

**DESCRIPTION OF THE A.I.D. BUREAU FOR AFRICA MONITORING,
EVALUATION, AND REPORTING SYSTEM**

Submitted to:

**Agency for International Development
Bureau for Africa
Office of Development Planning
Policy Planning and Evaluation Division
Washington, D.C. 20523**

March 1989



600 Water Street S.W., NBU 7-7
Washington, D.C. 20024

telephone: (202) 484-7170
telex: 4990821MANSY fax: (202) 488-0754

**DESCRIPTION OF THE A.I.D. BUREAU FOR AFRICA
MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING SYSTEM**

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.	ii
I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY	1
II. OVERVIEW OF AFRICA BUREAU'S MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING SYSTEM	5
A. Basic Organization of the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting System	5
B. Project/Nonproject-Level Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures	5
C. Country Program-Level Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures	10
D. Bureau-Level Strategy and Policy	13
III. ANALYSIS OF SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS	16
IV. RECOMMENDATIONS	26
ANNEX 1: Africa Bureau FY88-89, Annual Evaluation Plan	
ANNEX 2: A.I.D. Evaluation Summary	
ANNEX 3: State 78879, 18/3/88, Project Implementation Reports	
ANNEX 4: State 030918, 2/2/88, Africa Bureau Supplemental CDSS Guidance and Guidance on Concept Papers	
ANNEX 5: State 340629, 31/10/87, General CJSS Guidance	
ANNEX 6: State 378844, 11/28/87, Africa Bureau Guidance for FY89-91 Action Plans	
ANNEX 7: State 097541, 4/2/87, FY1989 ABS - Africa Bureau Guidance	
ANNEX 8: State 292525, 9/18/87, Africa Bureau Evaluation Initiative	

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This analysis was conducted for the Office of Development Planning, Policy Planning and Evaluation Division (AFR/DP/PPE) to more clearly institutionalize the Africa Bureau's monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system through a description of the system and an assessment of its overall strengths and weaknesses. Given that there appears to be limited common understanding of the system or even perception of it as a system, this study attempts to clarify the structure and functions of the system to facilitate greater understanding in the Bureau of current efforts to improve monitoring, evaluation and reporting.

The impetus for current initiatives to improve monitoring, evaluation, and reporting in the Africa Bureau is the Development Fund for Africa (DFA). By the elimination of functional accounts from A.I.D.'s sub-Saharan African assistance program, the DFA provides a legislative framework that increases the Bureau's flexibility in programming resources. The new flexibility under the DFA challenges the Bureau to strengthen its monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system to improve assistance program effectiveness and to respond to increasing accountability requirements.

As part of the background to the study, note is briefly made of agencywide guidance on monitoring and evaluation (M&E), A.I.D.'s long-standing commitment to evaluation, and recent shifts in agency policy toward M&E.

In describing the Bureau's monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system, functions and procedures set out by both agencywide and bureau guidance are reviewed according to major levels of program decision-making:

- Project and nonproject assistance reflected in documentation that includes evaluations and Project Implementation Reports;
- Country programs which include the CDSS, Action Plan, and ABS process; and
- Bureau strategy and policy which includes measurement and reporting of continent-wide program performance by sector as well as progress in policy reform.

Project level M&E procedures are recounted generally following the project document cycle, focusing particularly on the monitoring function of PIRs for Missions and AID/W. In reviewing guidance related to M&E functions at the country program level, emphasis is given to the central role of the Action Plan in setting strategic objectives, targets, and benchmarks by which the Mission's performance is measured in meeting CDSS objectives. Progress in providing better information on Bureau-wide performance is described by reviewing various initiatives and special studies involved in a two-part approach to: (1) develop improvements in

the overall functioning of the system; and (2) use rapid, low-cost methods for collection and analysis of data on program performance.

After describing monitoring, evaluation, and reporting procedures at each level of decision-making, the study draws some conclusions regarding aspects of the system that could be improved. A central deficiency of the system identified is a surplus of information available at the project level and an unmet demand for data at the country program and bureau levels. This imbalance between information supply and demand is partially attributed to the wide-ranging character of the Agency's program, and to the Bureau's limited ability to aggregate performance and impact data at the country program and bureau levels. On this point the study concludes:

- Greater consensus on appropriate indicators for measuring program performance and impact should contribute to the Bureau's ability to track country and sectoral progress.
- It may be possible to make some slight modifications in project-level data collected to provide proxy measures of country program impact and to selectively aggregate this data for cross-country comparison.
- Some benchmarks require data collection efforts outside of projects to provide independent measures at country level.

It is suggested that the search for consensus through the Evaluation Working Group may not be the most effective means of reaching decisions needed to select key indicators with which to track country and sectoral progress. The study recommends that TR and DP select a limited number of indicators of program performance to be tracked and reported on for all Category I missions over a fixed number of years.

After examining the issue of overall imbalance in information supply and demand, the analysis considers options for system improvements at each level of decision-making, giving priority to country program impact measurement through the following:

- Identification of cross-cutting objectives between missions by the Bureau and development of common approaches for impact measurement;
- Review of Bureau guidance on the CDSS, Action Plan, and ABS for opportunities to improve linkages and add more coherency to the overall country measurement task;
- Giving emphasis to making objectives measurable at the CDSS stage and to clearly defining priorities and tactics in presenting the proposed assistance strategy;

- Articulation of strategic objectives in the Action Plan at a level of focus as high above project purpose as is measurable to show progress toward objectives of sufficient significance to the recipient country to warrant U.S. assistance;
- Deriving goal statements for individual projects from Action Plans to develop better country program-to-project linkages and linkages between projects; and,
- Drawing a distinction between country trend indicators as measures of contextual variables or assumptions affecting project outcomes and program performance indicators that are commensurate with the scale of A.I.D. interventions, below the sectoral level, limited to specific occupational groups and geographic locations.

The study ends with an acknowledgement that any improvements in monitoring, evaluation, and reporting are dependent on overall direct hire staffing levels in each mission as well as OE resources available. The reduction in resources, particularly OE and PD&S, has increased reluctance to devote funds to data-gathering simply to establish baselines, or to measure changes in key variables (e.g., contraceptive use, household food consumption). There are many good reasons to improve monitoring and evaluation; yet there are fewer people and less money to do it with. Realization of this context is an important aspect of understanding and evaluating the findings on the system. It is not possible to expand functions such as Action Plan monitoring and evaluation without reducing other monitoring, evaluation, and reporting functions to compensate. This balance is difficult to achieve given increasing accountability requirements and oversight needs for both project and nonproject assistance.

I. BACKGROUND AND PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

This study represents Africa Bureau's effort to more clearly institutionalize its monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system through a description of the system and an analysis of its overall strengths and weaknesses. Given that there appears to be limited common understanding of the system or even perception of it as a system, this study attempts to clarify the structure, function, and performance of the system to facilitate broader understanding in the Bureau of current initiatives to improve monitoring, evaluation, and reporting.

Agency-wide Guidance on Monitoring and Evaluation

The A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook defines monitoring as a continuous management activity that requires information about (1) the use of assistance resources according to plans and regulations, and (2) the interim results and effects of resources in light of initial or revised objectives. Monitoring information is used to adjust or redesign activities to keep them on track toward their objectives, to raise issues for resolution by more senior managers, or to call for a more comprehensive evaluation.

Evaluation is defined by the Handbook as an activity that is undertaken periodically to inform managers about key issues -- relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability -- before major decisions are made regarding A.I.D.-funded activities or future program development. An evaluation looks beyond the achievement of inputs and outputs, which is documented by monitoring, to assess (1) the appropriateness of design in achieving development objectives, (2) the appropriateness of implementation in achieving development objectives, (3) the actual extent of development impact, and (4) lessons learned that can be applied elsewhere.

As the primary purpose of monitoring and evaluation is to assist A.I.D. and host country government managers to make well-informed decisions, A.I.D. requires that the level of effort and resources directed to monitoring and evaluation be commensurate with the information requirements of managers at different organizational levels within the Agency:

- At the project level, monitoring and ongoing evaluation should provide information about the use of project resources and should track progress toward the development objectives of the project as defined by the output, purpose, and goal statements of the project's Logical Framework.
- At the country program level, A.I.D. managers are instructed to develop comparable monitoring and evaluation systems to generate and use information drawing on data from specific projects, multi-project evaluations, special studies, and other relevant sources to periodically assess

progress toward achievement of the overall development objectives of A.I.D.'s assistance.

- Regional Bureaus must establish a system to: (1) review and approve the Evaluation Plans of their Missions; (2) assess the soundness of Mission Evaluation Plans and suggest improvements as necessary; (3) relate Bureau information needs to these plans to the extent possible; (4) prepare an annual Bureau Evaluation Plan covering Bureau information needs and including Bureau approved Mission evaluation schedules for the corresponding 2-year period; (5) establish reporting and review procedures for field-initiated evaluations; and (6) provide guidance, standards, and assistance to Missions and AID/W offices for monitoring and evaluation activities.

The Development Fund for Africa

The Development Fund for Africa (DFA) has provided the most recent impetus for the Africa Bureau to strengthen its monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system. By the elimination of functional accounts from A.I.D.'s sub-Saharan African assistance program, the DFA increases the Bureau's flexibility in programming resources while providing a degree of protection during an era of declining overall resources. The new flexibility in the DFA will allow the results of evaluations to play a larger role in Bureau programming decisions across sectors and across countries. Effective use of the Fund, however, requires the Bureau to strengthen its monitoring, evaluation and reporting system to improve assistance program effectiveness and to respond to the assessment requirement in the DFA legislation for a "consultative process that is informal and self-critical" (quoted from Africa Bureau FY88-89 Annual Evaluation Plan). Congressional reporting requirements have increased under the DFA. They require that Africa Bureau more carefully outline needs, define objectives, clarify indicators, describe successes and make appropriate linkages between sectors. In short, the DFA challenges the Bureau to demonstrate that protection does not lead to complacency and that flexibility improves effectiveness.

Long-Standing Commitment to Evaluation in A.I.D.

While the impetus which the DFA provides to the Africa Bureau to improve program effectiveness and external reporting is new, attention to monitoring, evaluation, and reporting has been a matter of concern to A.I.D. for many years. In the early 1970s, emphasis on improved data collection and analysis coincided with the adoption of the Logical Framework as a project design and evaluation planning tool. Subsequently, the New Directions Mandate in 1973 directed A.I.D. to target its programs to the poor majority and to assess the impact of the efforts on these groups. This led to a concern for making more explicit assessments of the validity of hypotheses and assumptions that underpinned project interventions. The Agency then began to seek ways to provide analyses of purpose/goal achievements to managers. In 1979, a series of

impact evaluations were initiated in a variety of sectors. A further incentive for renewed interest in monitoring, evaluation, and reporting issues occurred with the decentralization of program management and the delegation of authority to the field beginning in 1983. With this delegation, A.I.D. Missions were given increased accountability for their performance in meeting higher-order development objectives, for managing the use of available resources, and for reporting on performance outcomes.

Recent Shifts in Agency Policy Toward M&E

A.I.D. continues to rethink its approach to evaluation, partly because too often in the past evaluation results have been unused, incomplete or inconclusive. Studies were not always of use to the project being assessed. Reports were rarely utilized by other country programs or projects. Many other evaluations failed to address pending management issues directly and explicitly, or buried their responses to such questions inside volumes of data or lengthy descriptions without analysis. In response to these concerns, other significant shifts in the Agency's perspective toward monitoring and evaluation have recently become evident.

The first of these shifts concerns evaluation priorities. Where previous approaches tended to place primary emphasis on the generation of knowledge, secondary emphasis on accountability, and only tertiary emphasis on informing pending decisions, recent experience suggests that many A.I.D. managers now feel that this order of priority should be reversed. Monitoring and evaluation activities would, in this reversed order of priorities, thus become elements of ongoing management information systems for projects, programs, A.I.D. missions and the agency as a whole. Monitoring and evaluation efforts would be judged by their impact on the quality of program and project management. Among the many implications of this shift are:

- an increased priority for formative or mid-term evaluations, that focus on ways to improve implementation or possibly redesign an on-going project or program;
- a desire to link evaluation to decision makers' current issues and options;
- a concern with the timeliness and cost-effectiveness of information; and
- an increased willingness to regard evaluation as a continuous function rather than an occasional event.

A second major shift is a concern with the use of evaluations to generate information in response to broader questions than those reflected in the Logical Frameworks for individual projects. Most noteworthy among these issues are:

- the need to assess program performance at the country program, sectoral, and Bureau level;

- the need to address issues which tend to be poorly reflected in project logframes, such as sustainability, replicability, technology transfer and institutionalization; and
- a concern with the possible unplanned effects of development projects.

Purpose of the Study

The present analysis was conducted for the Bureau for Africa, Office of Development Planning, Policy Planning Evaluation Division (AFR/DP/PPE) as the first of three deliverables commissioned to strengthen the structure, function, and performance of the Bureau's monitoring, evaluation and reporting system. Other deliverables of the work order include: guidelines for the Africa Bureau to supplement the Agency's Evaluation Handbook; and recommendations to enhance 10-12 currently planned evaluations.

The objective of this study and the supplemental guidelines is to facilitate a broader understanding in the Bureau of recent initiatives to strengthen monitoring, evaluation, and reporting by respectively describing the system and setting out current guidelines regarding functions and performance. In addition to performing a communications role for Africa Bureau personnel by describing the system, this study is also intended to play a diagnostic function of identifying common operational problems as well as overall weaknesses of the system. The objective of the third deliverable under the work order, recommendations to enhance selected forthcoming evaluations, is to experiment with and maximize evaluation resources and lessons learned by using project evaluations to contribute to selected country program and bureau-level performance measurement.

II. OVERVIEW OF AFRICA BUREAU'S MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING SYSTEM

A. Basic Organization of Monitoring, Evaluation, and Reporting System

The overall monitoring and evaluation system of the Africa Bureau is reflected in the reports and decision memos which are used to document actions at each level of decision-making within the Bureau and to provide reports to the rest of the Agency and the Congress. For the purposes of this analysis, the major decision levels in the Bureau have been divided according to the framework set out by the Evaluation Working Group in its review of evaluation and reporting activities that need to be addressed to improve the Bureau's ability to measure program performance. These levels of decision-making are:

- project which includes evaluations and implementation reports of both projects and non-project assistance;
- country programs which includes the CDSS, Action Plan and ABS process; and
- bureau strategy and policy which includes measurement of continent-wide progress by sector (agriculture, health, natural resource management) as well as progress in policy reform, and reporting to the Congress.

Policy initiatives are assessed at all three levels of the system: at the project/non-project level through individual evaluations; at the country program level for potential linkages to the overall program in the country; and, at the Bureau level in the aggregate across Africa to report U.S. influence in ongoing shifts to sounder economic policies and privatization.

The description of Africa Bureau's monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system that follows is drawn from a review of guidance cables, memoranda, and other documents, as well as interviews with Africa Bureau staff, both in AID/W and in several Missions. After describing monitoring, evaluation, and reporting procedures at each level of decision-making, this study will draw some conclusions regarding aspects of the system that could be improved, and then suggest some options for changing the system for the Bureau to consider. The supplemental guidance which is the second product of this assignment will incorporate recommendations from this analysis which are most readily able to be implemented by the current system.

B. Project/Nonproject-Level Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures

Planning

The first elements of monitoring and evaluation at the project level begin with the generation of the PID and PP, and, for nonproject assistance, the PAIP and the PAAD. At the PID stage, consideration of

monitoring is required within the logical framework; indicators must be specified as a first attempt to measure how project performance will be tracked. Budgets at this stage may include a line item to cover evaluation costs. While logical frameworks are not required for nonproject assistance (NPA), most PAIPs do set forth objectives and potential performance indicators which can serve as a framework for future monitoring efforts.

Agencywide guidance issued in April 1987 (referenced in Africa Bureau FY88-89 Annual Evaluation Plan, see Annex 1) requires the inclusion of a line item in budgets at the PP or PAAD stage to cover monitoring and evaluation costs for all project or nonproject assistance. This supplemented previous guidance that required inclusion of a monitoring and evaluation plan. The M&E plan is used to focus on crucial monitoring issues early in project development (by highlighting major assumptions, hypotheses, and decision points) and to ensure that sufficient budgetary resources are allocated for the monitoring and evaluation function. The key steps in the development of the monitoring and evaluation plan include (as taught in the A.I.D. Project Design Course and Evaluation Planning Workshops):

- (1) Identifying information users;
- (2) Clarifying information needs;
- (3) Identifying priority questions;
- (4) Selecting indicators and identifying existing data sources;
- (5) Determining methods for obtaining additional information;
- (6) Identifying roles and responsibilities;
- (7) Establishing feedback procedures;
- (8) Developing budgets; and
- (9) Specifying the evaluation schedule.

In addition to the M&E plan, design documents (PPs and PAADs) must include reference to relevant evaluative information from other projects, where appropriate and available. The Project Officer is responsible for researching past experiences with similar activities and incorporating lessons learned into new design efforts. Key questions and issues on project strategy are identified in the PP as well as means to collect information to answer them over time. These are expected to be reviewed and approved by the ECPR.

Scheduling

Planned timing for evaluations in the PP or PAAD is generally tied to major project events rather than fixed calendar dates to ensure that sufficient progress in producing outputs has been achieved to allow for

measurement. Evaluation dates given in the planning stage are, however, illustrative, not binding. Actual timing for evaluation is expected to be tailored to project needs as implementation progresses. The PIR and ABS processes currently provide mechanisms for Missions to inform AID/W of project/nonproject evaluation schedules.

The A.I.D. Handbook indicates that the major factor in determining when to evaluate is the need for evaluative information to guide key upcoming decisions about the future implementation of the project or program. A.I.D. requires that such information be available prior to these decisions and that it be used to substantiate decisions and actions to be taken. Mid-term evaluations are not required for all projects. Final evaluations are required when a follow-on project is anticipated.

The Annual Evaluation Plan, prepared by the Mission Evaluation Officer, consists of (1) a rolling 2-year schedule listing upcoming evaluations and (2) a brief description of the main issues and reasons for the evaluations planned. Although a large part of the Annual Evaluation Plan concerns the scheduling of specific project evaluations, it is also expected to address any country program, sectoral and bureau-level information requirements. Certain program and sector-level information needs cannot be addressed through individual project evaluations and require the conduct of special studies or assessments. These are also to be specified in the Annual Evaluation Plan.

In addition to providing a coherent plan for the Mission, the Annual Evaluation Plan should serve as a basis for developing the monitoring and evaluation section of the Mission Action Plan. Since the ABS is regarded as primarily a programming and scheduling device, the Africa Bureau has recently proposed that Evaluation Plans be appended to the Action Plan rather than the ABS. This proposed change in Africa Bureau guidance is intended to facilitate AID/W review of the priority questions and research strategy for planned evaluations in light of past progress and planned targets of the Action Plan.

Monitoring Function of PIRs for Missions

PIRs are intended to serve as a management tool for Missions to assess all project activities on a systematic basis and link such assessments to monitoring of the Mission Action Plan, principally through the Mission Director's overview statement. As a result of recent Africa Bureau guidance (State 078879, 3/18/88, Project Implementation Reports, see Annex 3) the PIR format was modified to focus more explicitly on purpose and output-level tracking, analysis of problems and issues central to the project's success in meeting objectives, and tracking of major outstanding project evaluation and audit recommendations. More explicit focus on project performance at the purpose level is to be accomplished by utilizing PIRs for internal reviews of project progress while minimizing input level narratives. Greater attention to tracking recommendations from prior evaluations is to be achieved by including the following in the PIR discussion of important issues and problems, when applicable:

- (1) a summary of major conclusions from recent evaluations, and

- (2) a brief account of actions taken during the reporting period on recommendations from recent evaluations.

The companion Mission Director's overview statement is to include an assessment of the state of the Mission portfolio, a description of major accomplishments from the last six-month period, and a discussion of specific implementation problems.

Monitoring Function of PIRs for AID/W

By incorporating administrative information, financial data, project progress narratives, and an overview statement organized around the Action Plan Agenda, PIRs are intended to address concurrently a number of AID/W reporting concerns, e.g., project/program performance, special interest accomplishment, pipeline analysis, PACD issues, and funding considerations. In AID/W, responsibility for overall management of the PIR review process rests with AFR/PD (Africa Bureau Guidebook for Project Development Officers, July 1988). PIRs provide a mechanism for informing PD on project performance. PD makes decisions on issues for the PIR review, ensures collaboration with all relevant offices and bureaus, drafts the reporting cable to the Mission following the PIR review, and ensures appropriate feedback on implementation performance to Africa Bureau executive management. Through PD geographic office summary memos and the PD Director's synthesis of these summaries, the PIR process provides the AA/AFR and DAAs with an overview of Mission accomplishments and unresolved issues by subregion.

Over time, it is expected that the PIR process will also facilitate monitoring of the Bureau's various sector Action Plans. In particular, AFR/TR will use its participation in the PIR review process to track implementation of sector priority decisions and identify the need for potential adjustments in the strategies which have been approved by Bureau management. PIRs have not generated information for ABS use as financial reporting varies with the PAIS Report used in AID/W.

PIR Processing Steps

PIRs covering the first six months of the fiscal year are due on May 1st and for the last six months of the fiscal year on November 1st. Following receipt by AFR/PD/IPS, a microfiche copy of the document is made for AID/W permanent record and the original PIR is forwarded within two days of receipt to the appropriate AFR/PD geographic backstop. AFR/PD organizes copies of the PIR in the standard book form used by the division, which includes a copy of the reporting cable for the previous PIR cycle. The packages are distributed to the Project Committee which includes the PDO as Chairperson, the Geographic Desk Officer, AFR/TR, GC/AFR, AFR/DP, and other AID/W staff as appropriate (PDC, PRE, S&T, M/FM M/SER, FVA, MDI). The PDO provides at least five, but no more than ten, working days between distribution of the PIR and the actual PIR review.

Recurrent themes emphasized in the review meeting are pipeline/mortgage issues, success/failure at the purpose level, documentation received including previous cycle requests, evaluation, and consistency with strategic objectives. Reporting cables are sent to the field with both "generic" and project specific observations, approved by the AFR/PD Director. Each PD geographic office prepares a regional performance overview summarizing the salient points of PIR reviews, and as noted above, the PD Director prepares a synthesis of these summaries for discussion by the Bureau executive management.

Evaluation Funding

Routine evaluations are primarily funded through project budgets as specified in the PP or PAAD. Special assessments, impact studies, or policy-relevant evaluations, not otherwise included in projects' budgets, are funded from operating expenses and the Program Development and Support account.

Backstopping the Evaluation

The A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook provides a generic checklist of preparatory activities involved in the implementation of an evaluation. These preparatory activities are the responsibility of the Project Officer and the Mission Evaluation Officer. Basic actions and decisions to be taken include:

- (1) Agreement by all parties (relevant Mission offices, host government officials, and contractors) on objectives, expected results, roles and responsibilities;
- (2) Allocation of resources and staff time for the evaluation through the budgeting, PIO/T, and scheduling processes;
- (3) Preparation of background information and project history documentation, preliminary interview scheduling, and logistical support for the evaluation team;
- (4) Guidance on reporting on evaluation progress throughout the process through briefings with Mission, host government, and other involved parties;
- (5) Review of evaluation results, determination of necessary follow-up actions, and dissemination of lessons learned for use in decisions beyond the specific project.

Agencywide guidance requires a Mission Order on Evaluation to establish operational procedures and responsibilities for project and program evaluation activities. Use of Mission Orders on Evaluation is intended to ensure field application of agencywide and bureau evaluation guidance.

Submission to AID/W

The A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook states that an evaluation report and a completed A.I.D. Evaluation Summary are required for all evaluations. The A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (see Annex 2) replaces the PES form. Africa Bureau guidance indicates that the report and summary should be sent within 60 days of receipt of the final version to AFR/DP/PPE, PPC/CDIE/DI/Acquisitions, and SER/MO/CPM/P. SER/MO/CPM/P further circulates copies of evaluation reports and summaries within AID/W offices in accordance with standard distribution lists.

AID/W Review

Responsibility for AID/W review of field use of delegations of authority regarding project and non-project assistance, including evaluations, rests with PD. Backstopping PDOs read evaluation reports submitted and correspond with the appropriate Technical Office to determine if formal AID/W review is necessary. A determination is made whether there is something particular AID/W can learn from the evaluation or when there is an [evaluation] issue on which AID/W should provide guidance to the field. When an evaluation review is held, normally chaired by the PDO, the PDO is responsible for providing subsequent feedback to the field. A reporting cable is to be drafted by the PDO, cleared with the Project Committee and Bureau Evaluation Officer, summarizing important issues raised and recommending follow-up actions as appropriate (Guidebook for Project Development Officers, July 1988). In practice, it appears that these determinations are not of high priority to PDOs as such decisions are not as time-sensitive to bureau funding cycles as PD reviews of PIDs, PAADs, PPs, country program documentation, and actions on regional emergencies.

The Africa Bureau has suggested that the following categories of evaluations be reviewed by AID/W: (1) Project Issues Type - if certain issues identified at the project design stage are involved that could affect the success of the project, concerns at the output-purpose, EOPS or assumption levels; (2) Threshold Decisions Evaluations - when follow-on projects or major amendments involving expanding or extending project activities are contemplated; and (3) Lessons Learned Evaluations - if project implementation raises significant issues that are valuable to project designers or decision-makers concerned with other projects in the region or similar types of projects agencywide. AFR/DP has indicated that only 5-10% of completed evaluations are expected to be reviewed by AID/W independent of the PIR review process.

C. Country Program-Level Monitoring and Evaluation Procedures

Assessment of country program impact and effectiveness has become increasingly important in recent years with the emergence of the Action Plan as the main instrument for addressing Mission performance. This section describes the role of the Country Development Strategy Statements

(CDSS), Action Plan and the Annual Budget Submission (ABS) in the monitoring, evaluation and reporting functions of the Bureau.

CDSS

CDSSs, Concept Papers, Limited CDSSs, and SPSSs required of certain missions, lay out the broad analytical basis for the assistance strategy in each country. The overall monitoring, evaluation and reporting systems of each country program are to be laid out in the CDSS and, therefore, form the structure for the highest level of analysis within that country's portfolio. As outlined in Africa Bureau guidance (State 030913, 2/2/88, Africa Bureau Supplemental CDSS Guidance and Guidance on Concept Papers, see Annex 4), a section of the CDSS is to be used to explain the objectives of the M&E system, how the system will be managed, and principal measures for determining the overall success of the country program strategy. The Africa Bureau guidance supplements agencywide guidance prepared by PPC (State 340629, 10/31/87, General CDSS guidance, see Annex 5).

Overall agency guidance states that the CDSS provides an analytical basis for the proposed assistance strategy and develops the key elements of country programming. Instructions on problem analysis point out that country trend indicators and quantitative standards of achievement should be used and that data should be disaggregated by gender.

Africa-specific guidance mentions three priority areas in CDSS preparation:

- (1) Setting objectives and measuring progress under the End Hunger Initiative.
- (2) Responding to opportunities provided by the DFA.
- (3) Monitoring of progress in implementing new approaches and developing adequate evaluating/reporting systems.

The Mission sets overall country performance objectives in the CDSS which are to be articulated for the medium-term through the Action Plan. The CDSS answers questions about why A.I.D. is working in a country and how it will work with the host government to achieve mutually agreed development targets.

The CDSS is submitted to AID/W in hard copy for review and approval. The review, chaired by the DAA, is managed by DP with input from PD and TR. It is approved by the Administrator. A final document is prepared and distributed. Cables on reviews become part of the decision-making process and documentation. AID/W approves the CDSS during its review of the document and provides further guidance as needed. Since the CDSS covers periods of up to five years at a time, the direction and principal objectives of assistance are carefully agreed on by Senior Mission Management, DP and the AA, and are codified in the CDSS approval cable.

Action Plan

The Action Plan has become a new focal point in the Bureau's monitoring, evaluation and reporting system. It is at the Action Plan stage that strategic objectives, targets, and benchmarks are set by which the Mission's performance will be measured in meeting CDSS objectives (State 378844, 11/28/82, Africa Bureau Guidance for FY89-91 Action Plans, see Annex 6).

The Action Plan establishes the basis for Senior Bureau and Mission management agreement during Program Week on short and medium term priorities for implementing the CDSS strategy. It is also used as a review mechanism to assess progress in meeting Mission, Bureau and Agency objectives. As a monitoring tool, the Action Plan lays out quantitative indicators of program performance and qualitative indicators of policy reform progress and objectives. The basic components of the Action Plan which facilitate monitoring strategic objectives are targets and benchmarks established for the upcoming two years. Strategic objectives are defined as medium to long term goals as laid out in the CDSS and latest Action Plan. Missions are encouraged to select a few priority strategic objectives. Targets are defined as specific outcomes which must happen if strategic objectives are to be reached. Benchmarks are quantitative or qualitative measures that targets are being achieved.

Action Plans are formally reviewed every two years with intermediate measurement of objectives occurring with ABS review. As they are prepared at two-year intervals, subsequent Action Plans are to become evaluation reports on progress in reaching targets set out initially, although experience is not yet long enough to see whether this will be done systematically. Action Plans are generated by the Missions in consultation with AID/W and approved by the AA. Cables or memos developed from AID/W-review document the approval process.

Missions are increasingly urged to use Action Plans to report on progress in meeting established targets as measured by accepted performance indicators that reflect changes attributable, at least in part, to A.I.D. activities. The indicators should be commensurate with the scale of A.I.D. interventions and reflect the impact the program can realistically be expected to have in the near to medium-term. In most cases, this will mean selecting indicators below the sectoral level, limited to specific occupational groups and specific to particular geographic locations which are appropriate to the program component being monitored.

ABS

The ABS plays an obvious, central role in the budgeting process and permits AID/W to monitor important budgetary indicators, such as pipeline, cost ratios, and budgetary performance on selected special interest indicators and earmarks. The ABS is also an opportunity for missions to inform AID/W of evaluation scheduling for the coming year. As such, the ABS serves as an important source of information on Mission programs in the Bureau M&E System (State 097541, 4/2/87, FY1989 ABS - Africa Bureau Guidance, see Annex 7).

The ABS includes a listing of planned evaluations and studies with the planned date, last evaluation date, schedule, type of evaluation (routine, threshold, lessons learned), funding source with dollar amount, person days required and non-mission assistance needs. These lists are used by AID/W, both PD and DP, to discuss evaluation requirements and schedules as well as requests for more information. The ABS evaluation listing seems to be mainly informational and represents the end of the Mission process of deciding its evaluation needs in a timely way. The ABS evaluation list is prepared by the mission evaluation officer and transmitted to PD and DP in AID/W. The evaluation plan is part of the formal ABS and is responded to by cable when feedback is sent to the Mission on ABS approval.

