

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION

	Quantitative	Qualitative <i>EXs of Participatory Focus Groups (Men, Women, Youth, Traditional Auth/Local Govt)</i>
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of schools built • Number of teachers hired • Volume of supplies acquired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of schools and teachers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the new school meet local cultural concerns? Is the school located in a safe place for children (especially girls) to walk to and from? b. Does the school have a separate bathroom for girls and boys? c. Is the teacher abusive? Are students treated fairly regardless of family status? d. Does the teacher show up everyday? e. Is the curriculum culturally appropriate? Consistent w state-funded schools?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in access to education • % change in grade completion • Number of youth hired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and usefulness of education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the school provide skills children need to work locally, eg, agriculture? b. Does the school prepare youth to compete for scholarships to enter the next level? c. Has the company school freed up govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity of links to employment or higher education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. change in number of graduating students who went on to formal employment or higher education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to employment or higher education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in implementation and monitoring b. How many young people have secured local jobs vs how many have decided to move away? c. How many graduates were hired by the company and made higher income? d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment affected by relations with community stakeholder groups impacted by school <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. increased productivity due to better skilled/more literate workforce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ Changes in vandalism rates of company property • Quality of relations between the company and local government or traditional authorities • Effects on company's social license to operate.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN COMMUNITY HEALTH (AND SAFETY)

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process of the health care program
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of clinics/hospitals built. • Number of doctors/nurses hired. • Number of local health assistants hired or volunteering. • Volume of medical supplies acquired (vaccines, beds...). • Number of company workers/community members trained in safety classes. • Number of outreach/educational events (eg HIV, domestic violence) • Number of participants in events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of clinics and staff <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Level of medical qualifications of the staff? b. Does the new clinic respond to local medical priorities/concerns? c. Does the clinic have female workers to treat women/girls if culturally appropriate? d. Is the staff welcoming vs. disrespectful to users? e. Are patients treated fairly regardless of socio-economic status? f. Does the doctor/nurse report for duty as scheduled? g. Is the medical advice culturally appropriate? h. Is the recommended treatment available on site? i. Does the company treat safety as a community-wide issue?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in access to healthcare by gender and age group. • % change in users of prevention services (ie, prenatal care, HIV awareness) by gender and age. • % change in # of people treated (ie, immunizations, HIV counseling, malaria medication) by gender... • Rates of repetitive service use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of health care provided <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the clinic provide preventive care services (counseling) and products (immunizations/mosquito nets) consistent with urgent needs of the community? b. Are the recommendations/info provided adapted to the local culture to be user-friendly? c. Does the clinic provide effective treatment for common ailments/diseases? Volume and consistency of anecdotal evidence? d. Do users return to the clinic for additional services because they consider it high quality or because there is no viable alternative for treatment? e. Has the company clinic freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in health (malaria) /safety (car accidents) of various community groups. • Related effects on livelihoods and welfare stemming from better health and safety among workers and community-at-large. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved community health and safety <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in implementation and monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in health and safety? c. Degree to which community attributes/gives credits for changes in health and safety to company interventions (by gender, age, ethnic group). d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/productivity affected by better worker and community health. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Absenteeism due to illness/injury or caring for a sick family member b. Improved job performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.
--	--	--

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN LOCAL INCOME GENERATION/ LIVELIHOODS/ SUPPLY CHAIN

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on developing local business skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process of the income generation/livelihoods program
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of local people employed directly by company/ % of total employment at different job-skill levels? • # of local apprentices hired or volunteering. • # of direct and indirect youth employed (male vs female). • # of classes/programs offered by company related to jobs and livelihoods both within and beyond the company business. • # of new finance products introduced. • # of supply chain development programs established during the year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of direct and indirect employment/livelihood opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Frequency/quality of attempts to incorporate land/ property rights in negotiations with communities. b. Quality and pay of jobs accessible to female and/or youth workers? c. Is the employee selection process fair regardless of socio-economic or political status? d. Is the job training program relevant for company employment and/or other types of work? e. Is the job training program culturally appropriate for males and females? Content, time and place offered? f. Are job training teachers/mentors respectful/enthusiastic when working with diverse community members? g. Does the job training program build trust and familiarity between company and community? h. Do microentrepreneurs receive the preparation and supports they need to be successful? Are the risks fully understood by participating entrepreneurs? i. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in local supply chain development?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in direct employment rates (by gender and age) • % change in rates of participation in job/livelihood training programs. • Rates of trainees employed by company or other viable livelihoods including supply chain. • # and value of microloans disbursed to people or enterprises. • Total purchases (US\$) from local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of jobs and training provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the company provide jobs and wages that are better quality than other livelihood options? b. Do employees and their families feel better off than they were before being hired by the company? c. Are there trade offs between income vs health/safety/culture/other? d. Is there any community tension over who gets the company jobs and who does not? e. What is the quality of alternative livelihoods discussed in company-sponsored job training? f. Do alternative livelihood families feel better off than before? g. Have people come from outside the community for jobs and supply chain opportunities? h. Are there any negative effects either from specific types of indirect employment spurred by

