PD-AAV-393
ISN- 4759

ASIA NEAR EAST BUREAU
PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES
FOR
EVALUATION

ANE/DP/Evaluation

February 1986

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction 2

I. ANE Bureau Evaluation Policy. 4

II. Applicability of the Guidelines 5

III. The Asia Near East Bureau Evaluation Process 7

Step 1. Deciding When to Evaluate and in What Form 8

A. Determining at Design Stage the Nature and Scope of Evaluation Effort Required 8

B. Scheduling Periodic Evaluation 8

C. Unscheduled Evaluations or Special Studies . . . 9

D. Forms of Evaluation. 9

(1) Periodic Evaluations 9
(2) On-going Monitoring and Evaluation System (M&E) 9
(3) Project Completion/Final . . . . . Evaluations 10
(4) Impact Evaluations. 10
(5) Special Reviews, Assessments or . . . . . Sector Studies 10
(6) End of Tour Reports 11

E. Sources of Information 11

Step 2. Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Requirements for PIDs and PPs. 13

A. Project Identification Document (PID). 13
B. Project Paper (PP) 13
C. ANE Bureau Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans (Outline) 14

Step 3. Developing a Scope of Work for an Evaluation 17

A. Introduction 17
B. ANE Bureau Review of Evaluation Scopes of Work . 17
C. Outline for ANE Bureau Evaluation Scopes of Work 17
Scope of Work (Outline) . . . . . .
Basic Project Identification Data (Outline) . 24
Executive Summary (Outline) 25

Page

Step 4. Assembling and Orienting the Evaluation Team 26

A. Team Composition 26
B. Team Orientation 27

Step 5. Backstopping the Evaluation. 30

A. When a Decision to Evaluate Has Been Made. . . . 30
B. Two Months Prior to the Evaluation 30
C. Issue Final PIO/T. 31
D. One Month Prior to the Evaluation 31
E. Ten Days Prior to the Evaluation Team ETA. . . . 32
F. Upon Arrival of the Evaluation Team 32

Step 6. Reporting, Internal Review and Submission Procedures 33

A. "Final" Evaluation Report. 33
B. A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (Overview) 33
C. Internal Review Procedures 33
D. Submission Guidelines. 34
C. A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (Detailed Guidelines). 35

Step 7. ANE Bureau Logging, Distribution and Tracking Systems 48

A. Logging. 48
B. Distribution 48

Step 8. ANE Bureau Review Procedures. 49

A. Forms of Review. 49

1. Informal Reviews 49
a. Team Debriefing. 49
b. Technical Review of Draft Reports. . . . 49
c. Desk Reviews 49

2. Project Review Committee (PRC) Reviews . . . 50

3. ANPAC Reviews 51

B. Timing of Reviews 51

C. ANE Bureau Review Guidelines 51

Page

Step 9. Providing Feedback on Reviews 53

Step 10. Follow-up on Evaluation Recommendations 54

IV. Annual Mission Evaluation Plans. 55

A. Steps in Preparing an Annual Evaluation Plan 55
B. Annual Evaluation Plan Narratives. 56
C. Annual Evaluation Plan Schedules 56

V. The Mission Evaluation Process: Roles and Responsibilities. . 59

A. Responsibilities 59

B. Project Evaluation Review. 60
(1) Organization 60
(2) Purpose. 61

VI. Host Country Involvement 62

VII. Utilization of Prior Experience/Lessons Learned. 63

A. Utilization of Prior Experience in Project Design and Implementation 63

B. Identification of Lessons Learned During Evaluation. . . . 63

Bibliography 64

ASIA NEAR EAST BUREAU

PROCEDURAL GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATION

Introduction

The merger of the Asia and Near East Bureaus presents a unique opportunity to bring together two evaluation systems which in almost all respects fully complement each other. Central to each system is the use of evaluation to support management decision making. Each Bureau, in developing its own guidelines to insure evaluation was properly utilized, however, pursued somewhat different tracks. The decentralized focus of the Near East Bureau's evaluation system called for the development of formalized procedural guidelines. The Asia Bureau focused its attention on the development of simplified guidelines for data collection, monitoring and evaluation planning. The system described in these guidelines reflects a blending of both systems with the strengths of each retained. Major differences from prior guidelines or procedures are as follows:

- Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans

The ANE Bureau has adopted the Asia Bureau's approach to data collection, monitoring and evaluation planning. It is a system which emphasizes the development of small scale information gathering strategies to insure rapid feedback for management decision making and for documenting effects and impact. Detailed guidelines have been developed and will be distributed. A summary of this approach is provided in Section III, Step 2, Page 12. For all ANE missions a Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is required in all PP's, the depth and detail of which is determined by the nature of the project.

- Utilization of Prior Experience in Project Design

A new requirement for Asia missions is the inclusion in both the PID and the PP of a bibliography of materials consulted during project design. This is already required of NE missions. (See Section VII, Page 61.)

- Evaluation Scopes of Work

The NE Bureau in its guidelines adopted the Asia Bureau format for Scopes of Work for use by NE missions. All ANE missions, therefore, should be familiar with this basic requirement. Exceptions include the addition of a background statement (NE guidelines), revisions in the section dealing with reporting requirements to reflect ANE Bureau guidelines, deletion of the PES outline (NE guidelines) as a preferred format for organizing an evaluation report, and a new requirement for an Evaluation Summary.

