AN EVALUATION OF USAID'S EVALUATION FUNCTION:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REINVIGORATING THE EVALUATION CULTURE WITHIN THE AGENCY

By

Janice M. Weber
Bureau for Program and Policy Coordination
U.S. Agency for International Development

September 2004

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report examines the U.S. Agency for International Development's (USAID) evaluation function and seeks to take a fresh look at the manner in which the Agency carries out this important function; serves its primary audiences; and is moving toward becoming a better "learning organization." The views and recommendations expressed herein are solely those of the author. A rapid review of previous, selected "evaluations of evaluation" was conducted and thirty interviews were held over the course of a six-week period.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Demonstration by Senior Management of its commitment to ensuring USAID programs are accomplishing their objectives by **requiring** submission of quality evaluations so that the Agency can truly become a "learning organization."

2. Training for officers at all levels in order to return USAID to a "culture of evaluation." All employees should receive training on evaluation techniques and an incentive system should be developed to reward "risk takers" and innovation.

3. All final evaluations should be external. Professional integrity will be ensured through development of a peer review system to referee controversial conclusions and a tracking system to verify evaluation recommendations have been implemented.

4. All contracts and grants must include a provision requiring submission of evaluations and assessments to the Agency's Development Experience Clearing House (DEC) by contractors/grantees/Missions/Bureaus. No payment should be made until such requirement is fulfilled. Employees should be charged with following current Agency guidelines, i.e., submitting all evaluations to the DEC, including those deemed "sensitive."

5. "Policy abstracts" should be written for all evaluations, the purpose of which would be to draw policy implications of "lessons learned" from evaluations for USAID, as well as the rest of the foreign policy community.

6. The Agency's Knowledge for Development (KfD) activity must be more closely integrated with the evaluation function so that USAID does not create a structure within which there is little written, historic knowledge. KfD may have to be placed on a slower track until the "Knowledge" in KfD can be assured.

7. Greater participation in the international donor evaluation arena to exchange important development information and to regain USAID's status as the "premier development agency."

8. Modify PPC/DEI's role in evaluation to include:

- Oversight of all Bureau/Mission evaluation activities, including, maintaining an up-to-date inventory of all Bureau/Mission evaluations;
- Ensuring ALL Agency evaluations and assessments are included in the DEC, including those performed with/by contractors and grantees;
- Performing more joint evaluations with other donors (OECD, DAC), attend important international evaluation meetings, even if through videoconferencing, as well as involve other USG agencies in evaluation should they be present at field Missions;
- Development and standardization of evaluation training materials and methods so that the Agency performs uniformly high quality evaluations and Bureaus do not waste scarce resources reinventing training courses and "tool kits" due to the lack of a central repository of information;
- Consultation with all Missions (through Bureaus) to establish criteria for evaluations, i.e., when, what types, how, should be clear and such information disseminated widely;
- Identification of the nexus between the Agency's knowledge and policy formulation;
- Collaboration with all Bureaus in developing objective Scopes of Work (SOWs) for evaluations, participating in evaluations where warranted;
- Provision of technical assistance from in-house staff or through contracting of outside experts to Bureaus/ Missions' in performance of selected evaluations on the evaluation agenda or for field evaluations. These should include, but not be limited to: comparison of technical results or policy lessons/implications across regions; Impact Evaluations of no more than nine months where results have the potential for applicability beyond one region; retrospective examination or in-depth program reviews to inform the Agency's strategic planning;
- Contracting for experts or performance of in-house evaluations/short analyses dealing with innovative, timely or politically important issues;
- Coordination of an Inter-Bureau Evaluation Working Group to compile and implement an annual Agency evaluation agenda; establish peer referee groups for Mission and DEI evaluations; other tasks as required;
- Maintenance of EvalWeb, including state of the art information on evaluation techniques, updated TIPS, links to outside evaluation cites and other professional evaluators.

9. Undertake a thorough inventory of all Bureaus' Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) functions, personnel, websites, listservs, contractor evaluations and websites, to eliminate duplication of effort and wastage of scarce resources.

10. Staff PPC/DEI sufficiently to accomplish all of the above.

2

I. INTRODUCTION

The role of evaluation in the Agency has taken many turns over the last two decades. The Development Experience Clearing House (DEC) actually resulted from the Government Accounting Office Report of 1982, in which the Agency was faulted for not having a repository for its development experience. Since then, the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) has gone through many transformations, at one point reaching a staff of approximately 23 people, now with a low of 11 direct-hire employees.

The Government Performance Review Act (GPRA) and the advent of reengineering in 1993 were cited most often by those interviewed as the turning point for the demise of the evaluation function in the Agency. The fact that Agency guidance is inconsistent, providing guidance in the Automated Directives System (ADS) that only "recommends" each Strategic Objective be evaluated once during its lifetime but elsewhere stating that submission of evaluations is MANDATORY, allows already overburdened Missions whose staff is inadequately trained in evaluation techniques to either ignore the evaluation requirement, the submission requirement or both. (See Annex A for selected ADS guidance.)

With the push for performance monitoring and management for results, at some point Agency decision makers became confused and began to equate performance monitoring with evaluation. Thus, USAID has come to its current state – a meagerly-staffed evaluation office in the Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination and multiple, uncoordinated, sometimes unsatisfactory Bureau and Mission attempts at evaluating, often with little knowledge of solid evaluation techniques and certainly without systematic submission to the Agency's central knowledge repository. (See Annex I)

This report attempts to review the state of evaluation in USAID and makes recommendations on how the Agency can reinvigorate the evaluation function to serve its primary audiences, the foreign policy community and development practitioners, and move more intelligently and efficiently toward becoming a "learning organization." The views and recommendations expressed herein are solely those of the author. (See Annex B for Scope of Work)

II. RECENT EVALUATIONS

This report is based on a review of selected, recent "evaluations of evaluation, as well as thirty interviews which were held over the course of a six-week period. (See Annex C for a list of Interviewees) The most recent set of recommendations for improving the Agency's evaluation function was provided by Robert Navin, former Chief of the Evaluation, Studies and Program Assessment Division of the Development Evaluation and Information Office (PPC/DEI/ESPA) in June 2004. (See Annex D) His recommendations echo many which were included in the "Evaluation of Recent USAID Evaluation Experience, Working Paper No. 320," by Cynthia Clapp-Wincek and

Richard Blue, June 2001. (See Annex E)   Among other things, what these two papers have most in common is that their recommendations have been largely ignored by the Agency.

Another recent review of CDIE (March 2002) by a combination of internal staff members Timothy Mahoney and Joseph Gueron, and external consultants Sheila Ronis and George Hill, made assumptions about the quality and number of evaluations that operating units outside of CDIE would be capable of and actually carry out, recommended the creation of a more technology/information-based system (Knowledge for Development - KfD) whose major purpose was to serve PPC. (See Annex F) Unfortunately, it appears that the infrastructure to ensure that such a transformation actually occurred has not been put into place. Through document review and approximately thirty interviews, it is clear that the assumptions the reviewers made about how evaluations would be being accomplished within the Agency and entered into the DEC so that the KfD could be successful have not been borne out. Therefore, achieving a successful KfD is compromised. Too great an emphasis has been placed on technology as the answer to many of the Agency's concerns and issues, with the policy agenda becoming the predominant driver for PPC.   The KfD system under development has adopted many of the recommendations in that latter review; however, it has also sought to include system components geared to the development practitioner. I will discuss KfD and its implications for evaluation in a subsequent section.

I hope to demonstrate the feasibility of simultaneously adopting some of the key components of the purer policy/technology-based recommendations of Mahoney et al, as well as the key recommendations by Clapp-Wincek/Blue. Mahoney et al recommend that CDIE aim squarely at improving the intellectual leadership function of USAID in the foreign policy community through use of the Information Technology (IT) function and "knowledge management." They also suggest some possible monitoring by CDIE of Pillar Bureau findings to be included in Agency processes and guidance, leaving the responsibility for performing evaluations with Pillar Bureaus. Clapp-Wincek/Blue recommend that:

> "...senior Agency managers make learning about what works and what doesn't of primary importance. Only with visibility and high level support will evaluation, along with performance monitoring, be a means by which "truth speaks to power."

My recommendations are designed to assist USAID in finding its way back to evaluation as a staple in the development process, in a way which will, long with performance monitoring and "knowledge," "use truth to empower."

III. GETTING BACK TO A LEARNING ORGANIZATION

The Agency's Automated Directives System is quite clear:

"The Agency recommends that SO Teams conduct at least one evaluation aimed at assessing results achievement and lessons learned during the life of each SO. Situations that should require an evaluation include:

- A key management decision is required, and there is inadequate information;
- Performance information indicates an unexpected result (positive or negative) that
- should be explained (such as gender differential results);
- Customer, partner, or other informed feedback suggests that there are implementation problems, unmet needs, or unintended consequences or impacts;
- Issues of sustainability, cost-effectiveness, or relevance arise;
- *The validity of Results Framework hypotheses or critical assumptions is questioned, e.g., due to unanticipated changes in the host country environment;
- Periodic Portfolio Reviews have identified key questions that need to be answered or that need consensus; or
- Extracting lessons is important for the benefit of other Operating Units or future programming." (See Annex A)

Because some Bureaus grasp the importance of evaluation for most, if nor every USAID activity, they have issued their own guidance, rather than merely heed USAID/Washington's "recommendations." Global Health, the Africa Bureau, the E&E Bureau and a number of USAID Missions have Bureau Operating Procedures on evaluation, in the case of the former, or Mission Orders, in the case of the latter. Fortunately, the Agency has not yet lost its entire corps of personnel who understand and are committed to assessing and learning from the results of the development activities they manage. This provides USAID/Washington with an opportunity to recoup the ground it has lost if it acts quickly.

The recommendations stated above are not solely those of the author but, rather, were developed through numerous meetings with experienced, senior Agency personnel, as well as by those professionals cited in Annex C who are designated Bureau evaluation officers or nominally perform the function.

In October 2003, Administrator Natsios, through an Agency Notice, demonstrated his continued interest in evaluation, which resulted in at least one Bureau increasing its funding for evaluations. (See Annex G) It is not as if all staff believe evaluation is unimportant. The issue is one of competing, stated priorities by senior management. Unfortunately, since USAID's development professionals have limited staff, limited budget and copious priorities, unfortunately, due to a lack of training on the crucial role of evaluation in the development process, most have chosen to eliminate evaluations from their programs. Why? The ADS no longer requires it.

