Department of State TELEGRAM

PN-ABI-769

#23

#23 72775

PAGE 01 STATE 129397 1135 STATE 129397

ORIGIN AID-01

INFO OCT-01 AF-10 ARA-15 EA-12 EUR-12 NEA-07 10-15
/168 R

DRAFTED BY PPC/E:RBERG/MTURNER:SDW
APPROVED BY AA/AID:RMNOOTER
AA/ASIA, JSULLIVAN (DRAFT)
AA/AFR, GBUTCHER (DRAFT)
AA/NE, AWHITE (DRAFT)
AA/LAC, ECOY (DRAFT)
AA/PPC, ASHAKOW (DRAFT)
AA/DS, SLEVIN (INFO)
OPM:GRAMSEY (INFO)
AA/POC, CRAULLEYSON (INFO)
GS:MBALL (INFO)
AA/ASIA:JHAMILTON (INFO)
SER/MP:JELLIS (PHONE)
DESIRED DISTRIBUTION
1T ACTION PPC CHRON 2 3 4 8 INFO AFR 1A POC 11A NE 15 4ASIA 16 SMO
LA 16 AA/DS 8ASIA OA OM AAID ES SER 88P
----------000188 221300Z /51

R 211916Z MAY 79
FM SECSTATE WASHDC
TO AID PRIN POSTSV
AMEMBASSY ANKARA
USMISSION GENEVA
AMEMBASSY LAGOS
AMEMBASSY PARIS
AMEMBASSY ROME

UNCLAS STATE 129397

AIDAC GUATEMALA FOR USAID AND ROCAP KARACHI FOR AAG AND

E.O.11652: N/A
11S NAIROBI FOR USAID AND REDSO/EA PARIS FOR UNESCO AND
TAGS:
USOECD ROME ALSO FR AIDOFFCR FRIULI
SUBJECT: MANAGEMENT OFTHE MSSN EVALUATIONFUNCTION

FROM THE ACTING ADMINISTRATOR

1. AS PART OF ONGOING EXAMINATION OF WAYS TO STRENGTHEN AGENCY'S EVALUATION PROGRAM, ON APRIL 23RD I DISCUSSED WITH REGIONAL AA'S AND AA/PPC THE NATURE AND LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR MANAGEMENT OF MISSION EVALUATION PROGRAMS.

2. THE DISCUSSION WAS OCCASIONED BY OUR CONCERN THAT OVER THE PAST SEVERAL YEARS, THIS IMPORTANT PROGRAM MANAGEMENT FUNCTION HAS BEEN ORGANIZATIONALLY DOWNGRADED AND GIVEN INADEQUATE AUTHORITY AND ATTENTION IN SOME MISSIONS. THIS TENDENCY RUNS COUNTER TO OUR DESIRE THAT:

-- MISSIONS PLACE MORE EMPHASIS ON THE USE OF EVALUATION TO ASSESS SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AND PROJECTS;

-- MISSIONS ATTEMPT TO EVALUATE THE EFFECTIVENESS AND RELEVANCE OF THEIR POLICIES AND STRATEGIES;

-- THERE BE GREATER ASSURANCE/ACCOUNTABILITY FOR PROGRAM RESULTS AND BETTER FOLLOW-THROUGH ON

THE UTILIZATION OF EVALUATION FINDINGS; AND

-- WE DEMONSTRATE TO HOST COUNTRIES, AND TO CONGRESS, THE IMPORTANCE WE ATTACH TO THE EVALUATION PROCESS.

3. THE CONCLUSIONS OF OUR DISCUSSION WERE:

A. OVERALL RESPONSIBILITY FOR ASSURING THAT TO MAXIMUM FEASIBLE EXTENT MISSION POLICY AND PROGRAM DECISIONS ARE GUIDED BY, AND BASED UPON EVALUATION FINDINGS RESTS WITH THE MISSION DIRECTOR AND HIS/HER DEPUTY.

B. THE MISSION EVALUATION OFFICER (MEO) IS RESPONSIBL FOR THE EFFECTIVE FUNCTIONING OF THE MISSION EVALUATION SYSTEM; THIS RESPONSIBILITY SHOULD NORMALLY BE ASSIGNED TO THE MOST SENIOR PROGRAM OFFICER. THE MEO RESPONSIBILIT MAY, OF COURSE, BE PLACED AT THE DEPUTY DIRECTOR LEVEL IF THE MISSION DIRECTOR DESIRES OR BE RETAINED BY THE MISSION DIRECTOR.

C. IF A MISSION FEELS THAT IT IS NECESSARY TO ASSIGN THE MEO RESPONSIBILITY AT A LOWER ORGANIZATIONAL LEVEL THAN INDICATED ABOVE, AN EXPLANATION SHOULD BE SUBMITTED FOR AID/W REVIEW.

D. THE MEO RESPONSIBILITY DESCRIBED ABOVE IS SEEN AS AN EXECUTIVE FUNCTION INCLUDING EVALUATION POLICY, PROGRAMMING OF EVALUATION RESOURCES AND COORDINATION OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES. THE ACTUAL CONDUCT OF EVALUATION AND FOLLOW-ON ACTIVITIES AND SERVICES CAN BE ASSIGNED TO OTHERS WITHIN THE MISSION AND AT TIMES BE AIDED, AS APPROPRIATE, BY CONTRACTORS/CONSULTANTS/RSSA/PASA. ROLE OF EVALUATION OFFICER DISCUSSED IN NO. 10264 SUPPLEMENTS I AND II.

4. RECOGNIZE THAT AFRICA POSTS RECEIVED SIMILAR INSTRUCTIONS FROM AA/AFR PER STATE 311713 OF NOVEMBER 5, 1978. A NUMBER OF AFRICA POSTS HAVE NOT RESPONDED TO THAT MESSAGE AND ARE HEREBY REQUESTED TO DO SO ASAP.

5. IN LIGHT OF THE ABOVE, PLEASE ADVISE YOUR AA OF YOUR DECISION ON PLACEMENT OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR EVALUATION.
6. WELCOME YOUR SUGGESTIONS ON HOW TO STRENGTHEN THE POLICY AND PROGRAM MANAGEMENT USES OF EVALUATION IN YOUR MISSION AND HOW AID/W CAN ASSIST YOU. CHRISTOPHER

UNCLASSIFIED