



TEAM ACCOUNTABILITY

A guide for USAID team members

The REFORM Initiative
Team Accountability Team

June 1997

THE TEAM ACCOUNTABILITY TEAM

(The REFORM Initiative)

Theressa Pollitt, Team leader

Connie Turner

Susan Brunner

John Mitchell

Curtis Nissly

Paul Thorn

Susan Walls

John Haecker, Coordinator, REFORM Initiative

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE: EMPOWERMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY	2
Greater Empowerment of USAID Staff	2
Accountability in the Reengineered USAID	5
Legal and Regulatory Standards	5
Individual Team Member vs. Collective Team Accountability	9
Operating Unit Accountability	11
CHAPTER TWO: CORE TEAM ACCOUNTABILITY	13
SO Team: Managing to Achieve Results	13
Strategies and Mechanisms for Ensuring Accountability	13
CHAPTER THREE: EXPANDED TEAM--BALANCING	
PARTICIPATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY	15
Strategies for Including Partners and Customers on Expanded Teams	15
Accountability Concerns	16
Procurement and Assistance - Their Link to Accountability	17

INTRODUCTION

The Agency is continuing to foster improvements in management, organization, and personnel issues related to operating unit reengineering efforts. This is being accomplished under the REFORM Initiative announced by the Administrator in early December, 1996. Employees involved in REFORM have developed products that address problems and impediments that missions experience as they reengineer their operations.

The Team Accountability product was developed as part of REFORM. Its purpose is to provide information and reference material to operating unit staff. It addresses the latest issues related to accountability and accountability-related concerns, particularly in a team environment and a reengineered USAID. This document strives to provide concise, comprehensive guidance, including sections on the meaning of empowerment and accountability in USAID; core team accountability (both team and individual); and balancing participation and accountability in the expanded team. It provides illustrative examples describing: when it is appropriate to include our partners in the operations process of the Agency and which strategies may be used to accomplish this; the regulatory and legal authorities designed to enhance Agency accountability; strategies and mechanisms for ensuring accountability; mechanisms to identify roles, and results expected; and procurement and assistance mechanisms.

This document will continue to be a work-in-progress, reviewed and revised regularly as the Agency continues reengineering its operations and continues to learn how empowerment and accountability can be incorporated into our work and culture.

CHAPTER ONE: EMPOWERMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

As part of the reengineered USAID, five core values were established to guide the work of all members of the Agency staff: Customer Focus, Results Orientation, Teamwork, Valuing Diversity, and Empowerment and Accountability. Much has been said about empowerment in the reengineered USAID because it is an easy concept to grasp. However, the concept of accountability is less clear. What does the Agency mean by accountability?

ACCOUNTABILITY: TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR, AND BE HELD ANSWERABLE FOR ACTIONS AND ACHIEVING RESULTS, INDIVIDUALLY OR AS A TEAM.

How does the Agency ensure accountability? To whom are staff accountable and for what are they accountable? How can a Strategic Objective (SO) Team be held accountable for the work of a contractor over which they may have little control? Does a conflict exist when an individual is accountable for results as well as resources?

With the institutionalization of empowerment, Mission Directors overseas have greater authority and are able to operate with more authority and greater independence from Washington. It is expected that these managers will pass along these expanded authorities and will empower their staffs to a greater extent than in the past. Within clearly defined limits, managers now have greater ability to directly commit the U.S. Government. They also have more flexibility to apply resources as the situation and their training and experience dictate. If a manager has been empowered to make decisions, he or she must be delegated sufficient authority and have sufficient knowledge of the relevant legal, ethical, and policy issues. Otherwise they cannot be expected to be willing and capable of assuming accountability for the decisions that result.

GREATER EMPOWERMENT OF USAID STAFF

Some of the first steps taken by the Agency to support empowerment of USAID staff were: flattening and streamlining the organization; improving the span of control; and eliminating unnecessary layering and processes. The Agency also adopted teams as its primary mode for delivering assistance. The use of teams broadens the "power base" by decentralizing decision-making. It is intended to place authority and responsibility, and therefore accountability, in the hands of those closest to the work of foreign assistance.