Current ADS guidance on evaluation provides the circumstances under which evaluations should be carried out. Although USAID considers itself to be a "learning organization," building the knowledge base through experience as reflected in evaluations and assessing lessons learned for application in foreign policy decision making, are not among them. The emphasis on finding "Success Stories" and "Best

Practices," as opposed to "Lessons Learned," clearly limits the potential for learning about successes AND failures. There is a built-in disincentive for innovation in design and objectivity in evaluation if risk-taking in development programming is no longer valued. Acquisition of experience and knowledge through negative lessons learned well will often be at least as significant as learning from our successes. All lessons are important for application to our increasingly global problems.

Short-term performance monitoring allows us to easily declare success in the implementation of the majority of our SOs. However, evaluating the impact of USAID's work, sharing its lessons with other donors and the foreign policy community, its potential for sustainability over time, and whether the lessons learned are applicable elsewhere under similar circumstances or with some modification, is crucial to development work. Evaluations enable USAID to better look forward, in light of a changing global environment that no longer allows us to only consider national and regional implications of our work.

The majority of interviewees stated that the decline of evaluation arose when reengineering proponents of performance monitoring began to equate it with evaluation. I quote from the Clapp-Wincek/Blue report,

"...Evaluation is only one part of the Agency's current learning process. It is distinguished from the performance monitoring system because it looks back at the structure and design of Agency programs to understand why things have changed. It is distinguished from the newly popular assessments because of its focus specifically on Agency programs and its expectation of good social science and objectivity.

What has been learned about the Agency's evaluation experience is applied to help inform decisions and actions needed for the Agency to fully become this kind of learning organization...."

IV. THE RESPECTIVE ROLES OF THE DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION AND INFORMATION OFFICE (DEI) AND ALL OTHER AGENCY BUREAUS IN THE EVALUATION FUNCTION

All USAID evaluation officers interviewed agreed that DEI should play a coordinating role for evaluations in the Agency with the Bureaus and, through them, for the Missions. There was also agreement that Bureaus and Missions should be responsible for performing evaluations and for ensuring that EVERY evaluation and assessment is entered into the DEC, as currently mandated by the ADS. The proposed change in the ADS which would make evaluations a requirement under most circumstances, should ensure that Bureaus and Missions not only systematically evaluate the impact of their activities, specifically drawing out policy implications through a "policy abstract," but also track evaluation recommendations and provide for carrying them out in a timely manner.

In order to better develop a strengthened Agency capacity for evaluation and its implementation, DEI should reconstitute the Inter-Bureau Evaluation Group. That group will be key to reinvigorating a participatory process, leading to greater buy-in for the necessity for evaluations and their potential. DEI will hold regular consultations on evaluation training, handbook and toolkit development (sharing their individual experiences), USAID's contributions to international development evaluation fora, and the Agency's evaluation agenda, discussed in greater detail below. Increased quality of evaluations can be achieved through better criteria for when evaluations and assessments are required as well as their content; the teaching of new techniques for evaluation; and the sharing of experience across Bureaus on training and evaluation successes. The group or a sub-group should establish a standard evaluation template aimed at quality which would provide, at a minimum, the required components of every evaluation, perhaps in the form of a checklist. A checklist could include the threshold amount of an activity that would require an evaluation; an analysis of implementation issues, such as administrative, policy or technical; sustainability of the activity; institution building aspects; replicability potential; data quality requirements, etc.

Standardization of evaluation methods by the Agency will help provide for easier comparison across regions and sectors, and will serve to diminish duplication of effort, saving scarce Agency resources. All of those queried seconded the notion that all Agency operating units needed to be working from standard evaluation criteria and taking advantage of centrally-developed training courses.

The evaluation group should serve to enhance the integration of knowledge into KfD. A sub-group of the Inter-Bureau mechanism should also bring to the table some forward thinking as to policy issues which are coming down the road and need thorough study. This would ensure that not all research ideas done through PPC not only emanate from within the PPC Bureau, but also reflect the considered input of program officers and senior management of other Bureaus.

V. THE DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION AND INFORMATION OFFICE (DEI), ITS FUNCTIONS AND STAFFING

DEI should be staffed to properly carry out the evaluation coordination function for the Agency, as well as develop selected short-term policy papers and Impact Evaluation Studies. In order to perform the functions delineated in the recommendations above, especially those in 8, DEI will need a Director and Deputy, as well as divisions staffed to adequately deal with both the information technology side of the evaluation function and the knowledge side of it.

The Director should be the Agency's key interlocutor in international fora dealing with evaluation, such as the Organization for Economic Development (OECD) and in discussions on the Development Assistance Committee (DAC) guidelines on evaluation. Attendance in international fora, as well as sharing of evaluation techniques and joint evaluations, is the only way that the Agency will be able to keep abreast of new developments in evaluation and share its own. If necessary, video-

conferencing arrangements should be made for attendance at important conferences, though USAID should not opt out of these events so that it may maintain its reputation as a leading development agency.

To accomplish the monitoring of the Agency's Bureaus evaluations; coordinate timely input of evaluations and other knowledge into the Agency's DEC; develop the evaluation agenda; organize existing and develop new evaluation courses and other materials, including the development of an incentive system and a tracking system (to include all requirements mentioned in the Training section below); revise ADS guidelines; coordinate provision of technical assistance; develop tracking systems for evaluations and evaluation recommendation implementation; create peer referee groups on controversial evaluations and on publishable PPC publications; develop substantive inputs and positions for DAC and other international evaluation fora; develop cross-regional and/or cross-sectoral evaluations, update TIPS. At least two seasoned professionals and a more junior contractor will be required for these tasks. The replacement for Joseph Lieberson and the currently onboard contractor will not be sufficient for this task and should be supplemented by a more junior person. Such a person could be contracted with available funds under the Academy for Educational Development contract (DIS).

The potential utility of involving other professional evaluation organizations in our training, such as the Evaluators Institute was also noted by interviewees. The IDEA contract may prove useful and interesting in research on state-of-the-art evaluation techniques in order to assist limited evaluation staff in development of evaluation courses and training materials.

Two persons are required to fulfill the staff function (special projects) for the Administrator and the Agency. Those persons will focus on policy issues relevant to the Agency and foreign policy community, as well as participate in the Inter-Bureau Evaluation Group that will help determine the Agency's evaluation agenda. Such questions as policy relevance, whether we are choosing the right things to evaluate, including how generalizable the results actually are, will be among their concerns. Also, the launching of the new "policy abstract" for evaluations will be the responsibility of these personnel in order that the abstracts serve their intended purpose insofar as providing the development underpinnings to our foreign policy pieces and briefings. This staff will enlist the assistance of Bureau personnel on these issues, where appropriate, as well as selected contracted staff. There is currently one person onboard; another would be required, preferably a Presidential Management Fellow.

A direct-hire employee should be focused on the information aspects of evaluation, assisting in the integration of the knowledge side of DEI with KfD. Although other Bureaus/Missions would be expected to carry out the majority of evaluations, the information side of the office would assist the Contract/CTO/Controller staff in developing a system which will track report inputs to the central DEC. Contractual language and other disincentives to ignoring Agency guidance on report submission must be introduced and enforced. In addition, currently, there is no coordination

8

between evaluation and KfD which will ensure that KfD has the benefit of all of the Agency's knowledge. There are numerous listservs in the Agency, many which do not reflect the entirety of what the Agency is implementing in a particular sector or region. A significant amount of resources, which due to the short-term nature of this report could not be inventoried, are being spent by many regional and technical Bureaus to fill in for what appears to be central USAID's inability to meet their information demands. This employee should be able to get a handle on what is required by internal customers (which presumably reflects their external needs) so that the Agency can be smarter about managing its scarce resources. The new direct-hire Program Analyst on the Development Information side of the office should take on these functions.

Maintenance of EvalWeb was cited as important by some officers who were interviewed, yet insignificant by others. Further study of this issue should be done, including an assessment using the number of "hits" on the site. This task should be assigned to DIS as soon as possible. If continuing EvalWeb is found to be useful, then a decision should be made as to who in DIS should take on this responsibility.

Four senior sector professionals who can write well and follow guidance will be required in the areas of economics/trade, conflict resolution/disaster and the social sciences. Specific evaluation studies recommended by the evaluation agenda should be performed by this staff or by outsourcing. These professionals will also be expected to provide technical assistance to the Bureaus and Missions on development of SOWs and participate in evaluations where warranted. Also, this staff must be capable of interacting with technical SMEs in the Inter-Agency Evaluation Group in developing Impact Evaluations that assess historical performance, as well as in developing more strategic, forward thinking evaluations that anticipate Agency activity on problems in the future. DCHA and OTI have been doing a series of evaluations without guidance or much input from evaluation professionals, in most cases. The entire DEI staff must assist Bureaus and Missions in crafting evaluations studies so that lessons learned can be applied across the Agency and the USG.

Total new staff proposed:
One PMF for policy work
One junior contracted employee under DIS for evaluation work.

(See Annex H for current and proposed DEI organizational charts)

VI. TRAINING

Many years ago, before reengineering and the Agency's ADS, there was a requirement that all projects be evaluated. Before anyone developed an activity, s(he) queried CDIE to establish where any similar projects had been carried out, what lessons were learned that would be applicable, and whom you might contact to discuss the effort further. Moreover, each project had a line item in its budget to ensure such evaluations were carried out. Evaluations were recognized as important because one always needed to know what had been achieved, what institutions had been strengthened, what the

possibility was for sustainability, what lessons might be applied to other programs worldwide.

This acknowledgement of the usefulness and import of evaluation did not just happen. The "culture of evaluation" was ingrained into new employees through training. Few employees arrive from other development agencies to USAID's doorsteps, so it is the Agency's responsibility to train its staff. All International Development Interns (IDIs), New Entry Professionals (NEPs), Senior Managers, Cognizant Technical Officers (CTOs), Controllers, and Foreign Service Nationals (FSNs) should have adequate training on evaluation techniques. By training, I am not talking about 30 minutes during a two-week seminar. Rather, it is essential that evaluation be distinguished from performance monitoring and that that "culture" be re-established.

One way to accomplish this task would be to review all current courses in evaluation developed by contractors for which the Agency has paid. Those courses should be the property of the U.S. Government and, therefore, the Agency should be able to take from them the best material and develop a standard course. In addition, evaluation modules non-project personnel, such as Controllers, Contract Officers, Administrative personnel and others should be instituted. All new hires should be thoroughly schooled in evaluation techniques.

USAID employees should understand that knowledge developed through contractors belongs to the USG. Therefore, all evaluations and other documentations should be in the Agency's DEC, according to existing guidance on documentation submission. We must ensure that our "knowledge" is available for everyone, as it has been paid for by the U.S. taxpayer. The best way to ensure that is for all contracts and grants to require that documents be submitted and that payment will NOT be forthcoming before they are received. Having three officers, the CTO, Contracts Officer and Controller vigilant on this point, will ensure that the DEC no longer has large gaps in its knowledge base.

