



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



## EVALUATION

# BUREAU FOR POLICY, PLANNING AND LEARNING: EVALUATION OF PROGRAM CYCLE IMPLEMENTATION

September 2013

This publication was produced at the request of the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared independently by EnCompass LLC.

# **BUREAU FOR POLICY, PLANNING AND LEARNING: EVALUATION OF PROGRAM CYCLE IMPLEMENTATION**

## **CDCS REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT**

September 6, 2013

Contract No. AID-OAA-M-12-00021; Evaluation Mechanism No.M/OAA/GRO/LMA-12-00800

This document is a supplement to the full evaluation report, which can be accessed on the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC), and was prepared by Evaluation Team Member Leslie Fox.

### **DISCLAIMER**

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

## CDCS REVIEW SUMMARY REPORT

### 1 REVIEW PURPOSE

One component of the overall *Bureau for Policy, Planning and Learning: Evaluation of Program Cycle Implementation* methodology was the review of the principal Program Cycle documents, i.e., Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCS), Evaluation SOWs and Project Approval Designs (PADs) to determine the degree to which they aligned with the concerned Bureau for Policy, Planning and Learning (PPL) program guidance. This report presents the CDCS review. While this review was undertaken to determine adherence to the CDCS guidance, it can also be considered a proxy for assessing the actual quality of the CDCSs reviewed; quality being, in this case, a function of applying developed guidance to preparation of USAID country strategies.

### 2 REVIEW METHODOLOGY

Eighteen CDCSs were reviewed for this evaluation (see **Appendix 1** for the complete list). This represented all approved country CDCSs (as opposed to regional or sub-regional, programs, or countries in transition such as Southern Sudan) as of January 1, 2013.

Eight evaluation categories, consisting of three to ten criteria, were developed from the CDCS Guidance<sup>1</sup> to evaluate adherence to areas such as Development Context, Results Framework, Monitoring and Evaluation, Resources and Priorities (see **Error! Reference source not found.** for the complete list). Each CDCS was reviewed against the criteria using a rating system as follows: yes (complying with guidance), no (not complying), or somewhat (at least some degree of compliance). A not applicable (N/A) category was also included. The ratings were entered into a Country Worksheet (CWS) in Excel with compliance scores generated for each category (see example in **Appendix 3**). Scores from all 18 CWSs were then entered into a Master Dashboard (see **Appendix 4**), which aggregated scores from each CWS per category / criteria. The CWS scores provided the basis for the analysis used to evaluate adherence to the guidance.

A threshold of 80% average compliance for each category was used to determine broad adherence to the guidance. The 80% threshold was deemed a reasonable starting point as this review measured countries first use of the guidance in the development of their country strategies.

### 3 ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Three of eight categories achieved the threshold score of 80%, as shown in **Exhibit 1**. The majority of countries had one or more category scores that require attention by either improving the guidance itself, a better application by the countries, or, improving quality control by the concerned parties (e.g., Mission Management, Regional Bureaus or through the Washington review process). The discussion that follows examines the individual categories and the criteria that compose them. **Exhibit 2** in **Appendix 3** provides more details on the analysis used to prepare the points addressed in the discussion.

---

<sup>1</sup> USAID Country Development Cooperation Strategy Guidance, Version 3, 11/09/2011

Exhibit 1: CDCS Summary Scores: Results by Country and Alignment Categories/ Criteria

Country (CDCS version)	A. Development Context, Challenges Opportunities	B. Development Hypothesis	C. Results Framework Paper	D. M&E and Learning	E. GCC Strategy	F. GEFE Policy	G. Management Requirement	H. Program Resources & Priorities
Albania (2)	100%	83%	93%	79%	N/A*	80%**	100%	100%
Azerbaijan (2)	75%	67%	77%	64%	N/A*	70%	100%	100%
Bangladesh (2)	100%	100%	97%	100%	100%*	100%**	100%	75%
Bosnia Herzegovina (2)	100%	83%	88%	71%	100%*	90%**	100%	100%
Ethiopia (2)	100%	83%	90%	93%	83%*	70%**	38%	50%
Georgia (3)	100%	100%	100%	79%	83%	70%	100%	100%
Ghana (2)	88%	83%	95%	86%	83%	100%	75%	100%
Guatemala (3)	100%	100%	97%	93%	100%	100%**	100%	100%
Jordan (3)	88%	50%	82%	79%	N/A	90%	100%	50%
Liberia (2)	100%	50%	93%	57%	25%	60%	75%	0%
Mongolia (2)	100%	83%	85%	50%	50%	70%	88%	75%
Peru (2)	100%	50%	83%	71%	0%	75%	75%	75%
Russia (2)	100%	67%	77%	71%	0%*	70%**	100%	100%
Senegal (2)	100%	100%	88%	64%	100%	100%	100%	100%
Sri. Lanka (2)	88%	67%	88%	79%	N/A*	80%**	0%	0%
Uganda (2)	100%	100%	100%	100%	83%*	60%**	100%	50%
Ukraine(3)	88%	50%	90%	57%	83%	80%**	100%	100%
Zambia (2)	88%	83%	83%	88%	100%*	100%**	75%	50%
<b>AVERAGE</b>	95.28%	77.72 %	89.22%	76.72%	65.50%	79.38%	84.78%	73.61%

\*Countries that developed their CDCS before the GCCD Strategy was released by USAID/W (January 2012). N/A is applied to countries that did not have any climate change results, initiatives or activities

\*\*Countries that developed their CDCS before the GEWE Policy was released by USAID/W (March 2012).

### 3.1 DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT, OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES

As might be expected, Category A was the highest scoring category of the eight reviewed (95.3%), with only one country failing to reach the 80% threshold. Scores were 90% or better for all four criteria within the category.

Development Context, Opportunities and Challenges	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
1	<b>Does the CDCS describe the development context?</b> This section should cite economic, social, political, governance, and demographic indices, and identify important national and regional trends in security, economic development, political dynamics and special circumstances related to state fragility, conflict, or post-conflict transitions.
2	<b>Does the CDCS discuss the overarching U.S. foreign policy and national security considerations in the country?</b>
3	<b>Does the CDCS highlight the most important development challenges and opportunities facing the host country? Do the development challenges and opportunities identified in the CDCS reflect the analyses found in this first chapter?</b>
4	<b>Is the CDCS evidence based and does it provide relevant analysis?</b> The challenges and opportunities described should be based on evidence and analysis drawn from relevant studies and data, including the country's poverty reduction strategy; World Bank and International Monetary Fund assessments; geospatial analysis; and research, evaluations, and analysis commissioned by USAID, other USG agencies, other donors, the private sector, and independent policy research organizations.

The Missions demonstrated extreme candor in their CDCSs, highlighting the political, social, and economic challenges facing their countries.

### 3.2 DEVELOPMENT HYPOTHESIS

Overall, Category B did not meet the 80 % threshold (77.7) indicating countries' non-compliance with the guidance. Eleven of 18 countries met the threshold and seven did not. Criteria 1 and 2 just passed the threshold, both with 81.6 % scores, while Criterion 3 was at 71.1 %.

Development Hypothesis	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
1	<b>Is the CDCS based upon a sound development hypothesis that describes the theory of change, logic, and causal relationships principal development results?</b> This section explains why and how the proposed investments from USAID and others collectively lead to achieving the DOs and ultimately the CDCS Goal.
2	<b>Is the development hypothesis clearly articulated?</b> It includes a short narrative that explains the relationships between each layer of results (in the Results Framework, upwards from the sub-Intermediate Results (sub-IRs), to the IRs, the DOs, and the CDCS Goal.
3	<b>Is there an identified theory of change that underlies the development hypothesis?</b> A theory of change is the conceptual framework of causal relationships that explains the logic framed in the development hypothesis

Only two countries mentioned a theory of change (TOC) in their development hypothesis. This does not necessarily mean there was not a TOC but rather that many missions may not have

been familiar with the concept and/or preferred to talk about the development hypothesis in terms of causal relationships. CDCSs were not penalized for not specifically mentioning a TOC in this section of their strategies, but reviewers gave this criterion a non-compliance or somewhat score if the CDCS did not discuss the overall Results Framework set of causal relationships from Goal to at least Development Objectives and the underlying development hypothesis which they represent.

### 3.3 RESULTS FRAMEWORK

Ten different criteria were extracted from the CDCS guidance on the Category C Results Framework. Several of these criteria were actually indices composed of two or more “sub-criteria.” Each table below includes the principal category finding, followed by findings around these sub- criteria/indices.

The overall Category C score was nearly 90 % (89.2), with 16 out of the 18 countries meeting the 80 % threshold.

<b>1</b>	<b>Is the RF presentation based on the standardized design format found in the guidance and supported by accompanying narrative that addresses how USAID can best address the specific development challenges and opportunities identified by the Mission, based on evidence, to achieve its DOs and CDCS Goal, including:</b>
<b>Results Framework</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
a.	Does the RF demonstrate that the Mission is progressing toward the CDCS Goal as it advances toward achieving the DOs?
b.	Do the indicators demonstrate that there is movement towards the achievement of the Goal?
c.	Does the CDCS Goal reflect the cumulative impact of the DOs and capture the RF’s internal logic, i.e., if the DOs are accomplished or advanced, progress will be made toward achieving the CDCS Goal?
d.	Does the CDCS specify any other <u>critical elements</u> , in addition to the DOs, that are necessary to achieve the CDCS Goal such as host country commitments, results from other donors, and factors outside of USAID’s control?
e.	Does the CDCS Goal and associated DOs show progress toward <u>sustainability</u> and a reduction of future USAID support as appropriate?
f.	Are the roles of USAID and its partners in helping to achieve the CDCS Goal described in the RF narrative, including the specific contributions of the host country government, civil society, the private sector, State Department, other USG agencies, and others donors as appropriate.
g.	Do indicators demonstrate that the CDCS Goal (or progress toward the CDCS Goal) is measurable and achievable?
h.	Are the DOs based on the strategic priorities defined by the Mission, not solely on the size of the supporting assistance programs

Criteria 1 is an index composed of eight sub-criteria and assesses whether the presentation of the Results Framework discussion follows the format guidance, looks at the relationship between the overall CDCS goal and the Development Objectives, and how well these objectives address the challenges, opportunities, and Development Hypothesis identified in the first two CDCS sections.

The overall average for Criteria 1 was 88%, which indicates that all Missions were able to articulate their strategies to the corresponding Results Frameworks in a way that responded to the challenges addressed in the opening context section with more than adequate discussions of

critical elements necessary to achieve the Goal /Development Objectives, roles of USAID and its partners, etc.