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> suppliers by company. # of new businesses vendors registered. # of new vendors supporting mine activities. 	<p>company's presence or from external migration into the community?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % income change among direct employees. Related effects on household and community welfare stemming from new jobs. % change in quantity of workers engaged in alternative livelihoods endorsed by company, including local supply chain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of links to improved jobs, income, welfare: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in livelihood program implementation and monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? c. Degree to which community attributes changes in income and welfare to company interventions (direct hiring, supply chains, and support to alternative livelihoods). d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? e. Degree to which company legacy and long-term livelihood issues are addressed?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improved job performance through training b. Savings from local supply chain (less importing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. Effects on company's social license to operate. Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on infrastructure improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the infrastructure improvement program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is infrastructure prioritized/designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females?
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % change in male and female access to safe drinking water, paved roads, transport...). # or volume of roads built, clean wells provided... # of local people hired to build infrastructure (by gender and age). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of quality of infrastructure investments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the type and quality of services provided appropriate for the local communities to use and maintain? b. Is the location of infrastructure/services fair regarding socio-economic or political status of community members? c. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in maintaining infrastructure and services?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of other markets opened up as result 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community perception of quality and effectiveness of jobs and training provided:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of new infrastructure (roads, power). # of households using and helping to maintain new services (water, roads). % change in local content in supply chain due to better infrastructure. # of new businesses registered related to new infrastructure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the community feel better off than before the infrastructure investments were made? Is there any community tension over which services are provided and who has the best access/proximity? Have alternative livelihoods been bolstered by additional infrastructure (ie transport to markets, etc.)? Have people come from outside the community to benefit from new infrastructure and services? Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects? How will the projects be maintained over time? Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % change in health, education, safety, livelihoods status related to infrastructure investments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of links to improved health, safety, communication and welfare: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in service implementation and monitoring? Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? Degree to which community attributes changes in welfare to company interventions? Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Direct business benefits from power, roads... Indirect benefits from healthier, safer workers and their families. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. Effects on company's social license to operate. Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN LOCAL CAPACITY BUILDING

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on awareness and skill building. # and type of staff employed by company to conduct capacity building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the capacity building program. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Who was consulted when selecting areas for capacity building? Are local skills and knowledge contributing to the design as assets to be shared across stakeholder groups?
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # training events or meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of quality of capacity investments:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of participants (community) trained. • # of change agents identified. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the type of training relevant for the local communities? Is training prioritized/designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females? Is training access fair regarding socio-economic or political status of community members? Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in selecting the capacity building priorities? Quality and demographics of change agents identified.
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of participants giving high rating on self-assessed knowledge/skills gained (level 1 evaluation) • % of participants who pass a test on material covered during the course (level 2 evaluation) • # of new local organizations reached through awareness raising, workshops, training. • % change in local content in supply chain due to better knowledge, skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of capacity building provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the community feel better off than before the capacity investments were made? Is there any community tension over who received training and on what topics? Have alternative livelihoods been bolstered by additional knowledge, skills, networks? Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects? How will the knowledge and networks be maintained over time? Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of participants/organizations reporting change in practices after training (level 3 evaluation). • evidence of a) raised awareness, b) facilitated consensus/teamwork, c) formulated policy/strategy, d) implemented strategy/plan, e) enhanced skills and/or f) fostered networks. EX: change in number of women in leadership position in the village/community level. • Evidence of a) improved enabling environment, b) changed institutions and policies and/or c) enhanced organizational resources leveraged. • % change in health, education, safety, livelihoods or revenue management related to capacity investments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved knowledge, skills, actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in capacity building implementation and monitoring? Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? Extent to which community groups report using new awareness, skills, networks to support other private or community initiatives? Degree to which community attributes changes in welfare to company capacity development interventions? Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
Company's Return on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community.

Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Direct business benefits from enhanced local skills, knowledge, networks... b. Indirect benefits from increased trust and shared understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.
-------------------	---	---

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time and money spent on collaboration with community beginning in exploration phase • # of short-term consultants vs long-term staff employed by company to build and maintain local relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the capacity building program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Who was consulted when selecting topics, timing, participants, format for public events? b. Are local skills and knowledge contributing to the design as assets to be shared across stakeholder groups? (Information not just flowing one-way but in multi-directions.) c. Attitudes and qualifications of staff hired to engage w local stakeholders
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # public events held to exchange info • # of participants at public events. • # of local change agents/champions identified both within the company and within the community. • Frequency of information shared across stakeholder groups. • Availability of company reps to meet with community groups/ time taken to set up a mtg requested by community. • Existence or changes in dispute resolution mechanisms. • # of new committees formed to improve communications and/or accountability • # of company reps and local people trained in stakeholder engagement techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of stakeholder engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the type of public event, including topics and info, relevant for the local communities? b. Is the event designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females? c. Community perception of benefit from the mining project? d. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in selecting priority areas for stakeholder engagement? e. Accessibility of information shared across stakeholder groups (language, format, placement) f. Community perception of whether the company has planned for mine closure and anticipated effects on local population? g. Quality and demographics of change agents/engagement champions identified within company, community and local govt? h. Community/local govt perception of dispute resolution mechanisms?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of participants giving high rating to quality of public events and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of capacity building provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the community feel better off than before the engagement process?

	<p>information campaigns (level 1 eval).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of new local organizations reached through awareness raising, workshops, training. • Frequency of tripartite negotiations re projects bw govt, comm., company • # of reps from vulnerable groups included in communications and negotiations with company • Change in levels of trust between company and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Is there any community tension over who was engaged and on what topics? c. How will the exchange and relationships be maintained over time? d. Will there be institutionalized mechanisms for ongoing engagement and dialogue? e. Perceived quality and transparency of tripartite negotiations. f. Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon? g. Perceived responsiveness and trustworthiness of site management? h. Qualitative feedback from stakeholder groups/self-reported stakeholder satisfaction with engagement re closure issues? i. Degree of inclusion of local actors in monitoring company's community development strategies. j. Level of empowerment/voice felt by community through direct engagement in design and monitoring processes.
<p>Development Impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in levels of trust between community and company. • Evidence of a) raised awareness, b) facilitated consensus/ teamwork, c) formulated policy/strategy, d) implemented strategy/plan, e) enhanced skills and/or f) fostered networks. • Evidence of a) improved enabling environment, b) changed institutions and policies and/or c) enhanced organizational resources leveraged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved knowledge, skills, actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in decision-making and operation monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? c. Degree to which community attributes positive gains from engagement with company? d. Did the process change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? e. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. f. Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
<p>Company's Return on Investment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Change in frequency/duration of work stoppages, theft against company, sabotage b. Indirect benefits from increased trust, shared understanding, accurate information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of security as reported by company staff when in communities/ Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. • Disproportionate negative reactions by community or company compared w/ nature of the specific incident (accident, layoffs, vandalism). • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION

	Quantitative	Qualitative <i>EXs of Participatory Focus Groups (Men, Women, Youth, Traditional Auth/Local Govt)</i>
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of schools built • Number of teachers hired • Volume of supplies acquired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of schools and teachers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the new school meet local cultural concerns? Is the school located in a safe place for children (especially girls) to walk to and from? b. Does the school have a separate bathroom for girls and boys? c. Is the teacher abusive? Are students treated fairly regardless of family status? d. Does the teacher show up everyday? e. Is the curriculum culturally appropriate? Consistent w state-funded schools?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in access to education • % change in grade completion • Number of youth hired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and usefulness of education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the school provide skills children need to work locally, eg, agriculture? b. Does the school prepare youth to compete for scholarships to enter the next level? c. Has the company school freed up govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity of links to employment or higher education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. change in number of graduating students who went on to formal employment or higher education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to employment or higher education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in implementation and monitoring b. How many young people have secured local jobs vs how many have decided to move away? c. How many graduates were hired by the company and made higher income? d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment affected by relations with community stakeholder groups impacted by school <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. increased productivity due to better skilled/more literate workforce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ Changes in vandalism rates of company property • Quality of relations between the company and local government or traditional authorities • Effects on company's social license to operate.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN COMMUNITY HEALTH (AND SAFETY)