ADS Chapter 103, "Delegations of Authority", provides policy guidance regarding delegations of authority within the Agency, and makes specific reference to: (1) delegations to USPSCs and non-U.S. citizen employees; (2) delegations to and from AAs, Mission Directors and Other Principal Officers; and (3) delegations related to strategic planning; implementation of strategic, special or support objectives; and grants and cooperative agreements.

In September, 1995, the Administrator issued a Delegation of Authority to the Country Experimental Labs (CELs), supplemental to ADS 103, which has since been extended to apply Agency-wide. **STATE 214481 dated 9/9/95** contains the current guidance on delegations of authority, specifically:

- ! Mission directors **may** redelegate an authority to FSNs and PSCs that involves performance of some inherently governmental functions.
- ! USAID policy is revised to allow FSNs and PSCs to make final policy, budget, programming, and planning decisions.
- ! The policy regarding delegation or redelegation of authority to obligate or sub-obligate funds has NOT changed.
- ! FSN/PSCs may sign USAID implementation or other letters which reflect final policy with the prior clearance of an appropriate USDH.
- ! FSN/PSCs may sign routine implementation or other letters that do not involve final policy decisions without the prior clearance of a USDH employee.
- ! Changes in 4 and 5 above allow FSN/PSC to serve as COTRs, participate on selection panels, and actually make decisions.
- ! FSN/PSCs have authority to serve as division chiefs, and coaches/facilitators of SO and RP teams. They may also participate in the preparation of strategic plans, results frameworks, results indicators, monitoring and evaluation plans, and the annual R4. FSN/PSCs cannot supervise USDH on a permanent, continuing basis.
- ! Mission directors and principal officers will be held accountable for ensuring that:
 - ! USAID staff members are trained and capable of carrying out authorities that are redelegated to them.
 - ! USAID staff, to whom authorities are redelegated, bring to bear the full range of considerations that the mission director would bring to bear in the exercise of authorities, including adherence to U.S. Government ethics and conduct regulations.
 - ! USAID staff and SO teams carry out strategy and performance expectations as defined in the R4 and management contract.

Within the above parameters, USAID management should seek every opportunity to delegate authorities to teams, which will be held accountable for results; but only for results within their manageable interest.

ACCOUNTABILITY IN THE REENGINEERED USAID

1. LEGAL AND REGULATORY STANDARDS

There are a number of regulatory and legal authorities that are designed to enhance Agency accountability. These tools can be used by teams to evaluate and strengthen accountability within the team. For example, existing audit and management control mechanisms are excellent examples of accountability tools that may be used in a team setting to assess performance and results. A list and brief explanation of these mechanisms follow:

OMB Circular A-123, Management Accountability and Control (Point of Contact: M/MPI/MIC, Kyle Schooler)

As we develop and implement strategies for reengineering Agency programs and operations, we should design management structures that help ensure accountability for results, and include appropriate, cost-effective controls. This policy was issued under the authority of the **Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act of 1982 (31 USC 3512) (P.L. 97-255)**. A-123 is a valuable tool that provides useful information regarding the concept of accountability.

A-123 Definitions:

"Management Accountability" is the expectation that managers are responsible for the quality and timeliness of program performance, increasing productivity, controlling costs and mitigating adverse aspects of agency operations, and assuring that programs are managed with integrity and in compliance with applicable law.

"Management Controls" are the organization, policies, and procedures used to reasonably ensure that: (1) programs achieve their intended results; (2) resources are used consistent with agency mission; (3) programs and resources are protected from waste, fraud and mismanagement; (4) laws and regulations are followed; and (5) reliable and timely info is obtained, maintained, reported and used for decision making.