Only one of the eight sub-criteria failed to reach the threshold: e. *Does the CDCS Goal and associated DOs show progress toward sustainability and a reduction of future USAID support as appropriate?* There were certainly some countries, largely those in Central and Eastern Europe (CEE) which were either graduating from USAID assistance or were likely to do so, that sometimes, but not always, showed a plan for phasing USAID assistance. Perhaps the guidance on this particular issue needs to be better clarified, because there were no CDCS' that discussed sustainability well (eight countries were in compliance and 11 countries addressed it "somewhat").

There is also somewhat of a lack of clarity in the sense that most of the countries in this review, and in which USAID works more generally, are not on a trajectory for moving beyond development assistance in the near future. This makes the discussion of sustainability and the reduction of USAID support problematic. What would likely help address this issue is if there was a brief discussion of USAID's history of support to the concerned country that that showed where the current CDCS is in the continuum of initial support to the country's and projected future assistance.

While the final sub-criterion of this category index: *Are the DOs based on the strategic priorities defined by the Mission, not solely on the size of the supporting assistance programs*, scored nearly 90% across all countries, it was noted that evaluating whether a Mission's strategic priorities drove budgeting decisions was not quite as straight forward a measure as the score indicates. Based on several Case Studies, as well as a review of the Resource and Priority sections of the CDCSs, it was not always clear whether Missions received their indicative budget allocations and tailored their strategies to meet them, or whether the strategies were the result of responding to the analyses that formed the bases of the Context Chapter. Given the importance of Presidential Initiatives and a general decline in overall foreign assistance funding, there would seem to be at least a parameter setting role for budgets, including Presidential Initiatives, if not a greater role.

<b>2</b>	<b>Do DOs, with supporting IRs, provide evidence to answer the following questions as part of the RF narrative:</b>
<b>Results Framework</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
a.	Do the DOs contribute to the CDCS Goal? Are the causal linkages clear and plausible?
b.	Is the DO based on a clear development hypothesis and strong evidence, including from evaluations conducted by the Mission?
c.	Can the intended impact of the DO be determined? Does it show the magnitude of change anticipated over the life of the CDCS?
d.	Does the DO address identified sources of conflict, fragility, instability or vulnerability, if any?
e.	Does the DO focus USAID resources?
f.	Does the DO reflect USAID's comparative advantage in the country and a division of labor with other development partners, including the private sector?
g.	Does the DO take into account the political, economic, and social dynamics that influence development outcomes and impacts in the country or region?
h.	Are clear roles articulated for the host country government, civil society, and private sector and others to help achieve the DO?



i.	Does the DO narrative discuss USG diplomatic efforts or other interagency support needed to achieve the DO?
j.	Does the DO discuss reducing gaps between the status of males and females, enhancing the leadership and expertise of women and girls, and meeting their needs?
k.	Does the DO consider the particular issues associated with youth, minority groups, persons with disabilities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities?

Criterion 2 is an index of 11 sub-criteria. The principal focus of this section is on the Development Objectives, their individual and combined contribution to the CDCS Goal and the logic and linkages of the Intermediate Results (and sub-Intermediate Results) and their contribution to the Development Objectives, that is, the logic of the entire Results Framework. The 11 sub-criteria of this category index averaged 91 % across all countries. Missions scored no lower than 84 % on any of these sub-criteria (2b and 2f) and one scored 100 % across all countries (2j), which was indicative of the generally solid treatment of gender across the 18 countries. The only note of caution here concerns how well Development Objectives are actually based on strong evidence, including from evaluations (analyses and assessments) conducted by the Missions. From the perspective of reviewing adherence to the guidance, it was not the reviewer’s role to comment on whether the evidence generated from the analyses always led to the best choice of challenges to address; second-guessing the judgments of Missions is, in general, beyond the scope of the reviewer’s role. Having said that, there were several country strategies where the analyses, evaluations and assessments found in both the Context and Development Hypothesis sections were so compelling in setting up a clear conflict between what was chosen and what was analyzed as to require at least a “somewhat’ scoring.

<b>3</b>	<b>Non-USAID Resources:</b>
<b>Results Framework</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
a.	For each DO, does the CDCS narrative include assumptions about the results and impacts achieved through <u>non-USAID</u> resources, including other USG agencies, the host country government, other donors, multilateral development institutions, non-governmental organizations, and private sector organizations?
b.	Does this section outline how efforts are coordinated to create a division of labor among development actors?

Criterion 3, including two sub-criteria, scored at or above 90 %, indicative of the relatively in-depth discussions both in the narratives and in the annexes concerning the roles and resources of other development partners, US inter-agencies and host country actors, including governments, private sectors, and civil society.

<b>4</b>	<b>Special/Support Objectives:</b> If the Mission has proposed a Special Objective(s), has it provided a compelling reason why a DO is not appropriate to address the particular issue?
<b>5</b>	<b>Focus and Selectivity:</b> Does the CDCS demonstrate that the Mission is focusing strategically to maximize the impact of USAID resources in partnership with various stakeholders? Does he CDCS address each of the following means of targeting and prioritizing USAID interventions, highlighting any trade-offs
<b>Results Framework</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria</b>



With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance	
a.	Is there a clearly articulated <u>division of labor</u> between the Mission and other development actors', including resources and non-assistance tools, so that it can maximize the impact of its assistance and better focus in areas where it has a comparative advantage.
b.	Has the Missions proposed a <u>geographic focus</u> and whether interventions can be more effectively advanced by targeting resources in a defined area(s)? This could also include the targeting of specific populations and beneficiaries within regions, such as economically vulnerable households or particular communities.
c.	Has the Mission demonstrated and justified a prioritization of <u>sectors and sub-sectors</u> in terms of advancing the CDCS Goal?
d.	Has the Mission demonstrated its intention to build the capacity of specific <u>institutions</u> and related governance <u>systems</u> at the state (national), regional (sub-national), or local levels – or a combination of these – to achieve sustainable results?

The four sub-criteria that compose Criterion 5 averaged slightly more than 90 % with no Mission failing to reach the 80 % threshold. Missions were strong in their discussions on each of the sub-criteria: division of labor, geographic and sectoral focus and prioritization, and capacity building of institutions and governance systems. Mission's scored significantly higher on the discussion of geographic focus than they did on sector and sub-sector prioritization (94.7 % versus 86.8 %). The reason, it seems, was that it was easier to articulate a geographic focus, which in most cases coincided with a desire to "co-locate" different programs in the same districts or regions for reasons of synergy, efficiency and effectiveness, than it was in making decisions about whether to favor one sector over another, i.e., economic growth, social programs or democratic governance. Where the Presidential Initiatives were involved, it sometimes made the choices simpler as corresponding Development Objectives (e.g., Economic Growth and Health) had to be built around either Feed the Future, Global Health Initiative or the Global Climate Change Initiative.

Results Framework	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
6	<b>Agency-Wide Policies and Strategies:</b> Does the CDCS reflect, as appropriate, the USAID Policy Framework for 2011-2015 and Agency-wide policies and strategies (e.g., climate change, gender, and education) formulated by PPL and approved by Agency leadership and the Administrator? There should be some reference in the RF narrative and later the CDCS to the various policies and strategies developed by PPL, e.g., Gender Strategy; if education is a primary focus (a DO) then the narrative should reflect the education policy. Policies and strategies should be incorporated or reflected within the various RF levels. Relevant analysis and evidence contained in policies and strategies may be cited to help support the CDCS analytical sections and may help to frame the development hypothesis.
7	<b>USAID Forward:</b> Does the CDCS demonstrate how the Mission has integrated USAID Forward, into the RF / narrative including working through host country systems, developing the capacity of civil society and private sector partners, and advancing the use of science technology, and innovation?
8	<b>Integrating Presidential Initiatives:</b>

	Does the CDCS demonstrate integration of Presidential Initiatives and strategies, where applicable, to ensure that these investments promote sustainable development outcomes by incorporating appropriate democratic governance and economic growth interventions and following the same logic as the over-arching CDCS
--	--

The three criteria (6, 7, and 8) that deal with Agency-wide policies, strategies and initiatives were taken together as they have virtually identical guidance instructions given their meta-level reform frameworks for the way USAID does business in this new development effectiveness era. The three categories averaged 91% with no score lower than 89.5%; USAID Forward was the highest of the three at 92%. Sixteen of the 18 countries reviewed had at least one Presidential Initiative, either as a designated focus country or an aligned program, with nearly two-thirds having at least two, mainly Feed the Future and the Global Health Initiative. The Global Climate Change Initiative was represented in roughly three-quarters of the study countries. The review did not assess whether the Presidential Initiatives were either welcomed or effective. As Presidential Initiatives they are Agency policy and must, therefore, be integrated into the country strategy and the concerned Development Objectives without question although there does appear to be some flexibility in the way that this integration takes place.

USAID Forward showed up in a myriad of ways, from procurement reform and building the capacity of local partners to take on a bigger role in Mission programs and contracted services (e.g., evaluation recipients), to mentoring of DLIs, to the focus on results-based monitoring and reporting. A few strategies noted the burden this sometimes puts on staff who must play a greater role in the oversight of local partners who may not have acquired all the requisite skills and expertise to become “grant-worthy” or how this affects the procurement process.

<b>Results Framework</b>	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
<b>9</b>	<b>Critical Assumptions and Risks:</b>
	Does the CDCS include explanations for each DO relevant critical assumptions and “game changing” scenarios and assesses risks associated with its successful achievement. A risk factor or critical assumption lies beyond USAID’s control. For example, “Large-scale ethnic conflict surpassing the international community’s current capacity to manage or contain the conflict” would be a risk factor. For each risk factor, the CDCS assesses the degree to which the country team can identify and control critical risks. The CDCS also explains how the identified assumptions and risks will be assessed periodically
<b>10</b>	<b>Performance Indicators:</b>
	Does the RF includes at least one, but no more than three performance indicators for the CDCS Goal and each DO, IR and sub-IR? As a group, the indicators should capture the intended impact of the CDCS and how this impact will be achieved. Baseline values for these indicators should be included if available. These indicators are an important means to measure and evaluate the impact of the CDCS and progress toward achieving the results

Criterion 9, critical assumptions and risks, was the second lowest scoring of all Results Framework criteria. This low score reflects the earlier discussion concerning the realistic and feasible nature of formulated Development Objectives versus the candor of the analyses and assessments that might lead the reviewer to question the objectives. In this regard, the assumptions and risks that were developed in many of the country strategies were formulated to demonstrate that difficult political, economic or social context could be mitigated or shown not to be a risk to the achievement of the given Development Objective. Six of 18 countries’ critical

assumptions and risks did not demonstrate a reasonable response to the analyses provided earlier in the documents. It should be noted that the reviewer did not give any of these six countries a “non-compliance” score; rather, they were given scores of ‘somewhat’.