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process of the health care program
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of clinics/hospitals built. • Number of doctors/nurses hired. • Number of local health assistants hired or volunteering. • Volume of medical supplies acquired (vaccines, beds...). • Number of company workers/community members trained in safety classes. • Number of outreach/educational events (eg HIV, domestic violence) • Number of participants in events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of clinics and staff <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Level of medical qualifications of the staff? b. Does the new clinic respond to local medical priorities/concerns? c. Does the clinic have female workers to treat women/girls if culturally appropriate? d. Is the staff welcoming vs. disrespectful to users? e. Are patients treated fairly regardless of socio-economic status? f. Does the doctor/nurse report for duty as scheduled? g. Is the medical advice culturally appropriate? h. Is the recommended treatment available on site? i. Does the company treat safety as a community-wide issue?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in access to healthcare by gender and age group. • % change in users of prevention services (ie, prenatal care, HIV awareness) by gender and age. • % change in # of people treated (ie, immunizations, HIV counseling, malaria medication) by gender... • Rates of repetitive service use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of health care provided <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the clinic provide preventive care services (counseling) and products (immunizations/mosquito nets) consistent with urgent needs of the community? b. Are the recommendations/info provided adapted to the local culture to be user-friendly? c. Does the clinic provide effective treatment for common ailments/diseases? Volume and consistency of anecdotal evidence? d. Do users return to the clinic for additional services because they consider it high quality or because there is no viable alternative for treatment? e. Has the company clinic freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in health (malaria) /safety (car accidents) of various community groups. • Related effects on livelihoods and welfare stemming from better health and safety among workers and community-at-large. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved community health and safety <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in implementation and monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in health and safety? c. Degree to which community attributes/gives credits for changes in health and safety to company interventions (by gender, age, ethnic group). d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/productivity affected by better worker and community health. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Absenteeism due to illness/injury or caring for a sick family member b. Improved job performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.
--	--

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN LOCAL INCOME GENERATION/ LIVELIHOODS/ SUPPLY CHAIN

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on developing local business skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process of the income generation/livelihoods program
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of local people employed directly by company/ % of total employment at different job-skill levels? • # of local apprentices hired or volunteering. • # of direct and indirect youth employed (male vs female). • # of classes/programs offered by company related to jobs and livelihoods both within and beyond the company business. • # of new finance products introduced. • # of supply chain development programs established during the year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of direct and indirect employment/livelihood opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Frequency/quality of attempts to incorporate land/ property rights in negotiations with communities. b. Quality and pay of jobs accessible to female and/or youth workers? c. Is the employee selection process fair regardless of socio-economic or political status? d. Is the job training program relevant for company employment and/or other types of work? e. Is the job training program culturally appropriate for males and females? Content, time and place offered? f. Are job training teachers/mentors respectful/enthusiastic when working with diverse community members? g. Does the job training program build trust and familiarity between company and community? h. Do microentrepreneurs receive the preparation and supports they need to be successful? Are the risks fully understood by participating entrepreneurs? i. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in local supply chain development?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in direct employment rates (by gender and age) • % change in rates of participation in job/livelihood training programs. • Rates of trainees employed by company or other viable livelihoods including supply chain. • # and value of microloans disbursed to people or enterprises. • Total purchases (US\$) from local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of jobs and training provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the company provide jobs and wages that are better quality than other livelihood options? b. Do employees and their families feel better off than they were before being hired by the company? c. Are there trade offs between income vs health/safety/culture/other? d. Is there any community tension over who gets the company jobs and who does not? e. What is the quality of alternative livelihoods discussed in company-sponsored job training? f. Do alternative livelihood families feel better off than before? g. Have people come from outside the community for jobs and supply chain opportunities? h. Are there any negative effects either from specific types of indirect employment spurred by

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> suppliers by company. # of new businesses vendors registered. # of new vendors supporting mine activities. 	<p>company's presence or from external migration into the community?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % income change among direct employees. Related effects on household and community welfare stemming from new jobs. % change in quantity of workers engaged in alternative livelihoods endorsed by company, including local supply chain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of links to improved jobs, income, welfare: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in livelihood program implementation and monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? c. Degree to which community attributes changes in income and welfare to company interventions (direct hiring, supply chains, and support to alternative livelihoods). d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? e. Degree to which company legacy and long-term livelihood issues are addressed?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improved job performance through training b. Savings from local supply chain (less importing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. Effects on company's social license to operate. Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on infrastructure improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the infrastructure improvement program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is infrastructure prioritized/ designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females?
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % change in male and female access to safe drinking water, paved roads, transport...). # or volume of roads built, clean wells provided... # of local people hired to build infrastructure (by gender and age). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of quality of infrastructure investments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the type and quality of services provided appropriate for the local communities to use and maintain? b. Is the location of infrastructure/services fair regarding socio-economic or political status of community members? c. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in maintaining infrastructure and services?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of other markets opened up as result 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community perception of quality and effectiveness of jobs and training provided:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of new infrastructure (roads, power). # of households using and helping to maintain new services (water, roads). % change in local content in supply chain due to better infrastructure. # of new businesses registered related to new infrastructure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the community feel better off than before the infrastructure investments were made? Is there any community tension over which services are provided and who has the best access/proximity? Have alternative livelihoods been bolstered by additional infrastructure (ie transport to markets, etc.)? Have people come from outside the community to benefit from new infrastructure and services? Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects? How will the projects be maintained over time? Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % change in health, education, safety, livelihoods status related to infrastructure investments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of links to improved health, safety, communication and welfare: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in service implementation and monitoring? Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? Degree to which community attributes changes in welfare to company interventions? Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Direct business benefits from power, roads... Indirect benefits from healthier, safer workers and their families. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. Effects on company's social license to operate. Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN LOCAL CAPACITY BUILDING