D. Bureau Level Strategy and Policy

The overall strategy setting process for the Bureau is not closely tied to specific documents which are used internally to inform decisions. Although the PIR and ABS processes form an input to both budget allocation and country program decisions made by Bureau managers, cross-country and cross-sector programming decisions are not directly based on subsequent processing of information reported by Missions. Rather, bureau-level resource allocation decisions are based on an amalgam of formal and informal information sought by Bureau leadership.

Currently, the most complete articulation of Bureau strategy is made in the annual Congressional Presentation. Reporting to the Congress is also done in quarterly consultations, and annually in a series of budget hearings held in late winter. Congressional inquiries are responded to by country desk officers and the Technical Resources Division on a case by case basis.

An Evaluation Working Group was formed in June 1987 to focus on the issue of strengthening the Bureau's monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system to provide better information on Bureau-wide program performance. The Group recommended a two-part approach involving:

- (1) improvements in the overall functioning of the system; and
- (2) use of rapid, low-cost methods for collection and analysis of data on program performance.

Recently, progress has been made in pursuing this two-part approach through a variety of initiatives and special studies (as discussed in State 292525, 10/18/87, Africa Bureau Evaluation Initiative, see Annex 8):

System Improvements

- A draft Action Plan framework for the DFA has been developed by DP, which includes a system of strategic objectives, targets, and benchmarks. One of the key management changes proposed under the DFA is performance-based programming which can be carried out through mission and bureau Action Plans.
- TR is developing a systematic approach to collecting data and reporting on indicators of sectoral program performance for several sectors. The most progress appears to have been achieved in nutrition and natural resource management:
 - A nutrition monitoring system is being instituted by AFR/TR/HPN in three phases. Data collection tools were designed during phase I and data gathering was begun. Phase II, beginning in February 1989, will involve Mission feedback on the accuracy of information collected. Phase III will use all information collected to evaluate needs and trends by country and region to result in recommendations for action which will be included in the Africa Health strategy.
 - A preliminary list of natural resource indicators has been developed and in August 1988, a meeting was held with a select group of PVOs to get feedback on this list with the intention of selecting the most appropriate indicators. As a result of this meeting, a shorter list has been developed, which is currently being reviewed by the PVOs who participated in the August meeting.
- Two regional collaborative evaluation workshops were held in Dakar and Nairobi in 1988 to train mission staff and counterparts involved in evaluation planning and monitoring as well as solicit feedback on AID/W initiatives for the DFA. These were attended by PDOs and Program Officers and provided DP with useful input on mission needs in the improved evaluation and information gathering process.
- DP has been working with a number of missions, including Kenya, Rwanda, Zaire, Senegal, and Cameroon, to strengthen mission evaluation systems in coordination with developing Action Plan targets and benchmarks.

Performance Data Collection

- A three year cooperative agreement is underway with Cornell University to complete rigorous studies of the impact of policy reform activities on low-income groups in 6-8 countries. To date Guinea, Malawi and Cameroon are participating and at least two more countries will be added shortly.
- An inventory of household surveys previously completed has been made by the USDA Economic Research Service to provide a base for further data collection.
- DP and TR have been conducting impact evaluations on the results of agricultural credit projects in five African countries. Projects selected provided a range of size, design choices and regional variation.
- TR/ANR has several initiatives underway in agricultural research and in natural resource management to collect program performance data . In agricultural research, current initiatives include:
 - Peer review of the Plan for Supporting Agricultural Research and Faculties of Agriculture in Africa;
 - Interim evaluation of the Strengthening African Agricultural Research and Faculties of Agriculture (SAARFA) project;
 - Assessment of the impact of improved technologies on household consumption and incomes, using the IFPRI and Harvard survey data which were collected in Kenya, Malawi, Gambia and Rwanda;

In natural resource management (NRM), current or planned studies include:

- assessments have been completed or are underway in all NRM Group I countries, except Sudan.
 - In Group II, an assessment has been completed in Kenya. AFR/TR is planning to undertake natural resource assessments for the rest of the Group II countries in FY1989.
 - Zaire, a Group II country, is being considered a priority for biological diversity assessment in FY1989.
- TR/HPN has drafted a paper summarizing secondary data on the impact of all child survival activities in Africa.

III. ANALYSIS OF SYSTEM EFFECTIVENESS

This analysis draws on the basic findings on the functioning of the Bureau's monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system presented in the preceding section of this report in order to assess the system's performance in achieving its apparent objectives. This analysis is used in turn to draw some conclusions about the effectiveness of the system's operation, and its potential for improvement. Major conclusions reached are presented in bulletized form. A final section of this report suggests some next steps and makes recommendations.

Criteria for Determining System Effectiveness

In terms of this analysis, effectiveness can be defined differently for each function of the system, and can be further refined at the different levels of decision-making laid out in this study, as shown below:

Monitoring effectiveness is defined as the ability to follow progress in ongoing projects, and to develop some sense of country program success. At the Bureau level, informal monitoring information supplements the data contained in PIRs to determine the relative "comfort level" senior staff have with individual programs.

Evaluation effectiveness is primarily defined for mission use at project level and for action plan assessment every two years. A good evaluation answers project specific questions and contributes to overall assessment of the portfolio in some cases. Criteria applied by Congress to overall Bureau evaluation focus almost entirely on impact. These issues may or may not be the product of regular evaluation.

Reporting effectiveness is defined by timeliness and comprehensiveness of PIRs, reliability of financial data produced, and the ability to use regular reports to meet as many ad hoc Congressional requests as possible. At the Bureau level, the likelihood of being able to routinely handle Congressional inquiries with existing data is considered remote.

To facilitate discussion of how the system is currently operating versus how the system might potentially operate at each level of decision-making for each function, two matrices are presented. Figure 1: Current Standard of Effectiveness attempts to encapsulate effectiveness as it appears to be currently defined by users of the system in actual practice. Figure 2: Potential Standard of Effectiveness presents a normative view of functions that the system ought to be performing.

In addition to the different standards of effectiveness for each of the monitoring, evaluation, and reporting functions, there is a divergence of viewpoint regarding criteria of effectiveness based on where one sits in the system. A central AID/W concern is for data that provides convincing evidence that A.I.D. has impact and to improve understanding of technical opportunities and limitations that should influence

FIGURE 1: CURRENT STATUS OF EFFECTIVENESS

Functions Levels	Monitoring	Evaluation	Reporting
Project/Non-project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Progress checked through PIR's mainly at input/output levels. 2. Project monitoring, i.e. quarterly implementation reports, focuses on inputs and outputs not EOPs. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Most projects have mid-term evaluations. 2. Some projects have final evaluations. 3. Some lessons learned are incorporated into design and implementation. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All levels of Logframe are reported in PIRs. 2. Ad hoc reports for special needs. 3. Financial data collected regularly and analyzed for decisions.
Country Program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Impact data are often hard to obtain. 2. Measurement at purpose level and above is limited. 3. Country program and country trend indicators are mixed so attribution is sometimes limited. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluated through action plan. 2. Sectoral decisions made based on aggregate or single measures from projects. 3. Action plan objectives are measured through benchmarks only. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project financial data has to be re-analyzed to meet earmark reporting needs. 2. Action Plan program assessment subjectively interpreted in reporting. 3. No odd year reporting.
Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project level data used to monitor overall portfolio. 2. Very limited use of country specific independent data. 3. Data quality often dependent on state of data gathering subject country. 4. Data quality varies by sector or type of intervention (e.g., agriculture vs. health). 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Evaluated by Congress in funding decisions. 2. Variety of program and project level information used to determine overall funding priorities for continent. 3. Bureau concerns drive CDSS not vice versa. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Many Congressional requirements are prepared ad hoc. 2. Too much information has to be digested for decisions. 3. Quarterly reports to Congress on DFA.

FIGURE 2: POTENTIAL STANDARD OF EFFECTIVENESS

Levels \ Functions	Monitoring	Evaluation	Reporting
Project/Non-Project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> PIRs monitor purpose level achievement and sustainability concerns from project start-up. (Output attainment is not only factor in purpose achievement.) 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> All projects have mid-term evaluations which examine basic premise as well as design. Final evaluations focus on answering sustainability issues as well as measuring project accomplishments. Mid-term and final evaluation provide supplemental country program level (Action Plan/CDSS/PIR) information. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> PIRs report output level and above only. (Input issues are addressed on an exception basis.) PIRs reflect progress on sustainability. Relationship between financial data and project progress is analyzed beyond pipeline reporting needs.
Country Program	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Measures for strategic objectives are identified in Action Plan. Purpose levels of projects and target levels of objectives are measured every 2 years. Country program indicators are articulated separately from country trend as needed. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Action plan evaluates progress on strategic objectives as well as benchmarks. Some benchmarks require data collection efforts outside of projects to provide independent measures at country level. Country trend indicators evaluate overall development progress which may or may not be affected by A.I.D. programs. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Project and program financial data provide earmark information without special aggregation. Basic standards for qualitative and quantitative action plan reporting provide some basis for comparison. Strategic objective progress is reported annually in 1st PIR for FY.
Bureau	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Action plan reports used to monitor and compare progress across continent in A.I.D. prime areas of intervention. Country trend information provides context for program progress monitoring. Other donor data sources are used to monitor and compare progress. As data gathering and analysis is improved, in-country new data sources are used. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Congress presented data which includes perspective on A.I.D. intervention levels vis-à-vis other donors and by sector emphasis. Similarities in CDSS and AP objectives are used to evaluate progress in key sectors by bureau (TR&DP). Decisions on priority countries are informed by country as well as project data and are made in complete donor context. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Many Congressional requirements are foreseen and regular data gathering captures 75% routinely. Top leadership has summary reports in easy format for resource and program decisions.

programming decisions, such as between and within sectors. A primary Mission concern is for information needed to adjust implementation strategy to address various constraints and to gain understanding of the appropriateness of that strategy to best meet recipient country needs. Acknowledgement of this divergence of views should assist Bureau personnel concerned with mobilizing support for system improvements.

Imbalance in Information Supply and Demand

As one examines the various levels of the system: project/non-project, country program and bureau, the sources of primary data diminish and the rate of decisions being made with less empirical evidence increases. That is to say, there is a greater supply of information available and specifically tailored to make decisions at the project level than there is at the country program and bureau levels. For instance, an abundance of financial data makes reporting on earmarking more difficult, and the level of detail in the PIRs makes sorting out real portfolio accomplishments in a six month period dependent on either the synthesis abilities of the reader or the reporting acumen of the mission director in his/her overview.

The actual sources of primary data commonly available in the system are limited to:

- (1) Preliminary studies used in design phase.
- (2) Quarterly or semiannual reports from contractors to project officers used to generate PIRs.
- (3) Evaluation reports.
- (4) Ad hoc data collection for special inquiries.
- (5) Any available national statistics.
- (6) Regularly collected financial data.
- (7) USAID/host government technical committee assessments of compliance on policy reform conditionalities.

All the Bureau's information needs are basically met through these sources - the basic supply of information. The demand for information includes:

- (1) Measuring impact at the country level both in aggregate and by specific sectors (agriculture, health, education, nutrition, etc.) to report to the Bureau and Congress.
- (2) Comparing country progress across regions or subregions (bureau).
- (3) Comparing progress across sectors (bureau).

- (4) Charting project progress (mission and bureau).
- (5) Tracking progress on meeting earmarking requirements (bureau).

This imbalance between information demand and supply partially stems from the wide-ranging character of the Agency's program, and from the Bureau's limited ability to aggregate performance and impact data at the country program and bureau levels.

- Greater consensus on appropriate indicators for measuring program performance and impact should contribute to the Bureau's ability to track country and sectoral progress.
- It may be possible to make some slight modifications in project-level data collected to provide proxy measures of country program impact and to selectively aggregate this data for cross-country comparison.
- Some benchmarks require data collection efforts outside of projects to provide independent measures at country level.

The role of the host government in collaboration with the donor community in collecting and analyzing indicators becomes crucial for the long term. A sustainable capability in this area becomes both a means and a measure of long term development. A primary means to assure a reliable database over time is to develop host country data collection and analysis capacity.

Bureau Level

Despite seemingly heroic efforts on the part of the Bureau's technical offices, agreement on key indicators with which to track country and sectoral progress continues to be elusive.

- There are no agreed-upon sector indicators for measuring country program and bureau level impact.

The tendency to hope that project level data can somehow be transformed to provide higher level indicators as it is moved up the system is obscuring the need to make decisions on a few indicators and to try to track them for a fixed time period as a test of their viability. The search for consensus through the Evaluation Working Group may not be the most effective means of reaching decisions needed to give this measurement a try. While some projects have components to build capacity in national sectoral statistics that could be targeted to generate data on indicators, in others it may be necessary to select only a few indicators and persistently collect data on these.

The independent measure of strategic objectives in the Action Plan process could provide data over time which would be comparable across Africa at least for Category I and possibly Category II countries. Analysis of information generated by other donors to complete country

trend analysis and to fill in information on sectors where A.I.D. is not a lead donor would be a useful additional element in the system.

- Congress is given little information which compares A.I.D.'s emphasis with those of other donors by sector and by investment except in broad strategic terms in the CDSS.

On the Bureau level, the CDSS provides an opportunity for the individual country situations to influence overall bureau strategy in key sectors (agriculture, natural resources, health, education) if similarities in strategies could be brought to the mission's attention for comparative purposes. Data at the strategic objective level could be compared across the continent to discern whether certain intervention strategies yield better results over time in certain situations (e.g. do some kinds of privatization incentives work better than others?). The DFA is in fact requesting this kind of information in order to evaluate progress.

- Each country is generating its own set of strategic objectives and improving the linkages within its own country program for evaluation purposes. The Bureau can seek to identify cross-cutting objectives as they occur and measure them selectively.

There is considerable use of ad hoc report generation to meet Bureau needs for data in making resource allocations and in reporting to Congress, despite extensive efforts by DP and TR working with the missions to improve data collection.

A detailed examination of financial management data was not undertaken, but several users of the information indicated that the tallying of earmarking for Congressional reporting still takes long periods of time.

- The present financial reporting system is not sufficiently adapted to readily generate earmarking information for Congressional reporting.

The issue of response to Congressional inquiries may be partially solved if agreements could be made that certain data would be regularly available and that other kinds can only be provided at substantial additional program costs or with higher staffing levels. Since most of the Agency country standards are beyond the reach of African countries in the near term, the establishment of a Bureau set becomes important to preserve the flexibility in the DFA and maintaining the agreement with Congress to report more consistently on progress.

Country Program Level

Three basic documents are the focus of monitoring, evaluation, and reporting at the country program level: the CDSS, Action Plan, and ABS. The CDSS is the first step in country level objective-setting and performance measurement. There is an emerging consensus on the need to select measurable objectives at the CDSS stage which can then be translated into benchmarks and indicators in the Action plan phase. To

facilitate the translation of broad strategy statements into strategic objectives, targets and benchmarks, the CDSS should give greater emphasis to clearly defining priorities and tactics in presenting the proposed assistance strategy, and less emphasis on a description of host country characteristics.

- The need to make objectives measurable at the CDSS stage is becoming increasingly understood as more missions revise their strategies.
- A careful examination of the linkage called for among the CDSS, Action Plan, and ABS in Bureau guidance might add more coherency to the overall country program measurement task.

As the new focal point for country program measurement, the Action Plan becomes central to both objective-setting and performance monitoring. The first articulation of overall country program level measurement is through the strategic objectives of the Action Plan. Strategic objectives need to be expressed at a level of focus above project purpose statements to show progress toward goals of sufficient significance to the recipient country to warrant U.S. assistance. At the same time, strategic objectives must be articulated at a level of specificity to remain measurable, to provide a conceptual linkage between projects and overall country program objectives, and to help shift the focus of implementors to output-to-purpose level hypotheses issues.

- Strategic objectives should be expressed in terms as high above project purpose level as can be measurable.

It is difficult to derive country program level information from projects unless the linkages are first developed in the Action Plan. This would allow and perhaps encourage project impact measurement at the goal level to contribute to Action Plan monitoring.

- Goal level statements for individual projects should be drawn from the Action Plans to develop better country program-to-project linkages, and linkages between projects.

Although the ABS provides a means of checking Action Plan performance in non-review years, persons interviewed who had field experience with Action Plans stated that AID/W interest in measuring performance annually through the ABS was limited to financial data on spending.

- Regular feedback by AID/W on Action Plan objectives as part of an annual review at spring PIR time could provide more responsive monitoring.

AID/W feedback on progress toward meeting strategic objectives could focus on accomplishments, comparisons with previous reporting and any relevant comparative data from other countries in Africa. Missions could be told if they have achieved increases in certain areas that are above average (e.g. numbers of women in training programs, rates of contraceptive use, increases in cereal marketing in private hands, etc.). This will require some cross-country comparisons by TR for certain

sectors. An effective MIS depends on the usefulness of the information to those who generate it as well as those who receive it, enabling higher level officials to receive data on a subset of the indicators required at lower levels for internal management and external reporting. Feedback across countries would provide missions with some incentive to collect and analyze data and to use this in improving program objectives and targetting.

Targets are defined by Africa Bureau's guidance for Action Plans (see Annex 6) as "specific, short to medium term outcomes or actions which are to be accomplished in order to initiate or sustain movement toward achievement of strategic objectives." The use of terms "outcomes or actions" in the guidance has caused some mission uncertainty whether targets should be analogous to inputs, outputs, or EOPS conditions.

- Targets should be set in specific enough terms so as to clarify expected results of the assistance strategy, while demonstrating a direct relationship to the strategic objective.

Benchmarks are defined in the Africa Bureau Guidance for Action Plans as "quantitative or qualitative indicators that targets are being or have been achieved." Depending on the type of intervention, benchmarks may be expressed directly as a quantitative measure. In other cases, proxy measures will be needed in order to provide a basis for qualitative assessments used as benchmarks. There appears to be some confusion on what constitutes an appropriate qualitative measure.

Another source of confusion concerns the most appropriate use of country trend indicators as measures of performance. While there may be selected instances, such as in health programs, where trend indicators could be used to measure program performance, generally these indicators are better measures of the problems to be addressed through donor assistance. Country trend indicators are more appropriate measures of contextual variables or assumptions affecting project outcomes.

- Program performance indicators should be distinct from measures of degree of overall development in the country and linked as closely as possible to the objectives of the A.I.D. program (i.e. national life expectancy or decreased infant mortality should not be a country program performance indicator if USAID is only working in one region on health for a specific target population).

Impact data on achievement above purpose-level are typically hard to obtain and therefore measurement of progress at that level is limited. Currently, no independent measures (e.g. those which are not primarily project indicators) are explicitly called for in the Bureau's guidance on Action Plans. Rather, measurement of strategic objectives is carried out through targets and benchmarks.

- Increasing use is being made of independent measures for assessing progress toward strategic objectives.

While the ABS appears to be the key document used to review resource allocation and to do aggregated pipeline analysis, it is not currently used to monitor project performance beyond financial management requirements. The use of the ABS as the vehicle for evaluation scheduling appears to limit use of the Annual Evaluation Plan.

- No decisions appear to be currently made by AID/W using the Annual Evaluation Plan. It appears to be for information purposes only.
- There appears to be no attempt to use the financial information and earmaking data specifically called for in the Annual Evaluation Plan.

Project/Nonproject-Level

Project monitoring information, whether quarterly reports received by the missions or PIRs received by AID/W, tends to focus on inputs and outputs, rather than on monitoring progress toward purpose-level objectives by tracking data for EOPS indicators.

- Reporting requirements mutually agreed upon by USAID Missions and implementors could provide baseline information, when appropriate, for future impact measurement.

PIRs have proven to be a useful mechanism for facilitating internal reviews by Missions of project performance at the purpose level, yet have not fully been used by all missions as an opportunity twice a year to so.

- PIRs can be strengthened by increased reporting of purpose-level achievement while minimizing input and output level narratives. More consistent tracking of actions taken on major outstanding evaluation recommendations and closer linkage of overview statements with Action Plan benchmarks would improve the PIR as a monitoring tool.

Most project evaluations are used by Missions concerned with project implementation decisions, or the design of follow-on projects. A focus on implementation issues in mid-term evaluations can often lead to an acceptance of the project's design as a given and inadequate questioning of its basic premise, e.g. does the project address the problem it is intended to solve? Is the strategy the best for solving the problem? Are the project assumptions still valid?

- Mid-term evaluations should give greater emphasis to assessing the basic premise of the project's design rather than merely determining if implementation is in conformance with the Project Paper.

A focus of final evaluations on the design of follow-on projects can lead to inadequate attention to impact measurement and failure to take full advantage of such research activities to collect data needed for Action Plan benchmark measurement.

- Mid-term and final evaluations should be viewed as potential opportunities to provide supplemental information for country program performance and impact measurement.

While missions are generally incorporating lessons learned from evaluations in project designs and management, the A.I.D./W system lacks an effective way of capturing lessons learned. It was reported in interviews with PD divisions that evaluation reports and summaries do not come to Project Officers routinely even when specifically requested. It is not apparent, however, given the priorities of the PDOs in AID/W that there is sufficient time available to read and process evaluation findings, much less develop lessons learned across countries for bureau use.

- The current system does not provide AID/W PD backstops with evaluation information in a usable way. The current system emphasizing design provides limited incentive for use of evaluation information.

The reporting in the PIRs has been of good quality and has constantly improved over the last two years. There is, however, an abundance of data in the PIR and considerable time must be spent by the field in generating it and by AID/W in reading and analyzing it. As PIRs concentrate more on measuring purpose level achievement in projects, it may be possible over time to compare progress on similar kinds of projects and to prepare reports on a regional or continent-wide basis to present results of evaluations and PIRs collectively.

- Some PD offices organize PIR summaries for DAA use with consistent issues and themes for consideration. Dialogue with DAA on the content of PD chiefs' reporting on PIRs could yield data for cross country comparison overtime.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the analysis of findings described above, a number of recommendations for potential improvements to the system could be made.

- 1) Review guidance for the CDSS, Action Plan, and ABS for opportunities to improve linkages and add more coherency to the overall country measurement task.
- 2) Give greater attention to the measurability of CDSS objectives and their fit with Action Plans to improve linkages down to project level within the monitoring system.
- 3) Revise Action Plan guidance to clarify: that strategic objectives should be articulated as high above project purpose level as is measurable to show progress toward goals of sufficient significance to the recipient country to warrant U.S. assistance; that targets need to be expressed in terms above output level to demonstrate a direct relationship to the strategic objective; and, that some benchmarks can be set with a horizon year beyond the two-year Action Plan period.
- 4) The current ABS reporting system should be re-examined to see if earmark reporting could be aggregated more easily to reduce time spent in computing this for Bureau level reporting.
- 5) TR and DP should select sector level indicators to be tracked in Category I missions over a fixed number of years. This would provide the Bureau with higher-level performance measures and partially respond to Congressional reporting needs.
- 6) The Bureau should seek to identify cross-cutting strategic objectives as they occur and develop common approaches for impact measurement. The DFA Action Plan provides a potential mechanism for establishing these objectives.
- 7) PD backstops should review evaluation findings in PIRs to see if appropriate levels of findings are being transmitted by the Missions. Feedback on the quality of these sections may improve them.
- 8) More dialogue between the DAA and the PD divisions on the content of PIR summaries could improve the quality of information being transmitted to Bureau senior management.
- 9) Individual projects should be examined within each portfolio to see if they could generate baseline and monitoring data for strategic objective measurement in the Action Plan process.

- 10) Evaluation scopes of work should apply some bureau-level lessons-learned issues consistently to see if any cross country learning on specific kinds of projects can be generated.
- 11) A simple form to transmit purpose and goal level lessons learned could be forwarded with the evaluation summary to improve information sharing within regions and for the Bureau.
- 12) Other donor information sources in-country should be tapped to fill in-country trend information and to place A.I.D. intervention in appropriate perspective for Congress.
- 13) Program officers, TR, DP and PD should receive training in the logic of Action Plan measurement and its relationship to Logical Framework methodology and measurement. This should take place in joint AID/W and field sessions to improve communication and consensus on acceptable objectives, targets, benchmarks, indicators and other progress measurement terms and definitions.

Any improvements in monitoring, evaluation, and reporting are dependent on overall direct hire staffing levels in each mission as well as OE resources available. The reduction in resources, particularly OE and PD&S, has increased reluctance to devote funds to data-gathering simply to establish baselines, or to measure changes in key variables (e.g. contraceptive use, household food consumption). This conflict can lead to problems for the mission staff charged with carrying out monitoring, evaluation, and reporting, at either project and country program levels. There are many good reasons to improve monitoring and evaluation; yet there are fewer people and less money to do it with. Realization of this context is an important aspect of understanding and evaluating the findings on the system. It is not possible to expand functions such as Action Plan monitoring and evaluation without reducing other monitoring, evaluation, and reporting functions to compensate. This balance is difficult to achieve given increasing accountability requirements and oversight needs for both project and non-project assistance.

ANNEX 1

Africa Bureau FY88-89, Annual Evaluation Plan

MAR 15 1988

ACTION MEMORANDUM TO THE ASSISTANT ADMINISTRATOR

FROM: AAA/APR/DP, John Westley *JW*
SUBJECT: Africa Bureau FY 1988-1989 Evaluation Plan

BACKGROUND: The Bureau has been making progress in strengthening our evaluation system: (1) to use evaluation in our decision-making in order to improve our effectiveness and (2) to respond to the Development Fund for Africa's increased reporting on performance.

Since meeting with you on evaluation in September, we have completed several actions:

- Two regional Collaborative Evaluation Workshops were carried out early this year to train mission staff and counterparts involved in evaluation as well as communicate evaluation priorities and get feedback from the field.
- A three-year cooperative agreement was initiated with Cornell University to undertake a rigorous study of the impact of policy reform activities on low-income groups.
- An inventory of previous household surveys carried out in Africa was done by the Economic Research Service of the USDA in order to provide a base on which to build further data collection and analysis efforts.
- TR has begun developing a systematic approach to collecting and reporting indicators of program performance. A framework has been created by the Program Division and the technical divisions are working on the indicators in their technical areas.
- PD has been successful in giving greater emphasis to evaluation planning and results in the PIR process. One part of this effort was an experiment with organizing PIR reviews around Action Plan objectives that has now become a part of standard PIR guidance.

It will take time to complete these ventures, but there are a number of other actions that we feel are necessary as well:

- Impact evaluations: two series of evaluations on subsectors of agriculture (evaluation teams visiting three to four countries for each subsector).

- Additional assessment of policy reform to provide information in the next year before the initial results are available from the Cornell Study.
- Success stories to be systematically researched and prepared in time for next year's Congressional Presentation as well as for testimony.
- Action Plan targets and benchmarks. We will work intensively with four selected missions to develop and strengthen the mission evaluation systems to collect and use the data in missions' programming.
- Development indicators. We will identify three indicators to serve as management indicators of overall progress in the Bureau.

As is evident from the actions being taken, the emphasis in the Bureau is on program evaluation:

country programs through the Action Plan process
policy reform programs in the Cornell Study, and
sectoral programs across countries through the impact evaluations and in the efforts to collect and report indicators of program performance.

ACTION REQUESTED: Please sign the attached memorandum transmitting the Bureau's plan to AA/PPC.

Clearance:

AFR/DP, EGreeley Draft
AFR/DP, ESimmons Draft

cc:
AFR/DP/PAR, CCowey

Drafted: AFR/DP: CClapp-Wincek; 5265G: 3-14-88

MAR 21 1988

MEMORANDUM

TO: AA/PPC, Richard Bissell

FROM: AA/AFR, Charles L. Gladson 7s/Charles L. Gladson

SUBJECT: Annual Evaluation Plan -- Bureau for Africa

Attached is the Africa Bureau's Evaluation Plan. Improved evaluation is central to the success of the Development Fund for Africa. The trade-off for more flexibility in the DFA is increased reporting on performance. The DFA has supported the Bureau's shift to focussing on program evaluation: policy reform programs, country programs, and sectoral programs. I am committed to taking advantage of the Fund to develop a performance-based budget allocation system. The need for strengthening our evaluation system is clear. The attached plan discusses what actions were taken in 1987 as well as those planned for 1988-1989.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank you for PPC's support on the two Collaborative Evaluation Workshops we presented in Dakar and Nairobi early this year. PPC's work several years ago on the pilot workshop, and the recent work with Management Systems International assessing program impact allowed us to reorient the workshops. They now address both program and project evaluation in a way that precisely serves our needs.

Clearance:

DAA/AFR:WGBollinger

AFR/DP, JWestley JW

AFR/DP, JGovan JG

AFR/DP:EGreeley Draft

AFR/DP:ESimmons Draft

DAA/AFR:ELSaiers N

AFR/DP:CClapp-Wincek:5265G:3-8-88

AFRICA BUREAU EVALUATION PROGRAM FY 1988-1989

OVERVIEW

The Development Fund for Africa increases the Bureau's flexibility in allocating resources towards priority activities in support of sustainable economic growth in Africa. The Fund also encourages greater use of performance-based programming. Effective use of the Fund, however, requires the Bureau to strengthen its efforts to develop a monitoring, evaluation, and reporting system which provides an ongoing stream of information for decision-making:

- to improve the effectiveness of our programs, and
- to respond to the assessment requirement in the Legislation for a "consultative process that is informal and self-critical".

Increased attention to the evaluation process in Africa is consistent with overall Agency emphases. New Agency guidance on evaluation was issued in April, 1987. It continues to require a Mission Order on evaluation procedures and appropriate staffing, i.e., designation of a Mission evaluation officer. One notable change in the guidance is the required inclusion of a line item to cover monitoring and evaluation costs in project or nonproject assistance design. This supplements the previous requirement to include a monitoring and evaluation plan.

BUREAU DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE OBJECTIVES

Evaluation emphases follow the Bureau's priorities. The Bureau's overall goal for development assistance is laid out in a short document entitled "The U.S. Assistance Strategy for Africa" (6/86, revised 5/87). This goal -- reactivating sustained economic growth in Africa -- is to be accomplished by focussing efforts on three priorities:

- economic restructuring,
- agricultural development, and
- human resources development.