Legal Framework of Accountability:

The Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA P.L. 103-62) requires agencies to develop strategic plans, set performance goals, and report annually on actual performance compared to goals. The Act sets forth the major tenets of a results-oriented approach that focuses on using resources and information to achieve measurable progress toward program outcomes related to program goals. (Point of Contact: PPC)

The Federal Managers Financial Integrity Act of 1982 (31 USC 3512) (P.L. 97-255) establishes specific requirements with regard to management controls: (1) obligations and costs

comply with applicable law; (2) assets are safeguarded against waste, loss, unauthorized use, or misappropriation; and (3) revenues and expenditures are properly recorded and accounted for. The Act encompasses program, operations, and administrative areas as well as accounting and financial management. (Point of Contact: M/MPI/MIC, Kyle Schooler)

The Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act (P.L. 101-576) requires the preparation of an audit of financial statements for 24 Federal agencies. In this process, auditors report on internal controls and compliance with laws and regulations. (Point of Contact: IG/A/FA)

The Inspector General Act (P.L. 95-452 as amended) provides for independent review of agency programs and operations. These reviews should be used to identify and correct problems resulting from inadequate, excessive, or poorly designed controls, and to build appropriate controls into new programs. (Point of Contact: IG/Washington or the cognizant RIG)

Balance of Controls:

Managers and team members must carefully consider the appropriate balance of controls in their programs and operations. Too many controls can result in inefficient and ineffective government. Teams must ensure an appropriate balance between too many controls and too few controls.

Accountability Standards:

Teams should establish accountability controls that are consistent with the following standards:

- ! Compliance with law;
- ! Reasonable assurance and safeguards;
- ! Integrity, competence and attitude;
- ! Established delegations of authority and organization;
- ! Separation of duties and supervision;
- ! Access to and accountability for resources;
- ! Recording and documentation;
- ! Resolution of audit findings and other deficiencies.

ADS Chapter 591, "Financial Audits of USAID Contractors", Grantees and Host Government Recipients (Point of Contact: M/MPI/MIC, Connie Turner)

This reference provides Agency policy and procedures for planning, implementing and responding to financial audits of USAID-funded contractors, grantees, and foreign government recipients.

Use of Financial Audit Reports:

Most of the organizations to which USAID provides money, whether under a contract or grant, and whether a prime recipient or a subrecipient, are required to have some type of periodic audit of U.S. Government-provided funds.

Typically, financial audits are designed to determine whether: (1) the financial statements of an institution fairly represent its financial position and the results of its operations in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles or other basis of accounting; (2) the costs charged to the Government are fair, reasonable, adequately supported, and allocable in accordance with the applicable terms of the agreement or Government regulations; (3) adequate internal controls exist to safeguard the proper use of U.S. Government funds, commodities, and materials; and (4) implementing organizations comply with applicable laws, regulations, and agreement terms. The examination of these areas by auditors often reveals information related to whether the organization is achieving the results expected by USAID.

Inquiries regarding audit history of specific organizations and/or requests for copies of audit reports may be made to M/OP/PS/CAM (for U.S.-based organizations), IG/A/FA, or the cognizant RIG (for foreign-based recipients).

Resources within the Mission:

There are a number of individuals within a mission typically involved in the audit program, other than the Contracting Officer or Controller, who can serve as resources to the team regarding accountability issues:

- ! ***The Mission Audit Management Officer*** (1) develops and maintains the mission's audit inventory database; (2) coordinates with the OIG or RIG, mission activity manager, and other mission officials; (3) advises and reports to the mission Management Control Review Committee (MCRC); and (4) acts as liaison official to ensure that audit recommendations are resolved and closed in a timely manner.

- ! ***The Activity Manager***, who is the member of an SO or RP team designated to manage a given activity or set of activities: (1) ensures that all contracts/grants with non-U.S. organizations are included in the mission's audit inventory, and adequate funding is made available for the required audits; (2) participates in

developing an annual audit management plan; and (3) advises the Audit Management Officer on the status of audit recommendations and significant issues that should be brought to the attention of the MCRC.

- ! ***The Management Control Review Committee*** (1) provides oversight for the audit follow-up process; (2) serves as a decision-making body in situations involving audit follow-up impasses; (3) provides oversight for the identification, correction and reporting of mission material weaknesses; and (4) serves as a policy and decision-making body for matters deemed appropriate by the mission or SO teams.

ADS Chapter 103, "Delegations of Authority"

(Point of Contact: GC, Jan Miller)

Refer to section "Greater Empowerment of USAID Staff"
beginning on Page 2.