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on awareness and skill building. # and type of staff employed by company to conduct capacity building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the capacity building program. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Who was consulted when selecting areas for capacity building? Are local skills and knowledge contributing to the design as assets to be shared across stakeholder groups?
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # training events or meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of quality of capacity investments:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of participants (community) trained. • # of change agents identified. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the type of training relevant for the local communities? Is training prioritized/designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females? Is training access fair regarding socio-economic or political status of community members? Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in selecting the capacity building priorities? Quality and demographics of change agents identified.
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of participants giving high rating on self-assessed knowledge/skills gained (level 1 evaluation) • % of participants who pass a test on material covered during the course (level 2 evaluation) • # of new local organizations reached through awareness raising, workshops, training. • % change in local content in supply chain due to better knowledge, skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of capacity building provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the community feel better off than before the capacity investments were made? Is there any community tension over who received training and on what topics? Have alternative livelihoods been bolstered by additional knowledge, skills, networks? Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects? How will the knowledge and networks be maintained over time? Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of participants/organizations reporting change in practices after training (level 3 evaluation). • evidence of a) raised awareness, b) facilitated consensus/teamwork, c) formulated policy/strategy, d) implemented strategy/plan, e) enhanced skills and/or f) fostered networks. EX: change in number of women in leadership position in the village/community level. • Evidence of a) improved enabling environment, b) changed institutions and policies and/or c) enhanced organizational resources leveraged. • % change in health, education, safety, livelihoods or revenue management related to capacity investments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved knowledge, skills, actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in capacity building implementation and monitoring? Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? Extent to which community groups report using new awareness, skills, networks to support other private or community initiatives? Degree to which community attributes changes in welfare to company capacity development interventions? Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
Company's Return on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community.

Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Direct business benefits from enhanced local skills, knowledge, networks... b. Indirect benefits from increased trust and shared understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.
-------------------	---	---

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time and money spent on collaboration with community beginning in exploration phase • # of short-term consultants vs long-term staff employed by company to build and maintain local relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the capacity building program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Who was consulted when selecting topics, timing, participants, format for public events? b. Are local skills and knowledge contributing to the design as assets to be shared across stakeholder groups? (Information not just flowing one-way but in multi-directions.) c. Attitudes and qualifications of staff hired to engage w local stakeholders
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # public events held to exchange info • # of participants at public events. • # of local change agents/champions identified both within the company and within the community. • Frequency of information shared across stakeholder groups. • Availability of company reps to meet with community groups/ time taken to set up a mtg requested by community. • Existence or changes in dispute resolution mechanisms. • # of new committees formed to improve communications and/or accountability • # of company reps and local people trained in stakeholder engagement techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of stakeholder engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the type of public event, including topics and info, relevant for the local communities? b. Is the event designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females? c. Community perception of benefit from the mining project? d. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in selecting priority areas for stakeholder engagement? e. Accessibility of information shared across stakeholder groups (language, format, placement) f. Community perception of whether the company has planned for mine closure and anticipated effects on local population? g. Quality and demographics of change agents/engagement champions identified within company, community and local govt? h. Community/local govt perception of dispute resolution mechanisms?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of participants giving high rating to quality of public events and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of capacity building provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the community feel better off than before the engagement process?

	<p>information campaigns (level 1 eval).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of new local organizations reached through awareness raising, workshops, training. • Frequency of tripartite negotiations re projects bw govt, comm., company • # of reps from vulnerable groups included in communications and negotiations with company • Change in levels of trust between company and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Is there any community tension over who was engaged and on what topics? c. How will the exchange and relationships be maintained over time? d. Will there be institutionalized mechanisms for ongoing engagement and dialogue? e. Perceived quality and transparency of tripartite negotiations. f. Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon? g. Perceived responsiveness and trustworthiness of site management? h. Qualitative feedback from stakeholder groups/self-reported stakeholder satisfaction with engagement re closure issues? i. Degree of inclusion of local actors in monitoring company's community development strategies. j. Level of empowerment/voice felt by community through direct engagement in design and monitoring processes.
<p>Development Impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in levels of trust between community and company. • Evidence of a) raised awareness, b) facilitated consensus/ teamwork, c) formulated policy/strategy, d) implemented strategy/plan, e) enhanced skills and/or f) fostered networks. • Evidence of a) improved enabling environment, b) changed institutions and policies and/or c) enhanced organizational resources leveraged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved knowledge, skills, actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in decision-making and operation monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? c. Degree to which community attributes positive gains from engagement with company? d. Did the process change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? e. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. f. Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
<p>Company's Return on Investment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Change in frequency/duration of work stoppages, theft against company, sabotage b. Indirect benefits from increased trust, shared understanding, accurate information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of security as reported by company staff when in communities/ Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. • Disproportionate negative reactions by community or company compared w/ nature of the specific incident (accident, layoffs, vandalism). • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN COMMUNITY EDUCATION