To achieve strategic objectives in each of these priorities, the Bureau has systematically targetted resources in selected areas of concentration, such as policy reform, agricultural research, and child survival, and to specific countries. These targets reflect our best judgement of where critical problems lie and where concerted assistance can have the highest payoff. They also broadly reflect the consensus of other donors, African countries and, increasingly, Congress, as to the most important points for addressing Africa's development needs.

The Bureau's monitoring and evaluation system therefore must be set up to measure progress and impact:

- on the implementation of the Bureau's strategies in Africa,
- at the country program level, and
- for the individual project and program activities.

EVALUATION EMPHASES, FY 1988

Traditionally, the Bureau's evaluation efforts have been most effective at the project level. Regular monitoring of achievements in the delivery of outputs and periodic evaluations of purpose level progress has been well integrated into the project design and management process. While there is still room for improvement at this level, it is at the level of program and country evaluation that new initiatives must, principally be directed.

The new flexibility in the Development Fund for Africa will allow the results of evaluations to play a larger role in our programming decisions across sectors and across countries. Evaluation of policy reform program performance in several countries in FY 87, for example, has already played an important role in FY 1988 programming. First, it confirmed the potentially positive results which can be achieved through the provision of nonproject (program) assistance for policy reform. Second, the evaluation experience led to the design of a project to study how better to capture and measure the impact of policy reforms on various social and economic groups.

Increasingly, we need to focus on using Action Plans and country program and strategy statements as a way of better synchronizing program and project purpose-level objectives as well as identifying and achieving measurable impacts at both sector and country levels.

In the next section, we lay out key evaluation actions planned for FY 1988 in the Africa Bureau. The plan addresses evaluation actions expected to play important roles in short-term programming decisions as well as activities to strengthen the evaluation process over the medium to longer term.

KEY EVALUATION ACTIONS, FY 1988

A. Improving Evaluations at the Country Program Level

- The Bureau has completed two Collaborative Evaluation Workshops already this year. Program evaluation was a key topic for the workshops which strengthened the skills of Mission evaluation officers, other A.I.D. officers with responsibility for evaluation, and key host country counterparts.

- Bureau Action Plan Guidance requires missions to identify strategic objectives, targets, and benchmarks for its program in the coming two-year period as well as to report the Mission's plan for monitoring and evaluation. The Bureau plans to work with selected missions on the development of appropriate targets and benchmarks. Our training and consultancies in this area have shown that targets should be pegged at a level low enough to achieve measurable impact with A.I.D.'s finite resources, but high enough to allow the Mission to make choices amongst alternate means.
- PD has revised Project Implementation Report guidance to capture evaluation planning as well as evaluation results. As part of this process, AFR/PD worked on a pilot basis with the Zaire Mission Director to develop a PIR overview format that reports progress in achieving the Mission's Action Plan Objectives as well as project accomplishments. PD has now made this part of the standard PIR guidance.
- AFR/PD has also proposed institution of a system for analyzing project targets and indicators as an approach to developing program targets. AFR/DP will continue to work with AFR/PD on improving monitoring and evaluation at the country program level.

B. Assessing Progress in Implementing Bureau Strategic Objectives

1. Economic Restructuring/Policy Reform

- The Bureau has initiated a three-year cooperative agreement with Cornell University to undertake a rigorous study of the impact of policy reform activities on low-income groups. The study will help us to get a better sense of how to track our policy reform programs in the future.
- Additional assessment of policy reform will be done in FY 1988 to provide information before the initial results are available from the Cornell Study.

2. Agricultural Development

- Beginning in FY 1988, the Bureau proposes to test intermediate indicators and their relationship to impact in the African environment. By the early 1990's, the

Bureau should be able to regularly monitor these intermediate indicators in order to assess and report on the impact of its programs in agriculture.

- The Bureau also proposes to carry out a series of impact evaluations on a subsector of agriculture. The first set of four or five country-level studies will be completed in FY 1988 with an additional set planned for FY 1989..

a. Agricultural Production

- The Agricultural Research/Faculties of Agriculture strategy has been in place for two and a half years. In FY 1988, AFR/TR will review the progress made under the strategy and determine whether changes are necessary to improve its effectiveness and impact. As part of the review, it will update the targets set out in the plan.

b. Market Links Development

- As improving the function of agricultural markets (inputs and foodgrains) has been the focus of much project and nonproject assistance, and the effort to increase market efficiency brings together several elements of the overall Bureau strategy, this is the proposed subsector for impact evaluation in FY 1988 and FY 1989.

c. Natural Resource Management

- AFR/TR is developing an evaluation component for the Bureau's Natural Resource Management Plan; a limited information system will be proposed.

d. Drought and Famine Preparedness

- FEWS is the Africa Bureau's ongoing information system in this area.
- National Food Needs Assessments continue to be part of FVA's regular reporting.

Health and Population

- The monitoring of effectiveness and impact in these areas has traditionally been a centrally-funded activity. The Bureau relies on S&T/POP's Demographic and Health surveys as its major source of data collection and analysis. The Surveys assess national trends in fertility and family planning behavior, Child Survival effectiveness and changes in infant mortality. Four surveys were carried out in 1987; surveys are planned in FY 1988 for Botswana, Ghana, Kenya, Sudan, Uganda, and Zimbabwe.

25

C. Monitoring Crosscutting Issues

In addition to the priority areas identified in the Africa Bureau strategy, the Bureau will track crosscutting issues, including:

- PVOs
- Title XII
- Private sector
- Gender issues

- In FY 1988, the Bureau is planning an evaluation of the PVO umbrella mechanism. There are five umbrella projects in Africa of some duration and each takes a slightly different approach.

- Private sector: The current focus on strengthening monitoring and evaluation in this area is to develop standards of performance for small-scale credit activities. These standards would be used in designing, evaluating, and assessing the sustainability of small-scale credit activities.

- Beginning with this year's Action Plan guidance, missions have been required to disaggregate data on progress in achieving targets by gender.

- No special assessments of Title XII involvement are planned for FY 1988.

Clearance:

AFR/DP/PPE, ESimmons Draft
AFR/DP/PPE, EGreeley Draft
AFR/DP, J Govan _____

Drafted: AFR/DP/PPE: CClapp-Wincek: 11/28/87: x72996
Revised: AFR/DP/PPE: EBS, CCW, 11/30/87: 4872G
Final revision: AFR/DP: CCW, 3-14-88

A N N E X

ANALYSIS OF MISSION EVALUATION PLANS

FY 1988 EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO STRATEGIC CATEGORIES

ECONOMIC RESTRUCTURING

Guinea AEPRP - Promotion of Private Marketing & Distribution (675-0217)
Kenya KCB-LC Programs
Liberia Economic Stabilization Support (669-0213)
Madagascar MARS (587-0101)
Madagascar LC Counterpart
Mali Economic Policy Reform Program (688-0240)
Mozambique Private Sector Rehabilitation Program (690-0201(C))
Sudan Local Currency
Togo AEPRP - Cereals Export Liberalization (693-0229)
Zaire CIP (660-0100, 0103, 0121)
Zimbabwe Local Currency Projects

AGRICULTURE

Africa Regional Energy Initiatives for Africa (698-0424)
Africa Regional Strengthening African Agricultural Research & Faculties of Agriculture (SAARFA) (698-0435)
Africa Regional CIMMYT On-Farm Research (698-0435.03)
Botswana Agriculture College (633-0074)
Botswana Rural Sector Grant (633-0077)
Botswana Agricultural Technology (633-0221)
Burkina SAFGRAD II - IITA/ICRISAT (698-0452)
Burkina Southwest Regional Reforestation - AFRICARE (686-0934)
Burkina Agricultural Human Resource Development
Cape Verde Watershed Development (655-0013)
Chad PVO Development Initiatives (677-0051)
Comoros CARE/OPG (602-0001)
ESA CIMMYT On-Farm Research (698-0435.03)
ESA Integrated Tick Control (936-4083)
ESA ESAMI SRO Agricultural Management (698-0413.09)
ESA E.A. Regional Remote Sensing (698-0456)
Gambia Soil & Water Management (635-0202)
Gambia Agricultural Research & Diversification (635-0219)
Guinea Small Holders Preparation (675-0204)
Guinea Agribusiness Preparation (675-0212)
Guinea Bissau South Coast Agricultural Development (657-0010)
Guinea Bissau Food Crop Protection III (657-0012)
Kenya Private Enterprise Development (615-0238)
Kenya Agricultural Management (615-0221)
Lesotho LAPIS (632-0221)
Lesotho Agricultural Planning (632-0218)
Madagascar Int. Rice Research Irrigation (936-4111)
Malawi Fish Development/SADCC Tech. Supp. (690-0215)
Malawi Agricultural Research & Extension (612-0215)
Mali Semi-Arid Tropics Research (688-0226)
Mauritania OMVS Agriculture Research II (682-0957)

15

AGRICULTURE (con't)

Niger Integrated Livestock (683-0242)
Niger Niamey Department Development (683-0240)
Sahel Regional Gambia River Basin Development (625-0012)
Sahel Regional Energy Initiatives (625-0956)
Sierra Leone Peace Corps Small Project Assistance (698-0506.36)
Somalia Juba Development Analytical Studies (649-0134)
Southern Africa Regional Fisheries (690-0215)
Southern Africa Regional Sorghum & Millet Research (690-0224)
Sudan Eastern Refugee Reforestation (650-0064)
Togo Animal Traction (693-0218)
Zaire Small Projects
Zambia ZAMCAM Program (611-0747)

HUMAN RESOURCES

Africa Regional Family Health Initiatives (625-0969)
Africa Regional Sahel Human Resources II (625-0977)
Africa Regional Sahel AFRAD (625-0972)
Africa Regional Health Constraint to Rural Production (698-0408.01)
Africa Regional African Child Survival Initiative - Combatting
Childhood Communicable Diseases (698-0421):
1) Guinea
2) Togo
3) C.A.R.
4) Liberia
5) Rwanda
6) Cote d'Ivoire
7) WHO/AFRO
8) Lesotho
9) Burundi
Africa Regional African-American Labor Center (698-0442)
Africa Regional African-Graduate Fellowship Program III (698-0455)
Africa Regional Israeli African Support (698-0465)
Benin Rural Water Supply (680-0202)
Botswana Junior Secondary Education (633-0229)
Botswana Primary Education Improvement (633-0240)
Botswana W/F & Skills Training Phase II (633-0241)
Burkina Family Planning Support (686-0260)
Cameroon Health Constraints to Rural Production (698-0408)
Cameroon Support to Primary Education (631-0033)
Cape Verde Sal Desalination & Power (655-0005)
Congo Training*
Equatorial Guinea Cooperative Development Phase II (653-0003)
ESA ESAMI Family Health Initiative (698-0662.23)
Ghana Contraceptives Supplies (641-0109)

*to be evaluated with Zaire program evaluation

HUMAN RESOURCES (con't)

Guinea Bissau Technical Skills Training (657-0011)
Kenya FPSS-Voluntary Surgical Contraception (615-0232)
Kenya FPSS-Clinical Training/Supp. Ser. (615-0232)
Lesotho Basic Non-Formal Education System (632-0222)
Lesotho General Manpower Development & Training (632-0069)
Lesotho National University of Lesotho (632-0080)
Liberia Primary Health Care (669-0165)
Liberia Combating Childhood Communicable Diseases (698-0421.03)
Liberia Small & Medium Enterprise Development (669-0201)
Malawi CCCD (698-0421.12)
Malawi Health Institutions Development (612-0211)
Mali Integrated Family Health Services (688-0227)
Mali Human Resources Sector Study
Mauritania Rural Health Services (682-0230)
Nigeria Combating Childhood Communicable Diseases (698-0421)
Rwanda Private Enterprise Development (696-0121)
Senegal Family Health & Population (685-0048)
Somalia Management Training for Development (649-0119)
Sudan Rural Health Support (650-0030)
Swaziland Manpower Development (645-0218)
Swaziland Primary Health Care (645-0220)
Swaziland Training for Entrepreneurs (645-0227)
Swaziland Rural Water Borne Disease Control (645-0087)
Togo Rural Water Supply & Sanitation (693-0210)
Togo Credit Union Development (693-0224)
Uganda Family Health Initiative (698-0662)
Zaire Family Planning Services (660-0094)
Zaire Training Program
Zambia HIRD (611-0206)
Zimbabwe Harare Poly/B-Tech Program-Basic Education Skills Training
(613-K-606)
Zimbabwe Books for New Literates (613-0224)

OTHER

Botswana Housing Projects (633-HG-2)
Gambia PL480 Title II Section 206
Guinea Bissau Country Program
Kenya PL480 Title II
Lesotho CRS Outreach Program (LS-ID-004)
Madagascar Country Program
Madagascar PL480 Title I
Madagascar PL480 Food for Progress
Mozambique CARE Logistic Support (Transportation)
Sahel Regional Financial Management II (625-0974)
Somalia Kismayo Port Rehabilitation (649-0114)
Southern Africa Regional Transportation Development (690-0231.11)
Swaziland Rural Reconstruction (645-0224)
Zambia Regional Transportation & Storage (690-0209.2)
Zambia Regional Transportation Development (690-0231)

FY 1988 THRESHOLD AND GENERIC EVALUATIONS

THRESHOLD

Africa Regional Family Health Initiatives (625-0969) - Final;
first phase

Africa Regional ASCI-CCCD (698-0421):

- 1) Guinea - Extension
- 2) Togo - Extension
- 3) C.A.R. - Extension
- 4) Liberia - Extension
- 5) Rwanda - Extension
- 6) Burundi - Extension

Africa Regional SAARFA (698-0435) - Modifications for new
activities

Africa Regional African-Graduate Fellowship Program III (698-0455)
- possible three-year amendment

Equatorial Guinea Cooperative Development Phase II (653-0003) -
Formative; examine future direction

Gambia Soil and Water Management (635-0202) - Project extension

Gambia PL 480 Title II Section 206 - Program evaluation

Kenya Agricultural Management (615-0221) - Possible phase II

Lesotho CRS Outreach Program (LS-ID-004) - Final

Malawi Health Institutions Development (612-0211) - Identify needs
for future A.I.D. support

Malawi Agricultural Research & Extension (612-0215) - Guidance for
out-year programming of Bank/A.I.D. resources

Mali Human Resources Sector Study - Sector review

Mauritania OMUS Agriculture Research II (682-0957) - Four year
extension

Mauritania Human Resources Development (682-0233) - Adjustments in
PACD program

Mozambique CARE Logistic Support - Moving from emergency to
recovery phase

Mozambique Private Sector Rehabilitation Program (690-0201(C)) -
Recommendations for subsequent phase

THRESHOLD (con't)

Niger Integrated Livestock (683-0242) - Final; results to be used in design of Agricultural Sector Development Grant II

Niger Niamey Department Development (683-0240) - Final; continuation of key activities by GON or under Cooperative Development Grant

Southern Africa Regional Sorghum & Millet Research (690-0224) - End of project; Threshold

Togo AEPRP - Cereals Export Liberalization (693-0229) - Final Program Evaluation; follow-on activities

Uganda Family Health Initiative (698-0662) - Threshold

Zaire Family Planning Services (660-0094) - Threshold

Zaire Small Projects - Threshold

Zambia Regional Transport Development (690-0231) - A.I.D. follow-on procurement project

GENERIC

Africa Regional ASCI-CCCD (698-0421): WHO/AFRO - End of Grant

Africa Regional Energy Initiatives for Africa (698-0424) - Final; assess impact

Congo Training* - Program evaluation; examine objectives vis-a-vis mission strategy

ESA ESAMI SRO Agricultural Management (698-0413.09) - Final

ESA ESAMI Family Health Initiative (698-0662.23) - Final

Guinea Promotion of Private Marketing and Distribution (AEPRP) (675-0217) - Mid Term; AEPRP

Guinea Bissau Program - Country level evaluation

Kenya PL480 Title II - Nutritional/Economic Impact

Kenya KCB-LC Programs - Program evaluation

*to be evaluated with Zaire program evaluation

GENERIC (con't)

- Lesotho General Manpower Development & Training (632-0069) - Final; assess success/lessons learned
- Lesotho National University of Lesotho (632-0080) - Final; assess success/lessons learned
- Malawi Fish Development/SADCC Tech. Supp. (690-0215) - Final
- Mali Economic Policy Reform Program (688-0240) - Final; assessment to be used for future program direction
- Mauritania Rural Health Services (682-0230) - Final
- Rwanda Private Enterprise Development (696-0121) - Formative assessment
- Sahel Regional Energy Initiatives (625-0956) - Final
- Southern Africa Regional Fisheries (690-0215) - Final; lessons learned
- Sudan Eastern Refugee Reforestation (650-0064) - Assessment
- Swaziland Manpower Development (645-0218) - Assessment
- Swaziland Rural Reconstruction (645-0224) - Assessment
- Swaziland Primary Health Care (645-0220) - Critical review; guide future implementation
- Swaziland Training for Entrepreneurs (645-0227) - Assessment
- Togo Credit Union Development (693-0224) - Final; impact assessment
- Zaire Training Program - Program evaluation; examine objectives vis-a-vis mission strategy
- Zambia ZAMCAM Program (611-0747) - Assess probability of future success
- Zimbabwe Books for New Literates (613-0224) - Impact evaluation
- Zimbabwe Local Currency Projects - Program evaluation
- Zimbabwe Harare Poly/B-Tech. Program (613-K-606) - Program evaluation

EVALUATION OF COUNTRY PROGRAMS

Guinea Bissau
Madagascar

EVALUATION OF SECTOR PROGRAMS*

Botswana Housing Projects (633-HG-2)
Gambia PL480 Title II Section 206 Program
Kenya KCB-LC Programs
Mali Human Resources Sector Study
Mozambique Private Sector Rehabilitation Program (690-0201(C))
Togo African Economic Export Liberalization
Zaire Training Program**
Zambia ZAMCAM Program (611-0747)
Zimbabwe LC Projects
Zimbabwe Harare Poly/B-Tech. Program (613-K-606)

* included in strategic categories list & tables
**includes Congo training project

FY 1988 AFRICA EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO STRATEGIC CATEGORIES

	<u>Economic Restructuring</u>	<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Human Resource Development</u>	<u>Other*</u>
AFR Regional		3	16	
ESA Regional		4	1	
Sahel Regional		2		1 FM
S.A. Regional		2		1 TR
Benin			1	
Botswana		3	3	1 HS
Burkina		3	1	
Cameroon			2	
Cape Verde		1	1	
Chad		1		
Comoros		1		
Congo			1**	
Equatorial Guinea			1	
Gambia		2		1 FA
Ghana			1	
Guinea	1	2		
Guinea Bissau		2	1	1 CL
Kenya	1	2	2	1 FA
Lesotho		2	3	1 FA
Liberia	1		3	
Madagascar	2	1		1 CL 2 FA
Malawi		2	2	
Mali	1	1	2	
Mauritania		1	2	
Mozambique	1			1 TR
Niger		2		
Nigeria			1	
Rwanda			1	
Senegal			1	
Sierra Leone		1		
Somalia		1	1	1 TR
Sudan	1	1	1	
Swaziland			4	1 TR
Togo	1	1	2	
Uganda			1	
Zaire	1	1	2	
Zambia		1	1	2 TR
Zimbabwe	1		2	
TOTALS	<u>11</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>15</u>

* FM - Financial Management

TR - Transportation

HS - Housing

FA - Food Aid

CL - Country Level

**to be evaluated with Zaire program evaluation

45

FY 1988 AFRICA EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO EVALUATION CATEGORIES
(Threshold, Generic and Project Management)

	<u>Economic Restructuring</u>			<u>Agriculture</u>			<u>Human Resource Development</u>			<u>Other</u>		
	TH	GR	PM	TH	GR	PM	TH	GR	PM	TH	GR	PM
AFR Regional				1	1	1	8	1	7			
ESA Regional					1	3		1				
Sahel Regional					1	1						
S.A. Regional				1	1							1 1/
Benin												1 2/
Botswana									1			
Burkina						3			3			1 3/
Cameroon						3			1			
Cape Verde									2			
Chad						1			1			
Comoros						1						
Congo												
Equatorial Guinea								1	4/			
Gambia								1				
Ghana				1		1				1		5/
Guinea		1				2			1			
Guinea Bissau						2						
Kenya		1		1		1			2		1	6/
Lesotho						2					1	5/
Liberia			1					2	1			5/
Madagascar			2						3			
Malawi						1						2 5/
Mali		1		1	1		1		1			
Mauritania						1		1	1			
Mozambique		1					1	1				
Niger				2							1	2/
Nigeria												
Rwanda									1			
Senegal								1				
Sierra Leone									1			
Somalia						1						
Sudan			1			1			1			1 2/
Swaziland					1				1			
Togo		1						3	1		1	2/
Uganda						1			1	1		
Zaire			1					1				
Zambia				1				1	1			
Zimbabwe		1							1		1 2/	1 2/
								2				
TOTALS	3	3	5	9	7	27	13	15	32	4	3	7

1/Financial Management

2/Transportation

3/Housing

4/To be evaluated w/Zaire program evaluation

5/Food Aid

6/Country Level

FY 1988 AFRICA EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO EVALUATION CATEGORIES

	<u>Threshold</u>	<u>Generic</u>	<u>Project Management</u>
AFR Regional	9	2	8
ESA Regional		2	3
Sahel Regional		1	2
S.A. Regional	1	1	1
Benin			1
Botswana			7
Burkina			4
Cameroon			2
Cape Verde			2
Chad			1
Comoros			1
Congo		1*	
Equatorial Guinea	1		
Gambia	2		1
Ghana			1
Guinea		1	2
Guinea Bissau		1	3
Kenya	1	2	3
Lesotho	1	2	3
Liberia			4
Madagascar			5
Malawi	2	1	1
Mali	1	1	2
Mauritania	2	1	
Mozambique	2		
Niger	2		
Nigeria			1
Rwanda		1	
Senegal			1
Sierra Leone			1
Somalia			3
Sudan		1	2
Swaziland		4	1
Togo	1	1	2
Uganda	1		
Zaire	2	1	1
Zambia	1	1	2
Zimbabwe		3	
TOTALS	<u>29</u>	<u>28</u>	<u>71</u>

*to be evaluated with Zaire program evaluation

ANNEX 2

A.I.D. Evaluation Summary

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY - PART I

1. BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS.
 2. USE LETTER QUALITY TYPE, NOT "DOT MATRIX" TYPE.

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. Reporting A.I.D. Unit: Mission or AID/W Office _____ (ES# _____)	B. Was Evaluation Scheduled in Current FY Annual Evaluation Plan? Yes <input type="checkbox"/> Slipped <input type="checkbox"/> Ad Hoc <input type="checkbox"/> Evaluation Plan Submission Date: FY ____ Q ____	C. Evaluation Timing Interim <input type="checkbox"/> Final <input type="checkbox"/> Ex Post <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/>
D. Activity or Activities Evaluated (List the following information for project(s) or program(s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report.)		

Project No.	Project /Program Title	First PROAG or Equivalent (FY)	Most Recent PACD (Mo/Yr)	Planned LOP Cost (000)	Amount Obligated to Date (000)

ACTIONS

E. Action Decisions Approved By Mission or AID/W Office Director	Name of Officer Responsible for Action	Date Action to be Completed
Action(s) Required		
(Attach extra sheet if necessary)		

APPROVALS

F. Date Of Mission Or AID/W Office Review Of Evaluation: _____ (Month) _____ (Day) _____ (Year)

G. Approvals of Evaluation Summary And Action Decisions:

	Project/Program Officer	Representative of Borrower/Grantee	Evaluation Officer	Mission or AID/W Office Director
Name (Typed)				
Signature				
Date				

49

ABSTRACT

H. Evaluation Abstract (Do not exceed the space provided)

[Empty space for the Evaluation Abstract]

COSTS

I. Evaluation Costs

1. Evaluation Team		Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (U.S. \$)	Source of Funds
Name	Affiliation			

2. Mission/Office Professional Staff
Person-Days (Estimate) _____

3. Borrower/Grantee Professional
Staff Person-Days (Estimate) _____

50

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY -- PART II

S U M M A R Y

J. Summary of Evaluation Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations (Try not to exceed the three (3) pages provided)
Address the following items:

- Purpose of evaluation and methodology used
- Purpose of activity(ies) evaluated
- Findings and conclusions (relate to questions)
- Principal recommendations
- Lessons learned

Mission or Office:

Date This Summary Prepared:

Title And Date Of Full Evaluation Report:

51

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING AND SUBMITTING "A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY"

This form has two parts. Part I contains information to support future A.I.D. management action, and to process the evaluation into A.I.D.'s automated "memory". Part II is a self-contained summary of key elements of the full evaluation report; it can be distributed separately to interested A.I.D. staff.

WHAT WILL THIS FORM BE USED FOR?

- Record of the decisions reached by responsible officials, so that the principals involved in the activity or activities evaluated are clear about their subsequent responsibilities, and so that headquarters are aware of anticipated actions by the reporting unit.
- Notification that an evaluation has been completed, either as planned in the current Annual Evaluation Plan or for *ad hoc* reasons.
- Summary of findings at the time of the evaluation, for use in answering queries and for directing interested readers to the full evaluation report.
- Suggestions about lessons learned for use in planning and reviewing other activities of a similar nature. This form as well as the full evaluation report are processed by PPC/CDIE into A.I.D.'s automated "memory" for later access by planners and managers.

WHEN SHOULD THE FORM BE COMPLETED AND SUBMITTED? After the Mission or A.I.D./W office review of the evaluation, and after the full report has been put into a final draft (i.e., all pertinent comments included). The A.I.D. officer responsible for the evaluation should complete this form. Part of this task may be assigned to others (e.g., the evaluation team can be required to complete the Abstract and the Summary of Findings, Conclusions, and Recommendations). The individual designated as the Mission or A.I.D./W evaluation officer is responsible for ensuring that the form is completed and submitted in a timely fashion.

WHERE SHOULD THE FORM BE SENT? A copy of the form *and attachment(s)* should be sent to each of the following three places in A.I.D./Washington:

- The respective Bureau Evaluation Office
- PPC/CDIE/DI/Acquisitions, Room 209 SA-18 (Note: If word processor was used to type form, please attach floppy disk, labelled to indicate whether WANG PC, WANG OIS or other disk format.)
- SER/MO/CPM, Room B930 NS (please attach A.I.D. Form 5-18 or a 2-way memo and request duplication and standard distribution of 10 copies).

HOW TO ORDER ADDITIONAL COPIES OF THIS FORM: Copies of this form can be obtained by sending a "Supplies/Equipment/Services Requisition" (A.I.D. 5-7) to SER/MO/RM, Room 1264 SA-14 in A.I.D./Washington. Indicate the title and number of this form ("A.I.D. Evaluation Summary", A.I.D. 1330-5) and the quantity needed.

PART I (Facesheet and Page 2)

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT: Identify the Mission or A.I.D./W office that initiated the evaluation (e.g., U.S.A.I.D./Senegal, S&T/H). Missions and offices which maintain a serial numbering system for their evaluation reports can use the next line for that purpose (e.g., ES# 87/5).

B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN? If this form is being submitted close to the date indicated in the current FY Annual Evaluation Plan (or if the final draft of the full evaluation report was submitted close to that date), check "yes". If it is being submitted late or as carried over from a previous year's plan, check "slipped". In either case, indicate on the next line the FY and Quarter in which the evaluation was initially planned. If it is not included in this year's or last year's plan, check "ad hoc".

- 57

C. EVALUATION TIMING: If this is an evaluation of a single project or program, check the box most applicable to the timing of the evaluation relative to the anticipated life of the project or program. If this is the last evaluation expected to inform a decision about a subsequently phased or follow-on project, check "final", *even though the project may have a year or more to run before its PACD*. If this is an evaluation of more than a single project or program, check "other".

D. ACTIVITY OR ACTIVITIES EVALUATED: For an evaluation covering more than four projects or programs, only list the title and date of the full evaluation report.

E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR A.I.D./W OFFICE DIRECTOR: What is the Mission or office going to do based on the findings, conclusions, and recommendations of the evaluation; when are they going to do it; and who will be responsible for the actions required? List *in order of priority or importance* the key actions or decisions to be taken, unresolved issues and any items requiring further study. Identify as appropriate A.I.D. actions, borrower/grantee actions, and actions requiring joint efforts. Indicate any actions that are preliminary pending further discussion or negotiation with the borrower/grantee.

F. DATE OF MISSION OR A.I.D./W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: Date when the internal Mission or office review was held or completed.

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTIONS DECISIONS: As appropriate, the ranking representative of the borrower/grantee can sign beside the A.I.D. Project or Program Officer.

H. EVALUATION ABSTRACT: This one-paragraph abstract will be used by PPC/CDIE to enter information about the evaluation into A.I.D.'s automated "memory". It should invite potentially interested readers to the longer summary in Part II and perhaps ultimately to the full evaluation report. It should inform the reader about the following:

- If the evaluated activity or activities have characteristics related to the reader's interests.
- The key findings, conclusions, and lessons.
- An idea of the research methods used and the nature/quality of the data supporting findings.

Previous abstracts have often been deficient in one of two ways:

- Too much information on project design, implementation problems, and current project status discourages readers before they can determine if there are important findings of interest to them.
- A "remote" tone or style prevents readers from getting a real flavor of the activity or activities evaluated; progress or lack of progress; and major reasons as analyzed by the evaluation.

In sequential sentences, the abstract should convey:

- The programming reason behind the evaluation, and its timing (e.g., mid-term, final);
- The purpose and basic characteristics of the activities evaluated;
- A summary statement of the overall achievements or lack thereof to date;
- A picture of the status of the activities as disclosed in the full evaluation report;
- An idea of the research method and types of data sources used by the evaluators;
- The most important findings and conclusions; and key lessons learned.

Avoid the passive tense and vague adjectives. Where appropriate, use hard numbers. (An example of an abstract follows; "bullets" may be used to highlight key points).

EXAMPLE OF AN ABSTRACT

The project aims to help the Government of Zaire (GOZ) establish a self-sustaining primary health care (PHC) system in 50 rural health zones (RHZ). The project is being implemented by the Church of Christ in Zaire and the GOZ's PHC Office. This mid-term evaluation (8/81-4/84) was conducted by a GOZ-USAID/Z team on the basis of a review of project documents (including a 4/84 project activity report), visits to nine RHZ's, and interviews with project personnel. The purpose was to clarify some uncertainties about the initial design and set future priorities for activities. The major findings and conclusions are:

- This well-managed and coordinated project should attain most objectives by its 1986 end.
- Progress has been good in establishing RHZ's, converting dispensaries into health centers, installing latrines (over double the target), and training medical zone chiefs, nurses, and auxiliary health workers. Long-term training has lagged however, and family planning and well construction targets have proven unviable.
- The initial assumption that doctors and nurses can organize and train village health committees seems invalid.
- User fees at health centers are insufficient to cover service costs. A.I.D.'s PRICOR project is currently studying self-financing procedures.
- Because of the project's strategic importance in Zaire's health development, it is strongly recommended to extend it 4-5 years and increase RHZ and health center targets, stressing pharmaceutical/medical supplies development and regional Training for Trainers Centers for nurses, supervisors, and village health workers.

