	30	365
11	Number of oversight missions conducted by the CPSJ JIU (Contract)	output	Inspection		Location and type of oversight	CSPJ JIU records	Document review	Annual	5	4	13	6	9	6	1	4	2	2	24
12	Number of judicial sanctions reported by the CSPJ	output	Sanction		Infraction and sanction type	CSPJ records	Document review	Annual	12	10	6	8	8	9	5	9	2	5	43
Objective 3: Access to justice and protection of rights improved																			

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
D R. 6. 3-1	Number of individuals from low income or marginalized communities who received legal aid or victim's assistance with USG support	output	Individual		Location and sex	Court, Grantee and project supported entities records	Document review	Annual	0	1,200	1,204 (796M, 408F)	1,500	5,180(3,269M, 1,911F)	750	2,498 (1,802 M, 696F)	650	0	500	4,100
IR 3.1: Informal and formal legal services to key vulnerable populations increased																			
13	Percentage change in the number of GBV, TIP, or other vulnerable group cases adjudicated in the target jurisdictions	outcome	%	Numerator: Year Actual minus Previous year Denominator: Previous year	Type of vulnerability and location	Court records	Document review	Semi-Annual	PAP : 6 cases CDB: 0 FL: 3 CH: 3 SM : 1	+10%	PAP : +116% CDB :N/A FL: -100% CH: -67% SM: +300%	+15%	PAP : +231% CDB : +600% FL: +833% CH: +625% SM: +240%	+20%	PAP: N/A CDB: 11cases/-21% FL: 13 cases/-53.5% CH: 26 cases/-10.3% SM: N/A	+30%	+30%	+30%	+30%

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
14	(Contract) Number of people in pretrial or illegal detention who are tried, released, convicted, acquitted, or whose cases are otherwise advanced procedurally with USG assistance (Contract)	output	Detainee		Sex and outcome of assistance (Trial, release, conviction, acquittal or advanced procedurally)	Court, police, prison and project supported entities records	Document review	Quarterly	0	800	388 (363M, 25F)	800	2,352 (1,937M, 415F)	400	1,305 (1,146M, 159F)	400	0	250	2,400
<i>IR 3.2Adjudication of disputes at the sub-district level increased</i>																			
15	Number of people visiting USG supported informal or formal justice dispute resolution entities in	output	Individual		Location and sex	Dispute resolution entities records	Document review	Quarterly	0	N/A	0	200	167 (83M, 84F)	150	471 (384M, 87F)	100	0	50	500

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
	remote and marginalized communities																		
16	Percent increase in the number of disputes adjudicated in targeted remote jurisdictions (Contract)	outcome	%	Numerator: Year Actual minus Baseline value Denominator: Baseline value	Location and type of dispute	Dispute resolution entities, court and mechanisms records	Document review	Annual	Cap-Haitien: 3 disputes resolved Fort-Liberte: 36 disputes resolved	+15%	0%	+15%	N/A	+15%	PAP: 330% SM: 25% CH: 133% FL: 914%	+15%	0%	+15%	+15%
Objective 4: Civil society constituencies for reform strengthened																			
D R. 4.4-2	Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy	output	CSO		Type of intervention and location	Project records	Document review	Annual	0	2	4	2(cumulative)	3	2(jurisdictional)	3	2	0	3	3

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
	interventions																		
<i>IR 4.1 Public awareness of rights and judicial procedures increased</i>																			
17	Number of USG-assisted campaigns and programs to enhance public understanding, NGO support and media coverage of judicial independence and accountability (Contract)	output	Campaign and program		Location and type of jurisdiction	Project records	Document review	Quarterly	0	2	2	2	7	2	3	2	1	2	11
18	Change in level of confidence in the justice system (Contract)	outcome	%	Numerator: Number of citizens who have trust in	Location and sex	General public	Survey	Year 3 and Year 4	Average : 75% ; Port-au-Prince 85.71%. Croix-des-Bouque	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	30%	Average : 66% ; Port-au-Prince 52.9%. Saint-Marc	30%	N/A	30%	30%

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
				justice sector institutions Denominator: Number of respondents by jurisdiction					ts 100%. Saint-Marc 73.68%. Cap-Haitien 69.23%. Fort-Liberte 25%.						75%. Cap-Haitien 60%. Fort-Liberté 75%				
IR 4.2 Civil society networks, monitoring, and advocacy capacity increased																			
19	Percentage of USG-supported CSOs that show improved scores in the advocacy index	outcome	%	Numerator: Number of USG-supported CSOs that show improved scores in the advocacy index Denominator: Number of USG-supported CSOs	Location	USG supported CSOs	Evaluation	Annual	RENED H 3.1; AFASDA 1.8; MOTDE FAM 0.9; AFATN 0.7; RENDEH 3.5; RFJS 1.8; RECID P 2.9; CPD 2.5; Fondation	40%	N/A	+50%	84% RENED H 3.2; AFASDA 4.6; RENDEH 2.9; RFJS 4.5; RECIDP 3.6; CPD 3.4; Fondation Serovie 4.6 ; JILAP 2.8 ; GREAS 4 ; ACJU 3.1 ; CHCV 3.1 ; FEFBA	+50%	79% RENED H 4.2; AFASDA 4.9; RENDEH 3.8; RFJS 4.9; RECIDP 5.5; CPD 4.42; Fondation Serovie 4.5; JILAP 2.9;	+50%	+50%	+50%	+50%

Indicator ID	Indicator (Source)	Indicator Type	Unit of measure	Percentage formula	Disaggregation	Data Source	Data Collection Method	Frequency	Baseline	Target FY2017 (Oct 2016-Sept 2017)	Actual FY2017	Target FY2018 (Oct 2017-Sept 2018)	Actual FY2018	Target FY2019 (Oct 2018-Sept 2019)	Actual FY2019	Target FY2020 (Oct 2019-Sept 2020)	Target FY2021 (Oct 2020-Feb 2021)	Target for Extension Year (Feb 2021-Feb 2022)	LOP Target
									Serovie 5.1 ; JILAP 1.2 ; GREAS 3.6 ; ACJU 1.3 ; CHCV 2.9 ; MOUFH ED 4.9 ; FEFBA 4.5 ; CASODI 2.7				4.5 ; CASODI 4.9		GREAS 3.8; ACJU 3.4; CHCV 1.9 ; FEFBA 4.5 ; CASOD 15.1 ; OFC 3.8				

Annex II: Performance Indicator Reference Sheets (PIRS)

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: A.1	
Name of Indicator: Percent of justice system users who report that they have increased access to quality justice as a result of USG support	
Type of Indicator: Outcome	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): Project objective	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percentage of people who report that, as a result of USG-support, they have increased access to and trust in quality justice. Those people should have benefited from at least one USG supported service delivery such as: legal representation at courts from the project's Legal Aid lawyers, mediation service from the project's dispute resolution entities or other mechanism, or people who benefitted from improved procedures introduced by the new penal procedure code (such as plea bargaining and electronic bracelet). Quality justice is defined as a combination of access to justice (cost/physical access) and quality of the process and outcome of decision (including trust/confidence in the system). Numerator: Number of users who report increased access to quality justice Denominator: Number of citizens who had service delivery provided with USG support	
Unit of Measure: Percentage	
Disaggregated by: Location and sex	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): The goal of this indicator is to show how project activities such as support to criminal trials, support to the passage of law on legal aid, support to service delivery entities in target jurisdictions, support to any dispute resolution mechanism, support to legal assistance task force, support to the Judicial inspection unit, support to the code reform etc. have led to an increased access to quality justice for Haitian citizens. Through these activities, the project will increase physical access to justice, availability of justice, trust in the system, and quality of process and outcome of decision.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Justice system users	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by conducting an annual survey in Year 2 to Year 5 of the project. Each FY, JSSP will conduct a survey of beneficiaries in the target jurisdictions. JSSP will review the legal aid and the mediation forms completed by each lawyer/mediator. The project will also review court records to determine which citizens, after passage of the penal procedure code, potentially benefitted from improved procedures introduced by the new code. JSSP will develop the adequate methodology corresponding to the set of beneficiaries. JSSP will develop a questionnaire that will include questions related to (1) physical proximity to justice (2) cost (time, money) to access justice (3) trust/confidence in the formal justice system, and (4) quality of justice (process and outcome). We anticipate that, in any given year, a total of at least 1,000 people will benefit from USG-supported services. The project will select randomly 20% of beneficiaries for follow-up, with a goal of interviewing at least 10% (i.e., 50% participation), assuming they can be reached by phone directly on their personal phone or through a contact person. Those people selected should have benefitted, during the FY, from at least one USG supported service delivery such as: legal assistance and/or representation at courts from the project's Legal Aid lawyers, mediation service from the project's dispute resolution entities or other mechanism, or people who benefitted from improved procedures introduced by the new penal procedure code.	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will gather the completed questionnaires and enter the related data in a database that will be developed for this indicator.	

August 14, 2020

Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Annual report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2017			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: Beneficiaries could be reluctant and/or very influenced in answering the questionnaire. Beneficiaries could not be reached by phone easily because the phone number on the form is no longer active or the phone battery is empty. In addition, the denominator includes respondents who could not determine whether they had an increased access to justice thus affecting the total result of the indicator.			
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will explain that the main purpose of the survey is to identify areas for improvement in justice service delivery. The project will add to the "legal aid form" the "phone number of the beneficiary" in addition to a phone number of a contact person to maximize availability of beneficiary. Despite applying this measure for the survey in FY19, it was still difficult to reach the beneficiaries by phone. Consequently, all beneficiaries who have a phone number were called.			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Targets for FY20 and FY21 were decreased from 60% and 65% respectively to 55% for both fiscal years. Because of the ongoing socio/political/security crisis which began in 2018, courts were often partially operating or closed. Some related services such as legal assistance are also negatively impacted all together reducing access to justice for citizens. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	N/A	N/A	This is a new indicator proposed by JSSP in its FY2018 MEL plan. Thus, there is no target for FY2017 and targets are set from FY2018 to FY2021.
2018	40%	68%	In FY2018 JSSP conducted a perception survey of beneficiaries of legal assistance from the 5 Legal aid offices supported by JSSP (BAL). Sixty individuals (49 men and 11 women) were reached by phone and interviewed on access to justice (cost/physical access) and quality of the process (including trust in the formal justice system). 68% of the respondents reported that they have an increased access to and trust in quality justice.