	Quantitative	Qualitative <i>EXs of Participatory Focus Groups (Men, Women, Youth, Traditional Auth/Local Govt)</i>
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of schools built • Number of teachers hired • Volume of supplies acquired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of schools and teachers <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the new school meet local cultural concerns? Is the school located in a safe place for children (especially girls) to walk to and from? b. Does the school have a separate bathroom for girls and boys? c. Is the teacher abusive? Are students treated fairly regardless of family status? d. Does the teacher show up everyday? e. Is the curriculum culturally appropriate? Consistent w state-funded schools?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in access to education • % change in grade completion • Number of youth hired 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and usefulness of education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the school provide skills children need to work locally, eg, agriculture? b. Does the school prepare youth to compete for scholarships to enter the next level? c. Has the company school freed up govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quantity of links to employment or higher education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. change in number of graduating students who went on to formal employment or higher education 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to employment or higher education <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in implementation and monitoring b. How many young people have secured local jobs vs how many have decided to move away? c. How many graduates were hired by the company and made higher income? d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment affected by relations with community stakeholder groups impacted by school <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. increased productivity due to better skilled/more literate workforce 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ Changes in vandalism rates of company property • Quality of relations between the company and local government or traditional authorities • Effects on company's social license to operate.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN COMMUNITY HEALTH (AND SAFETY)

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process of the health care program
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of clinics/hospitals built. • Number of doctors/nurses hired. • Number of local health assistants hired or volunteering. • Volume of medical supplies acquired (vaccines, beds...). • Number of company workers/community members trained in safety classes. • Number of outreach/educational events (eg HIV, domestic violence) • Number of participants in events 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of clinics and staff <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Level of medical qualifications of the staff? b. Does the new clinic respond to local medical priorities/concerns? c. Does the clinic have female workers to treat women/girls if culturally appropriate? d. Is the staff welcoming vs. disrespectful to users? e. Are patients treated fairly regardless of socio-economic status? f. Does the doctor/nurse report for duty as scheduled? g. Is the medical advice culturally appropriate? h. Is the recommended treatment available on site? i. Does the company treat safety as a community-wide issue?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in access to healthcare by gender and age group. • % change in users of prevention services (ie, prenatal care, HIV awareness) by gender and age. • % change in # of people treated (ie, immunizations, HIV counseling, malaria medication) by gender... • Rates of repetitive service use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of health care provided <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the clinic provide preventive care services (counseling) and products (immunizations/mosquito nets) consistent with urgent needs of the community? b. Are the recommendations/info provided adapted to the local culture to be user-friendly? c. Does the clinic provide effective treatment for common ailments/diseases? Volume and consistency of anecdotal evidence? d. Do users return to the clinic for additional services because they consider it high quality or because there is no viable alternative for treatment? e. Has the company clinic freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in health (malaria) /safety (car accidents) of various community groups. • Related effects on livelihoods and welfare stemming from better health and safety among workers and community-at-large. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved community health and safety <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in implementation and monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in health and safety? c. Degree to which community attributes/gives credits for changes in health and safety to company interventions (by gender, age, ethnic group). d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/productivity affected by better worker and community health. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Absenteeism due to illness/injury or caring for a sick family member b. Improved job performance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.
--	--