There is some excellent evaluation training occurring in some Bureaus. Specifically, DCHA, Africa and E&E have extensively trained field personnel through a variety of contractors. They also have designated evaluation officers. They have developed training materials, handbooks and toolkits, each reinventing materials and spending scarce resources because there is no central training provided by PPC. There are no handbooks or training courses which the Agency "owns." Neither is there a standardized, easily accessible way to become knowledgeable about the state-of-the-art evaluation activities that the rest of the world uses.

Admittedly, since the ADS no longer requires evaluations (though it does require that those which have been done are submitted), there has been limited ability and call for a central organ of the Agency to perform the training function. It is my recommendation that DEI reinvigorate that function.

VII. KNOWLEDGE FOR DEVELOPMENT

The Knowledge for Development (KfD) Strategy has been approved and is entering its pilot implementation phase. In the course of interviewing a variety of professionals, some of whom have been immersed in the development of KfD, it became clear that there is a general perception that KfD relies far too heavily upon technological fixes. The fact that the Agency is suffering from a scarcity of human and programmatic resources has placed an exceptional burden on the majority of USAID employees in the field, as well as Washington.

For KfD to be successful there will be a heavy reliance on the willingness of USAID professionals to spend precious time interacting online on a variety of subjects having to do with the programs they are or have previously implemented. Most Missions are stretched to the limit on personnel who hardly have time to visit the field due to all of the USAID/Washington reporting requirements placed upon them, including cyclical and other requirements, such as Annual Reports and Strategic Plans, where guidance is frequently modified from year to year. Of extreme concern is the fact that the "knowledge" in KfD has not been forthcoming. Although Bureaus and Missions have been doing some evaluations, though not to the extent one would have hoped, many of those evaluations (and assessments) have not been entered into the DEC. Therefore, if the DEC is to be one of the major fonts of information, other than oral testimonies by USAID staff (should they have the time, inclination and the basic computer skills), there are vast holes in the Agency's knowledge base.

The Mahoney review correctly points out that there must be a clear definition of DEI's overall role. Over two years after the study was completed, there is still no direction for that office. The authors' focus on the knowledge management role versus the evaluation role for DEI was premised on the assumption that other Agency Bureaus would be diligently carrying out the evaluation function and entering important data into the DEC. From the recommendation below, one might infer that the authors do not believe evaluations are part of "learning" since USAID's lessons learned from technical sectors are to be used for inputs for process and guidance. (See Annex F for selected findings)

Recommendation No. 4 states:

"CDIE evaluation activities should be focused on supporting PPC's policy agenda and multi-sectoral linkages between the Agency strategic plan and program results. Responsibility for evaluation within technical sectors should be assigned to the Pillar Bureaus. CDIE may want to monitor results to ensure that significant findings are included in Agency processes and guidances."

Unfortunately, the Regional and Pillar Bureaus have done only selected evaluations. Some have been entered into the system, some have no idea if they are being entered nor do they believe they are required to do so! The "knowledge" which the Agency

intends to put into the KfD is "hit or miss." A subsequent paragraph on a possible reorientation of evaluation functions seems to contradict the above-mentioned guidance:

> "...Pillar Bureaus should be responsible for technical evaluations designed to develop best practices within a sector to assess the outcomes of pilot programs. Regional Bureaus should be responsible for evaluation studies within countries that are intended to inform new strategies with lessons learned. CDIE evaluations should be focused on cross-cutting evaluations that are designed to inform the Bureau policy and/or strategic planning processes. Depending on the Bureau, choice of adding staff to buttress CDIE evaluation capacity or adding money to outsource evaluation production, CDIE management will have to assess staff skills and needs to effectively carry out the revised POA (ESPA now) mission."

This reorientation recommendation would be extremely prudent if one could depend upon it being adequately implemented by the Bureaus and monitored by DEI. Since the report was published, the development of KfD and the implementation of a pilot for KfD have moved smartly forward, while the "knowledge" side of the coin, evaluation, has languished, focusing primarily on the production of issue-oriented papers.

The Mahoney review places evaluation demands on Bureaus but, at the same time, the Agency guidance frees Bureaus of that responsibility. The precipitous drop in evaluation submissions by 75% from 1994-2002, documented in the Clapp-Wincek/Blue report, has improved slightly. However, the Agency is losing a documented history of lessons learned/impact, which the "communities of practice" cannot capture. Once Agency programs are completed, if there are no evaluations on the impact, results or sustainability of these programs, future employees will surely reinvent old mistakes and not learn from decades of solid development experience. Retired USAID staff, though a good source of knowledge, with time may remember successes more vividly and details will surely fade.

Cursory examination of some technical listservs that currently exist in Bureaus shows that health professionals, for example, already have a variety of avenues to ask questions, consult with development colleagues worldwide and share information. How many different points of entry will busy development practitioners consult? Given too much work and too little time, most will seek their information from known sources.

Therefore, I would recommend a "go-slow" approach to KfD while a through inventory is made of all the Agency's listservs, websites and knowledge bases. Until there is a solid handle on what the Agency is currently funding, whether there is duplication in what is being proposed, and how knowledge (evaluations/assessments) can be better captured into the Agency's DEC, KfD should not be out in front. As an Agency, we must be confident that our development knowledge is available that will serve to ensure KfD's success. The marriage of the two should not be difficult. However, the coordination between KfD and how well our knowledge is being developed and whether we are capturing it has not been good. The Agency Learning Library already

has the ability to query employees on specific topics and, depending upon the topic, provides immediate or longer turnaround responses.

A small example of how little information is being entered into the system is supplied by the DEC's Judith Coker:

"Prior to 1996, the DEC could get the active award list, and then we could not get it again until just a couple of months ago. All acquisition and assistance agreements contain language requiring the submission of development experience material to DEC (Development Experience Clearinghouse). In a recent database search using Mission agreements listed in the Yellow Book, DEC found that in the Africa region 22 contractors or grantees held 47 agreements valued at $487.6 million and no development experience documents have been submitted. DEC issued letters to these companies requesting submission of relevant documents." (List is attached in Annex I)

VIII. THE NEXUS OF DEVELOPMENT WITH POLICY

The repository of Agency information should inform decision makers, ensure the Agency makes decisions based upon what we have learned from our vast experience and, with some additional effort in teasing out policy implications from that experience, better apply that knowledge to strategies and programs in the future.

There is some considerable question as to the appropriate role of PPC/DEI (the former CDIE) in the Agency, with regard to policy. While the Policy Bureau should certainly serve staff office function for the Administrator, it is also essential that it serve the development practitioners in the Agency. DEC, as the repository of information on USAID funded-activities for the international development and foreign policy community, needs to better provide the basis upon which informed foreign policy decisions are made, to the extent those decisions involve development or humanitarian assistance content. The Agency must be able to provide short-term policy papers, as well as longer-term impact evaluations. However, there should never be a case where the longer-term effort takes more than nine months, as its usefulness will not necessarily endure. Although there was uniform agreement that the CDIE Impact Evaluations should be instituted again, all of the interviewees agreed that they should be quicker and shorter, so that all of the information can be utilized in a timely fashion. Short Executive Summaries ought to provide the crucial information so that managers will read, not shelve them. Technical personnel will take the time to read a longer version, but policy makers do not have that time or interest.

A new requirement should be instituted, requiring that all evaluations include a maximum two-page "policy abstract." The abstract would highlight policy implications of the activity that was evaluated so that searches of the DEC database would more easily identify applicable lessons learned for the query or issue being researched. The evaluators or DEC professionals could undertake this task, though it is likely that development professionals could better identify such policy implications.

Currently, when the Library does searches, they include selected other donor and think tank databases. Unfortunately, our own information is not always provided. (Annex J contains a selected list of evaluations from the Bureaus, highlighted to demonstrate which information has not been submitted to the DEC).

Also, the development of the annual evaluation agenda for the Agency should include a marriage of development/humanitarian issues with policy/political issues. Such an agenda should be developed through the reconstituted Inter-Bureau Evaluation Working Group. Each Bureau representative should consult with its senior management, as well as its constituent Missions, proposing the three most important evaluation activities which it believes have cross-regional implications. These suggestions should be retrospective, as well as prospective in nature and should not include activities more appropriately funded by the Bureau. The PPC representative will recommend its evaluations after consultation with its senior management, its knowledge of special issues of interest within the USG foreign policy community, as well as consultation with A/AID's office. Once the evaluation agenda is established, implementation will be through a streamlined contracting procedure (if the effort includes external evaluators).

IX. INTEGRITY IN THE EVALUATION SYSTEM

To reinforce an evaluation mentality, many interviewees suggested that an incentive system be developed to reward "risk takers." Such a system would include a specific mention in employee evaluations as to the requirement to carry out and submit evaluations to the DEC. In addition, projects would be evaluated not only on their "success," but also on whether innovative ideas were attempted, i.e., whether they succeeded or not.

Rewards for innovation would also serve to discourage the "whitewashing" of evaluations, whether performed by internal or external evaluators. Many USAID employees have become disenchanted with a system that only rewards success (thus, the overwhelming majority of self-graded fully successful SOs), rather than rewarding an honest assessment of lessons learned. It is not unheard of for Missions to refuse country clearance to PPC/DEI evaluators because they feared an evaluation would turn up deficiencies in project management or other problems they did not want to share. USAID should pursue only truth through evaluation. Requests for a specific country's participation should be honored, if at all possible, as the country was most likely chosen because there was value-added to its inclusion. The assistance of Assistant Administrators should be enlisted to ensure appropriate, collegial collaboration.

A system should be created wherein any Mission which disagrees with the results of an evaluation can rebut the results in a separate section of the document, much like a GAO audit. A peer review system should be established for refereeing conclusions of evaluations in order that the integrity of the evaluation system is maintained. When a problem surfaces, the Inter-Bureau Evaluation Working Group could pull together a small group of Subject Matter Experts (SMEs) to perform this function. Such SME

groups should also come together to review Impact Evaluations or other Agency documents before they are published through PPC.

Also, like a GAO audit, a tracking system should be established to monitor the implementation of recommendations which have been accepted. PPC can establish the system, with Missions responsible for its implementation and DEI, collaborating with the Bureaus, to monitor it. The implementation of such a system would also serve to cut down on the number of external evaluators who are in such fear of losing prospective work that they reach positive conclusions before the evaluation takes place.