2019	50%	52.3%	In FY2019 JSSP conducted a perception survey of beneficiaries of legal assistance from the 4 Legal aid offices supported by JSSP (BAL). Sixty-five individuals (45 men and 20 women) were reached by phone and interviewed on access to justice (cost/physical access) and quality of the process (including trust in the formal justice system). 52.3% of the respondents reported that they have an increased access to and trust in quality justice.
2020	55%		
2021	55%		
2022	55%		
LOP	55%		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 1			
Name of Indicator: Number of new penal code that is adopted			
Type of Indicator: Output			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 1			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of penal code that is adopted by the Haitian Parliament as a result of USG-supported advocacy efforts.			
Unit of Measure: Number of codes			
Disaggregated by: N/A			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator relates to the success of USG advocacy activities in building consensus on the revised criminal code and facilitating their adoption at the Parliament. Activities may include but are not limited to: providing support to the Penal Reform Commission to complete the draft codes, supporting professional associations (PAPBA, APM, IAWJ, CHAIFEJ) to conduct analysis of the two draft codes, awarding grants to civil society organizations to inform and engage the public in the reform, hosting parliamentary public hearings, and holding working sessions etc.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: Legislative records			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by reviewing legislative records.			
Reporting Frequency: Quarterly			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review Parliament records or the National Gazette (<i>Le Moniteur</i>) to determine if the code is adopted			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Quarterly Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project leadership will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016			
Rationale for Targets: The target is set based on the number of existing criminal code that needs to be adopted by the Parliament.			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: Whether the Parliament meets, considers and passes any bills, the time and pace it would take to vote on the bill, and when this will occur is out of project's control			
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project's mitigation strategy will be to support advocacy and other activities to increase the likelihood of passage.			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Following contract modification in August 2019, the indicator changed from "Number of new penal code and criminal procedure code that are adopted" to "Number of new penal code that is adopted". Targets for FY20 and FY21 were reduced from 2 to 1. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	2	0	In FY2017 JSSP efforts led to significant progress regarding code passage. The codes are now being analyzed in Parliament with JSSP support. Parliamentarians are looking forward to passing them in FY2018.
2018	2	0	In FY2018, the penal code was officially inserted on the agenda of the Senate for passage.

2019	2	0	This fiscal year, the vote on the penal code was postponed in a few occasions due to the civil and political unrest. The MJPS consultant supported by JSSP continued to review the penal code and proposed modifications that will be sent to the Senate's Justice, Security and Defense Commission along with the list of errata.
2020	1		
2021	1		
2022	0		
LOP	1		

Other Notes (optional): N/A

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 2	
Name of Indicator: Number of USG-supported public sessions held regarding changes to the country's legal framework	
Type of indicator: Output	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR1.1	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of public sessions involving parliamentary committees, private sector and professional associations, civil society organizations etc, aiming at analyzing the draft criminal code, draft criminal procedure code and other draft legislations such as Law on the profession of lawyers and providing their inputs. Public sessions refer to hearings, town hall meetings and debates held regarding the draft legislation.	
Unit of Measure: Number of public sessions	
Disaggregated by: Location	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): USG support for public sessions helps develop consensus-building and transparency. An increase in the number of public sessions regarding the draft legislation suggests that USG assistance is building an increasingly democratic and consensus-building culture. It also increases the likelihood that when the new legislation is adopted, implementation will occur because a variety of groups came together in the public sessions to openly discuss the draft legislation.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Project records	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by reviewing the project's mission reports, attendance sheets and any other relevant document.	
Reporting Frequency: Quarterly	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review project records	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Quarterly Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Quarterly Report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	
Known Data Limitations: Whether the Parliament meets, considers and passes any bills, and when this will occur is out of project's control	
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project's mitigation strategy will be to support advocacy and other activities to increase the likelihood of passage	
CHANGES TO INDICATOR	
Changes to indicator: Targets for FY2020 and FY2021 were decreased because public sessions on code reform were conducted in FY2017, FY2018 and FY2019. The draft codes are completed as a result of these public sessions. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.	
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE	

Year	Target	Actual	Note
------	--------	--------	------

2017	3	13	IN FY2017 JSSP provided logistical support to the Parliament's Senate Justice and Security Commission, to conduct five public hearings on the draft penal code and draft penal procedure code. The project also supported the Penal Reform Commission in presenting the impact of the new penal and penal procedure codes on investment in Haiti, during the Saint-Yves series of conferences. In addition, the project supported GREAS in conducting 5 forums and 2 debates on the code reform.
2018	2	4	In FY2018 JSSP supported 4 public sessions of the Senate's Justice, Defense and Security Commission and Chamber of Deputies' Justice, Human Rights and Security Commission to discuss and debate the new penal code, the penal procedure code and the law on the profession of lawyers.
2019	2	2	In FY2019 JSSP supported the Senate's Justice and Security Commission in organizing a public session in Port-au-Prince to discuss the new penal code with representatives of judicial sector associations, CSPJ, law students and CSOs. JSSP also supported the Chamber of Deputies' Justice Commission in organizing a workshop in Cap-Haitien to discuss codes' novelties, obtain feedback and buy-in on the new codes.
2020	1		
2021	0		
2022	3		

LOP	11		
Other Notes <i>(optional)</i> : N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 3			
Name of Indicator: Number of civil society advocacy initiatives conducted to support the code reform process			
Type of indicator: Output			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 1.1			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of initiatives, conducted by civil society, in order to advocate for the code reform process (revised criminal code and criminal procedure code). Advocacy initiatives include but are not limited to: workshops, analysis report, discussion forums, media, focus groups/meetings involving policy makers, key civil society organizations, judge's associations, bar associations and law schools etc.			
Unit of Measure: Number of advocacy initiatives			
Disaggregated by: Location and Type of initiative			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator shows the level of effort in promoting consensus on and facilitating the passage of the revised criminal and criminal procedure codes. Civil society's role in effective advocacy efforts will help enhance citizens' participation in the code reform process.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: Project records			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by reviewing the project's documents			
Reporting Frequency: Quarterly			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review project records			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Quarterly Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly Report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably. It is anticipated that once the codes are adopted, advocacy initiatives of the civil society regarding the codes will no longer be needed and supported. Thus, the out-year targets decrease.			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: Whether the Parliament meets, considers and passes any bills, the time and pace it would take to vote the bill, and when this will occur is out of project's control.			
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project's mitigation strategy will be to support advocacy and other activities to increase the likelihood of passage			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for FY20 was increased. Most civil society advocacy initiatives were conducted in FY2017, FY2018 and FY2019. The draft codes are completed as a result of these initiatives. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	3	29	In FY2017, GREAS conducted 5 forums in target jurisdictions (Cap-Haitien, Fort-Liberte, Croix-des-Bouquets, Port-au-Prince and Saint-Marc), 2 debates (Port-au-Prince), 10 radio and TV spots; published 6 articles in newspapers and on social media (Facebook); conducted 1 working session with the Commission on Justice and Security of the Senate. In addition, the project supported the advocacy initiatives (Code analysis, report recommendations and presentation to policy makers) of <i>Association Professionnelle des Magistrats</i> (APM), International Association of Women Judges (IAWJ), the Port-au-Prince Bar association and CEJA.
2018	2	3	In FY2018 JSSP supported the advocacy initiatives on code reform and passage of the Port-au-Prince Bar Association, CHAIFEJ and ANAMAH.
2019	1	12	In FY2019 JSSP grantees GREAS and RECIDP conducted 2 conference-debates, 2 mock trials, awareness raising sessions, aired 3 radio spots, 1 TV show and 2 video clips on the innovations of the codes.
2020	1		
2021	0		
2022	2		
LOP	9		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: DR 1.3-1	
Name of Indicator: Number of judicial personnel trained with USG assistance	
Type of Indicator: Output	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 1.2	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator relates to the provision of professional training to enhance the skills and competencies of judicial personnel. Judicial personnel include: judges, magistrates, prosecutors, advocates, lawyers, inspectors and court staff such as clerks and bailiffs. Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. People attending the same type of training, but on different subjects can be counted twice. Narrative reports should indicate the type of training, who the training is for, level of training, duration of training, what constitutes completion. It is required that trainings follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies. All data should be sex-disaggregated; and where possible, training should meet national or international standards.	
Unit of Measure: Number of trainees	
Disaggregated by: Sex	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): Training of judicial personnel improves their ability to more effectively carry out their duties which improves the capacity of the judiciary to act as a check on government power. Training may also instill a sense of the value of and necessity for judicial independence, transparency and accountability in a democratic society.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Training sign-in sheets and project data base	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by reviewing the project's documents	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will collect and review sign-up sheets then enter the name of each trainee in the data base to determine the number of individuals trained by topic in each fiscal year	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Baseline is zero	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): on 07/21/2017 by Edno Estigene and Gerard Fontain. On 10/11/2018 by Jean Lindor and Gerard Fontain.	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	
Known Data Limitations: This indicator does not distinguish between short-, medium-, or long-term training. Data does not indicate effectiveness; this indicator will not show which judges or personnel can implement the objectives of the training and does not capture the quality or impact of the training. This indicator also groups together the training of persons across many different functional roles that vary in terms of their power/influence, which could mask gender and other disparities	
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project is not targeting high number of trainees but focusing on providing different training subjects to strengthen the same set of individuals (training and follow-up training)	
CHANGES TO INDICATOR	
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	200	290 (238M, 52F)	In FY2017, JSSP provided training for judicial personnel on CMIS, gender, leadership and management and protocol and ethics of lawyers.
2018	300	491 (385M, 106F)	In FY2018, JSSP provided training for judicial personnel on control visits and evaluation methods of judges; on professional ethics of lawyers and arbitration law; on gender; CMIS and mediation.
2019	300	629 (479M, 150F)	In FY2019 JSSP provided training to judicial personnel on financial crimes, gender and GBV, TIP, judicial investigation, CMIS, law on legal assistance, ethical rules to prevent judicial corruption.
2020	300		
2021	100		
2022	250		
LOP	1,450		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 4	
Name of Indicator: Percent of higher education entities that have integrated trainings on the revised criminal code into their formal core curriculum in a sustainable manner	
Type of indicator: Outcome	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 1.2	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of higher education entities that have integrated trainings on the revised criminal code into their formal core curriculum in a sustainable manner (Numerator) in comparison to the total number of higher education entities (Denominator). Sustainability is ensured when instructional methods and skills-based learning for criminal code are formally adopted into school curriculum and MOUs could be signed with high education entities to ensure that this curriculum is implemented. High education entities include but are not limited to: Law schools, Bar Schools, the School of Magistrates etc.	
Unit of Measure: Percentage	
Disaggregated by: Location and entity	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): The goal of this indicator is to show project support in capacity development of the legal education system. Once the criminal code is adopted, the project will support law schools and magistrates' school in improving their curriculum and incorporating trainings on the provisions of the new code for the graduates.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Entity leadership	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by reviewing the curriculum and interviewing the entity leadership	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review entity curriculum and interview entity leaders	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual Report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016	
Rationale for Targets: During the first two years of project implementation, USG efforts will aim at adopting the criminal code and criminal procedure code. The implementation of the activity related to this indicator will follow once code(s) is adopted.	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	
Known Data Limitations: Institutions may not share easily their curriculum	
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will work closely with leadership of educational institutions to explain the importance of adding topics on criminal code reform in their curricula prior to code passage so that the institutions are ready to act swiftly after code passage.	
CHANGES TO INDICATOR	
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added.	
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE	