Criterion 10, Performance Indicators, scored 94.7%, indicating that the number of indicators at each level of the Results Framework conforms to the guidance.

### 3.4 MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
1	<b>Monitoring:</b> Does the CDCS provide the basis, i.e., well-articulated performance indicators, with baselines and targets, for the subsequent development the Mission’s Performance Management Plan?
2	<b>Evaluation:</b> Does the CDCS reflect the following components of the Agency’s Evaluation Policy ( <a href="http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation">http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation</a> ) :
a.	Identification of high priority evaluation questions for each DO that can address: (a) the development hypotheses and key assumptions underlying the programs; (b) estimating program impact; (c) policy approach in a specific sector, and/or; (d) the efficiency of the USAID implementation approach
b.	At least one opportunity for impact evaluation of a project or project component within each DO
3	<b>Learning:</b> Does the CDCS incorporate a continuous learning approach? Learning provides for an iterative review of external changes and lessons learned from CDCS implementation. The approach should ensure that progress toward development objectives is guided by continuous learning, ongoing assessment of the causal pathway, and iterative adaptation of program implementation and, where relevant, within the strategy. Does the CDCS discuss or refer to:
a.	Facilitating coordination, collaboration, and exchange of experiential knowledge internally and with external stakeholders?
b.	Testing development hypotheses, filling critical knowledge gaps, and addressing uncertainties in the hypotheses with new research or syntheses of existing analyses?
c.	Ensuring new learning, innovations, and performance information gained through monitoring and evaluation inform strategy implementation?
d.	Identifying and monitoring game changers – the broad conditions that are beyond the Mission’s control but could evolve to impede strategy implementation – based on associated tripwires that may trigger programmatic and project contingencies or even changes in strategic direction.

Category D, Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (ME&L), comprises three criteria, one for each performance management area, and six sub-criteria. The category did not reach the 80% threshold (76.7%). Sixteen of 18 countries (or 95%) were in complete alignment with Criterion 1 (monitoring), while 11 of 16 were in complete compliance with the two evaluation sub-criteria for an average score of 88%. Only three countries complied with the Learning guidance sub-criteria, with an average score of 68%, which largely explains the reason for the low overall ME&L score.

While all four Learning sub-criteria were under 80%, it was sub-criterion 3d, monitoring game changes and the conditions beyond the Missions control that was the principal area of weakness among the learning sub-criteria (50%). As a general finding, continuous learning and adapting (CLA) or a learning agenda were infrequently mentioned if noted at all in many of the CDCSs. This is likely the result of CLA being one of the newer approaches integrated into the

performance management package and the fact that there had not been any formalized guidance related to it; just the best practice developed by a few USAID Missions. Two Agency-wide policies, Global Climate Change (GCC) and Gender Equality and Female Empowerment (GEFE), were incorporated into the overall PPL evaluation methodology and looked at in each of the other components of the evaluation (e.g., country case studies, interviews with staff, the on-line survey); and, were thus incorporated into this CDCS review for the purpose of seeing how well the policies were translated into CDCS guidance and integrated into country strategies.

Global Climate Change Initiative	
No.	Alignment Categories/ Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
1	The CDCS refers to the Presidents Global Climate Change Initiative
2	The CDCS incorporates Agency Global Climate Change guidance
3	The CDCS monitoring and evaluation plan is consistent with USAID's new evaluation policy to assess success, scalability, and replicability of direct climate change programming and integration activities.
Gender Equality	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
1	A Gender Analysis was conducted as part of the analytical agenda informing the CDCS
2	The Gender Analysis informed the formulation of CDCS results
3	The CDCS incorporates one or more Agency-formulated indicators designed to assess progress towards increasing gender equality and female empowerment results
4	The CDCS monitoring and evaluation plan includes either GEFE-specific indicators or sex-disaggregated indicators that measure progress toward achievement of gender equality and women's empowerment (see indicator section) results
5	The CDCS, at the country or subnational level, incorporates specific results that have associated targets and indicators for tracking progress relative to one of the following Agency wide policy goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce gender disparities in access to, control over and benefit from resources, wealth, opportunities, and services – economic, social, political, and cultural.</li> <li>• Reduce gender-based violence and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities, so that all people can live healthy and productive lives.</li> <li>• Increase capability of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes, and influence decision-making in households, communities, and societies.</li> </ul>

Category E Criterion 3 was dropped because the policy was provided to missions after the relevant version of the CDCS guidance went out (January 2012) and, thus Missions had inadequate instructions about how to integrate it into concerned CDCSs. The average of the two remaining criteria is 65.5%. Roughly, 12 of the 18 countries mentioned GCC strategy and incorporated it into their CDCSs.

While the GEFE Policy was not released until March 2012, CDCS guidance (version 2) was clear in the requirement that a gender analysis be undertaken as part of the analytical work, that it inform the formulation of results, and that it incorporate gender disaggregated indicators in the Monitoring and Evaluation plan. Related instructions require that specific results have specific indicators for tracking Agency-wide GEFE policy goals and that there are one or more Agency-formulated indicators that track GEFE results. The overall score for the five criteria composing Category F was 79.4%. Five of 16 countries scored 100% on all five criteria and an additional five countries scored 80 % or more. The first two criteria scored 97% and 94% respectively, while Criterion 5 showed an 87.8% score. The reason for the lower than expected overall category score given these three high criteria scores is due to the 59 % score for Criterion 3 and

the 73% score for Criterion 4. Surprisingly, there were few sex disaggregated indicators or GEFE-specific indicators.

<b>Management Requirements</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
<b>1</b>	Does the CDCS include a brief description of the required management resources for each of the program resource level scenarios? This description should include:
a.	Anticipated overall Operating Expense (OE) requirements
b.	Anticipated overall program-funded operational costs (PFOC) requirements, which would be included in the total program levels;
c.	Anticipated staffing requirements over the life of the CDCS, including U.S. Direct Hire, Personal Service Contractors and Foreign Service Nationals needed to implement the DO supporting programs
<b>2</b>	Does the CDCS provide justification for the Mission's proposed staffing needs relative to the broadening or narrowing its program? Specific issues regarding the match between the staff skill set and the programmatic priorities should be noted.
<b>Program Resources and Priorities</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Scenarios:</b> Does the CDCS include two planning scenarios, that is, a base scenario and an alternative scenario, that demonstrate the sensitivity of strategy, results to additional (or reduced) resources?
<b>2</b>	<b>Prioritization:</b> <i>Are DOs prioritized?</i> <i>For each DO the CDCS crosswalks and prioritizes all associated concerned program areas (program elements for Health and Education) by rank order. The prioritization should be based on what is most important to achieve the CDCS Goal and priority DOs, not solely based on the levels of assistance.</i>

The final two categories address management and resource guidance and how well the Missions have integrated this guidance into the CDCSs. Category G, Management Requirements, scored 84.8% with 11 of 16 countries scoring 100% on all four criteria. This Category score was significantly brought down by two countries that scored 38% and 0%, respectively. Otherwise, the principal concern associated with this category was the failure of four countries to show Program-financed Operating Costs (PFOC).

Category H, Program Resources and Priorities, did not attain the 80 % threshold (73.6 %). This was largely the result of six countries failing to provide two planning scenarios.

## **4 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

There is little doubt that the first set of CDCSs undertaken using PPL-developed guidance were of considerably good quality. A strong Program Cycle depends on the quality of the CDCS, including its incorporating reasonable, realistic, achievable, and measurable results. To a significant degree, the CDCSs reviewed did that. Having said that, there is some question concerning the willingness of some countries to develop results that completely flow from or are



informed by the analytic work that provides the CDCS evidence base, versus other non-programmatic considerations (e.g., economic, strategic geo-political interests). This is often reflected in the critical assumptions and risks sections of the concerned CDCSs that will acknowledge the many serious challenges facing their countries but then either ignore or discount them.

The following provide several other conclusions and corresponding recommendations that emerge from this review.

#### ***Provide a Required Structure for the CDCS***

The CDCS Guidance provides a recommended structure for use by the Missions in the preparation of their strategies, however, a minority of countries used the same structure. Additionally, many countries did not address one or more recommended guidance chapters and/or sections. This fact is masked, to some extent, by the good scores that most countries achieved. If guidance is supposed to help Missions produce a better product, i.e., a country strategy, then Missions should be required to follow the guidance in a structured way. Giving Missions flexibility to develop the CDCS (in terms of structure) in their own way does not seem to be a viable option in terms of producing quality.

It is recommended, therefore, that countries use a required structure for the CDCS that ensures all the relevant and required information so that concerned managers at all level of the Agency can review the document knowing what to expect and where to find it. Appendix 5 provides the Tables of Contents from three countries that provided virtually all the information called for in the guidance. These three countries also rated highest in terms of adherence to the guidance.

#### ***Provide a Required Page Limit for the CDCS***

The length of the reviewed CDCSs varied from roughly 40 to 80 pages plus Annexes. Because the strategies can be so long, it is not hard to believe that those responsible for reviewing, clearing, and approving them, do not always read every page and therefore might miss something important in terms of quality and adherence to the guidance. These documents could be significantly shortened without sacrificing quality.

#### ***Create Tools to Measure CDCS Adherence***

In this review, the reviewers could not find any specific evaluative tool to uniformly assess the several products required in the CDCS process. The Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research provided the team with one tool to review Results Framework narratives / CDCSs and it seemed very effective in terms of assisting the office to review these documents. However, the team found no other examples of such a tool used by other offices in PPL or the concerned Regional and Pillar Bureaus.

It is recommended that PPL develop an evaluative tool that not only helps reviewers to assess the adherence of a CDCS to the guidance but that can serve as a checklist for the Missions to ensure that they include all required information needed to produce a quality document. The methodology used in this evaluation may provide PPL with a framework to develop its own methodology for the review and approval of future CDCSs.

#### ***Require a Lessons Learned and Results Achieved Section***

There is no organized CDCS section that takes a retrospective look back at the performance of the previous country program strategy in terms of its achievement (or not) of articulated or planned results. This seems to be a major omission in the CDCS guidance and structure. Without the review and assessment of what went right and what went wrong, there is no way to determine what lessons were learned in terms of why results were or were not achieved and then to apply this knowledge to the new country strategy. Several CDCSs had a *What's New or Different* Section, which provided some learning that was then applied to the new strategy. It is



strongly recommended that such a section be incorporated into the guidance and be required in the development of the CDCS.

### ***Provide Model CDCS'***

Reviewers found that Guatemala, Uganda, Bangladesh, and Ethiopia had the best CDCSs. It is recommended that these be used as models for countries starting the CDCS process.

### ***Include Evidence Base***

It would be useful if the CDCSS used more foot notes throughout these documents and/or reference to studies, analyses, assessments and evaluations that were used to inform the results chosen to make sure the reader knows that the decisions were evidence-based.