The evaluators noted the following "lessons":

- The training of local leaders should begin as soon as the Project Identification Document is agreed upon.
- An annual national health conference spurs policy dialogue and development of donor sub-projects.
- The project's institution-building nature rather than directly service nature has helped prepare thousands of Zairois to work with others in large health systems.

I. EVALUATION COSTS: Costs of the evaluation are presented in two ways. The first are the cost of the work of the evaluation team per se. If Mission or office staff serve as members of the team, indicate the number of person-days in the third column. The second are the indirect estimated costs incurred by involvement of other Mission/Office and borrower/grantee staff in the broader evaluation process, including time for preparations, logistical support, and reviews.

PART II (Pages 3-6)

J. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS: The following reflects a consensus among A.I.D.'s Bureaus on common elements to be included in a summary of any evaluation. The summary should not exceed the three pages provided. It should be self-contained and avoid "in-house" jargon. Spell out acronyms when first used. Avoid unnecessarily complicated explanations of the activity or activities evaluated, or of the evaluation methodology; the interested reader can find this information in the full evaluation report. Get all the critical facts and findings into the summary since a large proportion of readers will go no further. Cover the following elements, preferably in the order given:

1. Purpose of the activity or activities evaluated. What constraints or opportunities does the loan and/or grant activity address; what is it trying to do about the constraints? Specify the problem, then specify the solution and its relationship, if any, to overall Mission or office strategy. State logframe purpose and goal, if applicable.

94'

2. Purpose of the evaluation and methodology used. Why was the evaluation undertaken? Briefly describe the types and sources of evidence used to assess effectiveness and impact.

3. Findings and conclusion. Discuss major findings and interpretations related to the questions in the Scope of Work. Note any major assumptions about the activity that proved invalid, including policy related factors. Cite progress since any previous evaluation.

4. Principal recommendations for this activity and its offspring (in the Mission country or in the office program). Specify the pertinent conclusions for A.I.D. in design and management of the activity, and for approval/disapproval and fundamental changes in any follow-on activities. *Note any recommendations from a previous evaluation that are still valid but were not acted upon.*

5. Lessons learned (for other activities and for A.I.D. generally). This is an opportunity to give A.I.D. colleagues advice about planning and implementation strategies, i.e., how to tackle a similar development problem, key design factors, factors pertinent to management and to evaluation itself. There may be no clear lessons. Don't stretch the findings by presenting vague generalizations in an effort to suggest broadly applicable lessons. If items 3-4 above are succinctly covered, the reader can derive pertinent lessons. On the other hand, don't hold back clear lessons even when these may seem trite or naive. Address:

-- Project Design Implications. Findings/conclusions about this activity that bear on the design or management of other similar activities and their assumptions.

-- Broad action implications. Elements which suggest action beyond the activity evaluated, and which need to be considered in designing similar activities in other contexts (e.g., policy requirements, factors in the country that were particularly constraining or supportive).

NOTE: The above outline is identical to the outline recommended for the Executive Summary of the full evaluation report. At the discretion of the Mission or Office, the latter can be copied.

K. ATTACHMENTS: Always attach a copy of the full evaluation report. A.I.D. assumes that the bibliography of the full report will include all items considered relevant to the evaluation by the Mission or Office. **NOTE:** if the Mission or Office has prepared documents that (1) comment in detail on the full report or (2) go into greater detail on matters requiring future A.I.D. action, these can be attached to the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary form or submitted separately via memoranda or cables.

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W AND BORROWER/GRANTEE: This section summarizes the comments of the Mission, AID/W Office, and the borrower/grantee on the full evaluation report. It should enable the reader to understand their respective views about the usefulness and quality of the evaluation, and why any recommendations may have been rejected. It can cover the following:

- To what extent does the evaluation meet the demands of the scope of work? Does the evaluation provide answers to the questions posed? Does it surface unforeseen issues of potential interest or concern to the Mission or Office?
- Did the evaluators spend sufficient time in the field to fully understand the activity, its impacts, and the problems encountered in managing the activity?
- Did any of the evaluators show particular biases which staff believe affected the findings? Avoid ad hominem discussions but cite objective evidence such as data overlooked, gaps in interviews, statements suggesting a lack of objectivity, weaknesses in data underlying principle conclusions and recommendations.
- Did the evaluation employ innovative methods which would be applicable and useful in evaluating other projects known to the Mission or Office? Note the development of proxy measures of impact or benefit; efforts to construct baseline data; techniques that were particularly effective in isolating the effects of the activity from other concurrent factors.
- Do the findings and lessons learned that are cited in the report generally concur with the conclusions reached by A.I.D. staff and well-informed host country officials? Do lower priority findings in the evaluation warrant greater emphasis?

ANNEX 3

**State 78879, 18/3/88,
Project Implementation Reports**

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 01 OF 07 STATE 078079
ORIGIN AID-00

6217 027650 A10303

STATE 078079

6217 022540 A10

ORIGIN OFFICE AID-00
INFO AAAP-03 AFEA-03 AFSA-03 AFFU-03 AFCU-03 AFOP-03 FPA-03
AFIR-03 FVA-03 PPPB-03 GC-03 GCAF-03 PPDC-03 APPC-03
SAST-03 FFP-03 ES-03 RELD-03 AFMG-03 /056 AA PL16

INFO LOG-00 AF-00 EB-00 AMAD-01 /001 R

DRAFTED BY: AID/AFR/PO/CCWAP:JHRADSKY
APPROVED BY: AID/AFR/PO:CPHASLEY
CLEARANCES: AID/AFR/PO/EAP:SBANER (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/PO/SAP:PTHORN (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/PO/:JGRAHAM (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/PO/SWAP:BBURNETT (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/OP/PPE:EGREELEY (DRAFT)

-----025347 152349Z /70/38

R 151750Z MAR 88
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USAID MISSIONS IN AFRICA

UNCLAS STATE 078079

AIDAC

C O R R E C T E D C O P Y - T E X T

E.O. 12356: N/A

SUBJECT: PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS

REF: (A) 86 STATE 130300 (B) STATE 360004 (C) STATE 23724

1. AFR BUREAU MANAGEMENT CONTINUES TO REASSESS ITS OVERALL INFORMATION NEEDS IN LIGHT OF THE NEW DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA AND GROWING DELEGATIONS OF AUTHORITY TO THE FIELD. IN THIS CONTEXT AFR/PO, AFR/OP AND OTHERS HAVE RECENTLY RE-EXAMINED THE SCOPE AND USE OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REPORTS (PIR). MODIFICATIONS TO EXISTING PIR FORMAT AND PROCEDURES HAVE BEEN RECOMMENDED WHICH SHOULD BETTER FOCUS REPORTING ON CORE IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE WHILE PLACING MINIMAL EXTRA BURDEN ON FIELD STAFF. THE PURPOSE OF THIS CABLE, THEREFORE, IS (1) TO REPORT ON NEW PIR PROCEDURES; (2) TO PROPOSE A NEW UNIFORM REPORTING FORMAT; AND (3) TO PROVIDE SPECIFIC INSTRUCTIONS FOR THE UPCOMING PIR CYCLE.

2. PIR PROCEDURES: GIVEN THE GROWING IMPORTANCE OF PIRs, STANDARD REVIEW PROCEDURES HAVE NOW BEEN ADOPTED BY AFR BUREAU TO IMPROVE ITS USE OF THE DOCUMENTS. FOLLOWING THEIR RECEIPT BY AFR/PO/IPS, PIRs ARE ROUTINELY PROCESSED IN THE FOLLOWING MANNER: MICROFILM OF PIR AND RETRANSMISSION TO APPROPRIATE AFR/PO GEOGRAPHIC BACKSTOP, ORGANIZED PACKAGING OF PIRs FOR REPRODUCTION AND STANDARD DISTRIBUTION, PROJECT COMMITTEE MEETING WITH AGENDA, FEEDBACK CABLE TO FIELD. THE TYPICAL PROJECT COMMITTEE REVIEW NOW OFFERS A UNIQUE OPPORTUNITY FOR REPRESENTATIVES OF THE FULL SPECTRUM OF AFR BUREAU (PO, DESK, OP, TRI) AND OTHER CONCERNED OFFICES (S AND T, FFP, PPC, GC, ETC) TO REVIEW MISSION PORTFOLIOS IN A REGULAR AND ORGANIZED MANNER. A NUMBER OF SPECIFIC REPORTING CONCERNS ARE EXPEDITIOUSLY DEALT WITH IN THIS MANNER (PROJECT/PROGRAM PERFORMANCE, SPECIAL INTEREST ACCOMPLISHMENT, PIPELINE ANALYSIS, EVALUATION TRACKING, PACO ISSUES, FUNDING CONSIDERATIONS, ETC.). THE REVISED PIR FORMAT PROPOSED IN PARA 3 OF THIS CABLE ADDRESSES THESE AID/M INTERESTS, WHILE SIMULTANEOUSLY RETAINING THE VALUE OF THE PIR AS A MISSION MANAGEMENT TOOL.

BECAUSE OF THE IMPORTANCE OF REGIONAL ACTIVITIES IN AFRICA AND THE NEED FOR PIRs TO REFLECT TOTAL PORTFOLIO PERFORMANCE, MISSIONS WHO HAVE NOT YET DONE SO ARE REQUESTED TO REPORT ON REGIONAL, CENTRALLY-FUNDED, AND PLAGD ACTIVITIES, IN ADDITION TO BILATERAL PROJECTS. IN ORDER TO EASE THE REPORTING BURDEN, AFR BUREAU WILL NO LONGER REQUIRE INDIVIDUAL NARRATIVES ON PROJECTS WITH AN LOP LESS THAN DOLS 500,000. RATHER, FOR THESE SMALL PROJECTS, MISSIONS NEED ONLY SEND A SUMMARY LIST SHOWING FUNDS AUTHORIZED, OBLIGATED AND EXPENDED, PACO AND A SIMPLE AND VERY BRIEF STATEMENT OF PROJECT PURPOSE AND ANY MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OR PROBLEMS.

THE BUREAU WILL CONTINUE TO CONDUCT PORTFOLIO REVIEWS TWICE A YEAR ALTHOUGH TIMING OF REPORTING HAS BEEN ADJUSTED SOMEWHAT TO BETTER COINCIDE WITH OVERALL PROGRAMMING REQUIREMENTS. AID/M REVIEWS WILL BE HELD IN MAY TO COVER THE FIRST TWO QUARTERS OF THE FY, AND IN NOVEMBER FOR THE LAST TWO QUARTERS OF THE FY. PIRs FOR THE FORMER SHOULD BE RECEIVED IN AID/M BY MAY 1, AND FOR THE LATTER, BY NOVEMBER 1. THESE PIRs SHOULD REFLECT THE STATUS OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AS OF 3/31 AND 9/30 RESPECTIVELY, WITH THE POSSIBLE EXCEPTION OF PROJECT FINANCIAL REPORTING, FOR WHICH EARLIER DATA WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IF END-OF-QUARTER INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE AT THE TIME OF REPORTING.

PIR SUBMISSIONS ARE REQUESTED TO ARRIVE IN AFR/PO/IPS IN TYPED DOCUMENT FORM, SO AS TO AVOID DELAYS IN PACKAGING AND DISTRIBUTION IN A I.D./M. ALSO, IF POSSIBLE, MISSIONS ARE URGED TO SEND COPIES OF WANG DISKETTE. DUE, PARTICULARLY, TO POOR READABILITY AFTER REPRODUCTION, SUBMISSION OF PIRs BY CABLE SHOULD BE USED ONLY AS A LAST RESORT.

3. PIR FORMAT: PROJECT PIRs HAVE BEEN MODIFIED TO FOCUS MORE EXPLICITLY ON (A) PURPOSE AND OUTPUT-LEVEL TRACKING (B) ANALYSIS OF PROBLEMS AND ISSUES CENTRAL TO THE PROJECT'S SUCCESS IN MEETING OBJECTIVES AND (C) TRACKING OF MAJOR OUTSTANDING PROJECT EVALUATION AND AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS. THIS SHOULD HELP MISSIONS MINIMIZE DETAILED INPUT REPORTING AND GENERALLY SHORTEN LENGTH OF PIRs. THE COMPANION MISSION DIRECTOR'S OVERVIEW STATEMENT SHOULD SIMILARLY BE CONCISE AND REFLECTIVE OF MISSION REVIEW OF PROJECTS AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE CURRENT ACTION PLAN (SEE BELOW).

A. MISSION OVERVIEW STATEMENT - AS NOTED IN REF (B), PIRs REPRESENT AN OPPORTUNITY FOR MISSION MANAGEMENT TO REVIEW ALL ACTIVITIES ON A REGULAR BASIS AND THEN TO REFLECT UPON THE EXTENT TO WHICH INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTE TO THE BROADER STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES UNDER WHICH THE MISSION IS EXPECTED TO FUNCTION. WHILE INDIVIDUAL PIR STATEMENTS WILL CONTINUE TO FOCUS ON MISSION PROJECTS, IT IS NOW REQUESTED THAT PIR OVERVIEW STATEMENTS BE ORGANIZED AROUND THE ACTION PLAN AGENDA, WHERE AVAILABLE. MISSIONS LACKING SUCH A FRAMEWORK SHOULD REFER TO THE APPROPRIATE SUBSTITUTE DOCUMENT (GUSS, CONCEPT PAPER OR SPSS). STRUCTURING OF THE OVERVIEW STATEMENT IN THIS MANNER WILL REGULARLY REMIND ALL MISSION AND A.I.D./M STAFF OF THE BROADER OBJECTIVES THAT MISSION PROJECTS AND PROGRAMS ARE ATTEMPTING TO ACHIEVE, WHILE SIMULTANEOUSLY PROVIDING REGULAR, ALBEIT IMPRESSIONISTIC, FEEDBACK ON THE STATUS OF ACTION PLAN PROGRESS. OVER TIME, WE HOPE THIS WILL MAKE IT EASIER FOR MISSIONS TO COMPLETE BI-ANNUAL ACTION PLAN UPDATES IN REPORTING ACCOMPLISHMENTS, WE URGE MISSIONS ALSO TO MAKE NOTE OF SPECIAL INTEREST-ACHIEVEMENTS, E.G., IN NATURAL RESOURCES, WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT, AND CHILD

UNCLASSIFIED

91

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 02 OF 02 STATE 078879

6217 022600 A103708

STATE 078879

6217 022600 A1

SURVIVAL. WE WILL THEN ENSURE THAT THESE ACCOMPLISHMENTS ARE INCORPORATED INTO BUREAU'S BROADER REPORTING AND CONGRESSIONAL CONSULTATIONS. GIVEN THE PERSPECTIVE OF CONTINUING AGENCY BUDGET DIFFICULTIES, MISSIONS ARE ENCOURAGED TO UNDERTAKE APPROPRIATE FINANCIAL ANALYSES (ESP. PIPELINE ANALYSIS) AS PART OF THE PROJECT REVIEW EXERCISE.

IT IS SUGGESTED THAT MISSION PIR REVIEW BE ORGANIZED AROUND ACTION PLAN ELEMENTS AS A MEANS OF FURTHERING PROJECT-PROGRAM COHERENCY AND SO AS TO SIMPLIFY OVERVIEW REPORTING TO WASHINGTON. THIS WILL ALSO SIMPLIFY THE ORGANIZATION OF PROJECT COMMITTEE REVIEWS IN AID/W AND SUBSEQUENT PIR REPORTING CABLES TO THE FIELD, WHICH WILL BE STRUCTURED IN A SIMILAR MANNER.

B. PROPOSED FORMAT FOR INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES - THE FOLLOWING FORMAT HAS BEEN SIMPLIFIED TO ELICIT ONLY THAT INFORMATION WHICH AFR BUREAU CONSIDERS ESSENTIAL FOR ITS BACKSTOPPING ROLE. THIS INFORMATION IS THE MINIMUM NOW REQUIRED IN PIRS, ALTHOUGH MISSIONS ARE GIVEN THE OPTION OF PROVIDING INFORMATION BEYOND THIS MINIMUM CORE. IF USEFUL, A SLIGHTLY MODIFIED FORMAT MAY BE USED TO REPORT ON SPECIAL TYPES OF ASSISTANCE, SUCH AS NPA AND FOOD AID. THE KEY FOR NPA AND FOOD AID WILL BE TO REPORT ON PROGRESS IN MEETING POLICY AND SELF-HELP OBJECTIVES, AS WELL AS ON DELIVERY OF INPUT.

I. ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

- COUNTRY
- PROJECT TITLE
- PROJECT NUMBER
- DATE OF REPORT
- IMPLEMENTING AGENCY
- MAJOR CONTRACTORS/AMOUNTS
- FIELD BACKSTOP OFFICER
- A.I.D. BACKSTOP OFFICER
- DATE OF LAST EVALUATION AND/OR AUDIT
- DATE OF NEXT EVALUATION AND/OR AUDIT
- WAIVERS PROCESSED DURING THE REPORTING PERIOD (SEE REF C)

II. FINANCIAL DATA (DOLS 000)

- DATE OF AUTHORIZATION
- AUTHORIZED LOP
- DATE OF INITIAL OBLIGATION
- PACD (ORIGINAL AND REVISED)
- CUMULATIVE OBLIGATION
- CUMULATIVE ACCRUED EXPENDITURES
- CUMULATIVE COMMITMENTS
- EST. COST OF INDIVIDUAL INPUTS (LIST KEY CATEGORIES OF PROJECT INPUTS FROM LOGFRAME OR BUDGET ELEMENTS FROM MACS AND NOTE PROJECTED COST)

III. PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

A. PROJECT PURPOSE -- (STATEMENT OF PURPOSE FROM PROJECT PAPER OR PAAD).

B. PROGRESS TOWARD MEETING EOPS -- (FOR NEW PROJECTS, THIS SECTION MAY BE LEFT BLANK. HOWEVER, ONCE A PROJECT IS AT LEAST 3 YEARS OLD AND/OR ITS FIRST EVALUATION IS COMPLETED, WE REQUEST AT LEAST IMPRESSIONISTIC REPORTING ON PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING PROJECT PURPOSE, AND TO EXTENT POSSIBLE, ANY SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS FROM DATA COLLECTIONS/IMPACT STUDIES FUNDED UNDER PROJECT).

C. PROJECT OUTPUTS (LEFT-HAND COLUMN TO LIST MAJOR

LOGFRAME OUTPUT TARGETS - NO RIGHT-HAND COLUMN TO DIRECTLY TRACK OUTPUT STATUS, INCLUDING FORTH PERCENTAGE QUANTIFICATION OF PROGRESS TOWARD COMPLETION)

D. IMPORTANT ISSUES/PROBLEMS -- (IMPLEMENTATION OR POLICY ISSUES REQUIRING MISSION MANAGEMENT DECISION, MAJOR OUTSTANDING EVALUATION OR AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS, AS WELL AS ACTIONS TAKEN DURING REPORTING PERIOD ON RECOMMENDATIONS)

E. IMPORTANT ACTIONS OVER NEXT SIX MONTHS, TIMEFRAME AND ACTION AGENT

4. INSTRUCTIONS ON THE UPCOMING PIR CYCLE: PIRS REFLECTING PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION PERFORMANCE OVER THE PERIOD 10/01/87 - 03/31/88 SHOULD BE RECEIVED IN AFR/PD/IPS BY 04/20/88 IN ORDER TO PERMIT MISSIONS AND AID/W TO REVIEW THEM PRIOR TO THE JUNE SERIES OF ABS REVIEWS. IN FUTURE, WE WILL TRY TO MOVE BACK SPRING SUBMISSIONS TO MAY 1, BUT URGE APRIL 20 SUBMISSION THIS YEAR IN ORDER TO ENSURE COMPLETION OF PIR REVIEWS BEFORE ABS'S.

MISSIONS ARE REQUESTED TO UTILIZE THE PROTOTYPE PIR FORMAT NOTED IN PARA THREE ABOVE. BECAUSE OF THE SHORTENED TIMEFRAME OF THIS PIR CYCLE, EXCEPTIONS WILL BE ALLOWED FOR INDIVIDUAL PROJECT REPORTING (PARA 3.B.1), ALTHOUGH ALL MISSIONS WILL BE EXPECTED TO HAVE MOVED TO THE NEW FORMAT FOR PIR SUBMISSIONS DUE 11/1/88.

5. PLEASE CONSULT WITH YOUR RESPECTIVE PD BACKSTOP OFFICER ON ANY QUESTIONS WHICH MAY ARISE OVER UPCOMING PIR SUBMISSION. SHULTZ

UNCLASSIFIED

58

ANNEX 4

State 030918, 2/2/88,

Africa Bureau Supplemental CDSS

Guidance and Guidance on Concept Papers

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 01 OF 03 STATE 030913
ORIGIN AID-00

5842 105926 AID5943

STATE 030913

5842 105926 AID59

ORIGIN OFFICE AFDP-06
INFO AAAF-03 AFCD-02 AFEA-03 AFSA-03 AFFW-04 AFCW-03 SEOP-01
FPA-02 AFEC-02 AFED-02 AFPO-04 SERP-01 AFTR-05 FVA-01
SECS-02 OFDA-02 AMAD-01 SETN-01 PPCE-01 POPR-01 PPPB-02
GC-01 GCAF-01 OL-01 STEH-03 STPO-01 PPR-01 STFN-02
SAST-01 PDP-04 AFPE-07 RNS-09 PVC-02 ES-01 OMB-02 RELO-01
PRE-06 /095 AB

INFO LOG-00 AF-00 EB-00 /000 R

DRAFTED BY: AID/AFR/DP/PPE:ESIMMONS:LM;
APPROVED BY: AID/AAA/AFR/DP:JRWESTLEY

AID/AFR/DP:JGOVAN AID/AFR/DP/PPE:EGREELEY
AID/AFR/DP/PAR:JWOLGIN(DRAFT) AID/AFR/DP/PAB:MMERRILL(DRAFT)
AID/AA/AFR:VLELLIDT AID/AFR/CCWA:JCOLES(INFO)
AID/AFR/EA:SMINTZ(INFO) AID/AFR/SA:FFISCHER(INFO)
AID/AFR/SWA:PDICHTER(INFO)
AID/AFR/PD:CPEASLEY(INFO)
AID/AFR/TR:KSHERPER(INFO)
AID/AFR/PRE:NNUNSON(INFO)
AID/PPC/PB:RMAUSHAMMER(DRAFT)

-----306555 0221542 /30

R 020640Z FEB 88
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AMEMBASSY NAIROBI
AMEMBASSY MONROVIA
AMEMBASSY DAKAR
AMEMBASSY MOGADISHU
AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM
AMEMBASSY KINSHASA
AMEMBASSY LUSAKA
AMEMBASSY BUJUMBURA
AMEMBASSY YAOUNDE
AMEMBASSY ACCRA
AMEMBASSY CONAKRY
AMEMBASSY ANTANANARIVO
AMEMBASSY LILONGWE
AMEMBASSY BAMAKO
AMEMBASSY MAPUTO
AMEMBASSY NIAMEY
AMEMBASSY NIGALI
AMEMBASSY DAR ES SALAAM
AMEMBASSY KAMPALA
AMEMBASSY NARARE

UNCLAS STATE 030913

AIDAC

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS:

SUBJECT: AFRICA BUREAU SUPPLEMENTAL CDSS GUIDANCE AND
GUIDANCE ON CONCEPT PAPERS

REF: (A) REVIEW SCHEDULING (B) STATE 340629 (C) STATE
289421 (D) AFRICA BUREAU PRIVATE SECTOR STRATEGY

1. SUMMARY. MALI AND SUDAN ARE EXPECTED TO PREPARE FULL
CDSS OVER THE NEXT SIX MONTHS; GHANA AND MADAGASCAR
WILL BE SUBMITTING CONCEPT PAPERS WITHIN THE SAME
TIMEFRAME. TANZANIA IS EXPECTED TO PREPARE A FULL CDSS
BY END CY 88. SPECIFIC SCHEDULING INFORMATION SHOULD
ALREADY HAVE ARRIVED IN REF A. AGENCY CDSS GUIDANCE
(REF B) IS SUPPLEMENTED IN THIS CABLE FOR THREE REASONS:
FIRST, AS THE INITIATIVE TO END HUNGER IN AFRICA (REF C)
GAINS MOMENTUM, INDIVIDUAL COUNTRY DOCUMENTATION SHOULD
REFLECT THE OBJECTIVES AND ANALYSES ASSOCIATED WITH THIS
CONTINENT-WIDE EFFORT. SECOND, WE MUST BEGIN TO THIN

HOW WE MIGHT RESPOND TO THE OPPORTUNITIES WHICH THE
DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA (DFA) GIVES US. THIRD, WE
WANT TO EMPHASIZE EFFECTIVE MONITORING OF PROGRESS IN
IMPLEMENTING NEW APPROACHES AND ON DEVELOPING ADEQUATE
EVALUATING AND REPORTING SYSTEMS. WE ALSO PROPOSE THAT
CONCEPT PAPERS SHOULD FOLLOW TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE THE

FORMATS SPECIFIED FOR CDSS. IT IS RECOGNIZED THAT AS
CONCEPT PAPERS ARE MORE IN THE NATURE OF INTERIM
DOCUMENTS, WRITTEN AT TIMES OF SUBSTANTIAL FLUX IN
DEVELOPMENT CIRCUMSTANCES, ANALYSES AND ARTICULATION OF
STRATEGIC CHOICES WILL BE LESS DETAILED AND MORE
TENTATIVE. END SUMMARY.

2. END HUNGER INITIATIVE. THE END HUNGER INITIATIVE
(EHI) REPRESENTS A U.S. COMMITMENT TO THE GOAL OF ENDING
HUNGER IN AFRICA THROUGH MARKET-BASED GROWTH. THE AIM
OF THE INITIATIVE IS TO SUSTAIN ECONOMIC GROWTH, THAT
IS, INCREASED PRODUCTION CAPACITY, OVER SUFFICIENT
PERIODS OF TIME TO END HUNGER AS A SYSTEMIC PROBLEM. IT
IS PROPOSED THAT A MIX OF POLICY REFORM, LONG-TERM
COMMITMENT OF RESOURCES, AND
INSTITUTIONAL/ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT IS REQUIRED.
THESE IMPLY: EFFICIENT ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES THROUGH
MARKET MECHANISMS IN A MACROECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT
CONDUCTIVE TO THE OPERATION OF SUCH MECHANISMS;
INCREASING THE EFFICIENCY WITH WHICH RESOURCES ARE USED
BY THE PUBLIC SECTOR IN THOSE ACTIVITIES APPROPRIATE TO
AND NECESSARY FOR THAT SECTOR TO PERFORM; LONG-TERM
COMMITMENT TO FUNDING IN THE MOST FLEXIBLE WAY POSSIBLE,
I.E., THE DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA AND MORE
INTEGRATED USE OF DA, ESF, AND PL 480 RESOURCES, RATHER
THAN SIMPLY MORE RESOURCES; BETTER COORDINATION AMONG
DONORS; AND MOBILIZATION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR --
BUSINESS, PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY GROUPS, AND INDIVIDUALS.
-- THROUGH EXPANDING THE USE OF THE MARKET SYSTEM BY
AFRICAN SOCIETIES.

IT SHOULD BE RECOGNIZED THAT THE END HUNGER INITIATIVE
GOALS AND APPROACHES UNDERSCORE THE STATEMENTS IN THE
AGENCY CDSS GUIDANCE (PARA 3) THAT QUOTE THE BASIC
DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM FOR AID IS INADEQUATE ECONOMIC
GROWTH. ECONOMIC GROWTH IS A FUNCTION OF HOW THE
ECONOMY ALLOCATES RESOURCES...THE FOUNDATION OF
SUCCESS...MUST BE ...BROAD-BASED ECONOMIC GROWTH THAT
PROVIDES PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT AS WELL AS HIGHER PER
CAPITA INCOMES FOR AN INCREASING PROPORTION OF THE
POPULATION. WITHOUT THIS FOUNDATION, PROGRESS IN OTHER
ELEMENTS... CANNOT BE SUSTAINED AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY
OBJECTIVES CANNOT BE ACHIEVED ENQUOTE. WE THEREFORE
WOULD LIKE TO SEE CDSS DO A THOROUGH JOB OF ANALYZING
THE CONSTRAINTS TO SUCH ECONOMIC GROWTH AND DISCUSSING
THE WAY IN WHICH AID PROPOSES TO ADDRESS THEM. IT IS
ALSO IMPERATIVE THAT ATTENTION BE DEVOTED TO THE
QUESTIONS OF POPULAR PARTICIPATION IN ECONOMIC ACTIVITY
(INCLUDING THE CAPACITY TO ACCEPT OR, THROUGH MARKET

MECHANISMS, SHIFT RISK), THE SUSTAINABILITY OF THE
GROWTH PROCESS, AND POTENTIAL THAT THE COUNTRY BEING
CONSIDERED HAS TO SOLVE ITS HUNGER PROBLEMS THROUGH THE
PROCESS OF GROWTH. THIS WILL ENABLE MISSIONS TO DEAL
WITH THE PROBLEMS SPECIFICALLY MENTIONED IN THE AGENCY
GUIDANCE WHILE EXPLICITLY LINKING THE CONCERNS (HUNGER,
HEALTH DEFICIENCIES, LACK OF EDUCATION, AND POPULATION
PRESSURES) IN A COHERENT ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY. WE
FULLY RECOGNIZE THE SPACE LIMITATIONS AND URGE MAXIMUM
USE OF EXPLANATORY TABLES IN ANNEXES.

3. DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA (DFA) CONCERNS. RECOGNIZING THE TREMENDOUS NEED FOR RESOURCES IN AFRICA AT

UNCLASSIFIED

60

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 02 OF 03 STATE 030913

8042 105926 AID5943

STATE 030913

8042 105926 AID59

THE SAME TIME AS FOREIGN ASSISTANCE FUNDING WAS SHRINKING OVERALL, THE END HUNGER INITIATIVE PROPOSED THAT A SINGLE DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA BE ESTAB-

CONSOLIDATE THE MAJOR ELEMENTS OF OUR CURRENT PROGRAM INTO A NEW COHERENT LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK. THE NEW DFA PERMITS BOTH PROJECT AND NONPROJECT USE OF FUNDS, DEPENDING ON THE NEED IN INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES AND FOR INDIVIDUAL ACTIVITIES, AND A FOCUS ON ECONOMIC POLICY REFORM AND PRIVATE SECTOR DEVELOPMENT AS WELL AS OTHER EFFORTS DESIGNED TO STIMULATE SUSTAINED ECONOMIC GROWTH. IN ADDITION, THE DFA ENCOURAGES CONTINUED SUPPORT FOR SPECIAL AREAS OF CONCERN SUCH AS POPULATION GROWTH SURVIVAL, NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT, AND PVOS. FINALLY, THE DFA WILL PROVIDE FLEXIBILITY TO REWARD PROGRESS IN COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE ALREADY EMBARKED ON ECONOMIC REFORM PROGRAMS, AS WELL AS ENCOURAGE OTHER COUNTRIES TO UNDERTAKE SUCH MARKET-ORIENTED APPROACHES. THE IMPORTANCE OF THE DFA FOR THE PREPARATION OF CDSS AND CONCEPT PAPERS IS THAT MISSIONS CAN DEVELOP THEIR STRATEGIC AND PROGRAMMING OPTIONS WITH FEWER RESTRICTIONS THAN PREVIOUSLY APPLIED. EVEN GREATER CONCENTRATION OF PORTFOLIOS ON A FEW KEY CONSTRAINTS IS PERMITTED; GREATER FLEXIBILITY IN USING NONPROJECT MODES OF ASSISTANCE IS ENCOURAGED. IT IS OUR INTENTION TO EMPHASIZE PERFORMANCEBASED ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES UNDER THE FUND.

4. MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING. BOTH THE END HUNGER INITIATIVE AND THE DFA WILL, HOWEVER, REQUIRE THE BUREAU AS A WHOLE TO STRENGTHEN ITS SYSTEMS FOR PERFORMANCE MONITORING, EVALUATION OF NONPROJECT AS WELL AS PROJECT ASSISTANCE, AND REPORTING. SINCE INCREASING OVERALL PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS AND IMPACT ARE FUNDAMENTAL, SPECIAL ATTENTION WILL BE PAID TO MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING ABOVE THE PROJECT LEVEL. AFRICA MISSIONS ARE, THEREFORE, REQUIRED TO

SUPPLEMENT THE AGENCY CDSS GUIDANCE OUTLINE WITH A SECTION V. MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING. IN THIS SECTION OF THE CDSS OR CONCEPT PAPER, MISSIONS SHOULD EXPLAIN (A) WHAT THE OBJECTIVES OF THEIR MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING SYSTEMS ARE; (B) HOW THEY PLAN TO MANAGE THESE SYSTEMS; AND (C) THE PRINCIPAL BENCHMARKS FOR MEASURING THE OVERALL SUCCESS OF THE CDSS STRATEGY, FOR EXAMPLE, GROSS DOMESTIC PRODUCT (GDP) AND GDP/CAPITA, GOVERNMENT EXPENDITURES AS A PERCENT OF GDP AND THE RATES OF CHANGE OF THESE MEASUREMENTS, MONEY SUPPLY AND CONSUMER PRICES OVER TIME COULD BE USED TO INDICATE GROWTH IN OVERALL ECONOMIC PRODUCTION CAPACITY. THE SYSTEM SHOULD INCLUDE TRACKING OF THE IMPACT OF PROGRAMS AT BOTH THE GRASSROOTS AND NATIONAL, "MACRO", LEVEL IF AT ALL POSSIBLE. THE ACTION PLAN, TO BE PREPARED ONE YEAR AFTER CDSS APPROVAL, SHOULD MORE COMPLETELY ARTICULATE BENCHMARKS AND TARGETS FOR EACH STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE TAKEN FROM THE CDSS. MANAGEMENT APPROACHES CAN ALSO BE MORE CLEARLY DEFINED IN THE ACTION PLAN. HOWEVER, AS MONITORING, EVALUATING, AND REPORTING ON PROGRESS ASSUME NEW IMPORTANCE WITH THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ENI AND DFA, BUREAU MANAGEMENT WOULD LIKE TO BEGIN TO UNDERSTAND HOW MISSIONS WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THE OVERALL PROCESS STARTING RIGHT FROM THE CDSS.

5. CONCEPT PAPERS AS INTERIM CDSS. CONCEPT PAPERS ARE INTENDED TO BE INTERIM STRATEGY DOCUMENTS IN COUNTRIES IN WHICH CONDITIONS ARE STILL ESPECIALLY FLUID. MISSIONS ARE OFTEN NEWLY-ESTABLISHED, DEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL APPEARS TO BE SUBSTANTIAL, AND DONOR SUPPORT IS GROWING RAPIDLY. CONCEPT PAPERS ENABLE THE MISSION TO CONDUCT A SERIOUS APPRAISAL OF THE SITUATION,

ALTHOUGH OFTEN WITH LESS DATA AND PRIOR ANALYSIS THAN WOULD BE AVAILABLE IN MORE STABLE COUNTRIES, AND TO SKETCH OUT A REASONABLE, ALTHOUGH TENTATIVE, STRATEGY FOR A TWO TO THREE YEAR PERIOD. WHILE AID/W WOULD LIKE FOR EACH USAID REQUESTED TO PREPARE A CONCEPT PAPER TO FOLLOW THE GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR THE CDSS PREPARATION TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, AID/W DOES NOT REQUIRE THAT EACH SUBJECT BE DESCRIBED IN THE DEPTH AND DETAIL CALLED FOR IN THE REGULAR CDSS GUIDANCE. IT IS EXPECTED THAT THE CONCEPT PAPER REQUESTED SHOULD BE ABOUT ONE-HALF THE LENGTH OF A REGULAR CDSS, THAT IS, NOT TO EXCEED 30 PAGES. CONCEPT PAPERS WILL BE REVIEWED AS THOUGH THEY WERE CDSS, BUT THE AA/AFR RATHER THAN A/AID WILL SIGN OFF ON THE APPROVAL CABLE.

6. CDSS OUTLINE AND PAGINATION. THE SUGGESTED OUTLINE AND NUMBERS OF PAGES FOR EACH MAJOR SECTION IS AS FOLLOWS:

- EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (NO MORE THAN 3 PAGES, DOUBLE-SPACED)
- I. OVERVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT (NO MORE THAN 3 PAGES)
- II. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS (20 PAGES)
- III. STRATEGY (20 PAGES)
- IV. RESOURCES AND OTHER DONORS (10 PAGES)
- V. MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING (5 PAGES)

REF W GIVES FULLER OUTLINE FOR SECTIONS I-IV AND DISCUSSES THE CONTENT REQUIRED FOR THESE SECTIONS.

7. REFERENCES AND ANNEXES. TO KEEP THE CDSS ITSELF AS CLOSE TO THE 60 PAGE LIMIT AS POSSIBLE, MISSIONS SHOULD FEEL FREE TO CITE REFERENCES, USE COGENT EXPLANATORY FOOTNOTES, AND ADD SUPPLEMENTARY ANNEXES TO INCREASE THE DEPTH ON PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT ISSUES (MANY OF WHICH ARE CITED IN PART TWO OF THE AGENCY CDSS GUIDANCE). SPECIAL ANNEXES CAN PRESENT ANALYSES OF PARTICULAR SUBSECTIONS OR CROSSCUTTING PROBLEMS AND THE CONCLUSIONS OF THESE ANALYSES CAN SIMPLY BE SUMMARIZED IN THE BODY OF THE CDSS ITSELF. THIS SHOULD ENABLE MISSIONS TO RESPOND FULLY TO SPECIFIC CONGRESSIONAL REQUIREMENTS, FOR EXAMPLE, TO INCLUDE AN ANALYSIS OF ACTIONS NECESSARY FOR CONSERVING BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND TROPICAL FORESTS. WHILE GUIDANCE ON THIS PARTICULAR ANALYSIS IS STILL BEING PREPARED, IT IS LIKELY THAT A SPECIAL ANNEX TO THE CDSS AND/OR ACTION PLANS WILL BE RECOMMENDED AS A USEFUL APPROACH TO ADEQUATELY ADDRESSING THESE CONCERNS.

8. TO SUM UP, THIS AFRICA BUREAU CDSS/CONCEPT PAPER GUIDANCE IS INTENDED TO SUPPLEMENT, NOT REPLACE, THE AGENCY CDSS GUIDANCE. WE EXPECT AFRICA MISSIONS TO FOCUS IN PARTICULAR ON THEIR ANALYSES OF CONSTRAINTS TO ECONOMIC GROWTH (INCLUDING VARIOUS RESOURCE GAPS-- FOREIGN EXCHANGE, INVESTMENT, BUDGETARY, ETC.) --AND THE ROLE WHICH U.S. ASSISTANCE FROM ALL SOURCES (ESF, DA, AND PL 480) CAN PLAY IN ENCOURAGING SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH THROUGH THE USE OF MARKET SYSTEMS SO THAT THERE CAN TRULY BE AN END TO HUNGER IN AFRICA. WE ENCOURAGE MISSIONS TO MAKE MAXIMUM USE OF THE NEW OPTIONS WHICH

THE DFA WILL GIVE US. AND, FINALLY, WE ASK THAT ALL REFLECT ON ACTIONS WHICH THE MISSIONS CAN TAKE TO IMPROVE MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND REPORTING ON

UNCLASSIFIED

61

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 03 OF 03 STATE 030913

5842 105926 A105943

PROGRESS. IF YOU HAVE ANY FURTHER QUESTIONS REGARDING
THE PREPARATION OF YOUR COSS AND CONCEPT PAPER, PLEASE
CONTACT AFR/DP. SNULTZ

UNCLASSIFIED

62

ANNEX 5

**State 340629, 31/10/87,
General CDSS Guidance**

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 01 OF 07 STATE 340629
ORIGIN AID-00

0103 050146 AID3301

STATE 340629

0103 050146

INFO RED-01 /001 A1 03WF

ORIGIN OFFICE PPPB-02

INFO AAF-03 AFEA-03 AFSA-03 AFFW-04 AFCW-03 AFDP-06 ANDP-03
 ANPD-05 AFPO-04 AALA-01 LACE-02 LASA-02 LACO-01 LADP-04
 LADR-03 AFTR-05 FVA-01 OFDA-02 PPCE-01 PDPR-01 16-01
 PPEA-01 FVMS-01 PPMF-01 PSC-02 16W-04 ANTR-06 APPC-02
 STPO-01 PPR-01 SAST-01 AFPE-07 PVC-02 FVPP-01 ES-01
 AAID-01 AGRI-01 COM-02 ANPE-03 NSC-01 OMB-02 XMB-06
 RELO-01 LACA-03 PRE-06 ANEA-02 ANEG-02 ANAA-01 ANSA-03
 /125 A4 931

INFO LOG-00 EUR-00 AF-00 ED-00 IO-10 NEA-04 ARA-00
 EAP-00 /023 R

DRAFTED BY: AID/PPC/PB:JSEGal:NM
 APPROVED BY: A-A/AID:JFMORRIS
 AID/AA/PPC:REBISSELL (DRAFT) AID/DAI/PPC:MYDAGATA (DRAFT)
 AID/ES:GJOE AID/AFR/DP:J ESTLEY (DRAFT)
 AID/LAC/DP:WHEELER (DRAFT) AID/ANE/OP:P ENEDY T (DRAFT)
 AID/ST/PO:GGOWER (DRAFT) AID/FVA/PPH:BRILEY (DRAFT)
 AID/PRC/PB:GAMILL (DRAFT)
 AID/PRE/PR:CCHASE-LANSDALE (DRAFT)
 AID/OFDA:JTAFT (DRAFT)

-----163235 311107Z /30

D 311053Z OCT 87 ZEX
FR SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AID WORLDWIDE IMMEDIATE

UNCLAS STATE 340629

AIDAC

E.O. 12336: N/A

TAGS:

SUBJECT: FY 1990 COSS GUIDANCE

THIS MESSAGE IS COMPOSED OF TWO PARTS. PART ONE PROVIDES GENERAL GUIDANCE FOR DRAFTING THE COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT (COSS); IT IS CONCERNED WITH BACKGROUND ANALYSES, THE GENERAL RATIONALE, STRUCTURE AND LOGIC OF THE COSS. PART TWO IDENTIFIES SPECIAL PRIORITIES AND ONGOING AND NEW AGENCY POLICIES THAT ARE TO BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN DRAFTING THE DOCUMENT.

PART ONE: GENERAL COSS GUIDANCE

1. INTRODUCTION.

SUCCESSFUL ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT IS ESSENTIAL TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF U.S. FOREIGN POLICY GOALS IN LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. ULTIMATELY, RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT LIES WITH THE COUNTRIES THEMSELVES. HOWEVER, THE INTERNATIONAL COMMUNITY, BOTH PRIVATE AND PUBLIC, CAN CLEARLY PLAY AN IMPORTANT SUPPORTING ROLE. A KEY TO

EFFECTIVE U.S. PARTICIPATION IN THAT PROCESS IS THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A WELL THOUGHT OUT DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE STRATEGY.

THE STRATEGY MUST BE GROUNDED IN THE DEVELOPMENT NEEDS OF THE COUNTRY, OUR OPPORTUNITIES FOR MAKING EFFECTIVE INTERVENTIONS, AND THE RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO ACHIEVE OUR FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES. FOR THE PERIOD COVERED BY THE COSS GUIDANCE, THE U.S. WILL BE ENGAGED IN AN EFFORT TO REDUCE ITS STRUCTURAL BUDGET DEFICITS. AS A CONSEQUENCE, RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO CARRY OUT FOREIGN ASSISTANCE

PROGRAMS MAY BE REDUCED. WE WILL BE UNDER INCREASING PRESSURE TO FULLY JUSTIFY ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE INVESTMENTS REQUIRED TO ACHIEVE U.S. FOREIGN POLICY GOALS IN LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES. IN THIS CONTEXT, THE ANALYSIS PRESENTED IN THE COSS WILL BE CRITICAL TO MAKING FUNDAMENTAL CHOICES OF RESOURCE ALLOCATIONS WITHIN AND AMONG COUNTRY PROGRAMS. IT IS IMPERATIVE THAT THE COSS SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESS THE BASIC ISSUES OF WHETHER AN ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAM CONTINUES TO BE IMPORTANT TO THE U.S. INTEREST IN A PARTICULAR COUNTRY AS WELL AS IDENTIFYING THE HIGHEST PRIORITY INVESTMENTS WHICH THE U.S. CAN UNDERTAKE IN PURSUIT OF OUR DEVELOPMENT AND FOREIGN POLICY GOALS.

ACCORDINGLY, THE GEOGRAPHIC BUREAUS AND PPC STAND READY TO SUPPORT THOSE MISSIONS PREPARING COSS'S IN ADVANCE OF FINAL SUBMISSION AND REVIEW - BY POUCH, TELEPHONE OR TBY, AS NEEDED PARTICULARLY IN THOSE COUNTRIES WHERE THE OVERALL SUCCESS OF THE DEVELOPMENT EFFORT IS DETERMINED TO BE IN JEOPARDY. WHERE THE OVERALL DEVELOPMENT EFFORT IS FOUND NOT TO BE SUCCEEDING, THE FINAL DETERMINATION OF THE DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY, AND OF POSSIBLE DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS IN ITS SUPPORT, MUST BE CONSIDERED A PRIORITY MATTER OF FOREIGN POLICY CONCERN FOR THE HIGHEST LEVELS OF SENIOR MANAGEMENT IN THE MISSION, THE AMERICAN EMBASSY, AID/WASHINGTON AND THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AND THE COSS PROCESS SHOULD BE CONDUCTED ACCORDINGLY.

THIS MESSAGE PROVIDES OVERALL GUIDANCE FOR FY 1990 COSS'S FROM DESIGNATED MISSIONS. DETAILED INFORMATION ON AGENCY POLICY AND PROGRAMMING PROCEDURES IS AVAILABLE IN POLICY PAPERS, SECTORAL AND BUREAU STRATEGIES, THE BLUEPRINT FOR DEVELOPMENT (JUNE 1985), AND OTHER RELATED SOURCES; NEW, AND PARTICULARLY IMPORTANT, POLICY CONCERNS ARE NOTED IN PART TWO OF THIS MESSAGE. MISSIONS ARE EXPECTED TO DRAW UPON THESE SOURCES IN DEVELOPING THE COSS. REGIONAL BUREAUS MAY ISSUE SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE TO TAILOR

REQUIREMENTS TO THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF INDIVIDUAL COUNTRIES, SPECIFYING THE TIMING AND REVIEW SCHEDULES OF FIELD SUBMISSIONS AS WELL AS MORE PRECISE COVERAGE, FORMAT, AND CONTENT.

COSS PREPARATION SHOULD BE A COLLABORATIVE PROCESS, INVOLVING, TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, KEY HOST COUNTRY ANALYSTS AND DECISION-MAKERS, THE U.S. EMBASSY, STATE AND AID/W. THE MISSION SHOULD ALSO SEEK THE VIEWS OF THE PEACE CORPS; INTERESTED MEMBERS OF THE PVO AND INTERNATIONAL DONOR COMMUNITY, AND REPRESENTATIVES OF LOCAL PRIVATE ENTERPRISE GROUPS. THE COSS PROCESS SHOULD PLAY AN IMPORTANT ROLE IN DETERMINING HOW THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SHOULD GO ABOUT ACHIEVING ITS BASIC FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES IN EACH RECIPIENT COUNTRY. THE COSS SHOULD BE APPROVED BY THE U.S. AMBASSADOR BEFORE SUBMISSION TO AID/W.

UNDER NORMAL CIRCUMSTANCES THE COSS IS UNCLASSIFIED. HOWEVER, IT IS CRITICAL THAT THE DOCUMENT BE FRANK; THUS, IF NECESSARY IT MAY BE CLASSIFIED.

2. PURPOSE OF THE COSS.

THE PURPOSE OF THE COSS PROCESS IS TO PROVIDE AN ANALYTICAL BASIS FOR THE PROPOSED ASSISTANCE STRATEGY. A THOROUGH, REALISTIC AND INSIGHTFUL ANALYSIS OF THE HOST COUNTRY'S DEVELOPMENT PROSPECTS AND PROBLEMS, BOTH MACROECONOMIC AND SECTORSPECIFIC, IS THE KEY TO A SUCCESSFUL STRATEGY. IT PROVIDES THE MISSION AN OPPORTUNITY TO THINK THROUGH ITS ASSESSMENT OF THE BASIC

UNCLASSIFIED

- (1)

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 02 OF 07 STATE 340629

0103 #58146 AID3308

STATE 340629

0103 #58146

DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES FACED BY THE HOST COUNTRY AND THE ROLE THAT A.I.D. CAN PLAY.

COUNTRY (AS INDICATED IN PARTS I AND II.A OF THE FORMAT OUTLINE BELOW) TO DETERMINE WHETHER THIS BASIC ECONOMIC FOUNDATION FOR SUSTAINED DEVELOPMENT HAS BEEN PUT IN PLACE. IF IT HAS NOT, THE SUBSEQUENT ANALYSIS AND STRATEGY FORMULATION ARE TO BE GIVEN SPECIAL, HIGH-LEVEL ATTENTION TO DETERMINE HOW THE U.S. GOVERNMENT SHOULD BEST PROCEED TO ACHIEVE ITS OBJECTIVES.

THE CDSS IS BASED ON THE CONCEPT OF COUNTRY PROGRAMMING. IT PROVIDES THE STRATEGY FRAMEWORK FOR TAILORING EACH A.I.D. PROGRAM INTERVENTION TO THE PARTICULAR HOST COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT ENVIRONMENT. THE CDSS IS THE KEY DOCUMENT FOR DESIGN OF A PROGRAM OF U.S. BILATERAL ASSISTANCE FOR EACH COUNTRY. ONCE APPROVED BY THE AGENCY, THE CDSS WILL GUIDE AID/W ASSESSMENT OF ACTION PLANS, POLICY AGENDA AND PROJECT PROPOSALS, INFORM CHOICES AMONG ALTERNATIVES, AND PROVIDE MEASURES OF PROGRESS TOWARD OBJECTIVES. IT SHOULD BE STRESSED THAT THE ACTION PLAN DOCUMENT DOES NOT SUBSTITUTE FOR THE STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK PROVIDED BY THE CDSS AND SHOULD NOT BE USED TO SUPPLANT THE CDSS.

4. SCOPE AND FORMAT OF THE CDSS.

THIS YEAR'S CDSS WILL FORM THE BASIS FOR THE 1990-94 PLANNING PERIOD. IT SHOULD ASSESS THE OVERALL POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT OF THE COUNTRY, DETERMINE THE RECENT SUCCESSES AND/OR FAILURES, AND THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES, OF DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS, IDENTIFY KEY DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS, AND PROPOSE A STRATEGY THAT WILL ASSIST THE HOST COUNTRY ACHIEVE AND SUSTAIN SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES. IT SHOULD SUMMARIZE A THOROUGH ANALYSIS OF THE KEY DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS AND CONSTRAINTS TO THEIR SOLUTION, DESCRIBE HOST COUNTRY AND OTHER DONOR PLANS AND EFFORTS TO ADDRESS THOSE PROBLEMS, AND EXPLAIN THE RATIONALE BEHIND THE MISSION ASSISTANCE STRATEGY. THE MISSION SHOULD ENSURE THAT ALL AVAILABLE A.I.D. AND A.I.D. GENERATED RESOURCES, INCLUDING OA, PL 480, ESF, NG'S AND LOCAL CURRENCY FUNDS ARE FOCUSED ON PRIORITY OBJECTIVES.

MOST IMPORTANTLY, THE CDSS SHOULD PROVIDE REASONS FOR

FOLLOWING A PARTICULAR ASSISTANCE APPROACH. IT IS NOT MERELY A DESCRIPTION OF MISSION INTENTIONS. IT IS ESSENTIALLY AN ANALYTICAL ARGUMENT IN FAVOR OF A COURSE OF ACTION, AND AS SUCH, IT MUST DESCRIBE ALTERNATIVES AND PROVIDE REASONS FOR THE RECOMMENDATIONS MADE.

IN ORDER THAT MISSION REASONING BE PRESENTED IN AN ACCESSIBLE MANNER, IT IS REQUESTED THAT CDSS SUBMISSIONS USE THE FOLLOWING OUTLINE:

THE AGENCY-WIDE REQUIREMENT IS THAT A CDSS MUST BE DONE AT LEAST ONCE EVERY FIVE YEARS, OR SOONER IF REQUIRED BY CHANGING COUNTRY CONDITIONS. THE PROCESS SHOULD EMBODY A FRESH LOOK AT THE A.I.D. PROGRAM IN THE CONTEXT OF EVOLVING COUNTRY CONDITIONS AND AN IMPROVED UNDERSTANDING OF THE NATURE OF THE DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS AND CONSTRAINTS. THE JUSTIFICATION FOR CONTINUING AN EXISTING STRATEGY MUST INCLUDE EVALUATIVE EVIDENCE THAT IT IS HAVING THE DESIRED EFFECTS. MOREOVER, THE BASIS FOR SIGNIFICANTLY ALTERING A STRATEGY IN A PARTICULAR SECTOR MUST BE A THOROUGH ANALYSIS OF THAT SECTOR. IN THIS REGARD, AN OBJECTIVE, THOROUGH ANALYSIS OF PROBLEMS IN A GIVEN SECTOR INVOLVING A FRESH LOOK AT POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEMS MAY BEST BE ACCOMPLISHED BY A TEAM COMPOSED PARTLY OF INDEPENDENT, OUTSIDE EXPERTS.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY (SEPARATE NO MORE THAN 3 PAGES)

I. OVERVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT (NO MORE THAN 5 PAGES)

II. PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS

A. INADEQUATE ECONOMIC GROWTH

1. BASIC ECONOMIC GROWTH

2. INCOME OF LOW INCOME GROUPS

B. HUNGER

C. HEALTH DEFICIENCIES, ESPECIALLY INFANT AND CHILD MORTALITY

D. LACK OF EDUCATION

E. POPULATION PRESSURES

III. STRATEGY

A. EXPLANATION OF PROBLEM SELECTION

B. STRATEGIES FOR SELECTED PROBLEMS

IV. RESOURCES AND OTHER DONORS

A. OTHER DONORS

B. U.S. RESOURCES

THIS OUTLINE IS NOT INTENDED TO SUGGEST THAT MISSION PROGRAMS SHOULD ADDRESS ALL OF THE PROBLEM AREAS IN ADDITION TO THE NEED FOR BASIC ECONOMIC GROWTH. NEITHER IS IT TO SUGGEST THAT MISSIONS ARE STRICTLY LIMITED TO THE CORE PROBLEM AREAS; PROPOSED INTERVENTIONS OUTSIDE OF

3. GENERAL FRAMEWORK OF THE CDSS.

THE BASIC DEVELOPMENT PROBLEM FOR A.I.D. IS INADEQUATE ECONOMIC GROWTH. ECONOMIC GROWTH IS A FUNCTION OF HOW THE ECONOMY ALLOCATES RESOURCES. OTHER KEY PROBLEMS OF CONCERN INCLUDE HUNGER, HEALTH DEFICIENCIES (ESPECIALLY INFANT AND CHILD MORTALITY), LACK OF EDUCATION, AND UNMANAGEABLE POPULATION PRESSURES. PROGRESS IN THESE AREAS IS THE BASIC GOAL OF THE A.I.D. ASSISTANCE PROGRAM. INTERVENTIONS OUTSIDE THESE BASIC PROBLEM AREA REQUIRE A CONVINCING RATIONALE, BUT MAY BE PROPOSED IF COUNTRYSPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS ARE COMPELLING. IN LATIN AMERICA, FOR INSTANCE, A COMPELLING RATIONALE HAS BEEN ESTABLISHED FOR SIGNIFICANT ASSISTANCE EFFORTS TO IMPROVE DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTIONS AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

THE FOUNDATION OF SUCCESS, HOWEVER, MUST BE BOTH BROADBASED ECONOMIC GROWTH THAT PROVIDES PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT AS WELL AS HIGHER PER CAPITA INCOMES FOR AN INCREASING PROPORTION OF THE POPULATION. WITHOUT THIS FOUNDATION, PROGRESS IN THE OTHER ELEMENTS OF THE FRAMEWORK (HUNGER, HEALTH, POPULATION AND EDUCATION) CANNOT BE SUSTAINED AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES CANNOT BE ACHIEVED.

THE CDSS MUST FIRST OF ALL, THEREFORE, ANALYZE THE RECENT ECONOMIC HISTORY AND CURRENT SITUATION OF THE HOST

UNCLASSIFIED

65

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 03 OF 07 STATE 340629

0103 050146 A103305

STATE 340629

0103 050146 A1

THESE PROBLEM AREAS ARE PERMITTED IF COUNTRY-SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS ARE COMPELLING, BUT WILL NEED A CONVINCING RATIONALE. IN ANY CASE, ONE OF THE MAJOR STRATEGY CHOICES IS THE SELECTION OF PROBLEM AREAS AND MISSIONS WILL NEED TO BE SELECTIVE ABOUT THOSE CHOICES. MISSIONS SHOULD MAKE EXPLICIT THEIR REASONING WITH RESPECT TO CHOICES MADE AND THOSE REJECTED.

THE BODY OF THE CDSS, EXCLUSIVE OF THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY, SHOULD NOT EXCEED 60 PAGES, DOUBLESPOCED. ANNEXES ARE NOT ENCOURAGED BUT MAY BE SUBMITTED IF NECESSARY ON ISSUES OF PARTICULAR IMPORTANCE. AS OUTLINED ABOVE, SECTIONS SHOULD HAVE THE FOLLOWING FOCUS:

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

THIS SECTION IS INDEPENDENT OF THE 60-PAGE DOCUMENT. IT SHOULD PROVIDE A BRIEF SUMMATION OF THE ENTIRE CDSS, BUT SHOULD NOT PROVIDE ANY NEW MATERIAL. LIMIT TO THREE PAGES.

I. OVERVIEW OF THE ENVIRONMENT FOR DEVELOPMENT

THIS SECTION SHOULD PROVIDE A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF THE POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT WITHIN WHICH DEVELOPMENT OCCURS. IT SHOULD OFFER A SUMMARY ASSESSMENT OF THE POTENTIAL FOR DEVELOPMENT SUCCESS OR FAILURE,

PROJECTED 10 OR 20 YEARS INTO THE FUTURE, AS INDICATED BY RECENT ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL TRENDS. IT SHOULD DESCRIBE, IN SUMMARY FORM, THE KEY DEVELOPMENT PROBLEMS FACING THE COUNTRY. IT SHOULD IDENTIFY RECENT DEVELOPMENT SUCCESSSES AND FAILURES. IT SHOULD ADDRESS THE STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES IN THE EFFORTS OF FOREIGN DONORS, AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH FOREIGN ASSISTANCE IS A COORDINATED PROCESS MOVING TOWARDS COMMON GOALS. THE POINT OF THIS SECTION IS TO PLACE THE SPECIFIC PROBLEM ANALYSES WHICH FOLLOW WITHIN A BROAD OVERALL CONTEXT AND ASSESSMENT.

II. PROBLEM ANALYSIS AND DESCRIPTION:

IN THIS SECTION THE MISSION SHOULD MAKE USE OF QUANTITATIVE COUNTRY TREND INDICATORS AND A.I.D. QUANTITATIVE STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT. IN PARTICULAR THE STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT SHOULD BE USED IN MAKING JUDGMENTS AS TO THE RELATIVE SEVERITY OF PROBLEMS (I.E., LEVELS SIGNIFICANTLY BELOW STANDARD LEVELS CONSTITUTE MAJOR PROBLEMS). COLLECTIVELY THESE STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT PROVIDE AN OPERATIONAL DEFINITION OF DEVELOPMENT SUCCESS.