Year	Target	Actual	Note
------	--------	--------	------

2017	N/A	N/A	During the first year of project implementation, USG efforts will focus on adopting the criminal code and criminal procedure code. The implementation of the activity related to this indicator will follow in the next year (2018)
2018	10%	N/A	Not applicable because the penal code and penal procedure code are not yet adopted. However, JSSP is strengthening the capacity of high education institutions through strategic planning to ensure these entities will be ready to provide trainings to lawyers and judges once the codes are adopted.
2019	30%	N/A	Not applicable because the penal code and the penal procedure code are not yet adopted. However, JSSP is strengthening the capacity of high education institutions to ensure these entities will be ready to provide trainings to lawyers and judges once the codes are adopted. In FY19, the strategic plan developed with the FBH was presented to lawyer members by the Bar president during their international seminar on the repression of transnational crimes and the document was adopted.
2020	75%		
2021	75%		
2022	30%		
LOP	75%		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 5	
Name of Indicator: Percent decrease in case processing time as a result of USG assistance	
Type of Indicator: Outcome	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percentage of decrease of case processing time in courts per jurisdiction as a result of USG-supported activities such as legal aid, new legislations (e.g. penal codes), Case Management Information system (CMIS), court inspection, court coordination committee, trainings of judicial personnel. A decrease in case processing time means a reduction in the number of days required for a case to be dealt with by the appropriate actor within the system, whether it be going to trial or otherwise disposed of. A positive percentage means there was a decrease in the number of days to process a case from the baseline to the Year actual. A negative percentage means that the number of days to process a case increased from the baseline to the Year actual. Numerator: Baseline value minus Year actual value	
Unit of Measure: Percentage	
Disaggregated by: Location	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator shows level of effort in reducing the time to process a case by: improving case management system, providing legal aid, adopting new legislations (e.g. penal code and penal procedure code), establishing the CMIS, conducting court inspection by JIU, establishing court coordination committee, trainings of judges and court personnel. USG assistance for an improved case management system will lead to confidence in the judicial system and in the government. It can also increase confidence in the economic environment. This indicator provides information useful in project planning because it indicates the capacity of a given court system.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Court records	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: In each Court of First Instance supported by the project, JSSP will select a sample of 10% of the total number of closed criminal cases (from case filing to judgement) of the Fiscal Year from the different registers of the court (<i>registre des cas, registre de condamnations, plumeur d'audiences, registre de distribution</i>). The sampling interval will be of 10. For each case, JSSP will record the case file/dossier number, the name of the litigant, the date of case filing, the name of the judge and the date of judgement. Once the field research is conducted, JSSP will record the findings in a database developed for this purpose. In this database for each case, JSSP will determine the number of days it took for it to be dealt with, from case filing to final judgment. Finally, JSSP will calculate the average of number of days it took in the said FY and attribute it to the CFI visited. To establish the Baseline, JSSP selected closed criminal cases from FY2015-2016. To calculate the percentage of decrease in case processing time per jurisdiction, JSSP will divide the numerator (Baseline value minus Year actual) by the denominator (year actual).	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review the different court records to determine the number of days for case processing	
Presentation of Data: Narrative	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: The collected baseline is as follows (in average of number of days): Port-au-Prince : 265 days; Croix-des-Bouquets : 291 days; Saint-Marc : 63 days; Cap-Haitien : 298 days and Fort-Liberte : 12 days.	

Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably

DATA QUALITY ISSUES

Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years

Known Data Limitations: Court records and registries are often not properly filled. Many times, the case file number isn't automatically mentioned next to the case in the *registre de cas* or in the *registre de condamnation* or in the *registre d'attribution*. Thus, it is extremely difficult to track the case from the prosecutor's office to the CFI and vice versa. In addition, cases are often heard by the court on a particular date but the judge decides de render his decision on a later date.

Actions to address Data Limitation: To minimize sampling errors, JSSP will search all court registries to find the date of judgment of each case selected.

CHANGES TO INDICATOR

Changes to indicator: Targets for FY2020 and FY2021 were decreased from "15% from baseline" to "10% from baseline" because after 3 years of implementation, the socio/political/security crisis and strikes of judges, lawyers, and clerks prevented courts from operating normally. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE

Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	2% from baseline	PAP : -161% CDB : -88% SM : - 222% CH : 19% FL : - 31%	The main way to speed up time processing of cases is the Legal assistance program; it only began at the end of August 2017. In addition, courts were paralyzed by judges' and clerks' strikes. Because of this year's strikes there were no jury trials in FY2017.
2018	5% from baseline	PAP: -74% CDB: -46% SM: -75% CH: 13% FL: -95%	In comparison with the baseline value of FY16, Cap-Haitien registered a decrease in case processing time of 13%. The FY18 samples collected in the remaining jurisdictions show an increase in case processing time mainly because criminal cases tried in FY18 are often selected based on the long time spent in pretrial detention, like in Port-au-Prince.

2019	10% from baseline	PAP: N/A CDB: -72% SM: N/A CH: -44% FL:-96%	The FY19 samples collected in 3 out of 5 jurisdictions show an increase in case processing time mainly because criminal cases tried in FY19 are often selected based on the long time spent in pretrial detention. Due to the security and road issues stemming from the protests that began in September 2019, JSSP was not able to collect this annual data in PAP and SM.
2020	10% from baseline		
2021	10% from baseline		
2022	10% from baseline		
LOP	10% from baseline		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: DR 1.5-1	
Name of Indicator: Number of USG-assisted courts with improved case management systems	
Type of Indicator: Outcome	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2.1	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Improved is defined as a case management system that functions to reduce the number of days required for a case to be dealt with by the appropriate actor within the system, whether it be going to trial or otherwise disposed of. Types of functional areas within case management systems include: controlling forms; establishing record control; case processing and record updating; scheduling case events; controlling and storing final records; and reporting management information.	
Unit of Measure: Number of USG-assisted courts	
Disaggregated by: None	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): Without reliable data, courts cannot deliver timely justice, control or monitor their own operations, or explain their operations to citizens. The lack of information on court operations makes citizens suspicious about the fairness, transparency, and integrity of the rule of law. Closed, secretive justice systems create the perception and often the reality of favoritism, malfeasance and denial of basic rights. Thus, the introduction of high-quality court management information systems affects not only efficiency but also effectiveness. It can have a significant impact on central ROL issues, such as human rights, access to justice, transparency and development of democratic institutions and society. USG assistance for an improved case management system will lead to confidence in the judicial system which leads to increased confidence in the government; It can also increase confidence in the economic environment	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Project records	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by review of any case management tool established in the court with USG support, by site visit to courts, review of court records and by interview of court staff	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: Project staff will visit supported courts to meet with court personnel and to determine if the court established new tools such as the CMIS for case management aiming at (1) reducing case processing time and (2) improving quality of case filing (case files and registers properly filled; piece of evidence properly stored).	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably. The target is cumulative of previous years.	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): on 10/11/2018 by Jean Lindor and Gerard Fontain.	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	

Known Data Limitations: JSSP has developed an automated case management system (CMIS) that functions to assist courts in reducing case processing time. But court staff are not regularly entering data in the CMIS and manual case registry, because of the overall lack of oversight by the Ministry of Justice (MJPS) and High Judicial Council (CSPJ) on courts and prosecutor's office. For the same reason, heads of jurisdictions (chief judges and chief prosecutors) are not yet using the CMIS to take case management decisions that would reduce case processing time. But since FY2019 they are making a greater and more extent use of it. JSSP has no control over courts and prosecutors' office oversight and use of the system.

Actions to address Data Limitations: Project staff will develop Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the MJPS and CSPJ to ensure greater oversight and commitment on the CMIS and develop other strategies including the ownership and expansion phase. JSSP will continue to support the National CMIS Committee established to address CMIS implementation and issues.