### ***Require Donor Mapping***

Two countries had donor mapping exercises that were more informative than the listing in annexes of the donor community and what they were doing and where. It is recommended that CDCS include maps (GSM) that show focus, both sectoral and geographic

### ***Include a Risk and Assumptions Section***

Many CDCS' did not have discrete Risk and Assumption sections and/or did not address these in a coherent way. It is recommended that such a section be mandatory.

### ***Performance Management***

CDCSs are viewed in the guidance as living strategies which must be flexible in order to respond to changed country contexts. This is obviously important but frequent change makes managing development results with fixed baselines and targets difficult to measure. Barring an extraordinary change in context, it is recommended that mid-term reviews or evaluations are the point at which major changes to performance management plans are made.

### ***Clarify the Relationship of the full CDCS and the Results Framework***

The Results Framework should contain the Theory of Change as an explicit statement, along with the overarching Development Problem, Development Hypothesis, and Results Framework narrative. The Results Framework should also be sufficiently developed to fit into the CDCS with room for a more detailed discussion of each Development Objective.

**Appendix 1. CDCS WORKPLAN**

(Last updated: 1/18/2013)

CDCS Countries	Type of CDCS*	CDCS Launch	CDCS Completed (actual or planned)	Status
<b>Africa</b>				
Uganda	CDCS (V2)	Pil	4/12/11	Approved
Zambia	CDCS (V2)	10/18/10	7/8/11	Approved
Ethiopia	CDCS (V2)	11/1/10	12/19/11	Approved
Liberia	CDCS (V2)	Pil	FY13, Q2	Under Review
Senegal	CDCS (V2)	10/15/10	4/2/12	Approved
Ghana	CDCS (V2)	11/29/11	12/14/12	Approved
<b>Asia</b>				
Sri Lanka	CDCS (V2)	Pil	4/8/11	Approved
Bangladesh	CDCS (V2)	10/18/10	8/30/11	Approved
Mongolia	CDCS (V2)	10/12/10	FY13, Q1	Approved
<b>Europe &amp; Eurasia</b>				
Russia	CDCS (V2)	11/29/10	8/30/11	Approved
Albania	CDCS (V2)	10/27/10	9/12/11	Approved
Azerbaijan	CDCS (V2)	1/25/11	5/9/12	Approved
Bosnia Herzegovina	CDCS (V2)	12/6/10	1/9/12	Approved
Ukraine	CDCS	12/6/10	7/11/12	Approved
Georgia	CDCS	10/27/11	7/11/12	Approved
<b>Latin America &amp; Caribbean</b>				
Peru	CDCS (V2)	Pil	6/26/12	Approved
Guatemala	CDCS	1/12/11	3/16/12	Approved
<b>Middle East</b>				
Jordan	CDCS	4/17/12	FY12, Q4	Approved

\*CDCS, CDCS under Version 2 of the CDCS Guidance, Regional Country Development Cooperation Strategy (RDCS),

Transition Strategy, or Abbreviated CDCS; for more information, see the USAID Planning Website:

<http://www.usaid.gov/results-and-data/planning/country-strategies-cdcs>

## Appendix 2. CDCS EVALUATIVE CATEGORIES AND CRITERIA

<b>Development Context, Opportunities and Challenges</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Does the CDCS describe the development context?</b> This section should cite economic, social, political, governance, and demographic indices, and identify important national and regional trends in security, economic development, political dynamics and special circumstances related to state fragility, conflict, or post-conflict transitions.
<b>2</b>	<b>Does the CDCS discuss the overarching U.S. foreign policy and national security considerations in the country?</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Does the CDCS highlight the most important development challenges and opportunities facing the host country? Do the development challenges and opportunities identified in the CDCS reflect the analyses found in this first chapter?</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Is the CDCS evidence based and does it provide relevant analysis?</b> The challenges and opportunities described should be based on evidence and analysis drawn from relevant studies and data, including the country's poverty reduction strategy; World Bank and International Monetary Fund assessments; geospatial analysis; and research, evaluations, and analysis commissioned by USAID, other USG agencies, other donors, the private sector, and independent policy research organizations.
<b>Development Hypothesis</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
<b>1</b>	<b>Is the CDCS based upon a sound development hypothesis that describes the theory of change, logic, and causal relationships principal development results? This section explains why and how the proposed investments from USAID and others collectively lead to achieving the DOs and ultimately the CDCS Goal.</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Is the development hypothesis clearly articulated?</b> It includes a short narrative that explains the relationships between each layer of results (in the Results Framework, upwards from the sub-Intermediate Results (sub-IRs), to the IRs, the DOs, and the CDCS Goal.
<b>3</b>	<b>Is there an identified theory of change that underlies the development hypothesis?</b> A theory of change is the conceptual framework of causal relationships that explains the logic framed in the development hypothesis

<b>Results Framework</b>	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
<b>1</b>	<b>Is the RF presentation based on the standardized design format found in the guidance and supported by accompanying narrative that addresses how USAID can best address the specific development challenges and opportunities identified by the Mission, based on evidence, to achieve its DOs and CDCS Goal, including:</b>
a.	Does the RF demonstrate that the Mission is progressing toward the CDCS Goal as it advances toward achieving the DOs?
b.	Do the indicators demonstrate that there is movement towards the achievement of the Goal?
c.	Does the CDCS Goal reflect the cumulative impact of the DOs and capture the RF's internal logic, i.e., if the DOs are accomplished or advanced, progress will be made toward achieving the CDCS Goal?
d.	Does the CDCS specify any other <u>critical elements</u> , in addition to the DOs, that are necessary to achieve the CDCS Goal such as host country commitments, results from other donors, and factors outside of USAID's control?
e.	Does the CDCS Goal and associated DOs show progress toward <u>sustainability</u> and a reduction of future USAID support as appropriate?
f.	Are the roles of USAID and its partners in helping to achieve the CDCS Goal described in the RF narrative, including the specific contributions of the host country government, civil society, the private sector, State Department, other USG agencies, and others donors as appropriate.
g.	Do indicators demonstrate that the CDCS Goal (or progress toward the CDCS Goal) is measurable and achievable?
h.	Are the DOs based on the strategic priorities defined by the Mission, not solely on the size of the supporting assistance programs
<b>2</b>	<b>Do DOs, with supporting IRs, provide evidence to answer the following questions as part of the RF narrative:</b>
a.	Do the DOs contribute to the CDCS Goal? Are the causal linkages clear and plausible?
b.	Is the DO based on a clear development hypothesis and strong evidence, including from evaluations conducted by the Mission?
c.	Can the intended impact of the DO be determined? Does it show the magnitude of change anticipated over the life of the CDCS?
d.	Does the DO address identified sources of conflict, fragility, instability or vulnerability, if any?
e.	Does the DO focus USAID resources?
f.	Does the DO reflect USAID's comparative advantage in the country and a division of labor with other development partners, including the private sector?
g.	Does the DO take into account the political, economic, and social dynamics that influence development outcomes and impacts in the country or region?
h.	Are clear roles articulated for the host country government, civil society, and private sector and others to help achieve the DO?
i.	Does the DO narrative discuss USG diplomatic efforts or other interagency support needed to achieve the DO?

<b>Results Framework</b>	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
j.	Does the DO discuss reducing gaps between the status of males and females, enhancing the leadership and expertise of women and girls, and meeting their needs?
k.	Does the DO consider the particular issues associated with youth, minority groups, persons with disabilities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities?
<b>3</b>	<b>Non-USAID Resources:</b>
a.	For each DO, does the CDCS narrative include assumptions about the results and impacts achieved through <u>non-USAID</u> resources, including other USG agencies, the host country government, other donors, multilateral development institutions, non-governmental organizations, and private sector organizations?
b.	Does this section outline how efforts are coordinated to create a division of labor among development actors?
<b>4</b>	<b>Special/Support Objectives:</b> If the Mission has proposed a Special Objective(s), has it provided a compelling reason why a DO is not appropriate to address the particular issue?
<b>5</b>	<b>Focus and Selectivity:</b> Does the CDCS demonstrate that the Mission is focusing strategically to maximize the impact of USAID resources in partnership with various stakeholders? Does the CDCS address each of the following means of targeting and prioritizing USAID interventions, highlighting any trade-offs
a.	Is there a clearly articulated <u>division of labor</u> between the Mission and other development actors', including resources and non-assistance tools, so that it can maximize the impact of its assistance and better focus in areas where it has a comparative advantage.
b.	Has the Missions proposed a <u>geographic focus</u> and whether interventions can be more effectively advanced by targeting resources in a defined area(s)? This could also include the targeting of specific populations and beneficiaries within regions, such as economically vulnerable households or particular communities.
c.	Has the Mission demonstrated and justified a prioritization of <u>sectors and sub-sectors</u> in terms of advancing the CDCS Goal?
d.	Has the Mission demonstrated its intention to build the capacity of specific <u>institutions</u> and related governance <u>systems</u> at the state (national), regional (sub-national), or local levels – or a combination of these – to achieve sustainable results?
<b>6</b>	<b>Agency-Wide Policies and Strategies:</b>  Does the CDCS reflect, as appropriate, the USAID Policy Framework for 2011-2015 and Agency-wide policies and strategies (e.g., climate change, gender, and education) formulated by PPL and approved by Agency leadership and the Administrator? There should be some reference in the RF narrative and later the CDCS to the various policies and strategies developed by PPL, e.g., Gender Strategy; if education is a primary focus (a DO) then the narrative should reflect the education policy. Policies and strategies should be incorporated or reflected within the various RF levels. Relevant analysis and evidence contained in policies and strategies may be cited to help support the CDCS analytical sections and may help to frame the development hypothesis.
<b>7</b>	<b>USAID Forward:</b>
	Does the CDCS demonstrate how the Mission has integrated USAID Forward, into the RF / narrative including working through host country systems, developing the capacity of civil society and private sector partners, and advancing the use of science technology, and

<b>Results Framework</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
	innovation?
<b>8</b>	<b>Integrating Presidential Initiatives:</b>
	Does the CDCS demonstrate integration of Presidential Initiatives and strategies, where applicable, to ensure that these investments promote sustainable development outcomes by incorporating appropriate democratic governance and economic growth interventions and following the same logic as the over-arching CDCS
<b>9</b>	<b>Critical Assumptions and Risks:</b>
	Does the CDCS include explanations for each DO relevant critical assumptions and “game changing” scenarios and assesses risks associated with its successful achievement. A risk factor or critical assumption lies beyond USAID’s control. For example, “Large-scale ethnic conflict surpassing the international community’s current capacity to manage or contain the conflict” would be a risk factor. For each risk factor, the CDCS assesses the degree to which the country team can identify and control critical risks. The CDCS also explains how the identified assumptions and risks will be assessed periodically
<b>10</b>	<b>Performance Indicators:</b>
	Does the RF includes at least one, but no more than three performance indicators for the CDCS Goal and each DO, IR and sub-IR? As a group, the indicators should capture the intended impact of the CDCS and how this impact will be achieved. Baseline values for these indicators should be included if available. These indicators are an important means to measure and evaluate the impact of the CDCS and progress toward achieving the results