It is difficult to imagine that a final evaluation, if performed internally, can be wholly objective. Mid-term performance assessments for management purposes are perfectly amenable to this type of evaluation, but if the Agency is to truly evaluate achievements and/or impact of a project or program, its successes and failures, an external evaluation should be performed. PPC, in collaboration with all Bureaus, should establish the parameters for internal versus external evaluations, including the cut off funding points for evaluating small activities.

A few Bureau evaluation officers were concerned about the instances in which USAID development-related documents need to be restricted to USAID direct-hire staff only, such as when detailed contract budget information or criticisms of a project are part of the document. Apparently, some evaluations have not been submitted because of these perceived sensitivities or, worse, these evaluations are termed "assessments," in an attempt to avoid submitting them. In sensitive cases, the Development Experience Clearing House (DEC) restricts the accessibility of such documents to internal access only (ADS 540.5.2b). If a report is restricted by the Agency, it will not be available through USAID's publicly accessible database. The citations (not the actual document) will be available through database access, provided via "CDIE Online" (http://cdie.usaid.gov), the internal, intranet website which the DEC also maintains for internal USAID use only.

X. CONCLUSIONS

Few of the above recommendations are new or different from what has been proposed by others. It is clear that the Agency is losing its "knowledge" and has chosen a technology "fix" which, unfortunately, will not fix the fact that our evaluations are insufficient in number and quality and our historical database is severely lacking to enable KfD to function properly. There needs to be some immediate action taken to rectify this situation before the Agency's knowledge base is lost and it is left with a wholly inadequate, incomplete picture of its many, significant activities and their impact. There can be no true "Knowledge for Development" framework without quality evaluations of our programs. USAID still has the capability to honestly evaluate its programs – as demonstrated by the Africa, E&E and Global Health Bureaus, among others. By beefing up PPC/DEI's capability to monitor and assist all Agency Bureaus, as well as reinvigorating its capability to train and perform cross-sector evaluations for the Agency, USAID can move toward a KfD which will actually be able to draw upon

solid, historical information, as well as its planned "communities of practice." Without such "knowledge," USAID will be developing another New Management System (NMS), a system that appeared to have significant information, but could not function.

The recommendations included in this report are manageable/doable without major disruption to either Agency processes or budget. The following are suggestions which can be undertaken now, as a priority, and would have a strong impact on moving the Agency in the right direction on evaluation.

XI. QUICK HITS

1. The Administrator should back an ADS modification, requiring evaluations.

2. PPC/DEI should staff up per 5, above, in order to carry out the recommendations of this report.

3. A number of meetings of the Inter-Bureau Group (or sub-groups) should be convened to make recommendations on development of the following, after which DEI should immediately move forward to implement:
   - Agency evaluation requirements, including timing, quality requirements, necessary components (a template or checklist);
   - a series of Agency-owned courses on evaluation which would include collecting information on all training being carried out by Bureaus and their contractors;
   - the Agency's evaluation agenda;
   - an incentive system for "risk takers" through performance bonuses or other means;
   - a peer group review roster created to objectively referee conclusions of controversial evaluations and review other PPC studies/documents intended for publication;
   - a provision in all contracts/grants, requiring that evaluations be submitted to the DEC before payment is made, as well as suggestions for enforcement by CTOs, Controllers and COs.

4. Contracts should be let immediately, if necessary, after 3, above has taken place to ensure every new and existing employee has adequate training on evaluation and evaluation is built into existing training course.

5. Special Projects Staff should work with the Inter-Bureau Group to institute "Policy abstracts" and DEI sector analysts for all evaluations, the purpose of which is to draw "lessons learned" from each evaluation having meaningful policy implications not only for USAID, but also for the rest of the foreign policy community.

6. DEI should meet with all Knowledge for Development (KfD) staff to develop an Action Plan which would more closely integrate the evaluation function, so that the

Agency is not left with a structure within which there is little written, historic knowledge.

7. An assessment should be done by the DI side of DEI of all Bureau Monitoring and Evaluation functions in order that duplication of effort is eliminated. Many Bureaus have their own evaluation websites, their own archivists or have contractors in whose databases the Agency's knowledge resides, sometimes not linked to the Agency's DEC. The purpose is to ensure that all of the Agency's information is in its central repository, not to inhibit sectoral or regional exchanges of information.

8. DEI should develop a tracking system for evaluation recommendations and their implementation, as well as one for monitoring the fulfillment of the Agency requirement that all assessments and evaluations are entered into the DEC.

9. Director, DEI should be quickly immersed into DAC evaluation deliberations in order that USAID take its rightful place among international aid agencies and be able to exchange information with other donors.

ANNEX A - KEY ADS CITATIONS

ADS 203.6.1: "When Is an Evaluation Appropriate?" (effective March 19, 2004) states:

*The Agency recommends that SO Teams conduct at least one evaluation aimed at assessing results achievement and lessons learned during the life of each SO. Situations that should require an evaluation include

- A key management decision is required, and there is inadequate information;
- Performance information indicates an unexpected result (positive or negative) that
- should be explained (such as gender differential results);
- Customer, partner, or other informed feedback suggests that there are implementation problems, unmet needs, or unintended consequences or impacts;
- Issues of sustainability, cost-effectiveness, or relevance arise;
- *The validity of Results Framework hypotheses or critical assumptions is questioned,
    e.g., due to unanticipated changes in the host country environment;
- Periodic Portfolio Reviews have identified key questions that need to be answered or that need consensus; or
- Extracting lessons is important for the benefit of other Operating Units or future programming.

Pillar and Regional Bureaus may request their Operating Units to conduct evaluations. For example, additional analytical work, including an evaluation, may be necessary to support continued funding for a particular SO. The intensive program review may also identify issues that need to be addressed through an evaluation. For more information about Intensive Program Review, see 203.3.10.

Some special studies may meet the criteria for Program Development and Learning (PD&L) Objectives and may be eligible for PD&L funding. For more information about PD&L funding, Operating Units should see ADS 201.3.3.5 and contact their Bureau program office.

B. ADS 203.3.6.8, "Sharing Evaluations to Enhance Agency Learning," (effective1/31/03), states that on a mandatory basis, evaluations must be submitted to the DEC.

Yet, as can be seen from A above, the evaluation of SOs is only "recommended." The issue is clear: given an ever-increasing set of mandatory requirements, fewer staff with experience and knowledge about evaluation and scarce financial resources, managers who have not be skilled in the importance of evaluation will forgo evaluation, when not required to do so. Thus, we see the drop off of evaluation submission tothe DEC from 1993 to 2003, by almost 75%. This is not to say that evaluations are not being done. Rather, Agency personnel have clearly not seen the "value-added" in submitting evaluations to the Agency's DEC.

C. ADS 203.3.12 is MANDATORY. Evaluation reports must be provided to the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC), where they will be accessible for use in planning and assessing other SOs. If the evaluation was not "finalized," the Operating Unit should submit the last draft it received. If appropriate and useful, the Operating Unit may submit the response of the SO Team, Operating Unit, or counterpart agency.

D. With regard to sensitive evaluations and assessments, ADS 540.5.2b states*:

All development experience materials, whether in paper copy or electronic form or other media, whether created by Agency direct hire employees or produced by USAID contractors, must be submitted to the PPC/CDIE/DI Development Experience Clearinghouse to be shared and used by Agency staff in USAID/W, field missions, and development partners.

It specifically states "and development partners," which implies that they are to be shared with the public.

However, there are instances in which USAID development-related documents need to be restricted to USAID direct-hire staff only, such as when detailed contract budget information is part of the document. In such cases, the Development Experience Clearing House (DEC) restricts the accessibility of such documents to internal access only. If a report is restricted by the Agency, it will not be available through our publicly accessible database. The citations (not the actual document) will be available through database access, provided via "CDIE Online" (http://cdie.usaid.gov), our internal, intranet website which the DEC also maintains for internal USAID use only. USAID staff must then order the actual document from the DEC. We do have an electronic ordering form available for their use.

*From e-mail Nagle/Weber, dtd. 8/4/04.

ANNEX B - SCOPE OF WORK

Assist PPC/CDIE to:

- Review its approach to evaluation, including recommendations on what needs to be done to reinstate more routine evaluations at the Mission and Bureau level; identify how we could engage more USAID staff in the CDIE supported evaluation process along the lines of Impact Evaluations conducted in the 1980s; assure better, more targeted input from Bureaus on the PPC evaluation agenda; and improve dissemination of findings within USAID and with a larger U.S. audience;
- Assure the new approach to Knowledge for Development is appropriately incorporating these evaluation findings;
- Review the organization and staffing pattern for CDIE with recommendations for how we fill several upcoming vacancies, including whether we should consider use of IPA or similar mechanisms since USDH hiring is not always providing the right skill sets.

ANNEX C – LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

Barbara Turner, A-AA/PPC
Sharon Pines-Benoliel, PPC/DEI
Anne Beasley, PPC/DEI
Jonathan Dworken, PPC/DEI
Joe Lieberson, PPC/DEI
Susan Wallace, PPC/DEI
Jeffery Malick, PPC/DEI
Cindy Arciaga, PPC/DEI
Judith Light, PPC/DEI
James Harold, PPC/DEI
David Simpson, PPC/SPP
Mary Stewart, DCHA/OTI
Emily McPhie, DCHA/PVC
Janet Kerley, AFR/DP
John Novak, G/OHA
Patricia Rader, EGAT/PAICO

Elaine Grigsby, PPD/DEI
Woody Navin, PPC/DEI (retired)
Sharon Sadler, PPC/DEI
Krishna Kumar, PPC/DEI
Grant Morrill, PPC/DEI
Robert Baker, PPC/DEI
Joseph Rabenstine, PPC/DEI
David Wolfe, PPC/DEI
Bruce Odell, PPC/DEI
Polly Byers, PPC/P
Thomas Marchione, DCHA/PPM
Hal Lipmann, DCHA/OTI
Cressida Slote, E&E/PO
Victoria Ellis, G/PRH
Donald Soules, LAC/SPO

ANNEX D - RECOMMENDATIONS FROM MEMORANDUM OF JUNE 22, 2004, TO AA (ACTING), BARBARA TURNER FROM ROBERT NAVIN, FORMER CHIEF OF PPC/DEI/ESPA

Recommendation #1. Those in USAID who are focused on designing and implementing programs have resisted for years Washington's seemingly endless requests for information to defend USAID's program in Washington. Cajoling and badgering by senior management have only had limited success. Instead, they might consider a compact based on mutual recognition of each others' needs: If operating units respond to a predetermined, finite (albeit large) number of requests for information, then AID/W will protect staff time and budgets for programmatic design and implementation.