CHANGES TO INDICATOR

Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE

Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	2	4	The project improved case management by establishing record control through the CMIS in four target jurisdictions (Port-au-Prince, Saint-Marc, Cap-Haitien and Fort-Liberte).
2018	6 (cumulative)	5	In FY2018 JSSP continued to support case management systems established in Port-au-Prince, Cap-Haitien, Fort-Liberte and Saint-Marc. The project also established and operationalized the CMIS in Croix-des-Bouquets Court of First Instance.
2019	8 (cumulative)	8	In FY2019 JSSP continued to improve case management of the courts of first instance (CFI) of Port-au-Prince, Saint-Marc, Croix-des-Bouquets, Cap-Haitien and Fort-Liberté by establishing record control through the CMIS. In QR4, JSSP completed the expansion of the CMIS in 3 new CFIs: Hinche, Mirebalais and Grande-Riviere-du-Nord.
2020	11 (cumulative)		
2021	11 (cumulative)		
2022	13 (cumulative)		

LOP	13		
Other Notes <i>(optional)</i> : N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 6			
Name of Indicator: Number of coordination mechanisms at the community level to help improve working relationships, information sharing, and case administration between judges, prosecutors, lawyers, and police			
Type of indicator: Output			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2.1			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of coordination mechanism established at the community level to improve working relationships and case administration between judicial personnel and police. Coordination mechanisms include but are not limited to: Forum of heads of jurisdictions per jurisdiction, Penal chain coordination committee and any other peer-to-peer exchange opportunity such as WhatsApp groups etc.			
Unit of Measure: Number of coordination mechanisms			
Disaggregated by: Type of mechanism			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator captures the level of effort to link the different justice actors, empower and inform them. This will lead to an improvement of the quality and effectiveness of their work and a reduction of unnecessary delays in case processing.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: Project staff			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by document review			
Reporting Frequency: Quarterly			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze documents of technical staff and mission reports			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Quarterly Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: Turnover of heads of jurisdictions could obstruct the organization of regular forums of heads of jurisdictions and proper follow-up and recommendation implementation			
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will make sure to create a follow-up committee from each forum in order to maintain a certain sustainability			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	4	7	In FY2017, JSSP supported 5 forums of heads of jurisdiction (1 forum in each of Cap-Haitien, Fort-Liberte, Croix-des-Bouquers and 2 in Saint-Marc) and established 2 WhatsApp groups (“Forum des chefs de juridiction de Fort-Liberte” and “Comite de suivi de Saint-Marc”)
2018	5	8	In FY2018, JSSP supported 3 forums of heads of jurisdiction in Croix-des-Bouquets, Fort-Liberte and Saint-Marc and established 3 WhatsApp groups in Port-au-Prince, Croix-des-Bouquets and Cap-Haitien. The previously established WhatsApp groups in Fort-Liberte and Saint-Marc are still active and in use by their members.
2019	5	7	In FY2019 JSSP supported 5 forums of heads of jurisdictions in Croix-des-Bouquets (2), Saint-Marc, Cap-Haitien and Fort-Liberte. In addition, JSSP established and supported 2 penal chain follow-up committees in PAP and CDB.
2020	5		
2021	2		
2022	2		
LOP	23		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 7			
Name of Indicator: Number of judicial and court personnel trained to perform their duties effectively and efficiently			
Type of indicator: Output			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2.2			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator relates to the provision of professional training to judicial actors to strengthen their human resources and technical and managerial capacities and skills needed to perform their duties in a successful, professional and competent way. Judicial and court personnel include: judges, magistrates, prosecutors, advocates, inspectors and court staff such as clerks, bailiffs, administrative assistants, archivists, IT technicians, accountants. Training refers to all training or education events whether short-term or long-term, in-country or abroad. It is required that trainings follow a documented curriculum with stated objectives and/or expected competencies. People attending the same type of training, but on different subjects can be counted twice.			
Unit of Measure: Number of trainees			
Disaggregated by: Sex			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): Training topics will include: court administration and management, record keeping, budget management and forecasting, judicial writing, accounting, GBV, TIP, child rights, ethics and discipline, gender, LGBT etc. These topics will strengthen the organizational and managerial capacity of judicial actors. They will acquire the specific technical and managerial skills needed to perform their duties effectively and efficiently. This will provide citizens with more confidence to seek resolution of disputes through the court system.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: Training records and sign-in sheets			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by reviewing attendance sheets			
Reporting Frequency: Quarterly			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze sign-up sheets and training records			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Quarterly Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: This indicator does not distinguish between short-, medium-, or long-term training. Data does not indicate effectiveness; this indicator will not show which judges or personnel can implement the objectives of the training and does not capture the quality or impact of the training. This indicator also groups together the training of persons across many different functional roles that vary in terms of their power/influence, which could mask gender and other disparities			
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project is not targeting high number of trainees but focusing on providing different training subjects to strengthen the same set of individuals (training and follow-up training)			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	150	270 (189M, 81F)	
2018	150	501 (387M, 114F)	

2019	150	672 (494M, 178F)	
2020	250		
2021	50		
2022	250		
LOP	1,000		

Other Notes *(optional)*: N/A

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 8			
Name of Indicator: Percent of USG trainees who report that the training has improved their job skills			
Type of Indicator: Outcome			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2.2			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator relates to the impact of provision of professional training to strengthen human resources and managerial capacities of judicial actors. Training topics will include: court administration and management, record keeping, budget management and forecasting, judicial writing, accounting, GBV, TIP, child rights, ethics and discipline etc. Numerator: Number of USG trainees who say that training improved their job skills when queried a specified period of time after the training to allow for implementation of training material. Denominator: Number of respondents by jurisdiction			
Unit of Measure: Percentage			
Disaggregated by: Location and sex			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator aims to capture the outcome of the training and the increase in knowledge of trainees as a result of project assistance. Training individuals and then evaluating their knowledge in months following the training will show which trainees have achieved the objectives of the training in their profession.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: USG trainees			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by conducting a survey of selected project trainees during or at the end of the Fiscal Year. JSSP will develop a questionnaire that will include questions on job skills' improvement such as ability to work independently, overall level of skills relevant to current employment, leadership skills, inter-personal and problem-solving skills etc. Each answer will correspond to a scoring on a scale of 0 to 5 (0= low and 5= high). Survey will be conducted months following the training, to allow for implementation of training material. New tools/templates adopted by trainees could be attached to the survey			
Reporting Frequency: Annual			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze survey results to establish the percentage of trainees who say that training improved their job skills			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Annual report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: Trainees could be reluctant in answering the questionnaire			
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will explain that one of the aim of the survey is to identify other areas for job capacity improvement.			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	60%	Port-au-Prince 100% (4M, 1F) Saint-Marc 97% (9M, 1F) Cap-Haitien 86% (16M, 1F) Fort-Liberté 93% (14M)	
2018	60%	Port-au-Prince 96% (6M, 2F)	
2019	60%	92% 63 (56M, 7F)	
2020	75%		
2021	75%		
2022	75%		
LOP	75%		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 9			
Name of Indicator: Number of performance monitoring and oversight of court personnel that are performed according to the law / international standards			
Type of indicator: Output			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2.2			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of performance monitoring and oversight of court personnel that are conducted by the CSPJ and/or MJPS Judicial Inspection Units (JIUs) by following the law and international standards. USG assistance includes but is not limited to: support the JIU in conducting field visits (disciplinary and routine inspections) and provide trainings and mentoring to inspectors prior or after the inspection.			
Unit of Measure: Number of performance monitoring conducted according to law/international standards			
Disaggregated by: Location			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): The JIU's inspections have revealed a lack of uniform court administrative procedures. Inspections will be more effective if there are standards, policies, and procedures against which court performance can be measured. USG assistance will provide this mentoring to inspectors and will lead to enhancement of the JIU.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: Judicial inspection unit records			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by reviewing the project and JIU records			
Reporting Frequency: Annual			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze project documents			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Annual report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: A total of 6 oversight missions were conducted with USG support			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably. In accordance with the USAID/JSSP Mutual Accountability strategy, local stakeholders should be more committed and take greater ownership of the activities as the program goes by. Thus, JSSP involvement and some indicator targets are decreasing in FY20 and FY21.			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: JIU could be slow or reluctant in conducting oversight mission without logistical support. In FY2019, JIU activities were completely paralyzed because there was no director at the head of the institution.			
Actions to address Data Limitations: JSSP has brought these data limitations to the Ambassador, the CSPJ promised they would appoint a director in FY2020. JSSP will provide adequate support to the JIU to conduct oversight missions.			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	8	9	JSSP provided logistical and technical support to the JIU to conduct 2 disciplinary inspections in the Peace courts of Marigot (Jacmel) and Moron (Grande-Anse) and 7 routine inspections in the Peace courts of Anse a Veaux, Grand Goave, Gonaive Section Nord and the Courts of First Instance of Coteaux, Grande Riviere du Nord, Jacmel and Port de Paix.
2018	6	11	JSSP conducted 2 trainings of inspectors on control visits and on report drafting. The project also provided logistical and technical support to the JIU to conduct 1 routine inspection of CFI of CH, 6 disciplinary inspections in peace courts of Jacmel, Lascahobas, Grison Garde, Saint-Marc, Cap-Haitien and Acul-du-Nord.; and 2 follow-up inspections to Mirebalais and Grande-Riviere du Nord.
2019	5	1	In FY2019 the JIU completed the inspection of the CFI of CDB. The JIU was not as active as in the previous FYs because the JIU coordinator resigned in December 2018 and since then no coordinator was appointed.
2020	3		
2021	2		
2022	2		
LOP	26		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 10			
Name of Indicator: Number of judges fully vetted by the CSPJ in accordance with procedures			
Type of indicator: Output			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2.3			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of unique judges who are vetted by the CSPJ in accordance with procedures.			
Unit of Measure: Number of judges vetted			
Disaggregated by: Location and sex			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): USG assistance will aim to build the administrative and functional units of the CSPJ. Intervention will include technical and logistical assistance, the development of regulations, standard operating procedures to conduct judicial vetting. This will lead to reducing corruption within the justice system.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: CSPJ records			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by document review			
Reporting Frequency: Annual			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze documents of CSPJ			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Annual report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: The CSPJ vetting commission provided a total of 55 reports related to judges to the CSPJ. At Program inception no judge was vetted by the CSPJ.			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably. In accordance with the USAID/JSSP Mutual Accountability strategy, local stakeholders should be more committed and take greater ownership of the activities as the program goes by. Thus, JSSP involvement and some indicator targets are decreasing in FY20 and FY21.			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: CSPJ could be reluctant in processing and /or publishing the results of the vetting. Sanctioning their peers is proven to be difficult since the CSPJ inception.			
Actions to address Data Limitations: JSSP will sign a Memorandum of Understanding with CSPJ mentioning the list of roles and responsibilities of each party. JSSP provides logistical support to the CSPJ Vetting Commission (CTC) to conduct vetting missions nationwide. The CTC investigates but the CSPJ board takes the vetting decision which frequency is beyond project control.			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	55	40	CSPJ vetting is complete for 40 judges. Twenty (20) passed, 10 failed and will be removed, 10 will be asked to provide additional info.
2018	100	42	In FY2018, the CSPJ vetted 42 judges: 35 passed and 7 didn't pass the vetting. JSSP provided logistical support to the CSPJ Vetting Commission (CTC) to conduct 6 vetting missions to the South, the Central Plateau and the North-East.
2019	100	39 (28 M, 11F)	In FY2019, the CSPJ released a list of vetting decisions: 32 judges and prosecutors were positively vetted and 7 were dismissed. In QR4 JSSP continued to provide logistical support to the CSPJ Vetting Commission (CTC) to conduct 7 vetting missions covering more than 7 cities. The CTC investigates and the CSPJ board takes the vetting decision.
2020	50		