<b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
<b>1</b>	<b>Monitoring:</b>
	Does the CDCS provide the basis, i.e., well-articulated performance indicators, with baselines and targets, for the subsequent development the Mission's Performance Management Plan?
<b>2</b>	<b>Evaluation:</b>
	Does the CDCS reflect the following components of the Agency's Evaluation Policy ( <a href="http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation">http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation</a> ) :
a.	Identification of high priority evaluation questions for each DO that can address: (a) the development hypotheses and key assumptions underlying the programs; (b) estimating program impact; (c) policy approach in a specific sector, and/or; (d) the efficiency of the USAID implementation approach
b.	At least one opportunity for impact evaluation of a project or project component within each DO
<b>3</b>	<b>Learning:</b>
	Does the CDCS incorporate a continuous learning approach? Learning provides for an iterative review of external changes and lessons learned from CDCS implementation. The approach should ensure that progress toward development objectives is guided by continuous learning, ongoing assessment of the causal pathway, and iterative adaptation of program implementation and, where relevant, within the strategy. Does the CDCS discuss or refer to:
a.	Facilitating coordination, collaboration, and exchange of experiential knowledge internally and with external stakeholders?
b.	Testing development hypotheses, filling critical knowledge gaps, and addressing uncertainties in the hypotheses with new research or syntheses of existing analyses?
c.	Ensuring new learning, innovations, and performance information gained through monitoring and evaluation inform strategy implementation?
d.	Identifying and monitoring game changers – the broad conditions that are beyond the Mission's control but could evolve to impede strategy implementation – based on associated tripwires that may trigger programmatic and project contingencies or even changes in strategic direction.
<b>Global Climate Change Initiative</b>	
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance
<b>1</b>	The CDCS refers to the Presidents Global Climate Change Initiative
<b>2</b>	The CDCS incorporates Agency Global Climate Change guidance
<b>3</b>	The CDCS monitoring and evaluation plan is consistent with USAID's new evaluation policy to assess success, scalability, and replicability of direct climate change programming and integration activities.

<b>Gender Equality</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
<b>1</b>	A Gender Analysis was conducted as part of the analytical agenda informing the CDCS
<b>2</b>	The Gender Analysis informed the formulation of CDCS results
<b>3</b>	The CDCS incorporates one or more Agency-formulated indicators designed to assess progress towards increasing gender equality and female empowerment results
<b>4</b>	The CDCS monitoring and evaluation plan includes either GEFE-specific indicators or sex-disaggregated indicators that measure progress toward achievement of gender equality and women's empowerment (see indicator section) results
<b>5</b>	The CDCS, at the country or subnational level, incorporates specific results that have associated targets and indicators for tracking progress relative to one of the following Agency wide policy goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce gender disparities in access to, control over and benefit from resources, wealth, opportunities, and services – economic, social, political, and cultural.</li> <li>• Reduce gender-based violence and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities, so that all people can live healthy and productive lives.</li> <li>• Increase capability of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes, and influence decision-making in households, communities, and societies.</li> </ul>
<b>G Management Requirements</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
<b>1</b>	Does the CDCS include a brief description of the required management resources for each of the program resource level scenarios? This description should include: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Anticipated overall Operating Expense (OE) requirements</li> <li>b. Anticipated overall program-funded operational costs (PFOC) requirements, which would be included in the total program levels;</li> <li>c. Anticipated staffing requirements over the life of the CDCS, including U.S. Direct Hire, Personal Service Contractors and Foreign Service Nationals needed to implement the DO supporting programs</li> </ol>
<b>2</b>	Does the CDCS provide justification for the Mission's proposed staffing needs relative to the broadening or narrowing its program? Specific issues regarding the match between the staff skill set and the programmatic priorities should be noted.
<b>H. Program Resources and Priorities</b>	
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>
<b>1</b>	Scenarios: Does the CDCS include two planning scenarios, that is, a base scenario and an alternative scenario, that demonstrate the sensitivity of strategy, results to additional (or reduced) resources?
<b>2</b>	<i>Prioritization: Are DOs prioritized? For each DO the CDCS crosswalks and prioritizes all associated concerned program areas (program elements for Health and Education) by rank order. The prioritization should be based on what is most important to achieve the CDCS Goal and priority DOs, not solely based on the levels of assistance.</i>

Appendix 3. COUNTRY WORKSHEET SAMPLE

CDCS Doc Review Guidance

Country Reviewed:

A. Development Context, Challenges and Opportunities					
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance	Score	Value		ADHERENCE COMMENTS
1	<b>Does the CDCS describe the development context?</b> This section should cite economic, social, political, governance, and demographic indices, and identify important national and regional trends in security, economic development, political dynamics and special circumstances related to state fragility, conflict, or post-conflict transitions.	yes	1	1	Yes, this is a well-done, thoroughly researched and evidence based document. It discusses social, economic and political dimensions of the broader context and provides the reader as well as justification for the formulation of DOs in the next section. Systemic inequality ... natural resource exploitation particularly in the Amazon
2	<b>Does the CDCS discuss the overarching U.S. foreign policy and national security considerations in the country?</b>	yes	1	1	One of our principal allies in a region which has a mixed commitment democratic practice, good governance and a free economy ... drug/narco trafficking. Also, important are preparations for the eventual phase out / graduation of the programme in ten years beginning with health, trade and education in the next one to three years
3	<b>Does the CDCS highlight the most important development challenges and opportunities facing the host country? Do the development challenges and opportunities identified in the CDCS reflect the analyses found in this first chapter?</b>	yes	1	1	Challenges: Cocoa vulnerable areas, narco-trafficking, poverty and inequality, resource-based conflicts; weak democratic institutions / governance and corruption. And, a weak public sector with poor capacity to deliver public services to rural, especially, Cocoa vulnerable regions and areas. Strengths include decentralization of some power and resources as a means to improve service delivery, but probably not

					enough ... and the private sector's / extractive industry's increased support of CSR
4	<b>Is the CDCS evidence based and does it provide relevant analysis?</b> The challenges and opportunities described should be based on evidence and analysis drawn from relevant studies and data, including the country's poverty reduction strategy; World Bank and International Monetary Fund assessments; geospatial analysis; and research, evaluations, and analysis commissioned by USAID, other USG agencies, other donors, the private sector, and independent policy research organizations.	yes	1	1	Yes, there is significant discussion of the analyses (studies, research, assessments) that were used to inform the CDCS (e.g., Japan's / JICA's more in-depth Gender Assessment) by USAID and its development partners and government. Also the bio-diversity assessment mandated by the Foreign Affairs Act was included. Leads to the focus on support to the governments priority to promote social inclusion and decrease poverty
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>4</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>4</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>100%</b>		

<b>B. Development Hypothesis</b>					
<b>No.</b>	<b>Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Value</b>		<b>ADHERENCE COMMENTS</b>
1	<b>Is the CDCS based upon a sound development hypothesis that describes the theory of change, logic, and causal relationships principal development results? This section explains why and how the proposed investments from USAID and others collectively lead to achieving the DOs and ultimately the CDCS Goal.</b>	somewhat	0.5	1	Since there is a separate DH section, there should have been a much more thorough discussion of the hypothesis and the set of causal relationships and linkages that underlie it ... there was not. Nor is there an overall discussion of how the DOs contribute to the Goal or the IRs contribute to the corresponding DOs

2	<b>Is the development hypothesis clearly articulated?</b> It includes a short narrative that explains the relationships between each layer of results (in the Results Framework, upwards from the sub-Intermediate Results (sub-IRs), to the IRs, the DOs, and the CDCS Goal.	somewhat	0.5	1	Same as above. And, this becomes more important because the Results Framework section does not provide a big picture for the overall CDCS nor do any of the DOs really link back the IRs to the DO and then upward to the Goal
3	<b>Is there an identified theory of change that underlies the development hypothesis?</b> A theory of change is the conceptual framework of causal relationships that explains the logic framed in the development hypothesis	somewhat	0.5	1	There is no mention of Theory of Change in the entire document. And, the DH section lays out in less than a paragraph the entire conceptual framework.
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>3</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1.5</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>50%</b>		

### C. The Results Framework

<i>(RF includes: CDCS Goal, Development Objectives, Intermediate Results, sub-Intermediate Results and Performance Indicators)</i>					
No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance	Score	Value		ADHERENCE COMMENTS
1	<b>Is the RF presentation based on the standardized design format found in the guidance and supported by accompanying narrative that addresses how USAID can best address the specific development challenges and opportunities identified by the Mission, based on evidence, to achieve its DOs and CDCS Goal, including:</b>				
a.	Does the RF demonstrate that the Mission is progressing toward the CDCS Goal as it advances toward achieving the DOs?	somewhat	0.5	1	There is no discussion of the overall results framework and how the three DOs contribute to the achievement of the Goal ... this is compounded by the deficiency noted in the DH, above
b.	Do the indicators demonstrate that there is movement towards the achievement of the Goal?	yes	1	1	The Goal Level indicators are illustrative. They seem measure Goal achievements

c.	Does the CDCS Goal reflect the cumulative impact of the DOs and capture the RF's internal logic, i.e., if the DOs are accomplished or advanced, progress will be made toward achieving the CDCS Goal?	somewhat	0.5	1	Just looking at the RF, it is not altogether evident that the three DOs will lead to the achievement of the goal. One could assume that DO 1 would generate conflict and instability (CN/AD); DO 2, if framed as a governance rather than service delivery result might have shown the intended relationship better; and, DO 3 should be more about equitable rather than sustainable resource use, particularly in vulnerable areas.
d.	Does the CDCS specify any other <u>critical elements</u> , in addition to the DOs, that are necessary to achieve the CDCS Goal such as host country commitments, results from other donors, and factors outside of USAID's control?	yes	1	1	There are good sections on "aid effectiveness" that includes government commitments, both national and local, donor involvement and civil society and private sector participation. The risks and assumptions section also discusses critical elements and is discussed below
e.	Does the CDCS Goal and associated DOs show progress toward <u>sustainability</u> and a reduction of future USAID support as appropriate?	yes	1	1	There is a major discussion concerning the Mission's exit strategy from Peru, including in the Resources and Priorities chapter.
f.	Are the roles of USAID and its partners in helping to achieve the CDCS Goal described in the RF narrative, including the specific contributions of the host country government, civil society, the private sector, State Department, other USG agencies, and others donors as appropriate.	yes	1	1	Each of the three DOs has a major section on partner participation relative to the achievement of DO results; and in the Development Context section there is an overall overview of the same
g.	Do indicators demonstrate that the CDCS Goal (or progress toward the CDCS Goal) is measurable and achievable?	N/A		0	The indicators are indicative. Indicators with targets and baselines are only produced subsequent to the approval of the CDCS
h.	Are the DOs based on the strategic priorities defined by the Mission, not solely on the size of the supporting assistance programs	yes	1	1	Funding does not seem to be the driving force for whether the DO is strategic or not; rather it is the analysis
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>7</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>6</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>86%</b>		
<b>2</b>	<b>Do <u>DOs</u>, with supporting IRs, provide evidence to answer the following questions as part of the RF</b>				