2. INDIVIDUAL TEAM MEMBER VS. COLLECTIVE TEAM ACCOUNTABILITY

Team members are accountable individually and collectively for achieving results. Team members are sometimes confused as to whom they are accountable and what they are accountable for. This confusion may be compounded because often the problem relates to which entity must be satisfied. SO teams may be accountable to management, customers, partners and/or stakeholders simultaneously.

Different individuals are accountable for different aspects of achieving results while serving on SO teams, depending upon their role as a team member. Within the team, the Intermediate Results or Results Package subteam or Activity Manager provides the first line of accountability and authority, as they are closest to the development problems being addressed. Within each subteam, there should be individuals responsible for managing the resources provided to that team. SO team members should have a clear understanding of their individual role and responsibilities within the team.

Aside from the supervisory responsibilities with which certain senior managers and team leaders might be vested, responsibilities for many USAID employees have shifted due to the Agency's adoption of the use of teams to accomplish its work. Team members, team leaders, and supervisors or senior management should work collaboratively and supportively to ensure that accountability is (1) tied specifically to delegated authorities; (2) related to the requirements of the team's stated objectives; and (3) described on the team members' annual evaluation forms. Individuals need a clear understanding of their roles and responsibilities in order to be held accountable.

- ! **Senior Managers** should serve as coaches and mentors. They should provide operating and authority parameters governing the SO team operations: the objective to be achieved, consistent with the approved strategic plan; performance measures and reporting requirements; the budget for achieving the SO; and any other requirements or special conditions. They hold the team accountable for results within its manageable interest.

- ! **Core team members** are expected to hold themselves accountable and to ensure that the team has the capacity, experience, judgment, and technical knowledge required to achieve results. Teams are accountable to management to ensure that results are achieved as planned, or if problems are encountered that hinder achievement of the expected results, that corrective action occurs.

! **Team leaders** are responsible for coaching, coordinating and assigning the work of the team. The team leader is accountable for the overall performance of the team.

3. OPERATING UNIT ACCOUNTABILITY

Operating units are responsible for developing strategic plans for program funds for which they have responsibility and authority. They must ensure the participation of interested USAID offices, partners, customers, and relevant stakeholders through planning, achieving, and performance monitoring and evaluation. Additionally, within the scope of its management contract, DOAs and agency directives, operating units must manage the implementation of the strategic plan, review performance, and report annually on that performance to their respective bureaus. Finally, during the course of implementation, they must ensure that their SO teams gather and use performance information to manage for results and that adequate resources are programmed for performance monitoring and evaluation.

ADS Chapter 203, "Performance Monitoring and Evaluation", is an excellent source of information. Its objective is to establish the framework for monitoring and evaluating overall Agency and operating unit performance. Towards that end, the Agency and its operating units must regularly collect and review data and information related to performance in order to continuously improve:

- ! The planning and implementation of development assistance;
- ! The effectiveness of management decisions and processes;
- ! The means by which the Agency learns through its experience; and
- ! The ability of the Agency to meet accountability and reporting requirements.

Operating units and SO teams conduct reviews as often as necessary, but are required at least once a year to assess progress toward achieving their strategic objectives, strategic support objectives, special objectives, and USAID-funded intermediate results in the results framework. These reviews serve operating unit internal management and planning needs. At least one of these reviews must provide analysis for the annual R4 report.

The results review section(s) of the R4 report must address the operating unit's performance for the immediate past fiscal year, focusing on progress made toward achievement of the SO, SSO, and SPOs. The R4 is also to be used for revalidating the operating unit's strategy based on progress and refining indicators and targets.

The ADS states that the following information shall be used to conduct the R4 results review:

- ! Data on the performance indicators of strategic objectives, strategic support objectives, special objectives and USAID-funded intermediate results;
- ! Information regarding critical assumptions in the strategic plan and intermediate

results supported by other donors;

- ! Information from any relevant evaluation activities completed during the period under review; and any other relevant information.

CHAPTER TWO: CORE TEAM ACCOUNTABILITY

SO TEAM: MANAGING TO ACHIEVE RESULTS

USAID staff in the core team are accountable for "managing for results" and are responsible for taking whatever actions are needed within legal parameters, to enhance the prospects for achieving significant development results. However, actually achieving results is only one indicator of success. Failure to achieve expected results must be explained, but does not, in and of itself, signify failure to "manage for results."