Recommendation #2. Evaluations and assessments should continue to be demand-driven, not exercises in recording history (USAID just does not have the Pentagon's budget for numerous in-house historians). ESPA should be strengthened to take on the function of making sure that lessons learned in Mozambique in community health, for example, are combined with lessons learned in Yemen on promoting civic participation. Due to USAID's decentralized decision-making regarding evaluations, the operating units and individual contractors are learning from experience, but the Agency and other partners generally do not.

Recommendation #3: USAID should evaluate the extent of senior management demand for evaluations and syntheses of other evaluations. The Administrator and the PPC Assistant Administrator should drive this exercise. What more should USAID do to for OMB's PART exercise, which requires USAID to evaluate one fourth of its operating units every year? Can USAID be better organized to handle both longer term research as well as questions with short fuses? In 1996 and 2002, ESPA's customer surveys focused on field practitioners of development. While these customers are still important, ESPA must first meet the needs among senior PPC and Agency leadership in Washington. The survey should also examine ESPA's role vis-à-vis that of PPC/P.

Recommendation #4: Change the name of DEI back to CDIE. USAID should recapture this valuable brand name. The "center" can be lower case, if our bureaucratic structure does not permit formal Centers.

Recommendation #5. Restore or increase CDIE/ESPA's funding. Funding was cut as mentioned above. With GPRA, OMB's PART, increased donor interest in accountability for results, and anticipated renewed concern from U.S. taxpayers that our dollars are being well spent abroad (in light of the price-tag for Afghanistan and Iraq and Sudan), USAID will have increasing pressure to show that its programs are having impact. USAID's reporting systems, its evaluations, and its ability to communicate with Washington decision-makers, currently aren't adequate. If they were, USAID (and other donors) wouldn't still be taking credit for success one year, and then blaming "externalities" the next when the successes have disappeared.

Recommendation #6. Development and Approval of the ESPA Annual Work Plan
The DAA for PPC should approve an Action Memo in March that finalizes ESPA's Annual Workplan after chairing a session in which the various points of view are freely aired. In prior years, the research agenda has been developed in consultation with many others in the Agency. Then the PPC AA made a final determination based on considering both the needs of the policy community and the needs of other stakeholders in the Agency. This past year, the agenda was put in place in a rather ad hoc fashion. While this can be explained by a lack of staff both in CDIE and in the PPC front office, it may result in allocations of resources that serve more the squeaky wheel than those with the greater need and potential.

Recommendation #7. Devote staff time to beefing up the Evaluation training that NEPs and IDIs receive, and make sure that the new PAL course has a strong evaluation section (not just monitoring). Right now the NEP class gets about two hours on monitoring, but virtually nothing on evaluation. For new TAACs, the ESPA Chief should continue the practice I began of presenting a one hour session on evaluations.

Recommendation #8. Cross-sectoral sharing of learning. Everyone knows that getting beyond sectoral stovepipes is desirable, but not enough staff-time is devoted to doing this. As a starting point, a senior AED staffer be tasked with culling the rich materials of the Global Health office for lessons that can be applied by EG and DG. Next, assessments of post-conflict and transition assistance programs should be examined for the same end.

Recommendation #9. Hold a workshop in which best practices in evaluation and information storage and sharing are discussed. The workshop would result in a number of recommendations for broader sharing of lessons learned among the development practitioners. How can the U.S. improve the sharing of best practices in relief and development assistance? This is larger than USAID, since much of this work is implemented by contractors and grantees using USAID's funding.

Recommendation #10. The results of #9 above should then be presented in an international forum, such as the DAC's Evaluation working group of so that the best practices of all donor nations can be shared. And beyond that, all donors need to work towards making sure that our development clients, be they government or non-government entities, can also learn from, and contribute to, a sharing of best practices in the dissemination of lessons learned in relief and development.

Recommendation #11. Relations with other Donors and the IFIs Concerning Evaluations. USAID has become less and less of a player in international meetings on evaluation. The U.S. has much to share with other donors and the clients in the countries in which we work. Yes Nicholson's office assures our participation in the big events, but those tend to be less substance than politics and ceremony. Some of the forum in which USAID could play a larger role to make sure that global development practices benefit from lessons learned would include:

- The DAC's evaluation working group (Grigsby and Lieberson attended the February meeting, but were essentially observers). The Brits, the Dutch, and the Scandinavians have been the leaders of the DAC for the past five years or so. Interestingly, USAID founded the DAC Evaluation Experts Group, but is almost a non-participant right now due other priorities of PPC management.
- The American Evaluation Association (Navin and Gale attended in December, but essentially as observers)
- The Foundation for Advanced Studies on International Development, Tokyo (Blumhagen attended in February 2003, but there have been no plans to follow up this exchange)
- The International Development Evaluation Association (www.IDEAS-int.org) was founded recently with IBRD support, but USAID has not participated.

CDIE/ESPA should be encouraged to use video conferencing and other technologies to share both findings and ideas with fellow evaluators of development programs.

Recommendation #12. Implementation of recommendations from assessments and evaluations. Senior managers should encourage each operating unit to have a review session to decide on which recommendations will be accepted and acted upon. A tracking system should be set up until the recommendations are closed (as is done with recommendations coming from the Inspector General). USAID's assessments are usually designed specifically to influence either policy or the future direction of implementation. Yet many recommendations are ignored or over-taken by the urgent rather than the important.

Recommendation #13. At a senior staff meeting, PPC needs to review the roles of various operating units in conducting evaluations.

Recommendations #14. Improve the contracting procedures for procurement of evaluation services. For 2002-4, PPC/ESPA decided not to spend scarce staff time trying to shorten the time it takes for OP to process an IQC work order. Instead, ESPA relied more heavily on the existing AED contract.

Recommendation #15. PPC needs to consider the implications of many more USG departments operating abroad on issues closely related to what USAID does. Perhaps it is time to consider more coordination on the design and implementation of joint evaluations.

Recommendation #16. CDIE should continue to press the Administrator's office to schedule a slot in the Senior Staff Meeting for a presentation about the roles and responsibilities in USAID for the generation and dissemination of best practices and lessons learned.

Recommendation #17. If CDIE's de facto budget determines de jure responsibilities, then it may be time to have this formally approved so that everyone can buy into clear objectives and resources levels.

Recommendation #18. With USAID continuing to be poorly staffed, the programmatic (non financial and non-IG) checks and balances within AID/W reviews should be strengthened to at least its former levels. Now would be a good time to begin broad discussions about the quality of USAID's evaluations, and make plans for a response to the DAC sponsored study.

Recommendation #19. ESPA Staffing.
(a). The CDIE Director should be instructed to focus on helping USAID technical staff and Program Officers learn from USAID's experience and those of other donors, while at the same time feeding our lessons learned into our communications with the executive and legislative branches, and our development partners. The Director could also provide leadership to our contractors and grantees, the donor community, the IFIs, and the U.S. foreign policy establishment.

(b). In a show of support to the new Director and the launching of a new information initiative, the Administrator should open a workshop to discuss the sharing of best practices from development assistance.

(c). Replace departed DH staff, and show support for these jobs from the top of PPC.

(d). ESPA can get more help accomplishing its work if the Sharon Benoliel position is filled 100 percent of the time, instead of the current 80 percent. Sharon could work either full time, of or half-time. If it is the latter, then another person can be recruited to work the other 50 percent of the time.

(e). CDIE staff, especially ESPA staff, should be encouraged (if not flat-out required) to go to the field at least once a year. This would permit the officer to not only do a better job by staying in touch with conditions in the field, but also help to get ideas for future evaluation topics.

(f). Navin's replacement needs to be encouraged to focus on helping the Agency capture and share best practices so as to improve implementation and the ability of the Agency to report on results in a credible fashion. While Front Lines is doing a much better job of sharing vignettes, these do not substitute for solid analysis of USAID's successes and shortcomings. The Evaluators' Community of Practice and EvalWeb should be supported as a way of improving evaluations throughout the Agency.

ANNEX E – SELECTED RECOMMENDATIONS FROM "EVALUATION OF RECENT USAID EVALUATION EXPERIENCE, WORKING PAPER NO. 320," CYNTHIA CLAPP-WINCEK AND RICHARD BLUE, JUNE 2001, U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Recommendations for a Learning Organization

1. Agency leadership should convene a high level task force with one question: "how can we become the best learning organization possible?" Issues of organization, responsibilities and common understandings need to follow. Some examples: both CDIE and Global do best practices type studies; BHR guidance differs radically from Agency guidance; OP needs to participate in order to work towards addressing serious constraints posed by the contracting process; success stories need to be delinked from evaluations and an alternative approach identified (LPA).
2. Recognizing that missions will not be able to capture the overall effectiveness and impact of Agency programs, a strategy needs to be developed on how the Agency will more adequately meet these needs.
3. More training is clearly required. This system has been running on the professionalism, good faith and project evaluation training of Agency staff and partners. With the expected staff turnovers in the next five years, this will be increasingly insufficient.
4. An Evaluation Handbook directed to both USAID and their partners needs to be developed.
5. Evaluation policies need to be changed so that no bureau has blanket policies that directly contradict to Agency policies.
6. It should be someone's job on an ongoing basis to market evaluation policies and the guidance captured in the handbook (i.e., "get the word out") and to update the handbook on an ongoing basis.
7. The Strategic Objective has become the Agency's primary unit of results expectation and management oversight. This is the level to which the R4 system is geared. Paradoxically, much evaluation work is going on at an activity level, much less at the SO level. The current ADS strongly recommends evaluations be conducted at the SO level at least once in the life of the SO. The Agency should consider upgrading this to a requirement after adequate attention from senior management, training and support. The requirement should be that all programs are covered at some point by an evaluation, not that each SO should be evaluated.
8. Every strategy submitted to Washington for approval should be required to have a section reviewing experience on what works, what doesn't and why. These should explicitly include the mission's previous strategic experience.
9. More attention needs to be given to timely harvesting and processing of the knowledge that is being produced, especially by Agency partners.
10. Participating in a strategic evaluation in someone else's mission ought to be an integral part of the terms of service of any aspiring USAID officer. As USAID does less and less of their own implementation, the Agency should be doing

more and more of their own evaluation. People learn completely differently when they are out in the world asking the questions than they do sitting in an office quickly scanning a report. Modern evaluation theory and experience demonstrate that evaluation can be both objective and constructive if the organization is willing to invest leadership and staff resources in the ownership of the evaluation process. Since staff resources are highly constrained and fewer evaluations are being done, the evaluations should be of the highest quality.