	narrative:				
a.	Do the DOs contribute to the CDCS Goal? Are the causal linkages clear and plausible?	somewhat	0.5	1	As note above, there is no overarching discussion as to how DOs contribute to the Goal in either the DH section or this RF section
b.	Is the DO based on a clear development hypothesis and strong evidence, including from evaluations conducted by the Mission?	somewhat	0.5	1	Each DO has its own DH section but several of them, particularly DO 2, are not well articulated in terms of logic (governance versus services delivery) but for the purposes of this rating, the DH section only looks at the relationship of the DO to the Goal and not how the IRs contribute to the DO. The subsequent section on IRs/Sub-IRs also does not make the linkage - logic case
c.	Can the intended impact of the DO be determined? Does it show the magnitude of change anticipated over the life of the CDCS?	yes	1	1	Not in terms of indicators but the narrative gives the broad notion of what is trying to be achieved.
d.	Does the DO address identified sources of conflict, fragility, instability or vulnerability, if any?	yes	1	1	Each DO does a good job of this since conflict / instability are a major problem that is being addressed by the CDCS and each of the 3 DOs
e.	Does the DO focus USAID resources?	yes	1	1	Yes, there is considerable discussion about targeting of populations, geographic areas and sectors, including how to close out the various programs over the next 3 years
f.	Does the DO reflect USAID's comparative advantage in the country and a division of labor with other development partners, including the private sector?	somewhat	0.5	1	There is no discrete discussion under each DO of the role of partners, whether donors, government (national and local), private sector, etc. Other countries did have such sections. This only had one in the Development Context Section and it was limited. The Annex also just reported the amount of donor funds. Some DOs did a better than others but in general, it did not merit a yes.

g.	Does the DO take into account the political, economic, and social dynamics that influence development outcomes and impacts in the country or region?	yes	1	1	This is started in the Development Context section and each of the three DOs refers back but with more precision to these three dimensions in the opening and description sections.
h.	Are clear roles articulated for the host country government, civil society, and private sector and others to help achieve the DO?	yes	1	1	Yes, each DO does an adequate job of discussing the role of CS, government and to a lesser extent the private sector.
i.	Does the DO narrative discuss USG diplomatic efforts or other interagency support needed to achieve the DO?	yes	1	1	Yes, there are sections in each. For instance under DO 3: This DO directly supports U.S. Congressional priorities reflected in the United States-Peru Trade Promotion Agreement's (PTPA) Environmental Chapter and Forestry Annex, President Obama's Climate Change Agenda, and the U.S. Embassy's Strategic and Resources Plan (MSRP) goals. It also supports the USG's commitment in Copenhagen to help countries manage the impact of global climate change
j.	Does the DO discuss reducing gaps between the status of males and females, enhancing the leadership and expertise of women and girls, and meeting their needs?	yes	1	1	The DOs were not as strong as the should have been in their coverage of gender and the issues notef for this criteria
k.	Does the DO consider the particular issues associated with youth, minority groups, persons with disabilities, and lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender communities?	somewhat	0.5	1	Little discussion of LGBT community although youth and minorities are very strong ...
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>11</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>9</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>82%</b>		
<b>3</b>	<b>Non-USAID Resources:</b>				
a.	For each DO, does the CDCS narrative include assumptions about the results and impacts achieved through <u>non-USAID</u> resources, including other USG agencies, the host country government, other donors, multilateral development institutions, non-governmental organizations, and private sector organizations?	yes	1	1	Could have been stronger but for instance, there is considerable discussion on CSR from the extractive industries and the need for government to increase funding for CN initiatives

	b.	Does this section outline how efforts are coordinated to create a division of labor among development actors?	somewhat	0.5	1	there is little discussion about a division of labor and no specific sections within each DO that talks about all of the partners and how they would complement the CDCS
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>				<b>2</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>				<b>1.5</b>		
<b>%age</b>				<b>75%</b>		
<b>4</b>		<b>4. Special/Support Objectives:</b> If the Mission has proposed a Special Objective(s), has it provided a compelling reason why a DO is not appropriate to address the particular issue?	N/A		0	There were No SpOs
<b>5</b>		<b>Focus and Selectivity:</b> Does the CDCS demonstrate that the Mission is focusing strategically to maximize the impact of USAID resources in partnership with various stakeholders? Does he CDCS address each of the following means of targeting and prioritizing USAID interventions, highlighting any trade-offs				
	a.	Is there a clearly articulated <u>division of labor</u> between the Mission and other development actors', including resources and non-assistance tools, so that it can maximize the impact of its assistance and better focus in areas where it has a comparative advantage.	somewhat	0.5	1	As noted above, there is not.
	b.	Has the Missions proposed a <u>geographic focus</u> and whether interventions can be more effectively advanced by targeting resources in a defined area(s)? This could also include the targeting of specific populations and beneficiaries within regions, such as economically vulnerable households or particular communities.	yes	1	1	Each DO is very strong on the geographic focus (Amazon basin) and why and which population groups are being targeted (vulnerable groups)
	c.	Has the Mission demonstrated and justified a prioritization of <u>sectors and sub-sectors</u> in terms of advancing the CDCS Goal?	somewhat	0.5	1	Largely related close-out operations. The Resources section has alternative scenario but not so relevant
	d.	Has the Mission demonstrated its intention to build the capacity of specific <u>institutions</u> and related governance <u>systems</u> at the state (national), regional (sub-national), or local levels – or a combination of these – to achieve sustainable results?	yes	1	1	Each DO provides a very detailed discussion and analysis of which institutions are being targeted for support and why. There is often one or more "supply-side" organizations (government) and "demand-side" as well (civil society)

POSSIBLE POINTS			4		
TOTAL			3		
%age			75%		
6	<b>Agency-Wide Policies and Strategies:</b> Does the CDCS reflect, as appropriate, the USAID Policy Framework for 2011-2015 and Agency-wide policies and strategies (e.g., climate change, gender, and education) formulated by PPL and approved by Agency leadership and the Administrator? There should be some reference in the RF narrative and later the CDCS to the various policies and strategies developed by PPL, e.g., Gender Strategy; if education is a primary focus (a DO) then the narrative should reflect the education policy. Policies and strategies should be incorporated or reflected within the various RF levels. Relevant analysis and evidence contained in policies and strategies may be cited to help support the CDCS analytical sections and may help to frame the development hypothesis.	yes	1	1	Most of the policies and strategies relevant to Peru are well articulated in the three DO sections as well as in the Development Context Chapter ... except GCCD, which may have come after the CDCS was developed because climate change, mitigation, etc., are major initiatives and results of the CDCS and particular DO 3.
7	<b>USAID Forward:</b> Does the CDCS demonstrate how the Mission has integrated USAID Forward, into the RF / narrative including working through host country systems, developing the capacity of civil society and private sector partners, and advancing the use of science technology, and innovation?	yes	1	1	There is a USAID/Forward section in the Development Context which places an emphasis on IPR, talent management, Innovation and S&T and M&E
8	<b>Integrating Presidential Initiatives:</b> Does the CDCS demonstrate integration of Presidential Initiatives and strategies, where applicable, to ensure that these investments promote sustainable development outcomes by incorporating appropriate democratic governance and economic growth interventions and following the same logic as the over-arching CDCS	yes	1	1	But since Peru is accelerating its close-out operations, there are not any PIs at least no, GHI, FtF, PEPFAR, PMI.

9	<p><b>Critical Assumptions and Risks:</b> Does the CDCS include explanations for each DO relevant critical assumptions and “game changing” scenarios and assesses risks associated with its successful achievement. A risk factor or critical assumption lies beyond USAID’s control. For example, “Large-scale ethnic conflict surpassing the international community’s current capacity to manage or contain the conflict” would be a risk factor. For each risk factor, the CDCS assesses the degree to which the country team can identify and control critical risks. The CDCS also explains how the identified assumptions and risks will be assessed periodically</p>	somewhat	0.5	1	There is an up-front section on Risks and Assumptions that highlights six or so assumptions, but none in the individual DOs. And from this reviewers point of view neither at the overall CDCS level or in the individual DOs are the risks and assumptions extensive enough to give the the CDCS the credibility that comes with assessing risks and building strategies knowing the full range of must-dos that are necessary. No discussion of game changers
10	<p><b>Performance Indicators:</b> Does the RF includes at least one, but no more than three performance indicators for the CDCS Goal and each DO, IR and sub-IR? As a group, the indicators should capture the intended impact of the CDCS and how this impact will be achieved. Baseline values for these indicators should be included if available. These indicators are an important means to measure and evaluate the impact of the CDCS and progress toward achieving the results</p>	yes	1	1	Yes, each DO, IR and sub-IR has at least one and no more than 3 indicators
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>29</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>24</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>83%</b>		

**D. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning**

No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance	Score	Value	ADHERENCE COMMENTS	
1	<p>Monitoring: Does the CDCS provide the basis, i.e., well-articulated performance indicators, with baselines and targets, for the subsequent development the Mission’s Performance Management Plan?</p>	yes	1	1	The indicators are called illustrative. This reviewer found many of them to be either unrealistic or, in some cases, unrelated to the result it was measuring. Many of them seemed difficult to actually measure but will assume that the Mission knows what it is capable of doing.