WHEREVER POSSIBLE, DATA SHOULD BE DISAGGREGATED ON A GENDER BASIS. IN ALL CASES, -THE PROBLEM DESCRIPTION SHOULD NOTE WHERE COUNTRY DATA SOURCES ARE INADEQUATE TO SUPPORT THE DESIRED LEVEL OF ANALYSIS. WHERE DATA ARE NOT AVAILABLE, MISSIONS SHOULD MAKE THE BEST POSSIBLE SUBSTITUTIONS. IF THE LACK OF RELIABLE AND TIMELY DATA ON KEY AREAS OF CONCERN OR MEASURES OF OVERALL PROGRESS, SUCH AS ON AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY OR ON THE LABOR FORCE AND EMPLOYMENT, PREVENTS AN ADEQUATE ANALYSIS, THE MISSION SHOULD CONSIDER HOW IT COULD EFFECTIVELY ASSIST THE HOST GOVERNMENT IN IMPROVING ITS CAPACITY TO COLLECT AND ANALYZE SUCH DATA.

THOUGH THE FORMAT BREAKS OUT FOR SEPARATE DISCUSSION EACH OF THE PROBLEM AREAS, THESE PROBLEMS ARE INTIMATELY TIED TO OVERALL ECONOMIC GROWTH. THE DISCUSSION SHOULD REFLECT THIS FACT. THE MISSION SHOULD NOT LIMIT DISCUSSION TO JUST THE INDICATORS BELOW; IT SHOULD PRESENT THE BEST TOTAL PICTURE OF THE PROBLEM SITUATION.

DISCUSSION OF EACH PROBLEM AREA SHOULD INCLUDE AN ASSESSMENT OF WHAT IS BEING DONE BY HOST COUNTRY AND FOREIGN DONORS, AND THE OVERALL ADEQUACY OF THOSE EFFORTS.

A. INADEQUATE ECONOMIC GROWTH

1. BASIC ECONOMIC GROWTH.

THE ANALYSIS SECTION SHOULD LEAD OFF WITH AN ASSESSMENT OF THE MACROECONOMIC ENVIRONMENT AND COUNTRY PERFORMANCE, RECENT TRENDS AND PROSPECTS FOR MEDIUM AND LONG-TERM STABILITY, STRUCTURAL CHANGE (IF NEEDED), AND SUSTAINABLE ECONOMIC GROWTH. IT SHOULD TAKE A HARD LOOK AT THE IMPLICATIONS OF RECENT (5-10 YEAR) MACROECONOMIC TRENDS, PROJECTED INTO THE FUTURE, FOR THE SUCCESS OF THE OVERALL DEVELOPMENT EFFORT. KEY INDICATORS FOR THIS PURPOSE ARE:

GROWTH OF REAL GDP - IS GDP INCREASING WITHOUT DETRIMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS, UNDUDEBT OR IMPRT DEPENDENCY, OR UNSUSTAINABLE GROWTH IN THE PUBLIC SECTOR? IS GROWTH AT A LEVEL TO BECOME SELF-SUSTAINING AT LEAST IN THE MEDIUM TERM?

PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT - IS PRODUCTIVE EMPLOYMENT INCREASING FASTER THAN THE LABOR FORCE THROUGH THE GENERATION OF NEW JOBS AND/OR BY INCREASING THE PRODUCTIVITY OF THOSE ALREADY EMPLOYED?

REAL FOREIGN EXCHANGE EARNINGS ARE THEY INCREASING AT LEAST AS FAST AS GDP, AND IS THE DEFICIT ON CURRENT ACCOUNT EITHER DECLINING OR STABLE AT A SUSTAINABLE LEVEL?

IF THE ANSWER TO THESE THREE BASIC QUESTIONS IS NEGATIVE, THE OVERALL DEVELOPMENT EFFORT MAY NOT BE SUCCEEDING AND THE MISSION SHOULD ESTABLISH THE ROOT CAUSES OF THESE NEGATIVE TRENDS AND WHAT IT WOULD TAKE TO TURN THE SITUATION AROUND. THIS MAY REQUIRE OUTSIDE ASSISTANCE. SUCH AN ANALYTICAL EFFORT COULD WELL TAKE MORE THAN A FEW MONTHS TO COMPLETE, AND THE MISSION MIGHT WISH TO SEEK GEOGRAPHIC BUREAU PERMISSION TO SUBMIT AN INTERIM CDSS THIS YEAR AND A COMPLETED EFFORT NEXT YEAR.

2. INCOME OF LOW INCOME GROUPS:

FOR THE OVERALL DEVELOPMENT EFFORT TO BE SUCCEEDING IT IS NECESSARY THAT THE INCOME OF LOW INCOME GROUPS BE EXPANDING AT LEAST AS FAST AS THE AGGREGATE LEVEL. A.I.D.'S STANDARD FOR INCOME GROWTH IS 2 PERCENT PER CAPITA GDP, AND IT IS DESIRABLE THAT LOW INCOME GROUPS REACH AT LEAST THAT STANDARD. THIS SECTION REFLECTS A.I.D.'S GENERAL COMMITMENT TO A PROCESS OF EQUITABLE GROWTH. AS SUCH, IT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN ALL DISCUSSIONS OF THE INCOME GROWTH ISSUE. IT SHOULD INCLUDE A DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS OF UNEMPLOYMENT, UNDEREMPLOYMENT AND GENERAL ECONOMIC PARTICIPATION SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSING PROBLEMS OF RISK SHARING AND PROFIT PARTICIPATION. MISSIONS SHOULD, TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, CONCEPTUALIZE AGRICULTURE SECTOR PROGRAMS IN TERMS OF THIS PROBLEM AS WELL AS IN RELATION TO THE HUNGER PROBLEM.)

B. HUNGER:

THE AGENCY HAS ADOPTED TWO INDICATORS:

1. PERCENTAGE OF POPULATION WITH F.A.O. CRITICAL LEVEL OF CALORIC INTAKE. STANDARD OF ACHIEVEMENT IS 90 PERCENT.

UNCLASSIFIED

66

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 04 OF 07 STATE 340620

0103 058146 A103305

STATE 340620

0103 058146 A10

2. PERCENTAGE OF CHILDREN UNDER FIVE WITH CHRONIC AND SEVERE UNDERNOURISHMENT (LESS THAN 80 PERCENT OF WEIGHT OR HEIGHT FOR AGE NORM, OR 2 STANDARD DEVIATIONS BELOW THE MEAN WEIGHT/HEIGHT FOR AGE). A.I.D.'S STANDARD IS FOR THE PERCENTAGE OF SUCH UNDERNOURISHED CHILDREN TO BE LESS THAN 20 PERCENT OF AGE GROUP.

DISCUSSION OF THE ROLE, AND LEVEL OF EFFORT, OF OTHER DONORS IS NECESSARY IN EXPLAINING MISSION PROBLEM SELECTION.

B. PROBLEM SPECIFIC STRATEGIES:

IN ADDITION ALL A.I.D. POSTS USING FVA FOOD NEEDS ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY TO TRACK OVERALL FOOD NEEDS AND AVAILABILITIES SHOULD UTILIZE THAT DATA IN DESCRIBING AND ANALYZING SERIOUS CYCLICAL OR STRUCTURAL FOOD DEFICIT SITUATIONS.

WITH RESPECT TO EACH PROBLEM OF MISSION FOCUS, THE CDSS SHOULD IDENTIFY SPECIFIC DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES - SHORT OR LONG TERM, POSSIBLY EXTENDING BEYOND THE CDSS PERIOD - AND MEASURABLE DEVELOPMENT BENCHMARKS. THE DISCUSSION SHOULD HIGHLIGHT THOSE CONSIDERED MOST IMPORTANT, EXPLAIN THE MISSION RATIONALE FOR ITS CHOICES AMONG POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVES, AND INDICATE EXACTLY WHAT THE PROPOSED PROGRAM IS EXPECTED TO ACCOMPLISH IF ALL GOES AS PLANNED, SPECIFYING WHICH GROUPS IN THE POPULATION ARE EXPECTED TO

MISSIONS MAY FIND THIS AN APPROPRIATE PLACE TO CONSIDER NATURAL RESOURCE SUSTAINABILITY/BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY ISSUES DISCUSSED IN PART II.

MAKE PROGRESS TOWARDS THE BENCHMARKS, SPECIFICALLY ADDRESSING THE IMPACT ON DEMOGRAPHIC CATEGORIES SUCH AS THE POOR AND WOMEN. TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE THESE PROJECTED A.I.D. ACCOMPLISHMENTS SHOULD BE SITUATED WITHIN THE LARGER TASK OF ACHIEVING QUANTITATIVE STANDARDS CITED ABOVE AND IN REF A. THE DISCUSSION OF ANTICIPATED ACCOMPLISHMENTS SHOULD EXPLICITLY INDICATE THE LIKELY PROSPECTS OF PROGRESS AGAINST THE PROBLEM, WITH AND WITHOUT THE PROPOSED A.I.D. ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, AND ANY SPECIAL DIPLOMATIC EFFORTS THAT MIGHT BE REQUIRED, SUCH AS IN SUPPLY OF MACROECONOMIC POLICY CHANGES AND/OR A STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT PROCESS, TO ASSURE SUCCESS.

C. HEALTH DEFICIENCIES, ESPECIALLY INFANT AND CHILD MORTALITY:

AGENCY INDICATORS ARE:

1. INFANT MORTALITY; STANDARD IS 75 DEATHS PER 1000 BIRTHS.
2. CHILD MORTALITY AGES 1-4; STANDARD IS 10 DEATHS PER 1000
3. LIFE EXPECTANCY AT BIRTH; STANDARD IS 60 YEARS.

MISSIONS SHOULD BE AWARE THAT JUSTIFICATIONS FOR STRATEGIES PROPOSING SUBSTANTIAL RESOURCE TRANSFERS THROUGH PROGRAM OR PROJECT ASSISTANCE (INCLUDING PL 480) WILL BE REVIEWED PARTICULARLY CLOSELY, TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE POLICY OBJECTIVES TO BE ACHIEVED, OTHER DONOR RESOURCE AVAILABILITIES, AND THE COUNTRY'S OWN SELFHELP EFFORTS.

D. LACK OF EDUCATION:

- AGENCY INDICATORS ARE:

1. PRIMARY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT FOR BOTH BOYS AND GIRLS; STANDARD IS 90 PERCENT.
2. COMPLETION OF 4 YEARS OF PRIMARY SCHOOL FOR BOTH BOYS AND GIRLS; STANDARD IS 70 PERCENT OF AGE GROUP.
3. ADULT LITERACY FOR BOTH MEN AND WOMEN; STANDARD IS 50 PERCENT.

MISSION OBJECTIVES SHOULD INCLUDE POLICY CHANGE OBJECTIVES, AND THUS THE STRATEGY SHOULD INCLUDE A DISCUSSION OF HOW THE MISSION WILL SEEK TO BRING ABOUT IDENTIFIED POLICY CHANGES.

E. POPULATION PRESSURES:

INDICATOR IS PERCENTAGE OF COUPLES WITH ACCESS TO A WIDE RANGE OF ACCEPTABLE VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES; STANDARD IS 80 PERCENT.

IN THE PRESENTATION OF EACH PROBLEM SPECIFIC STRATEGY, MISSION MUST EXPLAIN HOW THE A.I.D. EFFORT RELATES TO ACTIVITIES OF OTHER DONORS. IN PARTICULAR WE WANT TO KNOW IF THE DONORS SHARE A COMMON CONCEPTION OF THE PROBLEM AND OF WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE, AND THAT THE COLLECTIVE ASSISTANCE EFFORT MEETS A TEST OF SUSTAINABILITY (E.G. IT DOES NOT COMMIT MOST COUNTRY TO RECURRENT COSTS THAT ARE BEYOND ITS CAPACITY).

III. STRATEGY.

THE STRATEGY SECTION SHOULD FLOW FROM THE PRECEDING ANALYSIS AND INDICATE FIRST OF ALL, WHAT THE COUNTRY SHOULD BE DOING TO ACHIEVE A SUCCESSFUL OVERALL DEVELOPMENT PATH AND/OR TO OBTAIN MORE RAPID AND SUSTAINED PROGRESS. IT SHOULD THEN LOOK AT WHETHER OR NOT CURRENT MOST COUNTRY ECONOMIC POLICIES AND DEVELOPMENT PLANS, TOGETHER WITH CURRENT AND EXPECTED ASSISTANCE FROM OTHER FOREIGN DONORS, ARE ADEQUATE TO THE TASK AND HOW THE U.S. CAN BEST HELP WITH THE RESOURCES LIKELY TO BE AVAILABLE IN ITS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

IV. RESOURCES AND OTHER DONORS

A. OTHER DONORS

A. EXPLANATION OF PROBLEM SELECTION:

THE MISSION SHOULD EXPLAIN THE RATIONALE FOR ITS SPECIFIC CHOICE OF PROBLEMS TO BE FOCUSED ON IN THE PROPOSED STRATEGY. THE MISSION SHOULD BE AS CANDID AS POSSIBLE. RELEVANT FACTORS INCLUDE SEVERITY OF PROBLEMS, ATTITUDE OF THE MOST COUNTRY, PROGRAMS OF OTHER DONORS, MISSION RESOURCES AND CAPABILITIES, LIKELIHOOD OF SUCCESS, ETC.

THE STRATEGY SHOULD BE SET IN THE CONTEXT OF TOTAL RESOURCE AVAILABILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT -- FROM OTHER DONORS, FROM THE MOST COUNTRY, AND FROM MULTILATERAL DEVELOPMENT INSTITUTIONS TAKING INTO ACCOUNT THE STRATEGIC PRIORITIES ASSOCIATED WITH THOSE OTHER RESOURCES, AND SHOULD INCLUDE CONSIDERATION OF WAYS TO HELP THE MOST COUNTRY MAKE THE BEST USE OF TOTAL AVAILABLE DEVELOPMENT RESOURCES IN ACHIEVING THE GOALS OF THE STRATEGY.

THIS SECTION SHOULD PROVIDE A QUANTITATIVE OVERVIEW OF ALL DONOR ACTIVITY. THIS SHOULD BE SET AGAINST THE BACKGROUND OF MOST COUNTRY INVESTMENTS. IT SHOULD BE DISAGGREGATED BY SECTOR OR PROBLEM AREAS. THE TEXT

UNCLASSIFIED

67

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 05 OF 07 STATE 340629
SHOULD INCLUDE A TABLE LAYING OUT ABSOLUTE LEVELS AND
PERCENTAGES OF TOTAL INVESTMENT FROM EACH SOURCE.

0183 050146 A103385

STATE 340629

0183 05014

OF THIS GUIDANCE CONTAINS A SUMMARY OF THESE CROSSCUTTING
THEMES FOR MISSION ATTENTION.

D. U.S. RESOURCE*

THIS SECTION SHOULD CALL ATTENTION TO THE BUDGETARY
OPTIONS THE MISSION FACES AND EXPLAIN HOW THE MISSION
PROPOSES TO ALLOCATE RESOURCES AMONG PROBLEM AREAS. IT
SHOULD PROPOSE A GENERAL MAGNITUDE FOR SECTORAL AND
SUB-SECTORAL ASSISTANCE AND INDICATE WHAT KINDS OF
PROJECTS, WITH WHAT GENERAL AMOUNTS OF FUNDING, THE
MISSION EXPECTS TO INITIATE OVER THE PLANNING PERIOD.
MISSIONS SHOULD INDICATE PLANNED USE OF CENTRAL BUREAU
RESOURCES TO IMPLEMENT THE PROGRAM.

IN SO DOING, MISSIONS SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE
REALITIES OF THE DOMESTIC U.S. BUDGET SITUATION.
PROSPECTS ARE NOT OPTIMISTIC FOR INCREASED RESOURCE
AVAILABILITIES TO THE AGENCY OVER THE PLANNING PERIOD.
THE PRESIDENT RECENTLY SIGNED LEGISLATION REVIVING
GRAMM-RUDMANHOLLINGS BUDGET BALANCING PROVISIONS, WITH
THE REQUIREMENT FOR A BALANCED BUDGET TO BE ACHIEVED BY
1993. THUS, IN PREPARING THE CDSS, MISSION STRATEGY
SHOULD REFLECT THE ASSUMPTION THAT BUDGET LEVELS WILL
CONTINUE TO BE SERIOUSLY CONSTRAINED.

BESIDES CONSIDERATIONS OF THE TOTAL LEVEL OF RESOURCE
AVAILABILITIES, THE STRATEGY SHOULD TAKE INTO ACCOUNT
TYPES OF U.S. ASSISTANCE RESOURCES AVAILABLE, AND
POTENTIAL CONSTRAINTS THEREON, AS WELL AS MANAGEMENT AND
PERSONNEL CAPACITIES. IN THIS REGARD, MISSIONS SHOULD
REVIEW EXISTING PIPELINES OF ASSISTANCE TO DETERMINE
WHETHER THEY ARE CONSISTENT WITH THE STRATEGY BEING
PROPOSED OR WHETHER THEY COULD BE MORE EFFECTIVELY
DEPLOYED TO SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDED STRATEGY. THE
INCREASING TENDENCY OF CONGRESS TO EARMARK FUNDS FOR
VARIOUS PURPOSES IS PERFORCE REDUCING BUDGET MANAGEMENT
FLEXIBILITY. SHARP REDUCTIONS IN CERTAIN FUNCTIONAL
DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE ACCOUNTS HAS SEVERELY LIMITED THE
AGENCY'S ABILITY TO MOUNT SOME OF ITS PRIORITY PROGRAMS.
GIVING EQUAL PRIORITY TO NUMEROUS SECTORS AND ACTIVITIES
WILL BECOME INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT TO THE EXTENT THAT
THIS TREND CONTINUES.

SPECIFICALLY WITH REGARD TO FOOD AID, MISSIONS SHOULD
DESCRIBE HOW THE PROPOSED FOOD AID COMPONENTS OF THEIR
PROGRAM ADDRESS SPECIFIC STRATEGY OBJECTIVES. THIS
DISCUSSION SHOULD ADDRESS VARIOUS ELEMENTS OR SPIGOTS (PL
480/TITLE 1/111, TITLE 11, SECTION 206, ETC.) AND HOW THE
PROPOSED COMMODITY MIX FITS WITHIN PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND
RECIPIENT COUNTRY NEEDS.

MOREOVER, PERSONNEL IMPLICATIONS OF THE STRATEGY MUST BE
DISCUSSED AND ALTERNATIVES IDENTIFIED. FRAGMENTING
STRATEGY INTO MULTIPLE SECTORS PRODUCES PROGRAMS WHICH
STRETCH MISSION MANAGEMENT AND PERSONNEL CAPACITIES TO
THE LIMIT. THEREFORE, IN ASSESSING POSSIBLE STRATEGIC
INTERVENTIONS, MISSIONS ARE REQUESTED TO FOCUS THEIR
STRATEGIES ON THOSE FEW SECTORS WHERE MEANINGFUL AND
EFFECTIVE CONTRIBUTIONS ARE PLAUSIBLE WITH AVAILABLE
PERSONNEL, AVOIDING PROJECT PROLIFERATION AND SEEKING TO
CONCENTRATE RESOURCES IN THE MORE EFFECTIVE PROJECT OR
PROGRAM AREAS.

IN THE PROCESS OF MAKING HARD STRATEGIC CHOICES AND
CONCENTRATING RESOURCES ON KEY SECTORS, MISSIONS WILL BE
EXPECTED TO CONSIDER, AS APPROPRIATE, OTHER CROSSCUTTING
THEMES WHICH MAY BE CRITICAL TO ACHIEVING OUR OBJECTIVES
AND MEANINGFUL DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS. THE RECOMMENDED
STRATEGY IS TO REFLECT THOSE THAT ARE RELEVANT. PART TWO

**PART TWO: SPECIAL AGENCY CONCERNS AND NEW POLICY
DEVELOPMENTS**

POLICY REFORM, A HEALTHY PRIVATE SECTOR, TECHNOLOGY
TRANSFER, AND INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT REMAIN CRUCIAL
INGREDIENTS FOR A SOUND ECONOMIC SYSTEM CONDUCTIVE TO
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT. HOWEVER, SUSTAINED LONGTERM
DEVELOPMENT IS ULTIMATELY THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE LDC'S
THEMSELVES AND THE IMPROVEMENT OF THE INDIGENOUS
CAPABILITY TO CONCEIVE, ANALYZE, PLAN AND IMPLEMENT SOUND
DEVELOPMENT POLICIES, STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS IS
ESSENTIAL TO SUCCESS. THIS MUST INCLUDE AN ENHANCED
INSTITUTIONAL CAPACITY TO GENERATE, ADAPT AND TRANSFER
TECHNOLOGY APPROPRIATE TO LOCAL ENVIRONMENTS AND
RESOURCES.

IN PREPARING THE DOCUMENT, MISSIONS SHOULD BE CAREFUL TO
RESPOND TO THE FOLLOWING POLICY GUIDELINES:

1. MISSIONS SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THE PRIVATE SECTOR

INITIATIVE IS INEXTRICABLY LINKED WITH PRIVATIZATION,
FINANCIAL MARKETS AND MICROENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT.
MISSIONS SHOULD ALSO BE AWARE THAT AFR/PRE, LAC/PS, S AND
T/RD, AND PRE/PD HAVE RESOURCES AVAILABLE FOR ASSISTING
MISSIONS IN DEVELOPING PRIVATE SECTOR ACTIVITIES.

A. PRIVATE SECTOR. MISSIONS SHOULD ENDEAVOR TO HAVE THE
PRIVATE SECTOR TAKE A STRONGER ROLE IN IMPLEMENTATION OF
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS AND THE DELIVERY OF SOCIAL
SERVICES. IN THE PAST, THE SDA AND ARDN ACCOUNTS HAVE
BEEN ESPECIALLY EFFECTIVE FOR CHANNELING RESOURCES TO THE
PRIVATE SECTOR. PROGRAM INITIATIVES SHOULD ENCOURAGE THE
PRIVATE SECTOR TO TAKE ON THE MANAGEMENT AND FINANCIAL
RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEVELOPMENT EFFORTS. MORE ATTENTION
SHOULD BE GIVEN TO IMPLEMENTING POPULATION, HEALTH, CHILD
SURVIVAL, AND EVEN EDUCATION AND HUMAN RESOURCES
ACTIVITIES THROUGH PRIVATE SECTOR CHANNELS. THE USE OF
THE PRIVATE SECTOR IN THESE AREAS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN
THE CDSS AS AN INHERENT PART OF THE PROBLEM SPECIFIC
STRATEGIES.

B. PRIVATIZATION. POLICY DETERMINATION 14 (SEE 1986
STATE 189506) DEFINES PRIVATIZATION AND EXPLAINS ITS MANY
FORMS, DISCUSSES THE TYPE OF ASSISTANCE THAT A.I.D. COULD
OFFER TO FACILITATE PRIVATIZATION, PRESENTS SOME OF THE
MAJOR FACTORS THAT SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN PURSUING
PRIVATIZATION, AND DESCRIBES SOURCES OF TECHNICAL
ASSISTANCE FOR PRIVATIZATION. MISSION IMPLEMENTATION
ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE DESCRIBED IN THE CDSS. PRE CAN
PROVIDE ASSISTANCE IN PRIVATIZATION THROUGH ITS CENTER
FOR PRIVATIZATION; MISSIONS SHOULD AVAIL THEMSELVES OF
ITS SERVICES.

C. FINANCIAL MARKETS. A REVIEW OF A.I.D.'S FINANCIAL
MARKETS ACTIVITIES (PRIMARILY CREDIT PROJECTS) SUGGESTS A
NUMBER OF IMPORTANT DESIGN FEATURES IN WHICH ASSUMPTIONS,
CONVENTIONAL WISDOM, OR ANALYSIS HAVE RESULTED IN
PROJECTS SOMEWHAT ISOLATED FROM THE BROADER POLICY AND
INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES AND PROBLEMS IN THE LDC'S FINANCIAL
SECTOR. MISSIONS SHOULD BE AWARE THAT THE DRAFT
FINANCIAL MARKETS DEVELOPMENT POLICY PAPER, UNDERGOING
SENIOR STAFF REVIEW IN AID/W AT PRESENT, REQUIRES THAT
MISSIONS CONTEMPLATING FINANCIAL MARKETS ACTIVITIES
DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE FINANCIAL MARKETS DEVELOPMENT
STRATEGY FOR A.I.D. ACTIVITIES BEFORE OR IN CONJUNCTION
WITH PURSUING ADDITIONAL FINANCIAL MARKETS PROJECTS.

UNCLASSIFIED

68

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 06 OF 07 STATE 340629

0103 050146 AID3305

STATE 340629

0103 050146 A1

MISSIONS PURSUING THESE ACTIVITIES MAY WISH TO INCLUDE A PRELIMINARY FINANCIAL MARKETS ANALYSIS IN THEIR COSS. PRE/PD AND S AND AT/RD HAVE SPECIALIZED CONTRACTS IN

FINANCIAL MARKETS DEVELOPMENT AND RURAL SAVINGS MOBILIZATION, RESPECTIVELY; MISSIONS SHOULD SEEK TO UTILIZE THESE WHEN POSSIBLE.

B. MICROENTERPRISE. LEGISLATION CURRENTLY BEING CONSIDERED BY CONGRESS IS LIKELY TO DESIGNATE APPROXIMATELY DOLLARS 30 MILLION FOR MICROENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE. MISSIONS SHOULD DISCUSS IN THE COSS HOW THEY PLAN TO ADDRESS THIS SECTOR DURING THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS. THIS COULD BE PART OF THE SECTIONS ON INCOME OF LOW INCOME GROUPS.

2. WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT. WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT IS A CROSS CUTTING ISSUE. WID SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN THE PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS SECTION AND IN EACH OF THE STRATEGY SECTIONS. IN THE PROBLEM DESCRIPTION SECTION, WOMEN AND GIRLS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED NOT ONLY AS POTENTIAL BENEFICIARIES OF DEVELOPMENT PROGRESS BUT ALSO AS PARTICIPANTS IN THE DEVELOPMENT PROCESS. SIMILARLY, THE STRATEGY SECTION SHOULD DESCRIBE HOW EACH OF THE PROPOSED PROBLEM SPECIFIC STRATEGIES WILL EFFECTIVELY ADDRESS WOMEN'S AND GIRLS' ISSUES.

3. AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND NUTRITION (ARDN). MISSIONS SHOULD BE GUIDED BY THE AGENCY'S AGRICULTURAL FOCUS STATEMENT, AS TRANSMITTED 5/1/87 (STATE 131187), WHICH EMPHASIZED THAT THE FOCUS OF THE AGENCY'S AGRICULTURAL, RURAL DEVELOPMENT AND NUTRITION PROGRAM IS TO INCREASE THE INCOME OF THE RURAL POOR AND EXPAND THE AVAILABILITY AND CONSUMPTION OF FOOD, WHILE MAINTAINING AND ENHANCING THE NATURAL RESOURCE BASE. ASSISTANCE TO SUPPORT AGRICULTURAL EXPORT DEVELOPMENT MUST BE CONSISTENT WITH PD*15 (9/13/86) REGARDING THE BUMPER'S AMENDMENT.

4. BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY/TROPICAL FORESTS. AMENDMENTS TO THE FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT IN 1986 REQUIRE, REPEAT, REQUIRE THAT EACH COUNTRY DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY STATEMENT CONTAIN AN ANALYSIS OF (1) THE ACTIONS NECESSARY FOR THE COUNTRY TO CONSERVE BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE ACTIONS PROPOSED FOR SUPPORT BY A.I.D. MEET THE NEEDS THUS IDENTIFIED AND (2) THE ACTIONS NECESSARY FOR THE COUNTRY TO CONSERVE AND SUSTAIN MANAGEMENT OF TROPICAL FORESTS AND THE EXTENT TO WHICH ACTIONS PROPOSED FOR SUPPORT BY A.I.D. MEET THE NEEDS THUS IDENTIFIED. ASPECTS OF BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY MUST BE ANALYZED FOR ALL COUNTRIES, BUT ONLY COUNTRIES WHICH HAVE TROPICAL FORESTS NEED TO INCLUDE THEM. STATE 118324 PROVIDES INFORMATION ABOUT THESE REQUIREMENTS AND AID/W IS NOW PREPARING MORE

DETAILED GUIDANCE AND A SUGGESTED OUTLINE FOR MISSION USE. COPIES OF EXEMPLARY STUDIES SUBMITTED IN FY 1987 WILL ALSO BE MADE AVAILABLE. SOME TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE IS AVAILABLE FROM S&T/FNR AND THE REGIONAL BUREAUS.

5. CHILD SURVIVAL. THE AGENCY CHILD SURVIVAL STRATEGY APPROVED IN APRIL, 1986, AND SUBSTRATEGIES APPROVED SUBSEQUENTLY ON MUNIZATION, DIARRHEAL DISEASE CONTROL, NUTRITION FOR CHILD SURVIVAL, AND CHILD SPACING FOR CHILD SURVIVAL, PROVIDE GUIDANCE FOR CHILD SURVIVAL PROGRAMMING. ALTHOUGH CHILD SURVIVAL GOALS FOR 1990 WILL NOT BE MET IN ALL EMPHASIS COUNTRIES, CHILD SURVIVAL REMAINS AN AGENCY PRIORITY. MISSIONS SHOULD PLAN THEIR CHILD SURVIVAL STRATEGIES AND BUDGETS FOR THE PERIOD IT WILL TAKE TO ACCOMPLISH AGENCY GOALS IN THEIR RESPECTIVE COUNTRIES.

6. AIDS. POLICY GUIDANCE ON AIDS HAS BEEN TRANSMITTED (STATE 100939, DATED 4/4/87). MISSIONS SHOULD CONSIDER BUY-INS TO THE CENTRALLYFUNDED AIDS UMBRELLA PROJECT FOR MOST BILATERAL ACTIVITIES. IN ADDITION, ALL MISSION ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN IN THE CONTEXT OF A WHO-APPROVED COUNTRY PLAN OF ACTION, AND SHOULD COMPLEMENT WHO- AND OTHER DONOR-FUNDED ACTIVITIES.

7. POPULATION POLICY GUIDANCE. THE A.I.D. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE FOR POPULATION IS EXPANDING ACCESS TO FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES TO COUPLES IN THE DEVELOPING WORLD. CURRENT POPULATION POLICY EMPHASIZES THE NEEDS OF INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES. A.I.D. SUPPORTS INTERNATIONAL FAMILY PLANNING BECAUSE IT ENABLES COUPLES TO CHOOSE THE NUMBER AND SPACING OF THEIR CHILDREN, IT IMPROVES THE HEALTH OF MOTHERS AND CHILDREN, AND IT REDUCES ABORTION. A.I.D. POLICY ALSO EMPHASIZES PROVIDING INFORMATION ABOUT AND ACCESS TO A RANGE OF SAFE AND EFFECTIVE FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES SO THAT COUPLES MAY CHOOSE THE METHOD APPROPRIATE TO THEIR CIRCUMSTANCES.