11. The quality of evaluation design and methodology must be improved. If evaluation research is to become a credible and useful part of the agency's learning strategy, then more attention has to be paid to developing sound questions, good research designs and methods that will go beyond the kind of knowledge already at hand. Good evaluations will challenge the conventional wisdom, not just confirm it. In practical terms, this means drawing on professional evaluators to assist in the development of the key decisions about evaluation questions, research design and methodologies. Hopefully, USAID will have in-house expertise from which to draw to actively facilitate the process of use-based evaluation design. If not, USAID needs to find a contractual device for bringing in outside evaluation expertise at the stage when scopes of work, methods, and resources for the evaluation are being determined. Poorly stated questions and bad evaluation designs lead directly to poor evaluation results.

12. Standards and guidance for assessments must be developed. The assessments, with their quick backward look and a scan of the environment to decide how to move forward, make good sense in some contexts.

13. It is important to capture success but it needs a mechanism other than evaluations. Evaluations will always capture success when it occurs but linking the two distorts the evaluation process. An approach with guidance needs to be developed.

14. The role of mission evaluation officers should be reconsidered. Many missions have FSN evaluation officers by name that report being limited in their ability to carry out their job. How best can they be used and what needs to be done to support M&E officers where they exist.

15. Put evaluation back into the list of the Agency's priorities. The most senior Agency staff possible must demonstrate an interest in evaluation. Senior staff participation on evaluation teams would send a strong signal. Regional bureau senior staff could systematically debrief evaluation teams.

ANNEX - F FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FROM "REVIEW OF CDIE," SHEILA RONIS, THE UNIVERSITY GROUP, INC., TIMOTHY MAHONEY, USAID, JOSEPH GUERON, USAID, AND GEORGE HILL, CONSULTANT, MARCH 21, 2002

Based on its review, the team's principal findings are as follows:

Finding No. 1 The New PPC: PPC is undergoing a major transformation. Some of the more important changes include the reorganization of the Bureau, the inclusion of the budget function in its mandate, a new emphasis on intellectual leadership, and more broadly the Business Transformation efforts which include a reexamination of the Agency's IT architecture.

Recommendation No.1: In order for PPC to fulfill its new mandate, CDIE will need to become more focused on PPC priorities. For example, CDIE's work plan should be policy driven and focus on themes directly related to PPC's research needs. CDIE should also be charged with providing a similar array of support services for the Strategic Planning and Budget Office. In order to carry out this later function, CDIE should be charged with the responsibility for serving as the IT overseer for the Bureau.

Finding No. 2: Leadership: The lack of clear directions has had several adverse impacts on CDIE. In the absence of such, competing individual interests became the defining principle for selecting areas of focus.

Recommendation No.2: The key to a more effective CDIE is providing the office with clear directions in terms of how it can best support the Bureau's core functions of policy research, strategic planning and budgeting. After reaching agreement on these directions a work plan should also be developed that clearly describes expectations related to progress on agreed to themes.

Finding No. 3 CDIE's Legacy: The three divisions of CDIE all serve multiple customers. The demands of its various customers and the value they place on CDIE services have made it difficult for CDIE to move beyond its role as a library, clearing house, institutional memory, data search and impact evaluation service. However, the external environment has changed dramatically since CDIE first began operations. The main differences include: the rapid rise in internet usage and ease of access to data; a shift in emphasis to performance monitoring to measure program results; the new role that the technical centers now play in identifying lessons learned and best practices to maximize investments in their respective fields.

Recommendation No. 3: CDIE needs to reinvent itself focusing on its role as a knowledge management service unit equipped with the tools of today's technology. CDIE has in place the basic foundation for this transition – high quality IT skills, a large body of qualified researchers and quick access to presentation expertise. PPC should establish CDIE as its knowledge resource center. In this capacity CDIE should have responsibility for enabling all parts of PPC to access relevant data. This role should be

viewed not only in terms of the policy function of the Bureau but in terms of its role in the development and oversight of specific ADS chapters as well as its development and oversight of financial and results data. Enabling these various database systems to "speak" with one another will provide a new e-platform that should result in significantly increased efficiencies and greater collaboration within the Bureau.

Finding No. 4 Evaluation: Evaluation results play a key role in many policy issues and are a critical component of the Agency strategic planning process. The Review Team believes that the gap between Agency and PPC expectations for the evaluation function and the resources available to CDIE to meet those expectations is not sustainable.

Recommendation No.4: CDIE evaluation activities should be focused on supporting PPC's policy agenda and multi-sectoral linkages between the Agency strategic plan and program results. Responsibility for evaluation within technical sectors should be assigned to the Pillar Bureaus. CDIE may want to monitor results to ensure that significant findings are included in agency processes and guidance.

Finding No. 5 IT Infrastructure: CDIE's existing infrastructure provides, with minor modifications, a solid basis to support PPC's role as the Agency's new "think tank". In general, most of the information technology architecture presently supporting CDIE needs is adequate and in some cases excellent. In the long run, CDIE may need to migrate to a different database engine such as Oracle. The only instance of the wrong tool applied the wrong way, is the use of Lotus Notes.

Recommendation No. 5: The Bureau should prepare a plan for upgrading its IT infrastructure. A key component of this plan will be to provide training opportunities for CDIE staff to become more effective knowledge workers.

9. Implementing the Recommendations:

The evolution of CDIE as a PPC knowledge management support office will have to be actively managed. ...To help begin the process, the team has identified certain actions under each of its recommendations that can be taken. Where specific actions will require additional analysis and justifications, we have tried to identify them.

Improving CDIE Knowledge Management Infrastructure

The technical evolution of web based search and professional collaboration tools, which vastly expands the range of access of professionals to information, provides an opportunity for CDIE to begin to adjust its service model to customers. Over time, CDIE services, especially the library, clearing house and economic and social data, should be accessible directly by USAID professionals and other customers, requiring less facilitation from CDIE funded intermediaries. CDIE staff should be charged with developing a strategy for the evolution of its service model.

The team identified several steps that we believe are consistent with the recommended direction of change in this area: For example:

- Move the server(s) that houses the DIS development experience files and other material to the (198) network, outside of the USAID firewalls defining the USAID intranet. This will facilitate customer access and, eventually direct searches of the material as well as facilitate maintenance of the databases by the Development Exchange Clearing house staff (DEC). Work with IRM staff to confirm feasibility and costs.

- Conversion of unique, paper-based, USAID Library collection of historical strategy, budget, congressional presentation, program and organizational documents into machine readable form to provide backup and broader CDIE/DIO and staff access to these materials to service research requests. (estimated costs: $200-250,000) As a corollary and offset, consider closing the physical library and giving up the mezzanine space in RRB. (Savings to be estimated) The new agency "virtual library" could be supplemented by more active use of the existing contract with the Library of Congress for hard copy books or, if necessary, with the Dept. of State Library. An additional list of improvements is attached in Annex C.

- Use the decision to scan the USAID library collection to drive a decision on standardization of document storage technology for the Agency, e.g. Adobe Acrobat.

- Within the next several months, CDIE should be tasked to develop and coordinate, within the Bureau, a detailed plan for the evolution of its IT architecture and business practices. The plan should be designed to enhance CDIE knowledge management and decision support services for the PPC policy and strategic planning and budget agenda. PPC management should carefully review the plan and present it to the BTEC. Such a plan will help balance the current focus on administrative and financial systems improvements with requirements for technological investments that will improve the Agency's policy and program processes.

- While investments in new search engines and "portal" programs that would facilitate user access to current information and the use of web based "communities of practice" techniques with partners outside as well as inside the Agency will have to be planned with IRM to meet corporate needs and will take time and training to be fully useful, CDIE should expand its efforts to pilot these techniques.

Support for Strategic Planning and Budget

- Establish a strategic planning and budget and CDIE team to review the CDIE program results database (R-4 data) and set requirements for manipulating the

performance information as input into the strategic planning process. Revise tasking under the PWC contract to reflect new requirements.

- Review PWC performance and function in producing "Green Book" (U.S. Overseas Loans and Grants). Define budget office needs for historical information for presentations, education and public information.

- Review how existing PWC contract can support those requirements. Review needs for information support for current budget management tasks, especially presentation support. Analyze whether there is a role for contractor support of current needs.

- Strategic Planning and Budget should organize a working group to review the CBJ/ Annual Report process. Analyze the GPRA reporting structure and the database on agency results. Review current role of PWC in supporting the process and, based on recommendations of the working group, revise the support requirements as needed.

- Transfer the PME training function to HR.

- Merge contractor supported maintenance of the ADS chapters on program management into the strategic planning and budget office. Review role and need for continued contractor support.

Improved support for policy research and studies

- To help focus CDIE on the Bureau's agenda, PPC management should work with CDIE and the policy office to define the policy agenda in terms of specific research activities or analyses that CDIE management and contract managers can use to set priorities for core funded research analysis staff.

- As a model, CDIE – through its contracts – should be expected to establish virtual (research and data analyst) resources for new policy initiatives. This virtual resource could play a variety of roles, such as research assistance, community facilitator, new information resource/service promoter, resource librarian, activity coordinator, etc. This would also change the traditional researcher role from a solely on-demand resource to a pro-active participant/resource within a task group of value to the Agency. Within the contractor staff, this active node could serve to mobilize a variety of skills on behalf of the specific task.

Re-orienting the Evaluation Function

Expectations for the CDIE evaluation function need to be reduced. PPC should propose a reorientation of responsibilities for evaluation within the Agency. Pillar Bureaus should be responsible for technical evaluations designed to develop best practices within a sector to assess the outcomes of pilot programs. Regional Bureaus should be

responsible for evaluation studies within countries that are intended to inform new strategies with lessons learned. CDIE's evaluation mandate should be focused on cross cutting evaluations that are designed to inform the Bureau policy and/or strategic planning processes. Depending on the Bureau choice of adding staff to buttress CDIE evaluation capacity or adding money to outsource evaluation production, CDIE management will have to assess staff skills and needs to effectively carry out the revised POA mission.

The Review Team would envision a change in operating style for the evaluation function. While some new evaluation exercises would be designed to respond to specific policy development needs, a CDIE knowledge worker would be part of each policy development team. They would mine existing Agency lessons learned, pull upon evaluation findings from other donors, from the Pillar Bureaus and from Regional Bureaus and Missions to help ensure that the lessons of experience are reflected in current policy work. New evaluation efforts, when warranted, would be carried out in relevant time periods, i.e. short. The normal modality would be to contract for the evaluation work with CDIE managing the contracts closely to ensure comparable results, produced in a timely fashion, which adhere to appropriate professional methodological standards.