2	<p>Evaluation: Does the CDCS reflect the following components of the Agency's Evaluation Policy (<a href="http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation">http://www.usaid.gov/evaluation</a>) :</p>				
a.	<p>Identification of high priority evaluation questions for each DO that can address: (a) the development hypotheses and key assumptions underlying the programs; (b) estimating program impact; (c) policy approach in a specific sector, and/or; (d) the efficiency of the USAID implementation approach</p>	yes	1	1	<p>Very strong. Each DO stipulated the number and type of evaluations that would be undertaken during implementation relative to the four categories noted in the criteria.</p>
b.	<p>At least one opportunity for impact evaluation of a project or project component within each DO</p>	yes	1	1	<p>Yes, there was at least one impact evaluation question per DO</p>
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>2</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>2</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>100%</b>		
3	<p>Learning: Does the CDCS incorporate a continuous learning approach? Learning provides for an iterative review of external changes and lessons learned from CDCS implementation. The approach should ensure that progress toward development objectives is guided by continuous learning, ongoing assessment of the causal pathway, and iterative adaptation of program implementation and, where relevant, within the strategy. Does the CDCS discuss or refer to:</p>				
a.	<p>Facilitating coordination, collaboration, and exchange of experiential knowledge internally and with external stakeholders?</p>	no	0	1	<p>There is sporadic talk through in two DOs but no overall coherent discussion and nothing about internal CCE. This question is given a 'no,' however, because there no discussion at all in the entire document of a CLA or even a learning approach.</p>
b.	<p>Testing development hypotheses, filling critical knowledge gaps, and addressing uncertainties in the hypotheses with new research or syntheses of existing analyses?</p>	yes	1	1	<p>Yes, this is well covered in each DO and followed up in the M&amp;E and learning section</p>
c.	<p>Ensuring new learning, innovations, and performance information gained through monitoring and evaluation inform strategy implementation?</p>	somewhat	0.5	1	<p>A minimal discussion requiring extrapolating rather than directly addressing how this would happen</p>



d.	Identifying and monitoring game changers – the broad conditions that are beyond the Mission’s control but could evolve to impede strategy implementation – based on associated tripwires that may trigger programmatic and project contingencies or even changes in strategic? direction.	somewhat	0.5	1	In the Development Context section there is a discussion of assumptions, but not all that there should be and no discussion of game changers
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>4</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>2</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>50%</b>		
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>7</b>		<b>Total for this section</b>
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>5</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>71%</b>		

**E. Global Climate Change and Development Strategy**

No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance	Score	Value		ADHERENCE COMMENTS
1	The CDCS refers to the Presidents Global Climate Change Initiative	N/A		0	The Mission submitted its final version of its CDCS in June 2012. The GCCD Strategy came out January 2012. it seems likely, given the importance that climate change has to its CDCS, that there was either no time to incorporate it or they were unaware of the policy
2	The CDCS incorporates Agency Global Climate Change guidance	N/A		0	See above
3	The CDCS monitoring and evaluation plan is consistent with USAID’s new evaluation policy to assess success, scalability, and replicability of direct climate change programming and integration activities.	no	0	1	Regardless of whether the Mission was aware of GCCD strategy guidance or not, they were aware of the evaluation policy and the CDCS does not address this criteria
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>1</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>0</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>0%</b>		

**F. Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy**

No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance	Score	Value		ADHERENCE COMMENTS
1	A Gender Analysis was conducted as part of the analytical agenda informing the CDCS	yes	1	1	So stipulated in the Development Context Chapter
2	The Gender Analysis informed the formulation of CDCS results	yes	1	1	Yes, there is a specific section on gender and the analysis seems very good and informs the DOs
3	The CDCS incorporates one or more Agency-formulated indicators designed to assess progress towards increasing gender equality and female empowerment results	N/A		0	Do not have the list to be able to answer
4	The CDCS monitoring and evaluation plan includes either GEFE-specific indicators or sex-disaggregated indicators that measure progress toward achievement of gender equality and women's empowerment (see indicator section) results	somewhat	0.5	1	There are few GEFE-specific indicators and while there are some disaggregated indicators, they are far fewer than should be. The M&E Section states they will disaggregate by gender but the CDCS indicators should have been better formulated
5	The CDCS, at the country or subnational level, incorporates specific results that have associated targets and indicators for tracking progress relative to one of the following Agency wide policy goals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce gender disparities in access to, control over and benefit from resources, wealth, opportunities, and services – economic, social, political, and cultural.</li> <li>• Reduce gender-based violence and mitigate its harmful effects on individuals and communities, so that all people can live healthy and productive lives.</li> <li>• Increase capability of women and girls to realize their rights, determine their life outcomes, and influence decision-making in households, communities, and societies.</li> </ul>	somewhat	0.5	1	There are several results that respond to this criteria, but no targets or indicators, which in itself is OK, because the CDCS is not supposed to by this time to have targets and indicators. However, at least the indicators should have reflected the three bullet points under this criteria and they did not
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>4</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>3</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>75%</b>		

**G. Management Requirements**

No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance	Score	Value		ADHERENCE COMMENTS
1	Does the CDCS include a brief description of the required management resources for each of the program resource level scenarios? This description should include:				
a.	Anticipated overall Operating Expense (OE) requirements	yes	1	1	
b.	Anticipated overall program-funded operational costs (PFOC) requirements, which would be included in the total program levels;	yes	1	1	
c.	Anticipated staffing requirements over the life of the CDCS, including U.S. Direct Hire, Personal Service Contractors and Foreign Service Nationals needed to implement the DO supporting programs	yes	1	1	Including broken down by DO
2	2. Does the CDCS provide justification for the Mission's proposed staffing needs relative to the broadening or narrowing its program? <i>Specific issues regarding the match between the staff skill set and the programmatic priorities should be noted.</i>	no	0	1	There is discussion of the close out under R&P section but no specific discussion of staff skill sets or justification for the proposed staffing levels.
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>4</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>3</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>75%</b>		

**H. Program Resources and Priorities**

No.	Alignment Categories / Criteria With Criteria Descriptions and Rating Guidance	Score	Value		ADHERENCE COMMENTS
1	Scenarios: Does the CDCS include two planning scenarios, that is, a base scenario and an alternative scenario, that demonstrate the sensitivity of strategy, results to additional (or reduced) resources?	yes	1	1	Annex 1, contains the alternative budget scenario

2	<p><i>Prioritization: Are DOs prioritized? For each DO the CDCS crosswalks and prioritizes all associated concerned program areas (program elements for Health and Education) by rank order. The prioritization should be based on what is most important to achieve the CDCS Goal and priority DOs, not solely based on the levels of assistance.</i></p>	somewhat	0.5	1	There is a discussion of each DO and many of the components of the DOs particularly in terms of their close out but no real prioritization.
<b>POSSIBLE POINTS</b>			<b>2</b>		
<b>TOTAL</b>			<b>1.5</b>		
<b>%age</b>			<b>75%</b>		
					<p><b>Overall Summary and Analysis:</b> There were a number of weak spots in this CDCS: the Development Hypothesis section was weak and incomplete and the RF section did not provide an overall overview of the logic and causal relationships and weaknesses. The assumptions were incomplete and in DO 2 in particular, there were statements made concerning decentralization for instance that required government commitment to achieve the DO but this / these were not considered either critical assumptions or risks. DO 2 statement was about the need to improve management for improved service delivery but large parts of the narrative made very clear it was a "governance-supported" set of results. It indicated confused thinking, i.e., either good governance was being sought to overall or improved service delivery. The second principal weak point was M&amp;E and Learning in in particular. This seems to be a trend in the CDCS' review</p>

**Appendix 4. MASTER DASHBOARD**

Country	Albania	Azerbaijan	Bangladesh	Bosnia Herzegovina	Ethiopia	Georgia	Ghana	Guatemala	Jordan	Liberia	Mongolia	Peru	Russia	Senegal	Sri Lanka	Uganda	Ukraine	Zambia	Average 2012	
<b>A. Development Context, Challenges and Opportunities</b>																			<b>Average 2012</b>	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.0%
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	94.7%
3	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	97.4%
4	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	89.5%
<b>Average</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>75%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>88%</b>	<b>95.4%</b>
<b>B. Development Hypothesis</b>																			<b>Average 2012</b>	
1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	81.6%
2	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	81.6%
3	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	0.5	68.4%
<b>Average</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>67%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>33%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>83%</b>	<b>77.2%</b>
<b>C. The Results Framework</b>																			<b>Average 2012</b>	
1a	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	89.5%
1b	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	92.1%
1c	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	84.2%
1d	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	92.1%
1e	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	71.1%
1f	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	94.7%
1g	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	N/A	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	88.9%
1h	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	89.5%
2a	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	89.5%
2b	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	84.2%
2c	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	92.1%
2d	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	94.7%
2e	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	92.1%
2f	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	84.2%
2g	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	92.1%
2h	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	94.7%
2i	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	92.1%
2j	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	100.0%
2k	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	86.8%
3a	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	92.1%
3b	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	89.5%
4	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.5	N/A	N/A	N/A	1	N/A	N/A	1	1	N/A	1	90.0%

5a	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	86.8%
5b	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	94.7%
5c	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	86.8%
5d	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	94.7%
6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	89.5%
7	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	92.1%
8	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	89.5%
9	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0	1	1	0	73.7%
10	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	94.7%
Average	93%	77%	97%	88%	90%	100%	95%	97%	82%	93%	85%	83%	77%	88%	88%	100%	90%	83%	89.6%

<b>D. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning</b>																			<b>Average 2012</b>	
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	94.7%
2a	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	92.1%
2b	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	0	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	84.2%
3a	1	0.5	1	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	0	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	71.1%	
3b	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	76.3%	
3c	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	76.3%	
3d	0.5	0.5	1	0	0.5	0.5	1	0.5	0.5	0	0	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	0	0.5	50.0%	
Average	79%	64%	100%	71%	93%	79%	86%	93%	79%	57%	50%	71%	71%	64%	79%	100%	57%	88%	77.9%	

<b>E. Global Climate Change and Development Strategy</b>																			<b>Average 2012</b>
1	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	1	1	N/A	0.5	0.5	N/A	0	1	N/A	1	1	1	85.7%
2	N/A	N/A	1	1	1	1	1	1	N/A	0	0.5	N/A	0	1	N/A	1	1	1	82.1%
3	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0	1	N/A	0.5	0.5	1	55.0%
Average	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	83%	83%	83%	100%	N/A	25%	50%	0%	0%	100%	N/A	83%	83%	100%	74.3%

<b>F. Gender Equality and Female Empowerment Policy</b>																			<b>Average 2012</b>
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	97.4%
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	94.7%
3	0.5	0.5	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	N/A	0	N/A	1	0	1	1	58.8%
4	0.5	0	1	1	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	1	73.7%
5	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	1	1	1	0	1	84.2%
Average	80%	70%	100%	90%	70%	70%	100%	100%	90%	60%	70%	75%	70%	100%	80%	60%	80%	100%	82.4%

<b>G. Management Requirements</b>																			<b>Average 2012</b>
1a	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	89.5%
1b	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0.5	1	N/A	1	0	1	1	0	69.4%
1c	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	94.7%
2	1	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	86.8%
Average	100%	100%	100%	100%	38%	100%	75%	100%	100%	75%	88%	75%	100%	100%	0%	100%	100%	75%	85.5%