SO teams are accountable for achieving results, and also for ensuring that resources expended to achieve the results are used efficiently and effectively. They also are accountable for ensuring that all legal requirements are met.

STRATEGIES AND MECHANISMS FOR ENSURING ACCOUNTABILITY

Position Descriptions - Supervisors use position descriptions as the means by which they accurately reflect the current duties and responsibilities inherent in a position as well as knowledge, skills, complexity, and the scope and effect of the position. They can specifically reflect the expected level of participation or leadership of teams and are used as the basis for identifying and defining annual work objectives.

Work Objectives - Team members are accountable individually and collectively within the context of annual evaluation work objectives based on expected results. Work objectives should state the scope of a team member's expected contributions and performance measures. Team members are also expected to contribute input to each team member's objectives as well as providing 360 degree feedback within the personnel evaluation system at rating time.

Delegations of Authority - See "Greater Empowerment of USAID Staff"

Team Contract - A contract between the team and management is highly recommended, and is among the best practices identified by REFORM. Among other things, this contract establishes the specific strategic or special objective to be achieved; the authorities delegated from the mission director and the parameters by which the team will operate; when a team is empowered to make decisions; when it must defer to senior management; the results expected and performance indicators; and the resources available.

Team Charter - Adopting a team charter can be beneficial to ensuring accountability. This is a document governing the internal team operations. Team members identify and agree on specific results to be achieved, how those results will be measured, how the team itself will interact as a team, the roles of the team members, how to deal with non-performers, and any other

criteria the team feels critical to ensuring success. One such criterion is how decision-making will occur and the importance of being respectful of individual contributions and specific knowledge or authorities individuals, such as procurement officials, bring to the team. *Working in a team environment does not negate the regulatory or legislative restrictions that apply to how the work must be accomplished.*

The **Core Team** consists of USAID staff, possibly including, but not limited to, a team leader, acquisition specialist, financial analyst, various technical and program staff, a legal advisor and perhaps a gender specialist. Our partners and customer representatives join the Core Team to create the **Expanded Team**, who together are committed to achieving a strategic objective.

CHAPTER THREE: EXPANDED TEAM--BALANCING PARTICIPATION AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The role of accountability varies from that required of U.S. government employees and others authorized to carry out inherently U.S. Government functions, to that of contractors who, under performance based contracts, are legally and contractually accountable for expected results. A balance needs to be struck that maximizes use of the development knowledge, experience, and skills possessed by customer representatives and partners in order to achieve development results and meet U.S. foreign assistance objectives, and ensuring that potential implementors of USAID programs gain no unfair advantage as a result of engaging in consultation. The inclusion of partners and other expanded team members in as much of USAID's work as is appropriate, will increase ownership and support from those partners and will favorably affect partner accountability.

STRATEGIES FOR INCLUDING PARTNERS AND CUSTOMERS ON EXPANDED TEAMS

Differing goals and needs of both internal USAID team members as well as external team members can sometimes contribute to conflict. How is inclusion of external team members accomplished without jeopardizing the ability to achieve results? How can USAID best utilize partners who may become implementors while avoiding the occurrence of unfair competitive advantage? How can direct hire staff enforce or be held accountable themselves for the achievements of partners?

Strategic Planning - Participation and consultation are essential features of the Agency's strategic planning and implementation process. Once the mission forms an internal planning team to manage the planning process, it sponsors seminars and public meetings to obtain input from PVOs, NGOs, and consulting firms. Discussions with individuals and organizations concerning basic strategies is appropriate. The internal team then prepares the plan for USAID/W approval.

SO Teams - Once a core SO team comprising of USAID staff is formed, external SO team members from counterpart host-country government agencies, the private sector, PVOs/NGOs, customer representatives, and/or other donors can be identified using criteria such as local knowledge, specialized skills, relevant experience, and a role in achieving the strategic objective. External SO team members may not participate in activities that lead directly and predictably to a statement of work.

Evaluation Panels - External SO team members may serve on technical evaluation panels for contracts and agreements if not barred because of personal or institutional associations with grantees or contractors competing for awards under the specific activity.