Coordinating Knowledge Management Support Within PPC

Coordination of CDIE's knowledge management support capabilities with the users of their services will be very important as PPC seeks to improve CDIE services. PPC should establish a Bureau knowledge management team, chaired by CDIE, which would be composed of representatives of the policy, strategic planning and budget units and a front office representative. The objective of the group would be to focus on the demand for knowledge management support services and the capabilities, current and potential, within CDIE. The team would be expected to recommend improvements which could encompass Bureau operating modalities, CDIE investments in IT, defining knowledge management issues that require attention beyond PPC (perhaps through BTEC), etc.

10.   Next Steps

There are five additional steps the team recommends the leadership of PPC consider:

- Commission the development of a strategy that outlines what the USAID "intellectual leadership" brand is and how to make it real. This first requires the development of an operational plan to create the PPC "think tank" and agreement on its initial agenda for research and policy studies. Section One of this report discusses in more detail suggestions for this initial agenda.

- Development of a communications strategy to support the creation of the USAID "intellectual leadership" brand. Knowledge diffusion tools such as symposia should form the basis of this strategy.

- Development of a process that formally links the external policy-making function to internal policy. As part of this effort focus on translating lessons learned from AID experience into internal practice recommendations.

- Ask each Mission librarian to forward the titles of major studies (not to exceed twenty) that have shaped the Mission's thinking on country development issues and priorities. These should be scanned into the CDIE repository, the Development Exchange Clearinghouse (DEC) database.

- Consider creating a transition team that meets twice a month to oversee how the changes PPC leadership is creating are working and ways to facilitate those changes as they come up. Consider having the Review Team meet with the transition team as facilitators and to offer suggestions.

ANNEX G - ADMINISTRATOR'S NOTCE ON PROGRAM EVALUATIONS

10/20/2003

SUBJECT: Program Evaluations - Suggestions for Improvement

Improving the effectiveness of foreign-aid remains my top priority. In order to remain at the forefront of both international development theory and practice, we must continue to learn from field experience. Unfortunately, over the past years the number of evaluations submitted to the Agency's document repository has fallen to only one fourth of prior levels. We need to improve this situation.

ADS 203.3.6 provides Agency guidance on program evaluations. Additional assistance to operating units with the design and production of assessments and evaluations is now available on EvalWeb. This is a one-stop-web-shop on how to conduct evaluations produced by the Policy and Program Coordination Bureau's Center for Development Information and Evaluation. The current URL on USAID's internal website is http://cdie.usaid.gov/evalweb/, and it will be accessible from USAID's external website later this month. (Please copy and paste the web address into the internet address bar to download the information.)

Also, regional and pillar bureaus and Missions have the responsibility to produce evaluations that inform decision-making and better tell USAID's story. Evaluations should be commissioned not only to help the specific operating unit but also to generate and share broader lessons learned that can be factored into Agency policies and programs.

I have asked PPC to institute procedures that assure compliance with the above, and also assure that lessons learned and best practices are shared across USAID.

Andrew S. Natsios

Attachment: ADS 203 Guidance on Assessing and Learning

OFFICE OF DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION AND INFORMATION

PPC/DEI

```
                        ┌─────────────────┐
                        │  David Adams    │
                        │  Director       │
                        └─────────────────┘
                                │
                        ┌─────────────────┐
                        │ Elaine Grigsby  │
                        │ Deputy Director │
                        └─────────────────┘
                                │
        ┌─────────────────┐         ┌─────────────────┐
        │ Rose Anderson   │         │ Florence Roach  │
        │ Prog.Ops/Budget │         │ Secretary       │
        └─────────────────┘         └─────────────────┘
```

Jonathan Dworken Special Projects	Vacant Division Chief for Evaluation	Susan Wallace Division Chief for Information

Joseph Lieberson Supv. Soc.Sci.Analyst	Grant Morrill Program Econ.Officer	Sharon Sadler Tech. Info. Specialist	Judith Coker Program Analyst
Krishna Kumar Program Analyst	Kenneth Beasley Program Analyst	Celida Malone Program Analyst	Robert Baker Info.Specialist (PASA)
Anne Beasley Senior Research Analyst	Sharon Pines- Benoliel Social Science	Judith Light Info.Specialist (PASA)	Peter Hobby Senior Research Analyst

PROPOSED PPC/DEI ORGANIZATIONAL CHART

OFFICE OF DEVELOPMENT EVALUATION AND INFORMATION

PPC/DEI

- David Adams — Director
  - Elaine Grigsby — Deputy Director
    - Rose Anderson — Prog.Ops/Budget
    - Florence Roach — Secretary
    - Jonathan Dworken — Special Projects
      - Vacant-NEW — PMF Special
    - Vacant — Division Chief for Evaluation
      - Janet Kerley Supv. Social Science Analyst
      - Vacant-NEW — Evaluation Analyst
      - Anne Beasley — Senior Research Analyst
      - Grant Morrill — Program Econ.Officer
      - Kenneth Beasley — Program Analyst
      - Sharon Pines-Benoliel — Social Science Analyst
      - Krishna Kumar — Program Analyst
    - Susan Wallace — Division Chief for Information
      - Sharon Sadler — Tech. Info. Specialist
      - Celida Malone — Program Analyst Info./Eval. NEW
      - Judith Light — Info.Specialist (PASA)
      - Judith Coker — Program Analyst
      - Robert Baker — Info.Specialist (PASA)
      - Peter Hobby — Senior Research Analyst

36

ANNEX I - SAMPLE SEARCH BY DEC IN YELLOW BOOK OF CONTRACTORS WHO HAVE NOT SUBMITTED EVALUATION REPORTS

As of July 26, 2004, the contractors listed below have agreements with USAID missions in the Africa region and a check with the DEC database indicates that no development experience documents have been submitted.

The 22 contractors hold 47 agreements for a total value of $487,375,804.23.

Abt Associates Inc.
Academy for Educational Development (AED) – 7 contracts
Action Against Hunger (USA)
Adventist Development and Relief Agency International (ADRA) – 4 contracts
African Medical and Research Foundation (AMREF)
African Wildlife Foundation—5 contracts
Africare Inc. – 13 contracts
Aid to Artisans Inc.
American Council on Education
AMEX International Inc.
Aurora Associates International Inc.
AVSC International – 2 contracts
Carana Corp.
CARE Inc. – 8 contracts
Carter Center Inc.
Catholic Relief Services (CRS) – for 6 contracts
Centre for Population and Development Activities (CEDPA)
Centre for Higher Education Transformation (CHET)
Chemonics International Inc. – for 3 contracts
Clapp and Mayne Inc.
Cooperative Office for Voluntary Organizations, Inc. (COVOL)
Cooperative League of the USA (CLUSA)
Corporate Council on Africa (CCA)
Datex Inc.
Development Alternatives Inc. (DAI) – 3 contracts
Development Associates Inc. – 2 contracts
DPK Consulting
Education Development Center Inc. (EDC) – 2 contracts
Financial Markets International Inc.
International Foundation for Election Systems (IFES) – 7 contracts
International Rescue Committee (IRC) – 3 contracts
Malawi Center for Advice, Research and Education Rights (Malawi-CARER)
Management Sciences for Health (MSH) – 2 contracts
Management Systems International (MSI)
Population Services International (PSI) – 7 contracts
The Research Foundation of State University of New York – 5 contracts
Research Triangle Institute (RTI) – 5 contracts

United Methodist Committee on Relief (UMCOR)
Volunteers in Technical Assistance (VITA) – 2 contracts
World Resources Institute (WRI) – 2 contracts
World Vision Inc. – 9 contracts
World Meteorological Organization (WMO)
World Learning Inc. – 3 contracts
World Education Inc.
World Council of Credit Unions Inc. (WOCCU)
Winrock International
Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS)

ANNEX J - BUREAU EVALUATION INFORMATION AS OF AUGUST 25, 2004

Those in the DEC are highlighted; those with some sort of evaluation or assessment, but not the one listed, are italicized. 2004 was not searched; "fkeywords" search was utilized using extensive truncation to include variant word endings.

Evaluations in LAC missions notified in FY 2004 annual reports, Completed 2003

Central America Regional Program
- Evaluation of Acción SIDA's community-based activities under the HIV/AIDS program and evaluation of the program's behavior change efforts

Dominican Republic
- Comprehensive assessment of the justice sector served as the basis for design of the contractor's justice reform work plan for FY2004

Ecuador
- Mid-term evaluation of SpO 518-011 "Improved Social and Economic Conditions of Inhabitants along the Peru-Ecuador Border"

Guatemala
- Land titling assessment
- Review of community forestry concessions management and commercialization status in the Petén
- Evaluation of the Pro-Redes Salud activity

Guyana
- Evaluation of SO 504-003: Improved HIV/AIDS Awareness, Knowledge and Applied Prevention Strategies

Haiti
- Evaluation of the Agriculturally Sustainable Systems and Environmental Transformation (ASSET) program under the environment SO

Jamaica [note: first entry covers 4 mid-terms]
- Mid-term evaluations of the New Economy Project [two evaluations but no "mid-term"], Inner City Special Objective, the Ridge-to-Reef activity, and Adolescent Reproductive Health Program
- Abbreviated evaluations of the Environmental Audits for Sustainable Tourism Project and Coastal Water Quality Improvement Project to identify lessons learned and establish the framework for the design of follow-on programs

Nicaragua
- Evaluation of the Co-management of Protected Areas project.