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN LOCAL INCOME GENERATION/ LIVELIHOODS/ SUPPLY CHAIN

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on developing local business skills 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in design process of the income generation/livelihoods program
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of local people employed directly by company/ % of total employment at different job-skill levels? • # of local apprentices hired or volunteering. • # of direct and indirect youth employed (male vs female). • # of classes/programs offered by company related to jobs and livelihoods both within and beyond the company business. • # of new finance products introduced. • # of supply chain development programs established during the year 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of direct and indirect employment/livelihood opportunities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Frequency/quality of attempts to incorporate land/ property rights in negotiations with communities. b. Quality and pay of jobs accessible to female and/or youth workers? c. Is the employee selection process fair regardless of socio-economic or political status? d. Is the job training program relevant for company employment and/or other types of work? e. Is the job training program culturally appropriate for males and females? Content, time and place offered? f. Are job training teachers/mentors respectful/enthusiastic when working with diverse community members? g. Does the job training program build trust and familiarity between company and community? h. Do microentrepreneurs receive the preparation and supports they need to be successful? Are the risks fully understood by participating entrepreneurs? i. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in local supply chain development?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % change in direct employment rates (by gender and age) • % change in rates of participation in job/livelihood training programs. • Rates of trainees employed by company or other viable livelihoods including supply chain. • # and value of microloans disbursed to people or enterprises. • Total purchases (US\$) from local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of jobs and training provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the company provide jobs and wages that are better quality than other livelihood options? b. Do employees and their families feel better off than they were before being hired by the company? c. Are there trade offs between income vs health/safety/culture/other? d. Is there any community tension over who gets the company jobs and who does not? e. What is the quality of alternative livelihoods discussed in company-sponsored job training? f. Do alternative livelihood families feel better off than before? g. Have people come from outside the community for jobs and supply chain opportunities? h. Are there any negative effects either from specific types of indirect employment spurred by

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> suppliers by company. # of new businesses vendors registered. # of new vendors supporting mine activities. 	<p>company's presence or from external migration into the community?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % income change among direct employees. Related effects on household and community welfare stemming from new jobs. % change in quantity of workers engaged in alternative livelihoods endorsed by company, including local supply chain. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of links to improved jobs, income, welfare: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in livelihood program implementation and monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? c. Degree to which community attributes changes in income and welfare to company interventions (direct hiring, supply chains, and support to alternative livelihoods). d. Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? e. Degree to which company legacy and long-term livelihood issues are addressed?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Improved job performance through training b. Savings from local supply chain (less importing) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. Effects on company's social license to operate. Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN INFRASTRUCTURE & SERVICES

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money spent (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on infrastructure improvements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the infrastructure improvement program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is infrastructure prioritized/designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females?
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % change in male and female access to safe drinking water, paved roads, transport...). # or volume of roads built, clean wells provided... # of local people hired to build infrastructure (by gender and age). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of quality of infrastructure investments: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the type and quality of services provided appropriate for the local communities to use and maintain? b. Is the location of infrastructure/services fair regarding socio-economic or political status of community members? c. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in maintaining infrastructure and services?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # of other markets opened up as result 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community perception of quality and effectiveness of jobs and training provided:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> of new infrastructure (roads, power). # of households using and helping to maintain new services (water, roads). % change in local content in supply chain due to better infrastructure. # of new businesses registered related to new infrastructure. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the community feel better off than before the infrastructure investments were made? Is there any community tension over which services are provided and who has the best access/proximity? Have alternative livelihoods been bolstered by additional infrastructure (ie transport to markets, etc.)? Have people come from outside the community to benefit from new infrastructure and services? Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects? How will the projects be maintained over time? Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> % change in health, education, safety, livelihoods status related to infrastructure investments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Quality of links to improved health, safety, communication and welfare: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in service implementation and monitoring? Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? Degree to which community attributes changes in welfare to company interventions? Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
Company's Return on Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Direct business benefits from power, roads... Indirect benefits from healthier, safer workers and their families. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. Effects on company's social license to operate. Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN LOCAL CAPACITY BUILDING

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Money (and value of in-kind contributions) spent on awareness and skill building. # and type of staff employed by company to conduct capacity building. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the capacity building program. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Who was consulted when selecting areas for capacity building? Are local skills and knowledge contributing to the design as assets to be shared across stakeholder groups?
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> # training events or meetings. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of quality of capacity investments:

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of participants (community) trained. • # of change agents identified. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is the type of training relevant for the local communities? Is training prioritized/designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females? Is training access fair regarding socio-economic or political status of community members? Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in selecting the capacity building priorities? Quality and demographics of change agents identified.
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of participants giving high rating on self-assessed knowledge/skills gained (level 1 evaluation) • % of participants who pass a test on material covered during the course (level 2 evaluation) • # of new local organizations reached through awareness raising, workshops, training. • % change in local content in supply chain due to better knowledge, skills. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of capacity building provided: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Does the community feel better off than before the capacity investments were made? Is there any community tension over who received training and on what topics? Have alternative livelihoods been bolstered by additional knowledge, skills, networks? Has the company program freed up community or govt resources for other needed projects? How will the knowledge and networks be maintained over time? Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon?
Development Impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of participants/organizations reporting change in practices after training (level 3 evaluation). • evidence of a) raised awareness, b) facilitated consensus/teamwork, c) formulated policy/strategy, d) implemented strategy/plan, e) enhanced skills and/or f) fostered networks. EX: change in number of women in leadership position in the village/community level. • Evidence of a) improved enabling environment, b) changed institutions and policies and/or c) enhanced organizational resources leveraged. • % change in health, education, safety, livelihoods or revenue management related to capacity investments. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved knowledge, skills, actions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in capacity building implementation and monitoring? Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? Extent to which community groups report using new awareness, skills, networks to support other private or community initiatives? Degree to which community attributes changes in welfare to company capacity development interventions? Did the program change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
Company's Return on	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community.