THIS IS NOT INCONSISTENT WITH THE NEED IN SOME COUNTRIES TO ACHIEVE A BALANCE BETWEEN ECONOMIC GROWTH AND POPULATION GROWTH. THE SUCCESSFUL EXPANSION OF HIGH QUALITY FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES WILL INCREASE THE PRACTICE OF FAMILY PLANNING AND INEVITABLY LEAD TO LOWER POPULATION GROWTH RATES. THE U.S. SUPPORTS GOVERNMENTS WHICH HAVE DEMOGRAPHIC TARGETS, BUT DOES NOT SET SUCH TARGETS FOR ITS OWN PROGRAMS.

B. LAND TENURE. POLICY DETERMINATION 13 (5/9/86) SETS FORTH A.I.D. POLICY REGARDING ASSISTANCE TO LOC PROGRAMS

AND PROJECTS IN LAND TENURE DEVELOPMENT, LAND TENURE SECURITY AND RELATED ACTIVITIES. A.I.D. IS PREPARED, IN SELECTED CASES AND AS RESOURCES MAY BE AVAILABLE, TO ASSIST DEVELOPING COUNTRIES TO ESTABLISH OR IMPROVE MARKETBASED LAND TENURE SYSTEMS SO THAT PRODUCERS ARE ABLE TO OBTAIN LAND OR ADJUST THE AMOUNT OF LAND UTILIZED IN THEIR PRODUCTION PROCESSES. LAND AND OTHER RESOURCE TENURE MATTERS ARE KEY POLICY CONCERNS IN NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT. POLICY DIALOGUE AND ACTION PROGRAMS SHOULD EMPHASIZE MARKETORIENTED APPROACHES TO SUSTAINABLE RESOURCE USE.

B. DEMOCRATIC INITIATIVES. DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTION BUILDING HAS BECOME A REFOCUSSED PRIORITY FOR A.I.D. CONSEQUENTLY, AS PART OF OUR APPROACH TO ACHIEVING DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES, MISSIONS SHOULD FOCUS NOT ONLY ON ECONOMIC INSTITUTION BUILDING BUT ON DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTION BUILDING AS WELL. THE FAA MANDATES THAT A.I.D. PROGRAMS SHOULD PLACE EMPHASIS, QUOTE ON ASSURING MAXIMUM PARTICIPATION IN THE TASK OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ... THROUGH THE ENCOURAGEMENT OF DEMOCRATIC PRIVATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENT INSTITUTIONS, UNQUOTE. PD 12 ON HUMAN RIGHTS OUTLINES A.I.D.'S LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS AND COMMITMENT TO THIS APPROACH, AND OFFERS EXAMPLES OF PROJECTS ENCOURAGED FOR PROMOTING DEMOCRATIC INSTITUTION BUILDING. MISSIONS ARE ENCOURAGED TO INCORPORATE DEMOCRATIC INITIATIVES IN THEIR COSS, AS WELL AS CONSIDER PROJECT IDEAS TO BE IMPLEMENTED THROUGH SECTION 116 (E) OF THE FAA.

18. HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT. THE OFFICE OF HOUSING AND URBAN PROGRAMS (PRE/H), IN COLLABORATION WITH THE REGIONAL BUREAUS AND PARTICIPATING MISSIONS, IS ADOPTING A SECTOR LENDING APPROACH TO THE HOUSING GUARANTY (NG) PROGRAM. THE APPROACH EMPHASIZES THE USE OF NG RESOURCES TO LEVERAGE SECTOR POLICY REFORMS WHICH

UNCLASSIFIED

69

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 07 OF 07 STATE 340629

9103 050146 A103385

WOULD FACILITATE ACCESS BY LOW-INCOME FAMILIES TO SHELTER AND RELATED FACILITIES. SUCH PROGRAMS PROVIDE NG DOLLARS WHICH NEED NOT BE DIRECTLY LINKED TO SPECIFIC PROJECT EXPENDITURES. HOWEVER, THE USE OF THE LOCAL CURRENCY GENERATED BY SUCH PROGRAMS MUST BE SPECIFIED AND MUST FINANCE HOUSING AND RELATED SHELTER ACTIVITIES AFFORDABLE TO FAMILIES BELOW THE MEDIAN INCOME. SECTOR PROGRAMS ARE SOUGHT AS A MORE EFFICIENT VEHICLE FOR ADDRESSING FUNDAMENTAL CONSTRAINTS INHIBITING THE GROWTH OF SECTORAL OUTPUT AND PRODUCTIVITY THAN MORE TRADITIONAL PROJECTIZED ASSISTANCE.

THE CONSTRAINTS WHICH MIGHT BE ADDRESSED COULD INCLUDE,

FOR EXAMPLE, INAPPROPRIATE SUBSIDIES OR SHELTER SECTOR POLICIES AND STANDARDS AND INADEQUATE OR INAPPROPRIATE ALLOCATION OF RESOURCES TO OR WITHIN THE SECTOR. INSTITUTIONAL OR INFRASTRUCTURE CONSTRAINTS IN PARTICULAR MIGHT BE HANDLED BY A COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY WHICH INCLUDES NONPROJECTIZED DISBURSEMENT WITH RELATED PROJECTS FINANCED WITH LOCAL CURRENCY GENERATED BY THE NG FUNDS. MISSIONS ARE ALSO ENCOURAGED TO CONSIDER THE BROADER IMPLICATIONS OF THE NG RESOURCE IN MISSION PROGRAMMING IN AREAS SUCH AS SUPPORT FOR PRIVATE SECTOR AND INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLD EFFORTS, DEVELOPMENT OF MARKET-BASED FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, DECENTRALIZATION/LOCAL GOVERNMENT DEVELOPMENT/SECONDARY MARKET TOWN DEVELOPMENT, AND THE ECONOMIC EFFICIENCY OF URBAN INVESTMENTS.

THE REGIONAL HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT OFFICERS (RHUDD) ARE AVAILABLE TO ASSIST MISSIONS IN EXPLORING THESE NOVEL PROGRAMMING OPPORTUNITIES.

11. INTERNATIONAL DISASTER ASSISTANCE. THE OFFICE OF FOREIGN DISASTER ASSISTANCE (OFDA) HAS DETERMINED DURING THE LAST DECADE THAT MOST-COUNTRY DISASTER IMPACTS ARE BECOMING INCREASINGLY COSTLY BOTH IN ECONOMIC AND HUMAN TERMS. OFDA'S PRIMARY GOAL IS TO SAVE LIVES AND REDUCE HUMAN SUFFERING. HOWEVER, RECENTLY OFDA HAS BECOME INCREASINGLY DRAWN INTO DEVELOPMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES FOR WHICH MISSIONS SHOULD TAKE GREATER RESPONSIBILITY SUCH AS PESTICIDES MANAGEMENT, FLOOD HAZARDS MITIGATION, RANGELAND/CROP MONITORING, LANDUSE IMPACTS ANALYSES, AND LOCUST INFESTATIONS MANAGEMENT. CONSISTENT WITH DRAFT IG GUIDANCE REGARDING MISSION DISASTER PLANNING, USAIDS SHOULD ADDRESS IN THEIR STRATEGY STATEMENT MISSION DISASTER PREPAREDNESS PLANNING AND SHOULD DOCUMENT EFFORTS TO COOPERATE WITH HOST GOVERNMENTS IN ASSESSING THEIR POTENTIAL VULNERABILITY TO EVENTS WHICH CAUSE DISASTERS SUCH AS EARTHQUAKES, LANDSLIDES, FLOODS, DROUGHT, AND TSUNAMIS.

WHITHEAD

UNCLASSIFIED

ANNEX 6

State 378844, 11/28/87,

Africa Bureau Guidance for FY89-91 Action Plans

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 01 OF 03 STATE 370044
ORIGIN AID-00

0200 072013 0104270

STATE 370044

0200 071

ORIGIN OFFICE AFR-01
INFO AAAF-03 AFEA-03 AFFU-04 AFVU-03 AFYU-05 PPFD-02 DELO-01
/077 04 0030

INFO LOO-00 AF-00 /000 0

DRAFTED BY: AID/AFR/DP/PPE:EDWARDS:LN
APPROVED BY: AID/AA/AFR:CLARSON
AID/AFR/DP:JEWSTLEY
AID/AFR/DP/PPE:EGRELEY
AID/AFR/DP/PAR:JUGLOIN (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/EA:SPINTZ (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/EA:FFISCHER (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/CCWA:JCOLES (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/EA:SPINTZ (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/TR:KSTNERPER (INFO)
AID/PPC/PD:RMAUSHAMMER (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/PG:CPHASLEY (DRAFT)

AID/AFR/DP:JBOVAN
AID/AA/AFR:WOLLINGER
AID/AFR/DP/PAD:SHERRI-L (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/SMA:POICHTER (DRAFT)

-----004006 000104Z /37

R 200001Z NOV 87 ZEX
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USAID MISSIONS IN AFRICA

UNCLAS STATE 370044

AIDAC

E.O. 12958: R/A

TAGS:

SUBJECT: AFRICA BUREAU GUIDANCE FOR FY 89-91 ACTION
PLANS

REFS: (A) 86 STATE 090629 (B) 86 STATE 203075 (C) 87
STATE 112830 (D) 87 STATE 202525 (E) 87 STATE 067556
(F) 87 STATE 101670

1. SUMMARY. CAMEROON, KENYA, MADAGASCAR, NIGER,
SENEGAL, AND ZAMBIA MISSIONS ARE REQUESTED TO SUBMIT
ACTION PLANS FOR THE PERIOD FY 89 - FY 91. DUE DATES
ARE NOTED IN PARA. 6. THIS CABLE REPLACES ALL PREVIOUS
GUIDANCE, ALTHOUGH IT WILL BE NOTED THAT MANY ELEMENTS
REMAIN ESSENTIALLY THE SAME. EMPHASIS CONTINUES TO BE
PLACED ON THE PREPARATION OF ACTION PLANS WHICH ARE:
BRIEF (15 - 20 PAGES OR LESS); CONVEY A PROGRAM RATHER
THAN PROJECT PERSPECTIVE; AND CLEARLY PRESENT THE
MISSION'S KEY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES, TARGETS, AND
PERFORMANCE BENCHMARKS. END SUMMARY.

2. PURPOSE OF ACTION PLAN AND PROGRAM WEEK PROCESSES.
THE MAIN PURPOSE OF THE ACTION PLAN IS TO ESTABLISH THE
BASIS FOR SENIOR BUREAU AND MISSION MANAGEMENT
AGREEMENT, DURING PROGRAM WEEK, ON SHORT AND MEDIUM TERM

PRIORITIES REGARDING IMPLEMENTATION OF AN ASSISTANCE
STRATEGY LAID OUT IN AN APPROVED COSS. IN ADDITION, THE
REVIEW OF THE ACTION PLAN DURING PROGRAM WEEK IS
EXPECTED TO FACILITATE RESOLUTION OF ISSUES AFFECTING
PROGRESS AND PERFORMANCE IN ACHIEVING MISSION, BUREAU,
AND AGENCY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES.

3. FREQUENCY AND TIMING. CATEGORY I AND II COUNTRIES
ARE USUALLY EXPECTED TO PREPARE TWO ACTION PLANS
BETWEEN EACH COSS. CATEGORY III COUNTRIES, WHICH DO NOT
PREPARE COSSs BUT INSTEAD FOLLOW GUIDELINES FOR COUNTRY
PROGRAM STATEMENTS (REF C), ARE FREE TO DEVELOP ACTION
PLANS FOR THEIR OWN ANALYTICAL AND MANAGEMENT PURPOSES,
BUT THEY WILL NOT BE REVIEWED IN A.I.D./M AS PART OF THE
PROGRAM WEEK PROCESS AS DESCRIBED IN REF B AND BELOW.

A. THE FIRST ACTION PLAN IS EXPECTED TO BE DRAFTED ONE
YEAR AFTER APPROVAL OF A COSS. THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES
AROUND WHICH THE ACTION PLAN IS FORMULATED ARE TO BE
BASED ON THOSE IN THE COSS. THE TARGETS AND BENCHMARKS
WHICH THE MISSION WILL USE TO MONITOR PROGRESS IN
ACHIEVING THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES WILL, HOWEVER, BE
MORE CLEARLY DEFINED AND PRIORITIZED IN THE ACTION PLAN
THAN THEY WERE IN THE COSS. IN ADDITION, THE MISSION
SHOULD LAY OUT IN THE ACTION PLAN JUST HOW THE MISSION
PLANS TO MANAGE ITS POLICY DIALOGUE (S), PROGRAMS,
FINANCIAL RESOURCES, STAFF, AND OPERATIONS TO MEET THE
TARGETS OVER THE COMING TWO-YEAR PERIOD.

B. THE SECOND ACTION PLAN, PREPARED TWO YEARS AFTER THE
FIRST, SHOULD REFLECT THE PERFORMANCE OF THE PROGRAM IN
ACHIEVING THE TARGETS AND BENCHMARKS LAID OUT IN THE
FIRST PLAN, PROPOSE REVISIONS BASED ON THIS ASSESSMENT
OF PERFORMANCE, AND, AGAIN, LAY OUT JUST HOW THE MISSION
PLANS TO MANAGE ITS POLICY DIALOGUE (S), PROGRAMS,
FINANCIAL RESOURCES, STAFF, AND OPERATIONS OVER THE
COMING TWO-YEAR PERIOD.

C. IN CASES WHERE SIGNIFICANT EVENTS EITHER IN-COUNTRY
OR IN WASHINGTON ARE EXPECTED TO ALTER THE PROGRAMMING
ENVIRONMENT FOR A PERIOD OF ONE OR MORE YEARS, EITHER
THE MISSION OR AFR/DP MAY REQUEST THAT A NEW ACTION PLAN
BE PREPARED AND A PROGRAM WEEK OR OTHER REVIEW PROCESS
BE SET UP.

4. AS THE CORE DOCUMENT FOR THE PROGRAM WEEK REVIEW
PROCESS GENERALLY DESCRIBED IN REF B, THE ACTION PLAN
WILL SET THE BASIS FOR WASHINGTON-FIELD DISCUSSION OF

POLICY DIALOGUE OBJECTIVES AND APPROACHES, PROGRAM
PRIORITIES, RESOURCE ALLOCATION, STAFFING, AND PROGRAM
IMPLEMENTATION ACTIONS REQUIRING COORDINATION OF
EFFORT. ON THE INTERESTS OF FOCUSING DISCUSSION, IT IS
PLANNED THAT A.I.D./M WILL COMMUNICATE ITS PRELIMINARY
READING OF ISSUES WHICH WILL REQUIRE ATTENTION AS EARLY
AS POSSIBLE FOLLOWING THE ISSUANCE OF THIS GUIDANCE (AND
NOT LATER THAN TWO WEEKS BEFORE THE SCHEDULED PLAN
SUBMISSION). MISSIONS SHOULD THUS HAVE TIME TO
INCORPORATE RELEVANT MATERIAL IN THE ACTION PLANS OR TO
SUGGEST DIFFERENT ISSUES OR REVISIONS IN REGULAR
COMMUNICATION WITH DESKS. SUBMISSION OF THE ACTION PLAN
TO A.I.D./M AT LEAST ONE MONTH BEFORE THE SCHEDULED
PROGRAM WEEK WILL ALSO FACILITATE THE DISCUSSIONS. THIS
HAS BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN THE CALCULATION OF DUE
DATES FOR EACH MISSION SUBMISSION BELOW IN PARA 6.

5. ACTION PLANS SHOULD, TO THE MAXIMUM EXTENT POSSIBLE,
USE THE FOLLOWING OUTLINE:

I. A REVIEW OF PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING A.I.D.'S STRATEGIC
OBJECTIVES

-- A. PROGRAM IMPACT ASSESSMENT (2 PAGES)

THE STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES ESTABLISHED IN THE COSS OR
IN A PRIOR ACTION PLAN SHOULD BE RESTATED AND
PROGRESS MADE (OR NOT MADE) IN ACHIEVING THEM SHOULD
BE SUMMARIZED. TO THE EXTENT POSSIBLE, QUANTITATIVE
PROGRAM PERFORMANCE CRITERIA (E.G., INCREASED
PRODUCTION OF FOODGRAINS, INCREASED INCOMES, NUMBER
OF IMMUNIZATIONS GIVEN, NUMBERS OF PEOPLE TRAINED,
NUMBER OF PRIVATE SECTOR TRADERS INVOLVED IN A
FERTILIZER DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM, INCREASED
PARTICIPATION IN FORMAL MARKETS) AND FOCUSED
QUALITATIVE INDICATORS OF DEVELOPMENT DECISIONS TO

UNCLASSIFIED

12

PAGE 07 OF 03 STATE 370044

0288 07213 0104070

STATE 370044

0288 072

PROMOTE REVISED POLICIES, BETTER REPORTING OF PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES, (ETC.) SHOULD BE CITED. SINCE THESE ARE NOT READILY AVAILABLE OR ARE NOT AVAILABLE ON A GENDER-DISAGGREGATED BASIS, MISSIONS SHOULD CONSIDER UNDERTAKING SPECIAL ACTIONS TO IMPROVE MONITORING AND EVALUATION (SEE PART III-B BELOW).

-- B. IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE PROGRAM ACTION (2 PAGES)

THE IMPLICATIONS OF THIS ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS FOR DEFINING RELEVANT STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES FOR THE UPCOMING PERIOD AND PROGRAMMING IMPLEMENTATION

SHOULD BE BRIEFLY LAID OUT. PREVIOUS OBJECTIVES SHOULD BE EXPLICITLY REAFFIRMED OR REVISED; IF REVISED, THEN RATIONALE FOR REVISIONS SHOULD BE CLEAR.

II. STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES, TARGETS, AND BENCHMARKS FOR NEXT TWO YEAR PERIOD (2 PAGES)

-- THIS SECTION SHOULD PRESENT IN BOTH NARRATIVE AND TABULAR FORMAT A SUMMARY OF THE PRIORITY REPEAT PRIORITY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES THAT THE MISSION EXPECTS TO ACHIEVE IN THE UPCOMING TWO YEAR PERIOD AND, IN A GENERAL WAY, HOW IT WILL MANAGE AND MONITOR ITS ACTIVITIES.

-- "STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES" ARE DEFINED AS THE MEDIUM TO LONG TERM GOALS FOR THE MISSION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AS LAID OUT IN THE CDSS OR PREVIOUS ACTION PLAN. THESE ARE ALSO OFTEN REFERRED TO AS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES OR PROGRAM GOALS. AS PART OF THE BUREAU EFFORT TO FOCUS A.I.D. ASSISTANCE, MISSIONS ARE ENCOURAGED TO LIMIT PRIORITY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES TO THREE OR FOUR.

-- "TARGETS" ARE DEFINED AS SPECIFIC, SHORT- TO MEDIUM-TERM OUTCOMES OR ACTIONS WHICH ARE TO BE ACCOMPLISHED IN ORDER TO INITIATE OR SUSTAIN MOVEMENT TOWARD ACHIEVEMENT OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES.

-- "BENCHMARKS" ARE DEFINED AS QUANTITATIVE OR QUALITATIVE INDICATORS THAT THE TARGETS ARE BEING OR HAVE BEEN ACHIEVED.

-- THE LINKAGES BETWEEN OBJECTIVES, TARGETS, AND BENCHMARKS SHOULD BE EXPLAINED TO THE EXTENT NECESSARY TO MAKE THE LOGIC OF THE PROGRAM APPARENT. KEY ASSUMPTIONS REGARDING EXOGENOUS CONDITIONS SHOULD BE NOTED. THE LEVEL OF RISK THAT ASSUMPTIONS MIGHT NOT HOLD SHOULD BE EVALUATED.

-- ALL TARGETS AND BENCHMARKS SHOULD BE DISAGGREGATED BY GENDER.

III. MISSION MANAGEMENT, MONITORING, AND COORDINATION ACTIVITIES

-- A. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT: PLANS AND ISSUES (2 PAGES)

THIS SECTION SHOULD DESCRIBE HOW THE MISSION PLANS

TO MANAGE ITS RESOURCES (FINANCIAL, FOOD AID, AND STAFF) TO ACHIEVE ESTABLISHED PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND TARGETS. KEY REPEAT KEY ACTIONS REGARDING PROGRAM CONSOLIDATION, PROCEDURAL SIMPLIFICATIONS, STAFF REALIGNMENTS, IMPROVED UTILIZATION OF FCMS AND PSCS, COLLABORATION WITH PEACE CORPS VOLUNTEERS AND PWS,

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE BUREAU'S WOMEN IN DEVELOPMENT ACTION PLAN AND THE NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN, LOCAL CURRENCY MANAGEMENT, AND PIPELINE/MONITORAGE ISSUES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED AS RELEVANT. NEW INITIATIVES (POLICY DIALOGUE, SUBJECT ASSISTANCE, PROJECTS, RESEARCH) WHICH ARE PROPOSED OR PLANNED FOR THE UPCOMING TWO YEARS SHOULD BE SUMMARIZED.

-- B. TRACKING AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION (2 PAGES)

TRACKING AND PERFORMANCE EVALUATION IS AN ONGOING AGENCY PROCESS WHICH THE AFRICA BUREAU IS COMMITTED TO IMPROVING (REF B) AT BOTH PROJECT AND PROGRAM LEVEL. MISSIONS ARE ALSO REMINDED OF THE REQUIREMENT TO HAVE A SYSTEM TO MONITOR PROJECT OUTPUTS AND PROGRAM IMPACT BY GENDER (SEE REFS E AND F). THIS MUST BE DESCRIBED AS PART OF THE OVERALL PLAN.

THE MISSION'S PLANS FOR MONITORING AND EVALUATION SHOULD BE DESCRIBED IN TWO PAGES OR LESS IN THE ACTION PLAN. WHILE MISSIONS MAY WISH TO PRESENT A BULLETINIZED PROJECT EVALUATION SCHEDULE FOR THE UPCOMING TWO YEARS, THE DISCUSSION OF MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN THE ACTION PLAN SHOULD FOCUS PRINCIPALLY AT THE PROGRAM LEVEL, AND BE DIRECTLY RELATED TO THE PART II PRESENTATION OF OBJECTIVES, TARGETS, AND BENCHMARKS. TO THE EXTENT THAT ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES OR TARGETS IS SENSITIVE TO CERTAIN ASSUMPTIONS BEING MET, THE MISSION MAY ALSO WISH TO EXPLAIN HOW IT PLANS TO MONITOR OR ASSESS FACTORS WHICH AFFECT THESE ASSUMPTIONS.

IT IS EXPECTED THAT MISSIONS WILL TAKE ADVANTAGE OF THE ANNUAL PROJECT EVALUATION AND PIR REVIEW PROCESS TO RELAY, IN A SUMMARY AND QUALITATIVE FASHION, THE DIRECTION OF PROGRESS TOWARD THEIR STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES. THESE PERCEPTIONS CAN BE COMMUNICATED TO A.I.D./W EVERY SIX MONTHS THROUGH USE OF THE MISSION DIRECTOR'S OVERVIEW STATEMENT WHICH IS NORMALLY FORWARDED TO WASHINGTON WITH THE WRITTEN PIR. A MORE FORMAL AND QUANTITATIVE ASSESSMENT CAN

PLAN REVIEW SO AS TO PROVIDE A SUBSTANTIVE BASIS FOR PROGRAM WEEK DISCUSSIONS.

-- C. COORDINATION WITH OTHER DONORS (ONE PAGE)

THE MISSION SHOULD DESCRIBE THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ITS PROGRAM OBJECTIVES AND MANAGEMENT PLANS AND THOSE OF OTHER DONORS.

-- D. SPECIAL ISSUES/CONSIDERATIONS (ONE PAGE)

AS APPROPRIATE, SPECIAL ISSUES OR THE MISSION'S VIEWS WITH REGARD TO HANDLING SPECIAL CONCERNS, E.G., SPECIAL, CONGRESSIONALLY-MANDATED ACTIVITIES (E.G., BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY), COLLABORATION WITH TITLE III EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS, ACHIEVEMENTS AND PROSPECTS FOR GRAY AMENDMENT ORGANIZATION CONTRACTING, ETC. MIGHT BE INCLUDED.

NEW PROJECT DEVELOPMENT PLANS CAN BE DISCUSSED HERE IF THEY HAVE NOT ALREADY BEEN CONSIDERED IN EARLIER SECTIONS. THE ADS WILL REMAIN, HOWEVER, THE DOCUMENT IN WHICH NEW PROJECTS SHOULD BE INITIALLY DESCRIBED.

9. PROPOSED SCHEDULE OF DUE DATES FOR FY 03

13

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 02 OF 03 STATE 270044

0020 072013 0104070.

SEYLA: ACTION PLAN SUBMISSION BY FEBRUARY 6, 2008;
PROGRAM WEEK, FEBRUARY 20 - MARCH 4

CAMEROON: ACTION PLAN SUBMISSION BY FEBRUARY 23; PROGRAM
WEEK, MARCH 21 - 25

SENEGAL: ACTION PLAN UPDATE SUBMISSION BY MARCH 7, 2008;
PROGRAM WEEK, APRIL 4 - 8. NOTE: COMPLETELY NEW ACTION
PLAN IS NOT REQUIRED; ACTION PLAN SUBMITTED IN MAY,
2007, MAY BE UPDATED FOR THIS PROGRAM WEEK.

ZAMBIA: ACTION PLAN SUBMISSION BY APRIL 24; PROGRAM
WEEK, MAY 23 - 27

MADAGASCAR: ACTION PLAN SUBMISSION BY APRIL 6; PROGRAM
WEEK, MAY 8 - 12

HIGER: ACTION PLAN SUBMISSION BY MARCH 11; PROGRAM WEEK,
APRIL 11 - 15. NOTE: EARLIER PLAN TO HAVE JUNE PROGRAM
WEEK CONFLICTS WITH ADS REVIEWS.

MISSIONS ARE REQUESTED TO CONFIRM THESE DATES OR TO
PROPOSE ALTERNATIVES. SHULTZ

UNCLASSIFIED

74

ANNEX 7

**State 097541, 4/2/87, FY1989 ABS -
Africa Bureau Guidance**

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

Clarity
OUTGOING TELEGRAM *ABC*

PAGE 01 OF 03 STATE 097541
ORIGIN AID-02

0470 037001 4106176

STATE 097541

0470 037001 4106176

ORIGIN OFFICE AID-02
INFO AAF-02 AFCD-01 AFEA-03 AISA-03 AFFW-04 AFGW-03 FPA-02
AFPD-04 AFTR-05 APPB-02 GC-01 GCAF-01 OL-01 OCCM-01
AFDA-02 RELO-01 AFMI-03 /1147 44 302

INFO LOG-00 AF-00 H-01 /001 R

DRAFTED BY: AID/AFR/OP/PAB:HMERRILL:HM
APPROVED BY: AID/AFR/OP:JGOV:HM
AID/OP/PAB:JPMITSON (DRAFT) AID/AFR/CONT:RN:MG (DR: J)
AID/OP/EMS:CHCGRAW (DRAFT) AID/DAW/AFR:LRICHARDS (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/PO:CPEWLEY (DRAFT) AID/AFR/TR:KSHAPER (DRAFT)
AID/DAW/AFR:LSAVERS (DRAFT)

-----342586 0206402 /30

P 020637Z APR 87 ZEX
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USAID MISSIONS IN AFRICA PRIORITY

UNCLAS STATE 097541

AIDAC ABIDJAN FOR REDSO/W, NAIROBI FOR REDSO/E

E.O. 12356: N/A
TAGS:

SUBJECT: FY 1989 ABS - AFRICA BUREAU GUIDANCE

1. WE EXPECT THE DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA (DFA) TO BE A REALITY IN FY-88. THIS WILL ELIMINATE FUNCTIONAL ACCOUNTS, MAKE OUR FUNDS NO-YEAR, AND SIGNIFY A SPECIAL COMMITMENT FOR SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA. IF THE FUND IS APPROVED, WE ARE BEING ENCOURAGED BY SEVERAL CONGRESSIONAL INTERESTS TO GIVE PARTICULAR ATTENTION TO CERTAIN PRIORITY AREAS. THESE ARE AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, POPULATION, CHILD SURVIVAL, PVO ACTIVITIES, NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND ACTIVITIES FUNDED WITH LOCAL CURRENCY GENERATIONS. WE ARE NOT REQUIRING ALL MISSIONS TO INITIATE ACTIVITIES IN ALL AREAS. OUR MAJOR INTEREST FOR THE ABS IS FINDING OUT WHAT YOU ARE DOING IN THESE AREAS PARTICULARLY WITH RESOURCES OTHER THAN DIRECT BILATERAL DOLLAR FUNDED BUDGETS.

IN ADDITION, WE WILL NEED TO MAINTAIN A SHADOW BUDGET FOR FUNCTIONAL ACCOUNT CATEGORIES FOR THE INITIAL YEARS OF IMPLEMENTATION UNDER THE DFA. ACCORDINGLY, WE ARE

REQUESTING THAT YOU MAKE YOUR BUDGET REQUEST UNDER THE DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA, AND THEN INDICATE YOUR FUNCTIONAL ATTRIBUTIONS ON "AFRICA TABLE I" (SEE BELOW).

2. PPC GUIDANCE FOR THE ABS REVIEW IS SCHEDULED TO BE COMPLETED SOME TIME IN APRIL. WE ARE FORWARDING A PACKET OF INFORMATION AS WELL AS DISTRIBUTING A VANG DISK WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO BE USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THE AFRICA BUREAU PORTION OF THE FY-89 ABS FOR AFRICAN FIELD MISSIONS. WE HAVE TRIED TO MAKE THE NOTES ON PREPARING THE AFRICA SUBMISSION AS CLEAR AS POSSIBLE. FOR MOST OF THE BUREAU'S REQUESTED INFORMATION YOU CAN USE MUCH OF LAST YEAR'S FORMAT.

WE BELIEVE OUR ATTEMPT TO CONSOLIDATE FREQUENTLY REQUESTED INFORMATION IN THE ABS WILL, IN THE LONG TERM, MAKE THE DEMAND ON FIELD RESOURCES LESS OF A BURDEN. THE AFRICA BUREAU SUBMISSION IS TO BE INCLUDED WITH YOUR PPC ABS SUBMISSION AND YOU ARE TO ADHERE TO THE PPC DEADLINES FOR FORWARDING TO AID/W.