Results Review - External team members can participate in operating unit/SO results reviews.

Results Packages - External team members can be consulted during development, monitoring, and updating of Results Packages. Agency partners should be encouraged and expected to participate in strategy and results package development, implementation, and evaluation. Ultimately, the appropriate form and level of participation by contractors, partners, and customers will be determined by the operating unit as circumstances at post dictate, and within existing legal strictures.

Team or Partnering Agreement - This is an agreement or contract between the operating unit or SO team and its external partners. While it does not have the force of statute, it may provide a mechanism to exert control over the accountability of partners through inclusion of specific, limiting language. This agreement may follow the same format as the Team Contract or Team Charter discussed in Chapter 2, "Strategies and Mechanisms for Ensuring Accountability," or it may be defined verbally.

Evaluations - Evaluations of partners and their representatives are intended to serve as a basis for decisions as to whether to work with that partner or representative again. Such evaluations can also be integrated into performance-based contracts and grants. USAID/W has recently established a database to collect and store past performance evaluations on all USAID contractors (**Point of Contact: M/OP, Joseph Beausoleil**).

Automated Directives System (ADS) - The ADS, specifically Chapters 202 and 203, provides useful information related to accountability. Chapter 202, "Achieving Results," provides detailed information regarding responsibilities of operating units; the processes of a Results Package; and the composition, responsibilities and authorities of the SO team. Chapter 203, "Performance Monitoring and Evaluation," contains useful information regarding monitoring and evaluation policy, using information to manage for results, and participation in performance monitoring and evaluation (**Point of Contact: PPC**).

Proactive Measures - Mechanisms such as field trips, frequent SO team meetings, and ongoing monitoring of activities.

ACCOUNTABILITY CONCERNS

Organizational conflicts of interest are set out in the **Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), Subpart 9.5**, and in **Contract Information Bulletin (CIB) 94-2 and Supplement**. If an organization (partner) designs an activity or develops material that leads directly and predictably to a statement of work for a contract--regardless of whether the work is done under a contract or assistance instrument -- that organization (partner) may not, with a few limited exceptions, compete for the implementation contract, either as a prime or sub-contractor (**Point of Contact: M/OP/POL**).

Examples of When Conflicts May Occur and May Result in Preclusion From Competing:

- ! From the time an identifiable action is taken to start a procurement, (e.g. drafting a scope of work), until the contract is awarded or a work order is finalized, proprietary and source selection information may not be released without the approval of the contracting officer, and Agency officials involved with procurement may not, among other things, speak with potential contractors about business or employment opportunities without approval of the Ethics Counsel.
- ! In the design of specific activities when an organization can look out for its own interests and design toward its own strengths, or when privileged information is obtained.
- ! When material is provided that leads directly and predictably to a work statement.
- ! Consultation with potential contractors regarding the content of the SOW.

Examples of Activities that Do Not Raise an Issue of Organizational Conflict:

- ! Mission staff holds a series of meetings with NGOs on how best to implement an SO.
- ! Mission solicits written views from NGOs on potential activities that could be undertaken under an SO.
- ! Having participated in a number of SO team discussions, core team members preparing to write an SOW for a contract meet with a number of NGOs, customers and others. A consultation with the Contracting Officer determines that the core team holds oral discussions only with end-users and others who will not be bidding. Potential bidders will be consulted only on specific issues and only in writing.

PROCUREMENT AND ASSISTANCE

-

THEIR LINK TO ACCOUNTABILITY

An important function of a team is to properly determine whether its program requirement falls into the category of assistance (grants/cooperative agreements) or acquisition (contracts). Drafting the requirement in writing will help to make this determination, along with the technical expertise and guidance provided by the procurement team member.

Performance Based Contracts

In terms of accountability the performance statement of work (SOW) is one of the first

and most critical documents prepared in the contracting process. A performance statement of work:

- ! Identifies the work required to be accomplished;
- ! Establishes a basis for evaluating offerors' proposals;
- ! Forms the core of any resulting contract; and
- ! Develops criteria to evaluate a contractor's performance.