Investment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Direct business benefits from enhanced local skills, knowledge, networks... b. Indirect benefits from increased trust and shared understanding. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company/ vandalism rates of company property. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.
-------------------	---	---

TRACKING INVESTMENTS IN STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

	Quantitative	Qualitative
Inputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time and money spent on collaboration with community beginning in exploration phase • # of short-term consultants vs long-term staff employed by company to build and maintain local relationships. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of their engagement in prioritization and design process of the capacity building program. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Who was consulted when selecting topics, timing, participants, format for public events? b. Are local skills and knowledge contributing to the design as assets to be shared across stakeholder groups? (Information not just flowing one-way but in multi-directions.) c. Attitudes and qualifications of staff hired to engage w local stakeholders
Outputs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # public events held to exchange info • # of participants at public events. • # of local change agents/champions identified both within the company and within the community. • Frequency of information shared across stakeholder groups. • Availability of company reps to meet with community groups/ time taken to set up a mtg requested by community. • Existence or changes in dispute resolution mechanisms. • # of new committees formed to improve communications and/or accountability • # of company reps and local people trained in stakeholder engagement techniques 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder perceptions of quality of stakeholder engagement: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Is the type of public event, including topics and info, relevant for the local communities? b. Is the event designed in culturally appropriate ways for males and females? c. Community perception of benefit from the mining project? d. Are various EI project cycle phases considered fully in selecting priority areas for stakeholder engagement? e. Accessibility of information shared across stakeholder groups (language, format, placement) f. Community perception of whether the company has planned for mine closure and anticipated effects on local population? g. Quality and demographics of change agents/engagement champions identified within company, community and local govt? h. Community/local govt perception of dispute resolution mechanisms?
Outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % of participants giving high rating to quality of public events and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community perception of quality and effectiveness of capacity building provided: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Does the community feel better off than before the engagement process?

	<p>information campaigns (level 1 eval).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • # of new local organizations reached through awareness raising, workshops, training. • Frequency of tripartite negotiations re projects bw govt, comm., company • # of reps from vulnerable groups included in communications and negotiations with company • Change in levels of trust between company and community 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Is there any community tension over who was engaged and on what topics? c. How will the exchange and relationships be maintained over time? d. Will there be institutionalized mechanisms for ongoing engagement and dialogue? e. Perceived quality and transparency of tripartite negotiations. f. Have roles and responsibilities been clearly agreed upon? g. Perceived responsiveness and trustworthiness of site management? h. Qualitative feedback from stakeholder groups/self-reported stakeholder satisfaction with engagement re closure issues? i. Degree of inclusion of local actors in monitoring company's community development strategies. j. Level of empowerment/voice felt by community through direct engagement in design and monitoring processes.
<p>Development Impacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in levels of trust between community and company. • Evidence of a) raised awareness, b) facilitated consensus/ teamwork, c) formulated policy/strategy, d) implemented strategy/plan, e) enhanced skills and/or f) fostered networks. • Evidence of a) improved enabling environment, b) changed institutions and policies and/or c) enhanced organizational resources leveraged. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Quality of links to improved knowledge, skills, actions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Stakeholder perceptions of their voice/ engagement in decision-making and operation monitoring? b. Community perceptions of overall changes in welfare at household and community levels? c. Degree to which community attributes positive gains from engagement with company? d. Did the process change community perceptions of local govt positively or negatively? e. Changes in quantity and quality of opportunities to discuss local priorities with company reps. f. Degree to which company legacy and sustainability issues are addressed?
<p>Company's Return on Investment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Changes in operating environment/ productivity affected by better rapport with workers and broader community. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Change in frequency/duration of work stoppages, theft against company, sabotage b. Indirect benefits from increased trust, shared understanding, accurate information. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of security as reported by company staff when in communities/ Changes in company workforce perceptions of local community. • Disproportionate negative reactions by community or company compared w/ nature of the specific incident (accident, layoffs, vandalism). • Changes in local stakeholder perceptions about the company. • Changes in feelings of hostility toward the company. • Quality of relations between the company and local government and/or traditional authorities. • Effects on company's social license to operate. • Anticipated effects on company's legacy in the community.