WE WILL FORWARD A SET OF DUMMY TABLES TO THE FIELD WHEN

COMPLETED. WE WILL TRY TO HAVE THESE OUT OF AID/W BY THE LETH OF APRIL. LAST YEAR'S FORMAT CAN BE USED SHOULD YOU WISH TO GET A HEAD START ON COMPLETING YOUR STATISTICAL SUBMISSION. WE WOULD THAT YOU REVIEW THE PARTS OF YOUR SUBMISSION COMPILED PRIOR TO RECEIVING THE TABLE FORMAT DETAILS TO SEE THAT THEY MATCH.

WE DO NOT BELIEVE IT NECESSARY FOR ANY MISSION REPRESENTATION AT THE MEETINGS GIVEN A WELL PREPARED AFG AND THE ROLE OF THE GEOGRAPHIC OFFICE. GIVEN OUR FUNDING CONSTRAINTS, MISSIONS SHOULD NOT PLAN ON SENDING REPRESENTATIVES TO THE ABS REVIEWS UNLESS MISSION INVOLVEMENT CAN BE ACCOMPLISHED IN CONJUNCTION WITH HOME LEAVE, R AND R, ETC.

SUPPLEMENTAL AFRICA BUREAU CABLES WILL FOLLOW WITH INSTRUCTIONS FOR REPORTING OF AND PERSONNEL AS WELL AS MISSION ABS NARRATIVE AND HRDA (AMOP) COUNTRY TRAINING PLANS.

3. TABLE I - FUNCTIONAL ATTRIBUTION

PLEASE INDICATE THE FUNCTIONAL ATTRIBUTION (INCLUDING CANAL) FOR YOUR FY-1988 ACTUALS AND FY-1989 BUDGET REQUEST. THIS CAN BE DONE WITH A LISTING OF PROJECTS TO BE SUPPORTED IN FY 1988/1989, AMOUNT OF FY 1988 BUDGET AND FY 1989 REQUEST, AND APPROPRIATE FUNCTIONAL

ATTRIBUTION. IF YOU HAVE A SPLIT FUNDED PROJECT, INDICATE THE LEVEL OF FUNDING UNDER EACH FUNCTIONAL SPLIT.

4. TABLE II - PIPELINE ANALYSIS/MODIFICATIONS TO LOP AND PACD

DATA FOR PERIOD THROUGH FY 1986 WILL BE COMPILED IN AID/W AND FORWARDED TO THE MISSIONS FOR REVIEW. IT WILL INCLUDE ALL BILATERAL PROJECTS AND THE PRESENTATION WILL BE SEPARATED INTO DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE AND ECONOMIC SUPPORT FUNDING. YOU ARE REQUESTED TO INDICATE PIPELINE BALANCES ACCORDING TO YOUR FIELD RECORDS AS WELL AS INDICATE CHANGES MADE TO LIFE OF PROJECT FUNDING AND PROJECT COMPLETION DATE. NOTE, IF PACD OR LOP IS TO BE CHANGED THROUGH AN AMENDMENT, INDICATE WHEN IT IS SCHEDULED TO BE COMPLETED.

WE WILL MAKE EVERY EFFORT TO GET THESE TABLES POUNCHED OUT OF AID/W BEFORE APRIL 15 SO THAT YOU WILL HAVE AMPLE TIME TO VERIFY THAT AID/W DATA MATCHES MISSION RECORDS.

5. TABLE III - PVO ACTIVITY

THE TABLE IS A LISTING OF KNOWN PVO ACTIVITIES (INCLUDING CO-OPS) IN YOUR MISSION WITH A NOTATION OF HOW THEY ARE FUNDED (BILATERALLY, REGIONALLY OR CENTRALLY).

SPAN OF PVO LOP MEANS THE YEAR THE PVO PORTION OF THE ACTIVITY STARTED AND THE YEAR IT IS SCHEDULED TO BE COMPLETED. (IN SOME CASES, WHEN THE PVO ACTIVITY IS PART OF A LARGER PROJECT, THE PVO PORTION OF THE PROJECT MAY NOT COINCIDE WITH THE ACTIVE LIFE OF THE TOTAL PROJECT.) ALSO, IF THE PVO SUPPORT IS A PORTION OF A PROJECT, INDICATE THE TOTAL MONEY BEING SPENT ON PVO ACTIVITIES AND THE PVO PORTION AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL ACTIVITY.

6. TABLE IV - PRIVATE SECTOR ACTIVITIES

THE TABLE IS A LISTING OF KNOWN PRIVATE SECTOR

76

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 02 OF 03 STATE 097541

0470 037061 A106176

STATE 097541

0470 037061 A106176

ACTIVITIES IN YOUR MISSION WITH A NOTATION OF HOW THEY ARE FUNDED (BILATERALLY, REGIONALLY OR CENTRALLY).

SOURCE AND DOLLAR AMOUNT, PERSON DAYS REQUIRED FOR TASK, NON-MISSION ASSISTANCE REQUIRED. NOTE, THIS IS A LISTING RATHER THAN THE ANALYTICAL PRESENTATION CALLED FOR IN THE ACTION PLAN.

SPAN OF PRIVATE SECTOR LOP MEANS THE YEAR THE PRIVATE SECTOR PORTION OF THE ACTIVITY STARTED AND THE YEAR IT IS SCHEDULED TO BE COMPLETED. ADDITIONALLY, IF THE PRIVATE SECTOR SUPPORT IS A PORTION OF A PROJECT,

INDICATE THE TOTAL AMOUNT OF MONEY BEING SPENT ON PRIVATE SECTOR ACTIVITIES AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR PORTION AS A PERCENTAGE OF THE TOTAL ACTIVITY.

WE ARE SUGGESTING PRIVATE SECTOR BE DEFINED AS NON-GOVERNMENTAL AND PROFIT MAKING ACTIVITIES. YOU MAY EXPAND OR REFINE YOUR DEFINITION OF PRIVATE SECTOR AS LONG AS YOU INCLUDE A CLEAR EXPLANATION OF YOUR INTERPRETATION.

7. TABLE V - CENTRALLY FUNDED ACTIVITIES

PLEASE INCLUDE ALL KNOWN REGIONAL AND CENTRALLY FUNDED ACTIVITIES ON THIS LISTING BREAKING OUT THESE PROJECTS AS DIRECTLY RELATED TO MISSION PORTFOLIO (EXAMPLE: THE TRAINING COMPONENT OF A FAMILY PLANNING ACTIVITY), INDIRECTLY RELATED TO MISSION PORTFOLIO (EXAMPLE: A SMALL FIELD STUDY OF NUTRITION INTERVENTIONS WHICH MIGHT COMPLEMENT STRATEGIES IN AN ON-GOING PRIMARY HEALTH PROJECT), AND NOT RELATED TO MISSION PORTFOLIO (EXAMPLE: A SEMINAR FOR AIR TRAFFIC CONTROLLERS).

8. TABLE VI - LOCAL CURRENCY TABLE AND NARRATIVE

WE HAVE RECENTLY BEEN RECEIVING CONSIDERABLE CONGRESSIONAL PRESSURE TO DETAIL LOCAL CURRENCY ACTIVITIES. WE ARE AWARE THAT THIS IS ALSO AN AREA OF INTEREST FOR PPC, AND ASK THAT IN ADDITION TO PREPARING THE TABLE ON LOCAL CURRENCY EXPENDITURES FOR FYS 87-88-89, YOU ALSO PREPARE A TABLE TO INDICATE ANTICIPATED LOCAL CURRENCY GENERATIONS AND THEIR SOURCES FOR FY-1987, FY-1988, AND FY-1989. THIS TABLE SHOULD SUMMARIZE (BY DA, ESF OR PL 488 ACTIVITIES) RESOURCES CARRIED OVER FROM PREVIOUS YEARS, NEW RESOURCES, DRAWDOWNS, AND UNLIQUIDATED BALANCE AT THE END OF EACH FISCAL YEAR. PPC MAY HAVE FURTHER GUIDANCE IN THE WORLDWIDE ABS CABLE.

FOR THE NARRATIVE PORTION, TO THE EXTENT THAT IT IS NOT COVERED IN THE ABOVE TABLE, WE NEED INFORMATION ON THE SOURCE OF LOCAL CURRENCY ACCOUNTS, ACCOUNTABILITY PROCEDURES FOR THE FUNDS, PROGRAMMING PROCEDURES, ACTIVE PROJECTS SUPPORTED WITH LOCAL CURRENCY GENERATIONS, PLANNED PROJECTS FOR LOCAL CURRENCY SUPPORT, AND ANY AUDIT RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING USE AND HANDLING OF LOCAL CURRENCY PROGRAMING.

MISSIONS SHOULD REPORT ALL ACTIVITIES SUPPORTED WITH LOCAL CURRENCY FUNDING ON THE TABLE INCLUDING THE

FOLLOWING AREAS: CHILD SURVIVAL, BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY, NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, SMALL SCALE ENTERPRISE, AND PRIMARY EDUCATION.

9. TABLE VII - EVALUATIONS

A LISTING OF PLANNED EVALUATIONS WILL MOST PROBABLY ALSO BE INCLUDED IN THE PPC GUIDANCE. IF THIS IS THE CASE, YOU NEED INCLUDE ONLY ONE LISTING. WE SUGGEST THE FOLLOWING FORMAT: PROJECT NAME, LAST EVALUATION DATE, PROPOSED EVALUATION SCHEDULE, TYPE OF EVALUATION INCLUDING ROUTINE/THRESHOLD/LESSONS LEARNED, FUNDING

10. FOOD PROGRAMS

THE AFRICA BUREAU, IN CONCERT WITH FVA/FFP, CONTINUE BE INTERESTED IN ADDITIONAL PL-488 FOOD ACTIVITIES IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA. THESE MAY TAKE THE FORM OF ADDITIONAL TITLE I OR TITLE II ACTIVITIES, OR MAY INCLUDE SOME OF THE NEW INNOVATIVE USES OF FOOD RESOURCES THAT WERE DISCUSSED IN SOME DETAIL AT THE RECENT FOOD CONFERENCE IN ANNAPOLIS.

WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW WHAT YOU ARE PLANNING SO THAT I CAN MAKE SURE THAT FULL SUPPORT IS AVAILABLE IN AID/1 FOR YOUR FIELD SUBMISSIONS. IN ADDITION, SHOULD YOU WISH ASSISTANCE, WE CAN BEGIN PLANNING TO MAKE RESOURCES AVAILABLE TO HELP YOU IN THE PLANNING AND DESIGN PHASE OF NEW ACTIVITIES.

11. PVO ACTIVITIES

THE PVO NARRATIVE SHOULD BE USED TO HIGHLIGHT YOUR TABULAR SUBMISSION. WE WOULD LIKE TO KNOW HOW YOU ARE UTILIZING PVO RESOURCES (U.S. AND INDIGENOUS) IN YOUR CURRENT PORTFOLIO AS WELL AS HOW YOU PLAN TO USE THEM IN NEW ACTIVITIES - ESPECIALLY IN RELATION TO THE MISSION PRIORITIES. IN ADDITION, PLEASE IDENTIFY THE FORM OF CONSULTATIONS THAT YOU HAVE WITH THE PVO COMMUNITY AND HOW YOU SEE PVO'S INFLUENCING YOUR PROGRAMMING.

12. NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES

PLEASE DETAIL ALL OF THE ACTIVITIES AND SUB-ACTIVITIES IN YOUR PORTFOLIO WHICH HAVE A DIRECT RELATIONSHIP ON

NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT AND INDICATE THE DEGREE OF THEIR IMPACT. IN ADDITION TO THE OBVIOUS (VILLAGE WOODLOTS, WINDBREAKS, COOK STOVES, ETC.), PLEASE BE SURE TO INCLUDE ALL ACTIVITIES IN AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND PRODUCTION (E.G., SOIL CONSERVATION, BUNDING, TREE PLANTING, ALLEY CROPPING, ROTATION) THAT ARE AIMED AT RESOURCE CONSERVATION OR ENHANCEMENT, EVEN THOUGH A SHORT-TERM IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVE MAY BE INCREASED PRODUCTION OR INCOME. PLEASE INCLUDE DOLLAR FUNDING AND LOCAL CURRENCY SUPPORT FOR FY 1987, FY 1988 AND PROJECTED SUPPORT FOR FY 1989.

13. BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

PLEASE DETAIL ALL OF THE ACTIVITIES AND SUB-ACTIVITIES IN YOUR PORTFOLIO WHICH HAVE A DIRECT IMPACT ON ENHANCING BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND INDICATE THE DEGREE OF THEIR IMPACT. PLEASE INCLUDE DOLLAR FUNDING AND LOCAL CURRENCY SUPPORT FOR FY 1987, FY 1988 AND PROJECTED SUPPORT FOR FY 1989.

14. AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND FACILITIES OF AGRICULTURE

PLEASE DESCRIBE MISSION ACTIVITIES WHICH IMPLEMENT OR REFLECT THE BUREAU PLAN FOR SUPPORT TO AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH AND FACILITIES OF AGRICULTURE. PLEASE IDENTIFY IMPLEMENTING ORGANIZATIONS AND OUTLINE WHAT IS BEING ACCOMPLISHED. PLEASE INCLUDE DOLLAR FUNDING AND LOCAL CURRENCY SUPPORT FOR FY 1987, FY 1988 AND PROJECTED SUPPORT FOR FY 1989.

15. CHILD SURVIVAL ACTIVITIES

UNCLASSIFIED

UNCLASSIFIED
Department of State

OUTGOING
TELEGRAM

PAGE 03 OF 03 STATE 097541

0470 027061 A106176

PLEASE DETAIL MISSION ACTIVITIES WHICH SUPPORT THE CHILD SURVIVAL GOALS OF THE AGENCY. WE ARE KEEPING A BRIEF NARRATIVE OF ACTIVITIES WITH FISCAL SUPPORT BY YEAR FOR FY 87 THROUGH FY 89.

16. THERE HAS BEEN BUREAU INTEREST IN GAINING INFORMATION ON TRAINING AND WID. THESE TWO AREAS OF ACTIVITY ARE REPORTED IN THE CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION AND THE ACTION PLAN RESPECTIVELY. IF YOU HAVE REPORTING THAT YOU BELIEVE IS USEFUL REGARDING THE ABOVE PLEASE INCLUDE IT IN YOUR SUBMISSION.

17. AFR/DP/PPE HAS ALREADY SCHEDULED TWO PROGRAM WEEK REVIEWS FOR AFRICA MISSIONS: SOMALIA BEGINNING MAY 18 AND MALI BEGINNING MAY 27. IN ADDITION, SUDAN AND MOZAMBIQUE HAVE BEEN SINGLED OUT FOR A FULL DAY REVIEW,

BUT NO DATE IS SET AS YET. ALSO THE ZAMBIA COSS UPDATE IS SCHEDULED FOR JUNE 4 TO CORRESPOND WITH THE ABS REVIEW.

IT IS DOUBTFUL THAT THE SOMALIA PROGRAM WEEK CAN BE COMBINED WITH THE ABS PROCESS. WE WILL TRY TO COORDINATE THE OTHER THREE REVIEWS WITH THE BUDGET REVIEW. SHULTZ

UNCLASSIFIED

19

ANNEX 8

**State 292525, 9/18/87,
Africa Bureau Evaluation Initiative**

Department of State

TELEGRAM

PAGE 01 OF 03 STATE 292525
ORIGIN AID-00

9800 03361 AID6670

STATE 292525
ALLOCATION DECISIONS.

9800 03361

ORIGIN OFFICE AFSP-06
INFO AFE-03, AFSS-03, AFPA-03, AFCA-03, AFPO-04, AFTR-05, PPOE-01
STAS-02, STAE-02, SACT-01, ED-03, PCP-04, STPA-01, RELO-01
AFDA-01 /244 AI 219

INFO LGG-03 AF-00 H-01 /301 R

DRAFTED BY: AID/AFR/DP: CCLAPP-VINCEN; TBETHUNE: PB
APPROVED BY: AID/AFR/DP: CHESTLE/

AID/DAA/AFR: ELBAIERS (DRAFT)	AID/AFR/PO: CPEASLEY (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/PO: INAGOS/1 (DRAFT)	AID/AFR/TR: SCHERER (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/DP: ECPEELEY (DRAFT)	AID/AFR/CP: BOACHON (DRAFT)
AID/AFR/SA: RWRH (DRAFT)	AID/AFR/EA: SHINTZ (DRAFT)

292525 161802Z /30

P 181852Z SEP 87 ZEX
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO USAID MISSIONS IN AFRICA PRIORITY

UNCLAS STATE 292525

AIDAC

E.O. 12356: N/A

TAGS:

SUBJECT: AFRICA BUREAU EVALUATION INITIATIVE

1. THE AFRICA BUREAU IS IN THE PROCESS OF ASSESSING ITS EVALUATION PROGRAM IN ORDER TO IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND UTILITY OF EVALUATION WITHIN THE BUREAU. WHILE WE ARE STILL IN THE ASSESSMENT AND PLANNING STAGES OF THIS EFFORT, WE ARE SENDING YOU THIS INTERIM REPORT IN ORDER TO SET THE STAGE FOR THIS YEAR'S ANNUAL SCHEDULING CONFERENCE WHERE EVALUATION WILL BE DISCUSSED, AND TO SEEK COMMENTS FROM THOSE MISSIONS INTERESTED IN CONTRIBUTING TO THIS PLANNING PROCESS.

2. THE PRESIDENT'S INITIATIVE TO END HUNGER IN AFRICA AND THE CURRENTLY PROPOSED LEGISLATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA HAVE SPARKED BUREAU EFFORTS TO IMPROVE AND BROADEN THE SCOPE OF EVALUATION OF A.I.D. ACTIVITIES IN AFRICA. CONGRESSIONAL AND BUREAU INFORMATION NEEDS FOR PROGRAM MANAGEMENT DECISION MAKING AT ALL LEVELS REQUIRE A REASSESSMENT OF OUR BUREAU EVALUATION PROGRAM AND A CONCERTED EFFORT TO DEVELOP A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO EVALUATION.

3. THE NEW DEVELOPMENT FUND FOR AFRICA INCLUDES SIGNIFICANT MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS. IN PROPOSED LEGISLATION BOTH THE HOUSE AND THE SENATE ARE ASKING A.I.D. TO PREPARE AND SUBMIT A SERIES OF REPORTS STARTING IN FEBRUARY 1988 EVALUATING PROGRESS IN ACHIEVING THE OBJECTIVES OF U.S. ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS IN SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA. CONGRESSIONAL PRIORITIES INCLUDE AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, NATURAL RESOURCES, HEALTH, VOLUNTARY FAMILY PLANNING, EDUCATION AND INCOME GENERATING OPPORTUNITIES AND POLICY REFORM. THE CONGRESS SEEKS EVIDENCE OF PROGRESS THROUGH PARTICIPATION OF THE POOR MAJORITY IN A LONG-TERM DEVELOPMENT PROCESS THAT IS EQUITABLE, PARTICIPATORY, ENVIRONMENTALLY SUSTAINABLE, AND SELF-RELIANT.

4. THE AGENCY, THE BUREAU AND THE MISSIONS HAVE THEIR OWN MANAGEMENT INFORMATION NEEDS THAT EXTEND BEYOND THAT OF CONGRESS. FOR EXAMPLE, WITH THE NEW AFRICA DEVELOPMENT FUND, PROGRAMMING WILL, TO A MUCH GREATER EXTENT, BE BASED ON PERFORMANCE. WITH DECREASING LEVELS OF RESOURCES THE MISSIONS AND THE BUREAU WILL NEED BETTER INFORMATION TO MAKE MORE EFFECTIVE RESOURCE

WE ARE PARTICULARLY CONCERNED THAT WE BEGIN TO GO BEYOND MEASURING INPUTS AND OUTPUTS, AND ALSO MEASURE PURPOSE AND GOAL LEVEL ACHIEVEMENT. WE ARE INTERESTED IN MEASURING NOT ONLY SHORT-TERM PROGRESS, THROUGH AN AGREED SET OF INDICATORS BUT ALSO LONG-TERM IMPACT. THE BUREAU'S GOAL IS TO STRENGTHEN OUR OVERALL SYSTEM OF EVALUATION IN ORDER TO 1) DO A BETTER JOB OF ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF AFRICA BUREAU PROGRAMS, AND THROUGH THAT PROCESS, 2) LEARN FROM OUR EXPERIENCE TO IMPROVE OUR EFFECTIVENESS.

5. AT THIS TIME THE BUREAU IS IN THE PLANNING STAGE OF THIS EFFORT AND IS CURRENTLY WORKING TO IDENTIFY AND CATEGORIZE WHAT WE (CONGRESS, AGENCY, AFRID AND MISSIONS) NEED TO KNOW AND THE SYSTEMS REQUIRED FOR COLLECTING AND ANALYZING INFORMATION COLLECTED THROUGH EVALUATION. AT THE REQUEST OF AFR/AFR, THE BUREAU HAS ESTABLISHED AN EVALUATION WORKING GROUP TO IMPROVE MONITORING OF PROGRESS OF OUR PROGRAMS AND IMPROVE COMMUNICATION OF RESULTS WITHIN THE BUREAU AND MISSIONS AND TO CONSIDER AND THE WHITE HOUSE. THE WORKING GROUP HAS ALREADY BEGUN TO IDENTIFY INDICATORS FOR MEASURING PROGRESS AND IMPACT IN FOUR AREAS OF CONCENTRATION: AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION, INCREASING INCOME, HEALTH/CHILD SURVIVAL, AND POPULATION. IN ADDITION TO THIS WORKING

AFR/PO, AFR/TR AND THE GEOGRAPHICAL OFFICES, WE WILL BE SEEKING INPUT AND FEEDBACK FROM THE FIELD THROUGH BRIEFINGS AND PRESENTATIONS AND DISCUSSIONS AT THE VARIOUS BUREAU CONFERENCES SCHEDULED IN THE COMING YEAR (SCHEDULING, ECONOMISTS, MISSION DIRECTORS, HEALTH AND POPULATION, AGRICULTURE, AND EVALUATION CONFERENCES).

6. WE WANT A SYSTEM WHICH WILL PROVIDE AN ONGOING STREAM OF INFORMATION FOR DECISION-MAKING THAT MEASURES PROGRESS AND IMPACT IS:

- POLICY AREA,
- STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION AT THE BUREAU AND COUNTRY PROGRAM LEVELS, AND
- PROGRAM AND PROJECT SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES.

INCREASINGLY WE NEED TO SYNCHRONIZE PROGRAM AND PROJECT PURPOSE LEVEL OBJECTIVES TO COUNTRY PROGRAM STRATEGY OBJECTIVES AS REFLECTED IN OUR ACTION PLANS AND COUNTRY PROGRAM STATEMENTS. THERE ARE DEADLINES FOR REPORTING PROGRESS, ESPECIALLY TO CONGRESS, SO IMMEDIATE SHORT-TERM EFFORTS WILL BE NEEDED. IN ADDITION, WE WILL INITIATE LONGER-TERM EFFORTS TO INSTITUTIONALIZE A BUREAU-WIDE DATA COLLECTION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEM.

7. AT THIS TIME, INFORMATION COLLECTION IS BEING TARGETTED ON THE FOLLOWING AREAS: POLICY REFORM, AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTION AND INCOME, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH, HEALTH/CHILD SURVIVAL, POPULATION, AND NATURAL RESOURCE MANAGEMENT, BECAUSE THESE ARE AREAS FOR WHICH THE BUREAU HAS DEVELOPED STRATEGIES. INFORMATION IS ALREADY AVAILABLE OR IS IN PROCESS OF BEING MADE AVAILABLE FOR EACH OF THESE AREAS. FOR EXAMPLE:

--POLICY AREA: 4) AFR/DP/PAR HAS INITIATED A THREE YEAR EFFORT BY CORNELL UNIVERSITY TO EVALUATE BUREAU PERFORMANCE IN POLICY REFORM WITH EMPHASIS ON UNDERSTANDING THE WAY IN WHICH STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT AFFECTS THE POOREST 20 PERCENT OF THE POPULATION THIS IS A FOLLOW-UP TO THE POLICY REFORM ASSESSMENTS CARRIED OUT IN THE PAST YEAR IN SOMALIA, MALI, CAMBODIA, SAIFE, AND

UNCLASSIFIED

88

SENEGAL. THE SYNTHETIC POLICY REFORM PROGRAMS IN AFRICA. A PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT OF IMPACTS THROUGH 1987, WILL BE REQUESTED TO INCLUDE THE LATTER TWO COUNTRIES. AND BY THE END OF FY 87, AFRIDP HAS REQUESTED INFORMATION FROM MISS AND ON POLICY REFORM ACCOMPLISHMENTS FOR USE IN CONGRESSIONAL TESTIMONY. THIS DATA WILL BE REQUESTED AGAIN IN EARLY CY 1988.

GENERAL INFORMATION ON PROGRAM PROGRESS.

9. ALSO WE ARE PLANNING TO WORK CLOSELY WITH A SELECTED RE-MISSIONS WHO ARE INTERESTED IN BEGINNING TO BEGIN IMPLEMENTING EVALUATION SYSTEMS WITHIN THEIR MISSIONS. WE WOULD BE INTERESTED IN THE REVISIONS OF INTEREST AS WELL AS COMMENTS ON THE SUGGESTIONS IN PARAGRAPH 8 ABOVE.

10. FINALLY, IN ORDER TO WORK MORE CLOSELY WITH THE FIELD AND TO COMMUNICATE OUR EVALUATION INITIATIVE WE ARE PLANNING ONE OF THE APPROXIMATE IN JANUARY FOR MISSION EVALUATION OFFICERS AND AT THE POLICY REFORM OFFICERS. DEPT/EL WILL FOLLOW.

11. WHILE THIS HAS BEEN PRIMARILY A PRELIMINARY REPORT ON EVALUATION PLANS FOR THE BUREAU, WE ENCOURAGE MISSION COMMENTS FOR BY CABLE AND OR AT THE CONFERENCES SCHEDULED THIS FALL AND WINTER. ENULTZ

--BUREAU-LEVEL STRATEGY INITIATIVES: AF AFRITRAPH AND AFRIDP HAVE CONTACTED WITH THE ECONOMIC RESEARCH SERVICE OF USIA TO BEGIN CATALOGING HOUSEHOLD SURVEYS WITH DATA ON INCOME AND AGRICULTURE AND TAKING INTO ACCOUNT WHAT HAS ALREADY BEEN DONE. RECOMMEND APPROPRIATE AND COST EFFECTIVE INDICATORS THAT THE BUREAU COULD USE TO TRACK THE IMPACT OF VARIOUS PROGRAMS IN AGRICULTURE. THIS WILL BE DISCUSSED AT THE ADO CONFERENCE. BY AFRITRAPH WILL DEVELOP A REPORT ON IMPACT OF CHILD SURVIVAL AND POPULATION PROGRAMS IN AFRICA BASED ON THE ADO-CCCD IMPACT DATA COLLECTION SYSTEM, THE EVALUATION PLAN FOR THE AGENCY'S CHILD SURVIVAL INITIATIVE AND A CONTRACT WITH THE BUREAU OF THE CENSUS ON MONITORING AND EVALUATION.

--COUNTRY PROGRAM LEVEL STRATEGY INITIATIVES: THE BUREAU WILL BE DRAWING FROM THE EXPERIENCE WITH FY 1987 ACTION PLANS AS IT ESTABLISHES GUIDANCE FOR EACH OF THE FY 88 ACTION PLANS. IN ADDITION, THE BUREAU WILL BE TARGETTING FOUR OF THE ACTION PLANS SCHEDULED FOR FY 88 AND WORKING WITH THE MISSIONS TO STRENGTHEN THE PLANNING STATEMENTS, IDENTIFY CLEAR BENCHMARKS AND DEVELOP SYSTEMS TO MEASURE PROGRESS AGAINST THOSE BENCHMARKS.

--PROGRAM/PROJECT ACTIVITIES: THE BUREAU WILL CONTINUE TO ASK FOR SUCCESS STORIES, BUT THOSE WITH MORE OF AN EMPIRICAL BASIS. DEPT/EL WILL FOLLOW WHICH WILL ADDRESS WHAT WE ARE SEEKING IN SUCCESS STORIES THAT WILL CONTRIBUTE TO THIS INITIATIVE. ALSO, DEPT/EL WILL FOLLOW WITH MORE DETAILED GUIDANCE ON HOW BUREAU HOPES TO STRENGTHEN PROJECT MONITORING AND EVALUATION IN GENERAL.

8. WHILE SHORT AND LONG-TERM STRATEGIES ARE BEING FURTHER DEVELOPED, THERE ARE ACTIONS THE MISSIONS CAN TAKE WHICH ARE WITHIN THE REALM OF OUR CURRENT PROGRAM MANAGEMENT PRACTICES. THEY ARE THE FOLLOWING:

--IN PREPARING PROJECT PAPERS (PP), DEVELOP SOUND LOGICAL FRAMEWORKS WITH MEASURABLE PURPOSE STATEMENTS THAT THEN PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR BOTH PROJECT EVALUATION AS WELL AS PROGRAM IMPACT EVALUATION. IN ADDITION, AND THIS IS NOW AGENCY POLICY, DEVELOP GOOD DATA COLLECTION, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION PLANS (M & E PLANS) AND BUDGETS THAT OUTLINE HOW DATA COLLECTION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION WILL TAKE PLACE DURING THE COURSE OF PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION. THESE PLANS SHOULD REFLECT TO SOME EXTENT THE GUIDANCE ON M & E PLANS RECENTLY DISTRIBUTED BY PPC/CDIE, AND

--DESIGN MISSION PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEWS TO TRACK EVALUATION ACTIVITY. MORE SPECIFICALLY, YOUR MISSION PIR SHOULD TRACK A) IMPLEMENTATION OF PROJECT M & E PLANS AND SCHEDULED EVALUATIONS, AND B) PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING ACTION DECISIONS RESULTING FROM EVALUATIONS ALREADY CONDUCTED.

THE ABOVE SUGGESTIONS ARE CONCRETE WAYS IN WHICH WE CAN BEGIN TO EMPHASIZE AND TRACK EVALUATION WITHIN EXISTING PROGRAM MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS. WE WOULD STRONGLY WITHIN THE MISSION. A DEPT/EL WILL FOLLOW WITH MORE DETAILED GUIDANCE ON HOW THIS CAN BE USED MORE EFFECTIVELY TO

UNCLASSIFIED

81