2021	30		
2022	30		
LOP	365		

Other Notes (optional): N/A

THIS SHEET LAST UPUPDATED ON: 08/14/2020

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 11	
Name of Indicator: Number of oversight missions conducted by the CSPJ JIU	
Type of Indicator: Output	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2.3	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): A full cycle of routine inspection consists of four visits conducted by the JIU to the courts: presentation of the JIU to prepare court staff for the up-coming inspection, the routine inspection of the court aiming at auditing courts and judges' performances, presentation of the report and recommendations, and the follow-up inspection. Only the routine inspection and the follow-up inspection are considered as inspections. Thus this indicator measures the number of routine inspection, the follow-up inspection and the disciplinary inspection as oversight missions.	
Unit of Measure: Number of oversight missions	
Disaggregated by: Location and type of oversight	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): USG assistance to the CSPJ will increase its capacities to manage and oversee judicial actors. Processes will be improved, including increased rigor, coherence, accountability and transparency regarding professional performance, assignments and disciplinary procedures. An increase in inspection leads to an increase in performance and transparency.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: CSPJ JIU records and project records	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by document review	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will consult project records, JIU records and inspection reports to determine the number of inspections conducted	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: A total of 5 oversight missions were previously conducted by the CSPJ, prior to project award.	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably. In accordance with the USAID/JSSP Mutual Accountability strategy, local stakeholders should be more committed and take greater ownership of the activities as the program goes by. Thus, JSSP involvement and some indicator targets are decreasing in FY20 and FY21.	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	
Known Data Limitations: The CSPJ JIU could be slow or reluctant in conducting oversight mission without logistical support. In FY2019, JIU activities were completely paralyzed because there was no director at the head of the institution.	
Actions to address Data Limitations: JSSP has brought these data limitations to the Ambassador, the CSPJ promised they would appoint a director in FY2020. JSSP will provide adequate support to the JIU to conduct oversight missions.	
CHANGES TO INDICATOR	
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.	
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE	

Year	Target	Actual	Note
------	--------	--------	------

2017	4	13	A total of 13 oversight missions were conducted by the JIU during FY2017: 4 disciplinary inspections in the Peace Courts of Marigot, Bord de Mer de Limonade, Moron and Saint-Louis du Sud and 9 inspections in Courts of first instance of Mirebalais, Jacmel, Port de Paix, Coteaux and the Peace courts of Petit Goave, Grande Riviere du Nord, Grand Goave, Anse a Veaux and Gonaives section Nord.
2018	6	9	In FY2018 the JIU conducted 1 routine inspection in CH, 2 follow up inspection visits in Grande-Riviere du Nord and Mirebalais; and 6 disciplinary inspections in Cap-Haitien, Acul-du-Nord, Jacmel, Lascahobas, Grison Garde and SM.
2019	6	1	In FY2019 the JIU completed the inspection of the CFI of CDB. The JIU was not as active as in the previous FYs because the JIU coordinator resigned in December 2018 and since then no coordinator was appointed.
2020	4		
2021	2		
2022	2		
LOP	24		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 12			
Name of Indicator: Number of judicial sanctions reported by the CSPJ			
Type of indicator: Output			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 2.3			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of judicial sanctions that the CSPJ reports following its oversight mission.			
Unit of Measure: Number of judicial sanctions			
Disaggregated by: Infraction and sanction type			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator shows the level of effort at combating corruption at all levels within the judiciary. Disciplinary procedures, measures for misconduct or non-performance and rules regarding corruption, judicial ethics and illegal conduct will help the CSPJ in sanctioning judges. USG will provide guidance for the CSPJ in disciplinary situations. An increase in judicial sanctions will enhance the culture of lawfulness and will encourage judges and judicial personnel in reporting corruption, unethical or illegal conduct committed by their peers.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: CSPJ records			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by document review			
Reporting Frequency: Annual			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze project documents			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Annual report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: A total of 12 judges were sanctioned by the CSPJ			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably. In accordance with the USAID/JSSP Mutual Accountability strategy, local stakeholders should be more committed and take greater ownership of the activities as the program goes by. Thus, JSSP involvement and some indicator targets are decreasing in FY20 and FY21.			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: The CSPJ is reluctant in taking final sanction decisions following an oversight mission. Sanctioning their peers is proven to be difficult since the CSPJ inception. JSSP doesn't have the leverage to change this situation			
Actions to address Data Limitations: JSSP will sign a Memorandum of Understanding with CSPJ mentioning the list of roles and responsibilities of each party.			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	10	6	This year the CSPJ held 12 disciplinary hearings which led to sanctioning 6 judges.
2018	8	8	Target met
2019	9	5	In FY2019, the CSPJ reported 5 suspensions pending final decision from the CSPJ.
2020	9		
2021	2		
2022	5		
LOP	43		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: DR 6.3-1	
Name of Indicator: Number of individuals from low income or marginalized communities who received legal aid or victim's assistance with USG support	
Type of Indicator: Output	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 3	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): Areas of low income is defined as those where 60% of the population has an income in the lowest quintile of the country as a whole. Marginalized communities are those who have traditionally been excluded from power and access to resources, and may include detainees, indigenous peoples, tribal peoples, members of the LGBT community, victims of gender-based violence (GBV) and Trafficking in person (TIP), women and girls, youth, individuals with disabilities, or other similar groups.	
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals	
Disaggregated by: Location and sex. If and when applicable to the project's mandate, LGBTI, disability, youth, ethnicity.	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): Local availability of legal aid or victim's assistance for low income or marginalized communities indicates some degree of effectiveness in providing access to justice, a key component of rule of law and human rights. When low income and marginalized communities can access justice, it helps improve the legitimacy of the justice system as a whole because individuals can depend on the justice system to seek relief. This data indicates level of effort and when compared to number of individuals or marginalized communities that do not receive legal assistance, will be useful in program planning and allocation of resources.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Legal aid Offices supported by JSSP	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by document review	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review project and legal aid office records and forms to determine the number of individuals or victims receiving legal aid	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Baseline is zero	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): on 07/21/2017 by Edno Estigene and Gerard Fontain. On 10/11/2018 by Jean Lindor and Gerard Fontain.	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	
Known Data Limitations: The determination as to whether an area is of low income population, "where 60% of the population has an income in the lowest quintile of the country as a whole" is hindered by the fact that (1) there are no known available national census or other survey conducted by the GOH which ranks national income to determine if an area has a low income population, and (2) available studies on income level and poverty are done countrywide and are not broken down by areas (i.e. cities, departments, communes)	
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project's target jurisdictions include the Port-au-Prince/Cul-de-Sac, St. Marc, and Cap Haitian/Northern Corridors. Other jurisdictions may be proposed based on priorities identified by the GOH (Government of Haiti) or new and emerging opportunities	

CHANGES TO INDICATOR

Changes to indicator: JSSP will support 2 grants of 2 BALs for 6 months period during extension year. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	1,200	Total 1,204 (796M, 408F) Port-au-Prince : 151 (150M, 1F) Saint-Marc 51 (45M, 6F) Croix-des-Bouquets 87 (75M, 12F) Cap-Haitien 63 (53M, 10F) Fort-Liberte 66 (56M, 10F) Coteaux: 786 (417M, 369F)	In FY2017, the project provided legal assistance lawyers to represent individuals during criminal hearings in Port-au-Prince, Croix- des-Bouquets and Saint- Marc. The project also assisted victims of Hurricane Mathew in Coteaux to retrieve their lost documents. In September 2017, the project's Legal assistance offices (BAL) started assisting individuals in 4 target jurisdictions: Saint-Marc, Croix-des- Bouquets, Cap-Haitien and Fort-Liberte. The clerks' and judges' strikes paralyzed court activities and negatively impacted BAL services. Because of that year's strikes there were no jury trials. JSSP was scheduled to provide assistance in all 5 jurisdictions for these jury trials.
2018	1,500	Total 5,180 (3,269M, 1,911F) CDB: 298 (251M; 47F) CH:533 (408M; 125F) FL: 889 (617M; 272F) SM: 523 (391M; 132F) PAP: 1,011 (695M; 316F) Coteaux 1,926 (907M; 1,019F)	In FY2018, the project's 5 Legal aid offices (BALs) of Cap-Haitien, Fort-Liberte, Saint-Marc, Port-au-Prince and Croix-des-Bouquets continued to offer legal assistance to individuals and victims. They also represented detainees at hearings and at various stages of the penal chain (Peace court, Police stations, Prosecutor's office and prisons).