Panama
- Evaluation of the Protected Areas IR of the Canal Watershed Strategic Objective
  Evaluation of completed Justice Reform Special Objective

Peru
- Evaluations for 3 projects: poverty reduction and alleviation; environmental health; and addressing the threats of emerging and reemerging infectious diseases
- Evaluation of the America's Fund (financed by the Enterprise for America Institute and the Tropical Forest Conservation Act Secretariat)

Evaluations in LAC missions notified in FY 2004 annual reports for 2004
Bolivia
- Activity Evaluation: Marketing Access and Poverty Alleviation
- Activity Evaluation: Rural Financial Services
- Conflict Vulnerability Assessment Update
- Alternative Development Assessment

Caribbean Regional Program
- Mid-term evaluation of the work carried out by the Caribbean Epidemiology Center
- Final evaluation of the HIV/AIDS NGO networks program carried out by Family Health International

Central America Regional Program
- Mid-term evaluation of SO 596-005: Increased Central American Competitiveness in Global Markets

Colombia
- Evaluation encompassing activities implemented under all three Mission strategic objectives in the Putumayo Department

Dominican Republic
- Evaluation to examine mission's strategy and past activities in support of the health sector reform process
- Evaluation of assistance related to NGO sustainability in the family planning/reproductive health sector

Ecuador
- Mid-term evaluation of the activity to promote judicial security, including Elimination of antiquated legislation and judicial and legal monitoring to review grantee performance

Guatemala
- Thematic evaluations of Peace Program-supported activities in land, indigenous participation, and human rights

Jamaica
* Final evaluations for the Ridge-to-Reef program, the New Economy Project, and the Peace and Prosperity Project

LAC Regional
* Evaluation to determine whether the training underway at the three Centers of Excellence for Teacher Training is resulting in improved teaching of reading in the early grades
* External evaluation of the Parks in Peril program will include evaluation of activities in Bolivia, Ecuador, Guatemala and Mexico and look at the Parks in Peril management structure
* USAID Inspector General audit of LAC Regional activities to determine what regional activities the LAC Bureau is funding, how it is managing these activities, and what responsibilities for management have been assigned to others. Additionally, the audit will determine if financial audits are being performed, and provided to the Office of the Inspector General, in accordance with USAID policies and U. S. laws and regulations

Peru
* Mission and the government of Peru will carry out comprehensive evaluations of Phase I of the Peru-Ecuador Border Program, and the Integrated Alternative Development Initiative

USAID/E&E Mission Evaluations and Assessments: 2003 and 2004
Albania
* 2003 Evaluations/Assessments: None
* 2004 Evaluations/Assessments
* Mid-term evaluation of the Mission's Small Business Credit and Assistance project

Armenia
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
* Armenia Labor Market Evaluation and Strategy Assessment, Education Development Center, Washington, DC, April 2003
* Human Capacity Development Assessment, USAID, March 2003
* A Quick Education Sector Assessment, Aguirre International, March 2003
* Gender Assessment Report & Action Plan, Susan D. Somach, March 2003
* Assessment of USAID/Armenia's Direct Assistance Programs, USAID, February 2003
* USAID/Armenia Energy Program Assessment, USAID, February 2003
* Assessment of Opportunities for USAID Assistance to Armenia in the Environment, USAID, January 2003
* Conflict Vulnerability Assessment, USAID, January 2003
* Armenia Rule of Law/Anti-Corruption Assessment, ARD, Inc., December 2002

- An Assessment of USAID's Health Strategy in Armenia, Robert J. Taylor, Capri-Mara Fillmore, Tatyana N. Makarova, November 2002
- USAID/Armenia HIV/AIDS/STI Strategy, The Synergy Project, November 2002

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Competitiveness Assessment
- Financial Sector Assessment
- Assessment of Accounting Reform
- Institutional Assessment of the Regulatory Commission

Azerbaijan
2002 and 2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise Program Evaluation [done in 2004]
- Agro-Input Market Development Program Evaluation [2003]
- Political Party Assessment
- Legal Database Assessment
- Elections Assessment
- Civil Society Development Evaluation
- Community Development and USAID Humanitarian Assistance in Conflict Affected Areas Evaluation [strategic objective 3.1]
- Family Planning and Reproductive Health Assessment
- 2004 Evaluations/Assessments:
- Agricultural Wholesale Market Feasibility
- Financial/banking Sector Assessment
- Private Sector Assessment Update
- Food Quality Assessment
- Economic Impacts of Corruption

Belarus
2003 Evaluations/Assessments: None
2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Belarus Civil Society Strengthening Project
- Belarus Political Process Strengthening Project

Bosnia
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- The Media Environment in Bosnia and Herzegovina [assessment]
- Local Governance Assessment and Policy Recommendations
- Priorities and Partners: Developing the Rule of Law in Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Biodiversity Assessment in Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Bosnia and Herzegovina Tax Administration Systems Assessment
- Enforcement of Secured Transactions and Bankruptcy Norms in Bosnia-Herzegovina
- Court Administration Assessment
- Pension Fund Reform Assessment

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Mobilizing Capital for SMEs
- Civil Society Assessment
- FBiH Civil Service Agency Assessment

Bulgaria
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- Evaluation of the Peace Corps SPA program

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Participant Training Program
- Corruption Vulnerability Assessment in the Health Sector [part of the IRIS Center's initiative to field test USAID/E&E Bureau's corruption assessment methodology in Bulgaria]

Central Asian Republics
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- Media and Information Assessment
- Community Action Investment Program
- Malnutrition Prevention for Children Under Five

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Commercial law project mid-term assessment
- CAMFA mid-term assessment
- Enterprise Development Program mid-term assessment
- Basic Education assessment

Croatia
2003 Evaluations/Assessments: None
2004 Evaluations/Assessments:
- NGO Assessment

Georgia
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- Micro and SME Credit Activities in Georgia
- Trafficking Assessment
- Georgia Community Mobilization Initiative [have mid-term from 2002]
- Health Care Financing Assessment

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- RAPA Program Evaluation
- Citizen Advocate! Program Mid-Term Evaluation
- Court System Assessment
- IFES CEP Mid-Term Evaluation
- IRIS Mid-Term Evaluation

- Media Innovations Program Mid-Term Evaluation
- Youth Assessment

Kosovo
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- Local Governance assessment
- Corruption assessment
- Labor Market assessment
- Returns and Reconciliation
- Biodiversity

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Evaluation of Economic Reform assistance (2000-2003)
- Evaluation of the Private Sector Support assistance (2000-2004)
- Evaluation of the Court Administration project (2002-2003)
- Close out Evaluation of Strategic Objective 3.1 -- Return to Normalcy
- Independent Media Assessment
- Civil Society Assessment
- Agriculture Sector Assessment

Macedonia
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- Local Governance Assessment
- Civil Society Assessment

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Public Sector Assessment (linked with fiscal policy reform)
- Parliamentary Assistance Evaluation
- ICT Usage Assessment
- Data Quality Assessment

Moldova
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- Mid-Term Evaluation of the Private Farmer Assistance Program and the Private Farm Commercialization Program
- Evaluation of the Costs of Reintegration of Transnistria into Moldova
- Mid-term assessment of the Moldova 2001 - 2005 Strategy;
- Critical Gaps in and Recommendations for Anti-trafficking Activities

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Assessment of the Use of Irrigated Agriculture

Montenegro
2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Mid-term evaluation of CRDA

- Strategic assessment of media
- Strategic assessment of political processes

Romania
2003 Evaluations/Assessments: None
2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Performance assessment of the GRASP (Governance Reform and Sustainable Partnerships) Program
- Final evaluation of the Romanian-American Sustainable Partnerships (RASP) program
- Assessment of the Romanian legal environment concerning trafficking in persons
- Assessment of the Agriculture Portfolio
- Mid-term evaluation of the Romanian Family Health Initiative

Russia
2003 Evaluations/Assessments
- RFE SME Strategy design
- Media assessment
- Assessment of Russian American Rule of Law Consortium (funded by USAID/Washington)
- Assessment of the Current State of Russian Legal Education: Opportunities for Targeted Funding with Maximum Impact
- SME sector analytical report
- Targeted regional democracy polling
- RLMS - Russian Longitudinal Monitoring Survey

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Assessment of new local government law impact
- Targeted Regional Democracy Polling
- Series of evaluations and assessments as part of the development of a new Mission strategy on gender, youth, and biodiversity

Serbia 2004
Evaluations/Assessments
- Mid-term evaluation of CRDA
- Strategic assessment of media
- Strategic assessment of political processes

Ukraine 2003
Evaluations/Assessments
- Ukraine banking sector study
- Assessment of the CIPA examination process in CIS
- Assessment of Local Government Reform Project in Ukraine
- Financial Leasing Legislation analysis
- Assessment of Bond Markets in Ukraine [have: Ukraine debt market assessment]

- Survey of NBU Compliance with Basel Core Principals of Effective Banking Supervision
- Gender Survey of Ukraine's Banking Sector
- Mortgage Assessment
- Information Disclosure Systems of the Securities and Stock Market State Commission and Securities Industry in Ukraine
- Survey for the establishment of a Credit Bureau in Ukraine
- Mid-term Evaluation of the PFID Program
- Semi-annual Review of the Western NIS Enterprise Fund
- Rapid Evaluation of Reform Measures in Pilot Cities

2004 Evaluations/Assessments
- Land Titling Initiative evaluation
- Smaller Farmer Training II evaluation
- Tariff and Non-tariff Barriers to Leasing
- Microenterprise/NGO evaluation
- NTCA evaluation
- Local Environment Action Program final evaluation
- Assessment of Trafficking in Women and Children in Ukraine
- Child Survival assessment

G/H - Evaluations and Assessments for FY 2003

Mission Funded:
  Published (Public) Reports produced:
- India – IFPS Evaluation

Non-Public/Internal Reports only:
- Jamaica – ARH Assessment
- Cambodia – RACHA Evaluation
- Nigeria – FP/RH Program Strategy Assessment
- Georgia – Women's Health Assessment
- Indonesia – STARH Assessment/Mgt Review
- Jordan – SO 3 Evaluation
- Albania – Assessment & Design
- Nigeria – Assessment/Future Strategy
- Kenya – AMKENI Expanded Management Review*
- Philippines – Friendly Care Systems Review
- Cambodia – RHAC Evaluation
- Tanzania – Assessment and Design
- Ecuador – Health Systems Assessment

Core funded (USAID/W):
  Published (Public) Reports produced:
- GH/HIDN – BASICS II Evaluation

- GH/PRH – CTR/FHI Evaluation
- GH/PRH – PRIME II Evaluation
- GH/PRH – Human Capacity Development in Health Evaluation

Non-Public/Internal Reports only:
- GH/PRH – PC Program Assessment
- GH/PDMS – Fellows Program Evaluation

Mission Funded – 14
Core Funded (GH) – 5

Evaluations and Assessments for FY 2004-G/H (Preliminary information)

Mission Funded:
Published (Public) Reports produced:
- Ukraine: Health Assessment & Design
- Ukraine: PMTCT Program Review
- Malawi: Social Marketing Mid-Term Evaluation (possibly)
- Philippines: EnRICH Assessment
- E&E Bureau: FP/RH Assessment (possibly)
- Philippines: Contraceptive Self Reliance Assessment

Non-Public/Internal Reports only:
- Philippines: Demographic Review
- Cambodia: Global Fund Assessment
- Jordan: External Evaluation of JAFPP & JSI
- Philippines: IDSCP Evaluation

Unknown at this Time
- Philippines: AED Social Acceptance Project Evaluation
- Philippines: Male Involvement Assessment

Core funded (USAID/W):
Published (Public) Reports to be produced:
- GH/PRH: Birthspacing Review
- GH/PRH: AdvanceAfrica & CATALYST Evaluation
- GH/PRH: Management & Leadership Evaluation
- GH/PRH: M&E Assessment & Work plan Development
- GH/HIDN: PHR plus Evaluation
- GH/PRH: Gender Violence – Literature Review and Analysis

Non-Public/Internal Reports only:
- GH/PRH: FP Graduation and Lessons Learned Analysis & Review