A **Quality Assurance Plan** should be developed which directly corresponds to the performance standards against which a contractor's performance will be measured. The plan will be used to determine if the contractor is meeting the contract requirements. Positive and/or negative performance incentives, based on the plan measurements, should be included. The performance statement of work, performance standards, the Quality Assurance Plan, and the contract incentives are interdependent and must be compatible in form, style, and substance, and must be cross-referenced.

After the team has developed the performance statement of work, the type of contract most appropriate for the requirement should be selected. The procurement team member can provide expertise and guidance in the selection. Each type of contract should contain substantive terms; i.e., description (a performance statement of work); quantity (amount of service); location for performance; inspection and acceptance; delivery schedule or period of performance; and pricing method.

Payment of fee may be conditioned on the contractor's meeting performance requirements of the performance statement of work and other terms of the contract. Adjustments to the fee paid to the contractor occur if the outcomes of performance do not meet the targets stipulated in the contract. Terms for reductions or adjustments are specified in the contract.

M/OP/W has awarded numerous performance based contracts and maintains a listing of active contracts. A training course has also been developed. The procurement team member can provide guidance and assistance in coordinating sample contracts and training course materials.

Performance Based Assistance Agreements

The design of a performance based assistance agreement utilizes the same concepts as performance based contracts. A recipient's technical application must set forth in detail the strategies, interim results, activities, and indicators to best accomplish the stated strategic objectives and results. The technical portion of the application must be able to stand alone. Therefore, like the performance based contract, the government identifies the strategic objectives and results to be accomplished and allows the recipients the ability to use originality, creativity and technical merit to construct an overall framework that can best achieve the strategic

objectives and results. This is a relatively new frontier of development assistance for USAID, and may be utilized when Agency goals and strategic objectives are identified through results packages and initiatives developed by teams.

Evaluation and Award

In the evaluation and award process for both performance based contracts and assistance agreements, we are evaluating the best overall value to the Government, based on such factors as technical expertise of staff, technical approach, cost control, past performance, and management expertise. The team's evaluation panel should stress oral presentations; they give the evaluation team an opportunity to meet key personnel of the prospective contractor and grantee. This process allows the evaluation team to assess how the individuals interact as a team, as well as how they will interact with their proposed subcontractors and subrecipients. This interactive process also allows the evaluation team to assess how the contractor/grantee team will manage the contract/grant and how they will achieve results.

Performance Monitoring/Progress Evaluation/Tracking

All of the time and effort spent in developing and awarding performance based instruments will not compensate for a lack of performance monitoring and progress tracking once the instrument is in place. After the award, the work begins. It is a joint partnering effort between the team and its contractors/grantees to ensure that everything possible is done to achieve results. The team's Activity Manager and Contracting Officer Technical Representative (COTR) must work closely with contractors/grantees to ensure that interim results are being achieved, and if not, that needed corrections are made early on. The procurement team member can provide guidance and assistance. The concept of accountability as related to contractors, grantees, and team members is predicated on partnering arrangements throughout the life of the agreement/contract. Results will directly correlate with how well contracts and agreements are being monitored and tracked for performance and progress.

Examples

- ! Performance Based Contract: "Cost Plus Award Fee Contract" for "Quality Assurance in Health Care Services in Developing Countries." This contract was awarded in September 1996 for the Global Bureau PHN Center, Contract No. HRN-C-00-96-00013. The COTR point of contact in G/PHN is Dr. James Heiby at 703-875-4575. Dr. Heiby can provide information regarding the development of the statement of work (SOW). For an electronic copy of the RFP, contact Ms. Theresa Pollitt, M/OP, at 703-875-1082.

- ! Performance Based Assistance: A "Performance Based Cooperative Agreement" which provides support for BCM activities in developing countries. The agreement was awarded in November 1996 for the Global Bureau PHN Center, Cooperative Agreement No. HRN-A-00-97-00007-00. This instrument is

currently being utilized as a model for further performance based assistance initiatives in the Global Bureau. The Activity Manager point of contact in G/PHN is Ms. Susan Anthony at 703-875-4035. For an electronic copy of the RFA, contact Ms. Theresa Pollitt, M/OP, at 703-875-1082.