2019	750	Total 2,498 (1,802M, 696F) PAP: 578 (415M, 163F) SM: 579 (383M, 196F) FL: 967 (740M, 227F) CH: 374 (264M, 110F)	In FY2019, JSSP-supported BAL lawyers continued to offer legal assistance to individuals and victims. They also represented detainees at criminal and correctional hearings and at various stages of the penal chain (Peace court, Police stations, Prosecutor's office and prisons). Finally, they continued to follow-up on unresolved cases of 1,102 individuals (988 men and 114 women). Due to the security and road issues stemming from the protests that began in September 2019, JSSP was not able to collect September legal aid forms from the BAL of Saint-Marc. Thus, the SM data covers a period of 11 months (Oct 2018 to Aug 2019). JSSP will include the Sept 2019 data of SM in the next QR Oct-Dec 2019 and related PMP.
2020	650		
2021	0		
2022	500		
LOP	4,600		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 13	
Name of Indicator: Percentage change in the number of GBV, TIP, or other vulnerable group cases adjudicated in the target jurisdictions	
Type of indicator: Outcome	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 3.1	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percentage of change in the number of GBV, TIP or other vulnerable group cases that are adjudicated in the target jurisdictions within the fiscal year. A positive percentage change means an increase in GBV and TIP disputes that are being adjudicated from one year to another. A negative percentage change means a decrease in the number of GBV and TIP disputes adjudicated from one year to another. Numerator: Year Actual minus Previous year Denominator: Previous year	
Unit of Measure: Percentage change	
Disaggregated by: Type of vulnerability and Location	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): Through the provision of legal assistance and legal defense to populations/victims and through support to criminal trials and other project activities, USG support will ensure that cases involving GBV, TIP victims are adjudicated within the statutory timeframe. A positive percentage change means an increase in GBV and TIP disputes that are being adjudicated from one year to another. A negative percentage change means a decrease in the number of GBV and TIP disputes adjudicated from one year to another.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Court records	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by review of Court registries. In each Fiscal Year, JSSP will go through court registries to determine how many vulnerable cases (GBV, TIP and others) were adjudicated. Then to calculate the percentage change, JSSP will use the following equation: Year Actual minus Previous Year and divide it by Previous Year.	
Reporting Frequency: Semi-Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E team will research the Court registries (<i>Registre des cas, registre de condamnations</i> and others) to determine how many cases that involve GBV, TIP, and or other vulnerable groups are adjudicated per fiscal year. Then to calculate the percentage change, JSSP will use the following equation: Year Actual minus Previous Year and divide it by Previous Year.	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the 2 nd and 4 th Quarterly Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: 2 nd and 4 th Quarterly report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Legal assistance programs in the target jurisdictions began in the 4th quarter of FY2017. Thus, to establish the baseline, JSSP recorded the number of GBV, TIP, or other vulnerable group cases that were adjudicated in the target jurisdictions from April to June 2017 (prior to JSSP intervention). The baseline is as follows: Port-au-Prince : 6 ; Croix-des-Bouquets : 0 ; Fort-Liberté : 3 ; Cap-Haitien : 3 ; Saint-Marc : 1.	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	

Known Data Limitations: Supported dispute resolution entities could not keep track of all disputes resolved that involve GBV, TIP victims and other vulnerable group

Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will develop a form to enable entities to use and keep track of these cases.

CHANGES TO INDICATOR

Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE

Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	+10%	PAP : +116% CDB: N/A FL : -100% CH : -67% SM : +300%	Legal assistance lawyers provided support to criminal trials in Port-au-Prince and Saint-Marc. Legal assistance programs in 4 target jurisdictions began in September 2017. The clerks' and judges' strike that occurred in QR4 paralyzed court activities and negatively impacted courts' and BAL services. Therefore, the percentage achieved in FY2017 is low.
2018	+15%	PAP : +231% CDB : +600% FL: +833% CH: +625% SM : +240%	Data collected for FY18 show an increase of GBV and TIP cases that were resolved in JSSP 5 target jurisdictions, in comparison with the previous FY17.
2019	+20%	PAP: N/A CDB: 11cases/ -21% FL: 13 cases/ -53.5% CH: 26 cases/ -10.3% SM: N/A	Data collected for FY19 show a decrease of GBV and TIP cases that were resolved in 3 out of 5 target jurisdictions, in comparison with the previous FY18. Due to the security and road issues stemming from the protests that began in September 2019, JSSP was not able to collect data in PAP and SM for the second semester.
2020	+30%		
2021	+30%		
2022	+30%		
LOP	+30%		

Other Notes (optional): N/A

THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 14	
Name of Indicator: Number of people in pretrial or illegal detention who are tried, released, convicted, acquitted, or whose cases are otherwise advanced procedurally with USG assistance	
Type of Indicator: Output	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 3.1	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the total number of people in pretrial or illegal detention at target prisons who were tried and convicted (following a trial) or tried and acquitted (following a trial) or released (they were either released without a trial or released after being held illegally beyond a court ordered release date) or had their case advanced procedurally (i.e., assistance significantly contributed to a pretrial decision or order by a judge or prosecutor or whose case was heard by the judge and the decision is rendered later) with the legal assistance provided by the Project. Detainees are either in pretrial detention (i.e. their cases have not been scheduled for trial or reviewed by a judge for a final decision) or in illegal detention (i.e. they were kept in jail beyond the period for which they were sentenced to serve after a final judicial decision).	
Unit of Measure: Number of detainees assisted	
Disaggregated by: Outcome of the assistance (i.e. detainee “tried”, “released”, “convicted”, “acquitted”, or “whose case file was advanced procedurally”) and sex	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator is a direct measure of how project assistance in target prisons police stations and courts can effectively lead to reducing illegal and pretrial detention in prisons and increasing the conviction rate in courts. This will impact positively the Haitian judicial system and improve the rule of law.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Court, police, prison and project supported entities records	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by prison visits and document review	
Reporting Frequency: Quarterly	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review project supported entities, CMIS, courts and prison records to keep track of pretrial detainee cases and determine the outcome of project assistance	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Quarterly Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Quarterly report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Baseline is zero	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	
Known Data Limitations: Project assistance to a detainee could start during one quarter and progress can occur in the next quarter (trial, acquittal, conviction) thus the risk of double-counting detainees assisted	
Actions to address Data Limitations: Project will collect closed legal aid cases each month and establish a database with name of detainees (and all related information) assisted during each quarter	
CHANGES TO INDICATOR	
Changes to indicator: JSSP will support 2 grants of 2 BALs for 6 months period during extension year. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	800	388 (363M, 25F) 229 T (156 C, 67 A, 6 AP) and 159 R	In FY2017, the project supported the Courts of first instance of Port-au-Prince, Croix-des-Bouquets and Saint-Marc in organizing intensive criminal hearings. The project launched its legal assistance program at the end of August 2017 through opening legal assistance offices in Croix-des-Bouquets, Cap-Haitien, Saint-Marc and Fort-Liberte. However the clerks' and judges' strikes paralyzed court activities and negatively impacted BAL services. Because of this year's strikes there were no jury trials. JSSP was scheduled to provide assistance in all 5 jurisdictions for these jury trials.
2018	800	2,352 (1,937M, 415F) 2,352: 695 T (420 C, 259 A, 16 AP) and 1,657 R	In FY2018 legal assistants from the 5 BALs followed up on cases of detainees in various stages of the penal chain (Peace court, Police stations, Prosecutor's office and prisons). They also represented detainees at criminal hearings.
2019	400	1,305 (1,146M, 159F) 748T (563A, 185C) and 557R	In FY2019 legal assistants from the 4 BALs followed up on cases of detainees in various stages of the penal chain (Peace court, Police stations, Prosecutor's office and prisons). They also represented detainees at criminal and correctional hearings.
2020	400		
2021	0		
2022	250		
LOP	2,650		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 15	
Name of Indicator: Number of people visiting USG supported informal or formal justice dispute resolution entities in remote and marginalized communities	
Type of indicator: Output	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 3.2	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of individuals who visit USG supported justice dispute resolution centers or mechanisms located in remote and marginalized communities, such as the mobile units of the Legal aid offices (BAL). These mobile units are bringing legal services closer to the people (“proximity justice”). Marginalized communities are those who have traditionally been excluded from power and access to resources, and may include indigenous peoples, tribal peoples, members of the LGBT community, victims of gender-based violence (GBV) and Trafficking in person (TIP), women and girls, youth, individuals with disabilities, or other similar groups.	
Unit of Measure: Number of individuals	
Disaggregated by: Location and sex	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): Because of the weak presence of the court system in several remote areas, locally delivered justice is rare. Disputes are often resolved by local government officials or religious figures; which leads to vigilante justice and more violence. This indicator captures the impact of establishing USG supported justice dispute resolution centers or mechanisms in remote areas and accessible for marginalized communities. Through these entities, justice delivery is available and accessible to residents living in remote areas and for marginalized communities. Disputes that are resolved at these entities do not enter the court system thus leading to a reduction in courts’ caseload	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Dispute resolution entities records	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by document review	
Reporting Frequency: Quarterly	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze documents of supported entities to determine how many people visited those centers or mechanisms.	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Quarterly Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Quarterly report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Baseline is zero.	
Rationale for Targets: JSSP (ASU/DDG) will conduct a study to determine what types of conflicts and crimes are most common in rural, remote and underserved areas and how they are resolved in practice, as well as to evaluate the access to, and the confidence in the informal and formal justice system in key jurisdictions. This study will enable JSSP to set appropriate targets for this indicator.	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	
Known Data Limitations: Formal and informal justice dispute resolution entities could not keep track of how many people visited the centers	
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will develop a form to enable those centers to use and keep track of number of visitors	
CHANGES TO INDICATOR	

Changes to indicator: JSSP will support 2 grants of 2 BALs for 6 months period during extension year. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	N/A	0	Results will be obtained in FY2018. Results of this activity are contingent on completion of a study by sub-contractor DDG on informal and formal justice dispute resolutions. It took more time than expected for DDG to conduct and analyze the 4000 household surveys, 24 focus groups, 48 one-on-one discussions and 15 key informant interviews. The results of the study will serve as a valuable basis for launching a pilot program, through grants, to support formal and informal justice resolutions entities in remote and marginalized communities in target jurisdictions.
2018	200	167 (83M, 84F)	In FY2018 the BALs started conducting “mobile units” to remote and marginalized areas to bring justice closer to vulnerable populations at the community level. Through these mobile units, BALs lawyers and mediators start to represent individuals, mediate cases or provide consultations.

2019	150	471 (384M, 87F)	In FY2019 legal assistants from the 4 BALs continued to conduct “mobile units” to remote and marginalized areas to bring justice closer to vulnerable populations at the community level. Through these mobile units, BALs lawyers and mediators represent individuals, mediate cases or provide consultations.
2020	100		
2021	0		
2022	50		
LOP	500		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 16	
Name of Indicator: Percent increase in the number of disputes adjudicated in targeted remote jurisdictions	
Type of indicator: Outcome	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 3.2	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percentage of increase of disputes that are adjudicated and resolved in remote jurisdictions, by mediators and legal assistants from dispute resolution entities such as the Mobile units of the Legal Aid offices (BAL) supported by the project. These mobile units are bringing legal services closer to the people ("proximity justice"). Numerator: Year Actual minus Baseline value Denominator: Baseline value	
Unit of Measure: Percent increase	
Disaggregated by: Location and type of dispute	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator is directly linked to the previous indicator. Through the entities, initiatives and mechanisms established for justice service to marginalized communities and populations living in remote areas, USG support will assist in increasing the number of disputes and conflicts resolved. Vigilante justice-related violence will be reduced in rural areas. An increase of conflicts resolved suggests greater accessibility of the justice system in remote communities.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Dispute resolution entities, court and mechanisms records	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by review of document of supported-entities and mechanisms	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze documents of supported entities and mechanisms such as the mobile units in targeted remote jurisdictions to determine how many disputes are resolved for the first year of support and then for following years.	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Baseline is zero. Since the baseline is established before our interventions, an increase has not yet occurred thus the percentage of increase is zero. In QR4 of FY2018, BAL mobile units started to provide mediation services and legal representations to individuals in remote and underserved areas as follows: Cap-Haitien: 3 disputes resolved; Fort-Liberte: 36 disputes resolved.	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably.	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A	
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years	
Known Data Limitations: Supported entities could not keep track of all disputes they helped resolve	
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will develop a form to enable entities to use and keep track of	
CHANGES TO INDICATOR	
Changes to indicator: JSSP will support 2 grants of 2 BALs for 6 months period during extension year. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.	

PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE

Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	+15%	0%	Following the completion of study by sub-contractor DDG on informal and formal justice dispute resolutions, the baseline was established. The results of the study will serve as a valuable basis for launching in FY2018 a pilot program, through grants, to support formal and informal justice resolutions entities in remote and marginalized communities in target jurisdictions. Results will be obtained in FY2018.
2018	+15%	N/A	In QR4 of FY2018, BAL mobile units started to provide mediation services to individuals in remote and underserved areas. This service will increase in the next FY.
2019	+15%	PAP: 330% SM: 25% CH: 133% FL: 914%	Mobile units of the BALs are offering mainly legal representation to detainees and victims in remote and underserved areas. All jurisdictions have scored an increase in the number of disputes resolved through the mobile units.
2020	+15%		
2021	+0%		
2022	+15%		
LOP	+15%		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: DR 4.2-2	
Name of Indicator: Number of civil society organizations (CSOs) receiving USG assistance engaged in advocacy interventions	
Type of Indicator: Output	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 4	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of Civil society organizations (CSOs) that initiate or participate in advocacy interventions, with USG support. Civil Society Organizations include but is not limited to local NGOs, Bar associations and Magistrates' associations. Advocacy is a means for individuals or organizations to shape public agendas, change public policies, and influence other processes that impact their lives. Advocacy does not involve one march, meeting or poster, but a series of strategic, interconnected, integrated activities designed to achieve a goal. Advocacy intervention should be: Strategic (planned action, not random); Involve a set of actions that are sustained in order to build pressure; Be designed to persuade; Be targeted and; Involve alliance building.	
Unit of Measure: Number of assisted CSOs	
Disaggregated by: Type of intervention and location. If and when applicable to the project's mandate, number of groups working on LGBTI issues, number of women's rights groups, number indigenous people's groups, number of disability rights organizations, number of groups working on religious freedom.	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator captures USG support to local civil society. Advocacy interventions are essential aspects of democratic policy making, citizen participation and oversight of all branches of government. These interventions play an important role in determining social justice, political and civil liberties, and in giving voice to citizens and marginalized groups. Advocacy expresses the power of an individual or organization to shape public agendas and change public policies. It is a critical means for citizens to express their needs and concerns to government.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: Project and grantee documents such as RFP to select the CSO, grant awarded to the CSO, advocacy plans or strategies, implementation plans, advocacy campaign materials, recording of press conference, technical report of activity, financial receipt of activity, sign-up sheets of supported activity, copy of testimony or press release	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by document review. The bid process is as follows: the project releases a Request for Proposal detailing the mandate and SOW required. Submissions from interested CSOs are open until a certain deadline. Once the deadline is reached, a selection committee from JSSP is established to study and score the submissions (technical and financial scoring) then select the winning CSO. A grant is then signed with the CSO that includes different information such as timeline for implementation and deliverables etc.	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review project documents to account for the number of supported-CSOs engaged in advocacy interventions	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Baseline is zero	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): o n 07/21/2017 by Edno Estigene and Gerard Fontain and on 10/11/2018 by Jean Lindor and Gerard Fontain.	

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: Project support to CSOs will make them self-sufficient by FY2020			
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will not target additional CSOs in out years			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	2	4	In FY2017, the project supported: (1) GREAS, (2) PAP Bar Association, (3) APM and (4) CHAIFEJ in in their advocacy efforts on code reform. These 4 CSOs analyzed the draft Codes and provided reports of their analysis that served as advocacy documents. Then they presented them to policy makers.
2018	2 (cumulative)	3	In FY2018, the project supported: (1) PAP Bar Association, (2) FBH (3) and CHAIFEJ in their advocacy efforts on code reform and on the law on the profession of lawyers.
2019	2 (cumulative)	3	In FY2019 JSSP supported 3 CSOs in implementing their advocacy plans on judicial guarantees (executed by AFASDA and RENDH in CH) and on the mechanisms of informal and its limits (executed by OFC in SM).
2020	2		
2021	0		
2022	3		
LOP	5		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet			
Indicator ID: 17			
Name of Indicator: Number of USG-assisted campaigns and programs to enhance public understanding, NGO support and media coverage of judicial independence and accountability			
Type of Indicator: Output			
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 4.1			
DESCRIPTION			
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the number of campaigns and programs financed and implemented by the project to enhance citizen understanding, encourage NGO support and media coverage of judicial independence and accountability. Campaigns include all organized outreach activities intended to build support for judicial independence and accountability. It could include but is not limited to: public meetings, roundtables, discussions, seminars, training sessions competitions and workshops. Media coverage range from electronic media to print media.			
Unit of Measure: Number of campaigns and programs			
Disaggregated by: Location and type of campaign			
Rationale for Indicator (optional): Public NGO and media understanding, and support are essential for meaningful and long-term viability of judicial system. This indicator shows USG level of effort in conducting outreach activities to achieve such support. An increase in the number of campaigns and programs suggests that USG support increases public understanding for the need of an independent and accountable judiciary which increases the checks and balances in a government and can decrease corruption.			
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION			
Data Source: Project records regarding campaigns and programs			
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by document review			
Reporting Frequency: Quarterly			
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR			
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING			
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will review project records to account for the number of campaigns and programs aiming at civic education of citizens			
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Quarterly Report			
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets			
Reporting of Data: Quarterly report			
TARGETS AND BASELINE			
Baseline Timeframe: 10/2016			
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably			
DATA QUALITY ISSUES			
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: Campaigns and programs, when not correctly branded, could threaten attribution to project			
Actions to address Data Limitations: Project will respect procedures for branding and marking			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note

2017	2	2	In FY2017 JSSP supported the training of CSOs court monitoring and launched the investigative journalism competition.
------	---	---	---

2018	2	7	In FY2018 JSSP supported the hot line on corruption, the award ceremony of journalists trained in FY2017, the FY2018 investigative journalism competition; the training of NGOs on justice sector advocacy, 2 programs on civic education in PAP, CDB, SM, CH and FL; and 1 court monitoring program in PAP and SM.
2019	2	3	In FY2019 JSSP supported 1 court monitoring program that was terminated. In addition, the project supported 2 civic education campaigns implemented by GREAS and RECIDP on judicial independence and other issues related to the judiciary.
2020	2		
2021	1		
2022	2		
LOP	11		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 18	
Name of Indicator: Change in level of confidence in the justice system	
Type of indicator: Outcome	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 4.1	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percentage of surveyed citizens who report trust in justice system and justice sector institutions. Results will be reported by jurisdiction and by total average. The comparison between the results of Y3 and Y4 and the baseline will show the change in level of confidence specifically the increase or decrease in trust. Numerator: Number of citizens who have trust in justice sector institutions Denominator: Number of respondents by jurisdiction	
Unit of Measure: Percentage	
Disaggregated by: Location and sex	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator captures the change in citizen's level of confidence in justice sector institutions as a result of JSSP activities, assuming that external factors do not deteriorate. Through USG supported activities, citizens have a better understanding of the justice system, how to access it and what to expect from it. These activities will not only help establish productive relationships between the judiciary and the public but will also increase the trust and confidence.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: General public	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by conducting a survey of individuals who benefitted from USG assistance or activities. To establish a figure against which JSSP will measure change in years 3 and 4, JSSP conducted in Year 2 a perception survey of beneficiaries of legal assistance (legal representation and mediation) from the 5 Legal aid offices supported by JSSP. Sixty individuals (49 men and 11 women) were reached by phone and interviewed on access to justice (cost/physical access) and quality of the process (including trust in the formal justice system). The following question was included: "I can state that I have trust in the justice system and institutions of my country"? Collected answers for "Agree" and "Totally Agree" are used to calculate the percentage who report trust. The same question will be asked in the survey to be conducted in Years 3 and 4.	
Reporting Frequency: Year 3 and Year 4	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze survey results	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Baseline is zero. Since the baseline is established before our interventions, change has not yet occurred thus the percentage who has increased confidence is zero. The perception survey mentioned above gave us a figure against which we can measure change in years 3 and 4. These figures are as follows: Average: 75%; Port-au-Prince 85.71%. Croix-des-Bouquets 100%. Saint-Marc 73.68%. Cap-Haitien 69.23%. Fort-Liberte 25%.	
Rationale for Targets: There are no targets for Year 1, Year 2 and Year 5 of the project. The targets are set for Year 3 and Year 4 to allow for enough USG level of effort to take place before measuring change in level of confidence in the justice system.	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	

Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A			
Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (optional): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years			
Known Data Limitations: Citizens could be reluctant and/or very influenced in answering this question.			
Actions to address Data Limitations: JSSP will explain what we mean by the following terms: “justice sector institutions”, “justice system” and “trust” to avoid errors in the responses.			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: The definition of the indicator was refined to better explain what is measured. Because of the ongoing socio/political/security crisis which began in 2018, courts were often partially operating or closed. Some related services such as legal assistance are also negatively impacted all together reducing access to justice and confidence in the justice system for citizens. Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	N/A	N/A	Results are collected in FY2019 and FY2020
2018	N/A	N/A	The survey related to this indicator will be conducted in FY19 and results will be reported then.
2019	30%	Average: 66%; Port-au-Prince 52.9% Saint-Marc 75% Cap-Haitien 60% Fort-Liberté 75%	In FY2019 JSSP conducted a perception survey of beneficiaries of legal assistance from the 4 Legal aid offices supported by JSSP (BAL). Sixty-five individuals (45 men and 20 women) were interviewed. The result of 66% shows an average increase in confidence in the 4 jurisdictions compared to the FY19 Target. In particular, in FL and SM, there is an increase in trust in justice sector institutions. While in CH and PAP there is a decrease in that trust.
2020	30%		
2021	N/A		
2022	30%		
LOP	30%		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