<b>H. Program Resources and Priorities</b>																			<b>Average</b>
1	1	1	0.5	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0.5	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	63.2%

2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0.5	1	1	0	1	1	1	86.8%
Average	100%	100%	75%	100%	50%	100%	100%	100%	50%	0%	75%	75%	100%	100%	0%	50%	100%	50%	75.0%



## Appendix 5. EXEMPLARY TABLES OF CONTENTS

### CONTENTS BANGLADESH

#### EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

#### A. INTRODUCTION

#### B. DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES

1. Development Challenges:
2. Development Opportunities:
3. The Government of Bangladesh Led Plans:
4. Development Partner Coordination and Aid Effectiveness:

#### C. USAID/BANGLADESH RESULTS FRAMEWORK

1. USAID Forward Reforms
2. Cross-cutting Issues:
3. Critical Assumptions and Risks:

#### D. **DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE #1:** Citizen Confidence in Governance Institutions Increased

1. Development Hypothesis:
2. Geographic Focus and Targeted Beneficiaries:
3. Intermediate Results:
4. Linkages with Other USAID Programs:
5. Other USG Support:
6. GOB Commitment:
7. Other Donor Support:
8. Leveraging Use of Science, Technology, and Game Changing Innovations to Achieve the

DO

9. Leveraging Local Institution Participation:

#### E. **DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE # 2:** Food Security Improved

1. Development Hypothesis:
2. Geographic Focus and Targeted Beneficiaries:
3. Intermediate Results:
4. Linkages to Other USAID Programs:
5. Other USG Support:
6. GOB Commitment:

7. Other Donor Support:

8. Leveraging Use of Science, Technology, and Game Changing Innovations to Achieve the

DO:

9. Leveraging Local Institution Participation:

**F. DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE #3: Health Status Improved**

1. Development Hypothesis:

2. Geographic Focus and Targeted Beneficiaries:

3. Intermediate Results:

4. Linkages to Other USAID Programs:

5. Other USG Support:

6. Donor Coordination, Alliances and Partnerships:

7. GOB Commitment:

8. Leveraging use of Science, Technology, and Game Changing Innovation to Achieve the

DO:

9. Leveraging Local Institution Participation in the USAID Health Program:

**G. DEVELOPMENT Objective 4: Responsiveness to Climate Change Improved**

1. Development Hypothesis:

2. Geographic Focus and Target Beneficiaries:

3. Intermediate Results:

4. Linkages to Other USAID Programs:

5. Other USG Support:

6. GOB Commitment:

7. Other Donor Support:

8. Leveraging Use of Science Technology, and Game Changing Innovations to Achieve DO:

9. Leveraging Local Institution Participation:

**H. MONITORING AND EVALUATION**

**I. RESOURCES AND PRIORITIES**

**J. MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS**

1. Anticipated Staffing Requirements:

2. Anticipated Overall Operating Expense (OE) Funding Requirements:

3. Anticipated Program-Funded Operational Costs:

4. Anticipated New Project Designs/Project Extensions:

Annexes to the CDCS

Annex 1: Analytical & Learning Agenda

Annex 2: Results Framework and Links to GOB National Plans

Annex 3: Critical Assumptions and Risks

Annex 4: Illustrative Indicators and Evaluation Questions

Annex 5: References

## **GUATEMALA**

### **Table of Contents**

**Page**

**Acronyms and Abbreviations iv**

**Foreword vi**

**Executive Summary 1**

#### **I. Development Opportunities and Challenges 3**

**A. Country Overview**

**B. Analysis of Development Challenges**

**C. Problem Statement**

**D. Country Leadership and Donor Programs**

#### **II. Results Framework 12**

**A. Overall Goal**

**B. Development Hypothesis**

**C. Relationships between Sub-Intermediate Results, Intermediate Results, Development Objectives and Goal**

**D. Focus and Synergy**

**E. Critical Assumptions and Assessment of Risks**

#### **III. Development Objective One 22**

**A. Description**

**B. Intermediate Result 1**

**C. Intermediate Result 2**

**D. Changes to Program**

**E. Aid Effectiveness**

#### **IV. Development Objective Two 33**

**A. Description**

**B. Intermediate Result 1**

**C. Intermediate Result 2**

**D. Intermediate Result 3**

**E. Changes to Program**

**F. Aid Effectiveness**

#### **V. Development Objective Three 45**

**A. Description**

**B. Intermediate Result 1**

**C. Intermediate Result 2**

**D. Intermediate Result 3**

**E. Changes to Program**

**F. Aid Effectiveness**

#### **VI. Cross-cutting Issues 52**

**A. Policy**

**B. Local Governance**

#### **VII. Performance Management 54**

**VIII. Resources and Priorities 59**

**Appendices 61**

- 1. CDCS Budget FY 2012 – FY 2016**
- 2. Non-USG Resources**
- 3. Staffing and Operational Expenditure Requirements**
- 4. Results Framework**
- 5. Policy/Legal Priority Agenda**
- 6. Collaborating, Learning and Adapting**

## **ETHIOPIA**

Executive Summary

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Development Opportunities and Challenges

Country Overview

Opportunities and Obstacles

Government and Donor Alignment

Analyses Undertaken

Results Framework

Overall Goal: Ethiopia's Transformation to a Prosperous and Resilient Country Accelerated

Relationship of DOs to overall goal

Policy Priorities and 'Soft' Power

DO 1: Increased Economic Growth with Resiliency in Rural Ethiopia

- Background and Rationale
- Description of the Development Objective
- Operating Principles
- Geographic Focus
- Gender
- Details of IR-level Objectives
- Expected Results for the DO

DO 2: Increased Utilization of Quality Health Services

DO 3: Improved Learning Outcomes

Support Objective - Improved Governance Environment for Sustainable Development

Procurement Reform

Monitoring and Evaluation

Resources and Priorities

USAID/Ethiopia CDCS Budget

USAID/Ethiopia FY2012 Initiative Breakout

Non-USG Resources

CDCS Management Requirements

## **Table of Contents: Russia**

### **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY 1**

#### I. DEVELOPMENT CHALLENGES AND OPPORTUNITIES ANALYSIS 4

A. Democracy and Governance – Findings of Assessments and Analyses 4

B. Health and Human Development – Findings of Assessments and Analyses 7

C. Donor Coordination and the Operating Environment - Findings of Assessment and Analyses 9

D. The North Caucasus – Findings of Assessments and Analyses 11

E. Other Analyses 12

- The Economy 12
- Biodiversity 14
- Gender 15
- Alliance and Public-Private Partnership Opportunities 17
- Summary 18

#### II. DEVELOPMENT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES 19

A. Summary and Goal Statements 19

B. Overarching Critical Assumptions, Risks and Parameters 23

C. Linkages of Development Objectives to the Goal Statements 24

D. Strategic Focus, Prioritization of Objectives and Geographic Regions 25

E. Coordination with the Interagency and Diplomatic Efforts 25

**DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE #1 (DO1): RESILIENT CIVIL SOCIETY & RESPONSIVE, ACCOUNTABLE DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE 27**

- Background and Rationale 27
- Description of the Development Objective 28
- Operating Principles 28
- Geographic Focus 29
- Gender 29

### **Details of IR-level Objectives 31**

IR 1.1 More Inclusive Citizen Engagement on Public Interest Issues 31

IR 1.2 Increased Protection of Rights and Freedoms 31

IR 1.3 Sub-National Governance More Transparent, Accountable, and Inclusive 32

Expected Results for DO1 in 2016 33



**DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE #2 (DO2): TARGETED HEALTH AND SOCIAL OUTCOMES IMPROVED 35**

- Background and Rationale 35
- Description of Development Objective 36
- Operating Principles 37
- Geographic Focus 37
- Gender 39

**Details of IR-level Objectives 41**

IR 2.1: Strengthened Systems for Sustained Delivery of HIV Prevention and Care among Most Affected Populations: 41

IR 2.2: Capacity of the national tuberculosis system to manage tuberculosis and multi-drug resistant tuberculosis in the Russian Federation strengthened, and trans-border transmission reduced 41

IR 2.3: Systems of support for vulnerable children and families strengthened through the development of enhanced tools and the consolidation of best practices 42

IR 2.4: Improved reproductive health status of population and infant health 43

Expected Results for DO2 in 2016 44

**DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE #3 (DO3): CAPACITY TO ADDRESS GLOBAL DEVELOPMENT AND HUMANITARIAN CHALLENGES ENHANCED 45**

- Background and Rationale 45
- Geographic Focus 46
- Gender 46

**Details of IR-level Objectives 47**

IR 3.1 Knowledge and Skills to Address Global Development and Humanitarian Challenges Improved: 47

IR 3.2 Mechanisms for Joint Collaboration in Third Countries Strengthened 48

IR 3.3 Climate Change Adaptation Strategy Strengthened 48

Expected Results for DO3 in 2016 49

**SPECIAL OBJECTIVE #1 (SpO1): REDUCED DRIVERS OF INSTABILITY IN THE NORTH CAUCASUS 51**

Background and Rationale 51

Geographic Focus 51

Gender 52

IR SpO1.1: Increased economic opportunities for those groups most likely to be drawn into conflict 54

IR SpO1.2: Increased public satisfaction with the effectiveness of local governance	54
IR SpO1.3: Increased capacity to monitor and respond to human rights violations	55
IR SpO1.4: Improved quality and access to medical-social services	56
Expected Results for SpO1 in 2016	56
III. MONITORING AND EVALUATION	58
IV. RESOURCES AND PRIORITIES	60
V. MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS	64
A. Staffing	64
B. Internal Reorganization	67
C. Operating Expense Resource Requirements	68
VI. CONCLUSION	69
Annex 1: Illustrative Performance Management Indicators and Evaluation Questions	71
Annex 2: Table of Key Project Designs and Other Interventions Necessary to Implement the Strategy	79
Annex 3: Key Terms and Acronyms	80
Annex 4: Key Assessments and Analyses Conducted in Support of the CDCS	81
Annex 5: Future USAID Assistance that Addresses Identified Conservation Needs	82
Annex 6: USAID Russia FY 2012-2015 Implemented Resources. Budget Scenarios 2 and 3	



**EnCompass LLC**

Main Point of Contact:

Lynne Franco, Vice President for Technical  
Assistance and Evaluation

EnCompass LLC

Tel: +1-301-287-8717

Fax: +1-301-685-3720

Email: [lfranco@encompassworld.com](mailto:lfranco@encompassworld.com)

Alternate Point of Contact:

Tessie Catsambas

President, EnCompass LLC

11426 Rockville Pike, Suite 229

Rockville, MD 20852

Tel: +1-301-287-8707

Email: [tcatsambas@encompassworld.com](mailto:tcatsambas@encompassworld.com)