USAID Performance Indicator Reference Sheet	
Indicator ID: 19	
Name of Indicator: Percentage of USG-supported CSOs that show improved scores in the advocacy index	
Type of indicator: Outcome	
Name of Result Measured (DO, IR, sub-IR, Project Purpose, Project Outcome, Project Output, etc.): IR 4.2	
DESCRIPTION	
Precise Definition(s): This indicator measures the percentage of surveyed CSOs that have improved scores in the advocacy index, as a result of USG support. The advocacy index is a tool that serves to enable organizations to define and manage their capacity for advocacy and assists donor organizations in targeting specific areas of increased capacity. By “advocacy capacity,” we mean the organization’s systems, policies and values that enable the organization to raise public support and effect change in support of a cause or issue. JSSP created the Haiti Advocacy Index. The Advocacy Index relies on 5 advocacy components to be assessed for each CSO: (1) Design and develop an advocacy plan; (2) Conduct outreach activity; (3) Obtain Contact / Commitment from decision makers; (4) Build alliances and (5) Organize the collection, analysis and use of information. Numerator: Number of USG-supported CSOs that show improved scores in the advocacy index Denominator: Number of USG-supported CSOs	
Unit of Measure: Percentage	
Disaggregated by: Location	
Rationale for Indicator (optional): This indicator shows level of effort in strengthening the advocacy capacity of CSOs and measuring it using an international tool which is the Advocacy index.	
PLAN FOR DATA COLLECTION	
Data Source: USG-supported CSOs	
Method of Data Collection and Construction: Data will be collected by conducting an evaluation of USG-supported CSOs to measure their advocacy scores. JSSP developed the Advocacy index that relies on 5 advocacy components to be assessed for each CSO: (1) Design and develop an advocacy plan; (2) Conduct outreach activity; (3) Obtain Contact / Commitment from decision makers; (4) Build alliances and (5) Organize the collection, analysis and use of information. Each of the five (5) elements of the Advocacy Index is scored in ascending order of capacity, between 0 = no capacity, and 6 = excellent capacity / achievement with virtually no possibility of improvement. Scores of each CSO are entered in the database that was developed by JSSP and an average score will be obtained per CSO. Results of the evaluation conducted in FY2017 serve as baseline. They are the scores in the advocacy index against which we will measure improvement in Year 2. Improvement is measured from Year to Year.	
Reporting Frequency: Annual	
Individual(s) responsible at USAID: COR	
PLAN FOR ANALYSIS, REVIEW AND REPORTING	
Data analysis: The M&E advisor will analyze advocacy scoring from Year to Year using the database that was developed	
Presentation of Data: Data will be presented in the Annual Report	
Review of Data: M&E advisor and project management will review data to confirm fulfillment of indicator, compared against annual targets	
Reporting of Data: Annual report	
TARGETS AND BASELINE	
Baseline Timeframe: Results of the evaluation conducted in FY2017 serve as baseline. They are the CSO scores in the advocacy index against which we will measure improvement in Year 2. Baseline is as follows: RENEDH 3.1; AFASDA 1.8; MOTDEFAM 0.9; AFATN 0.7; RENDH 3.5; RFJS 1.8; RECIDP 2.9; CPD 2.5; Fondation Serovie 5.1; JILAP 1.2; GREAS 3.6; ACJU 1.3; CHCV 2.9 ; CASODI 2.7 ; MOUFHED 4.9 ; FEFBA 4.5	
Rationale for Targets: Based on anticipated level of effort for the first year of project implementation, the target is set reasonably.	
DATA QUALITY ISSUES	
Dates of Previous Data Quality Assessments and Name of Reviewer(s): N/A	

Date of Future Data Quality Assessments (<i>optional</i>): USAID requires DQA at least once every three years
--

Known Data Limitations: CSOs could be reluctant in having their advocacy efforts/activities evaluated every year			
Actions to address Data Limitations: The project will share with supported CSOs the advocacy index tool that will was designed by the project to suit the Haitian context			
CHANGES TO INDICATOR			
Changes to indicator: Target for Extension Year (February 2021 to February 2022) was added and LOP target was modified accordingly.			
PERFORMANCE INDICATOR VALUE			
Year	Target	Actual	Note
2017	+40%	N/A	In FY2017, JSSP conducted the evaluation of CSOs using the Advocacy index developed by the Project. Results serve as Baseline against which we will measure improvement in the next Fiscal year.
2018	+50%	84% RENEDH 3.2 AFASDA 4.6 RENDH 2.9 RFJS 4.5 RECIDP 3.6 CPD 3.4 Fondation Serovie 4.6 JILAP 2.8 GREAS 4 ACJU 3.1 CHCV 3.1 FEFBA 4.5 CASODI 4.9	Following an evaluation based on the Advocacy Index, 11 out of 13 supported CSOs (corresponding to 84%) showed improved scores in the index from FY17 to FY18.
2019	+50%	79% RENEDH 4.2; AFASDA 4.9; RENDH 3.8; RFJS 4.9; RECIDP 5.5; CPD 4.42; Fondation Serovie 4.5; JILAP 2.9; GREAS 3.8; ACJU 3.4; CHCV 1.9 ; FEFBA 4.5 ; CASODI 5.1 ; OFC 3.8	Following an evaluation based on the Advocacy Index conducted in QR4, 11 out of 14 supported CSOs (corresponding to 79%) showed improved scores in the index from FY18 to FY19.
2020	+50%		
2021	+50%		
2022	+50%		
LOP	+50%		
Other Notes (optional): N/A			
THIS SHEET LAST UPDATED ON: 08/14/2020			

Annex III: Learning Plan

Learning Event	Participants	Responsible Party	When it occurs	Resources needed	Knowledge Capture	Knowledge Share	Notes
<i>Weekly report</i>	All technical staff and senior leadership contribute	COP and communication advisor	Weekly inputs are due to communication advisor on Thursday COB	Weekly report	Report on drive	USAID, PMU, Technical team	Feeds into quarterly report
<i>Component-based assessments</i>	Senior leadership (COP/DCOP/Senior Program advisor) and Objective staff	Objective Lead	Quarterly	Data; external resources for upcoming prep	Quarterly report	USAID, PMU	Feeds into quarterly review
<i>Quarterly reviews</i>	All technical staff and senior leadership contribute	Senior leadership	At close of quarter	Data	Quarterly report and PMP table	USAID, PMU	Discuss previous project lessons learned as an initial topic
<i>Status of progress of MOU with partners</i>	Senior leadership and Objective staff/lead	Senior leadership	Depends on MOU	Data	MOU on drive	Counterparts, USAID, HO, Technical team	
<i>Staff retreat</i>	All staff	Senior leadership	Annual	Venue, food, facilitator	Annual report; provides a basis for work plan	USAID, HO; annual report is available to public	

October 30, 2019

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

					for upcoming year		
<i>Periodic evaluations</i>	Technical staff, grantees, counterparts	External consultant	At end of project years 2 and 3	LOE for external consultant; tools	Evaluation report	USAID, HO, Technical team, counterparts	Perhaps parts with counterparts

To ensure project learning, JSSP staff participated in a session to identify potential learning opportunities. Staff will benefit from dedicated time to review and discuss the data that is being collected and apply it to upcoming activities, correcting design and implementation steps as needed. Staff will also benefit from the opportunity to consider upcoming activities and what they need to learn to best support anticipated tasks. This matrix identifies the types of learning events that staff discussed.

Chronologically, the events are as follows:

1. Senior technical staff contribute by component to the weekly report, which is compiled by the communication advisor and the COP and sent to USAID, the home office (HO), and all technical staff. Weekly inputs are due to the COP and communication advisor by Thursday COB. The final weekly report is sent out on Monday.
2. Component based assessments: In the last week of each quarter, Senior leadership (COP/DCOP/Senior Program advisor) and Objective staff meet to review, interpret, and discuss the data from that quarter, answer the questions below. Their assessment of the component feeds into the quarterly review. During the component assessment, staff identify topics they would like to learn more about to help them better support project activities and develop a plan to acquire that knowledge, including events, resources, and experts who could be of assistance.
3. Quarterly reviews are held the first week following the close of the quarterly. Senior staff contribute in presenting their findings in the quarterly review, allowing for efficient analysis of data and discussion about project processes and results. The Quarterly report and related PMP table will be sent to USAID, and PMU.
4. Status of progress of MOUs are held with partners to track the progress of MOU activities. Senior leadership and Objective staff/lead participate in the exercise.
5. Staff retreats would be held annually, reviewing the data from the previous year and generating lessons learned on process and outcomes, in preparation for work planning of the upcoming year, and annual report of the current year.
6. The project will be evaluated by an independent group midway through the contract and at the end of year 3. Conducting an internal evaluation at the end of years 2 and 3 prepare the project for the upcoming evaluations, allowing time to ensure files are in order, data is gathered and available, and as well as help staff think about structure and direction of activities to best achieve results in the project's remaining time.

Sample questions

Looking back:

8. What result was intended? (output and outcome)
9. How long did it take? (what were the steps involved)
10. How much did it cost? (expenditures, staff time, counterpart time)
11. What was accomplished? (how does this fit within our scope of work)
12. What was the client's reaction? Counterpart's reaction? Home office reaction?
13. What unintended consequences were created?
14. What is the most significant change that was generated during the past quarter/year?

Looking forward:

6. What are our upcoming intended results and their activities?
7. What do we need to know about them?
8. What resources do we need to be effective with our activities?
9. What experts/outside events can we take advantage of to learn?
10. What measures can we take to ensure that our activities are sustainable?

Other question format:

- *Who* will achieve a given change or accomplish a given task?
- *What* will change or be accomplished through that effort?
- *When* will the change or accomplishment occur?
- *How much* change will occur, or what will the level of accomplishment be?
- *How do we know* that the change or the accomplishment has occurred?