- Introduction of the new A.I.D Evaluation Summary

The ANE Bureau will use as its primary reporting format the new A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (Parts I and II). This form replaces the Project Evaluation Summary (PES) and combines procedures established by the former Asia and Near East Bureaus. It includes a facesheet which lists major evaluation recommendations and action decisions, a one page abstract for entry into the Agency's automated memory, a three-page summary of the evaluation report, and one page for recording mission comments on the full report. Completion of Parts I and II is required for all evaluations conducted in the ANE Bureau. It is not to be used as a stand alone report as was often the case with the PES. Instead the full evaluation report is to be attached. (See Section III - Step 6, Page 33 for detailed discussion.)

- Logging, Distribution, Tracking and ANE Bureau Review Procedures

The formalized logging, distribution, tracking and review systems developed by the NE Bureau have been adopted for use in the ANE Bureau. The basic system uses the Project Review Committee (PRC) concept for implementation. The primary ANE Bureau project backstop officer (for field managed projects) or the ANE Bureau project officer (for ANE Bureau managed regional projects) chairs this committee. He/she is responsible for backstopping all aspects of evaluation pertaining to the project in close coordination with the ANE Bureau's Evaluation Division. In turn, ANE/DP/E in implementing elements of the system for which it is directly responsible (annual evaluation planning and tracking), coordinates its activities with each concerned project or project backstop officer. On project specific evaluation issues or arrangements, Missions should deal directly with the responsible ANE project backstop officer with copy to the Bureau's Evaluation Division. ANE/DP/E will clear all cables and correspondence to the field on matters dealing with evaluation. (See Section III, Steps 7-9, Pages 48-53.)

- Annual Evaluation Plans

General guidelines for the development of annual evaluation plans are included. It is expected that annual evaluation plans will continue to be reviewed in the context of all major program documents, i.e., Action Plans, CDSSs, ABSs, etc. To the extent feasible, annual evaluations should be fully integrated into broader program thinking. In turn, the reviewers will judge the merits of broad program documents, in part, by the extent to which the documents address relevant evaluation issues.

These guidelines describe a process for evaluation within the ANE Bureau. They were developed for use by both ANE/W and field staffs. The approach, as outlined here, specifies how, when, and why an evaluation should be undertaken. Since most evaluations conducted by the ANE Bureau are project specific, these guidelines tend to focus on the evaluation needs of Mission and Bureau staffs directly involved in project activities.

I. ANE Bureau Evaluation Policy

The ANE Bureau's policy on evaluation considers data collection, monitoring and evaluation as indispensable tools for every level of Mission, Bureau and Agency management. They provide information for improved project implementation and, if done well, help the Bureau and host country avoid pitfalls during the design and implementation of future projects and programs. The purpose of these activities is to provide information to managers concerning project progress, performance and impact or potential for impact. Ideally, the process begins during project design and continues throughout the period of implementation.

At the project level, the ANE Bureau's policy is as follows:

- During project design, a Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is to be prepared and funded through the project. The plan is to be included in the project paper. The purpose of the plan is to guide on-going project evaluation activities and to provide a schedule for periodic evaluations. It should set forth the major output, purpose and goal related questions that will be addressed and methodologies for data collection and analysis that will be employed for both on-going and periodic evaluations.

- During project implementation, the project officer should ensure that data on these questions are gathered and analyzed at regular intervals. The data analyses should be completed quickly to provide rapid feedback to managers to inform project decision-making and to guide fine-tuning of the project, if appropriate.

- For decision making, when managers determine that a broad assessment of project progress is needed concerning future direction of the project or for follow-on or related design activities, an external evaluation may be conducted. Such assessments are usually considered useful at the end of the second or in the third year of project implementation and upon project completion. In these circumstances, the project officer will provide the data generated during the process of on-going evaluation to the external evaluation team. The availability of such data then provides an empirical basis for Bureau evaluation reports. As appropriate, mission staff should schedule external evaluations to ensure that the evaluation findings are available to guide the design of follow-on projects.

The ANE Bureau's policy regarding annual evaluation planning calls for plans closely linked to Action Plans and future programming decisions. In addition to project specific concerns, annual evaluation plans should endeavor to address broader program level issues.

The ANE Bureau's policy on utilization of lessons learned through the evaluation process, requires that such lessons be used to help shape the design of new projects. A bibliography of documents consulted during project design is therefore required in all PIDS and project papers. Aggregate evaluation findings, on the other hand, should help create an information base for both country and regional planning.

II. Applicability of the Guidelines

These guidelines apply to all DA and ESF funded projects (including capital projects) and Housing Investment Guarantees planned and implemented by the Asia Near East Bureau. In addition, we are exploring the application of some of these guidelines to non-project forms of assistance such as Commodity Import Programs and to PL 480 Titles I, II and III. No project is arbitrarily excluded from evaluation or subjected to only one form of evaluation, e.g., final reports for "capital projects". Seldom, if ever, would a single project evaluation be expected to cover or respond to all of the concerns addressed here. The applicable criteria and approaches for evaluations should be determined by project-specific conditions. The most important consideration is utility. Project evaluation, regardless of its scope and nature, must be designed to serve a particular purpose of project, mission or Bureau management.

In using these guidelines, the reader should bear in mind lessons learned about evaluation which have emerged from A.I.D.'s past experience:

1. The effectiveness of the evaluation process is largely dependent upon the quality, explicitness and rigor of program or project design and monitoring.

2. Evaluation must comprehend the total program or project. It is neither feasible nor productive to limit the evaluation process to the fractional resource input of a single source or donor.

3. The responsibility for evaluation should be placed as close as possible, both functionally and organizationally, to the user of the evaluation findings.

4. The host country should play an active role in evaluating donor assisted projects. Where the host country does not have adequate capacity for evaluation, the donors should offer training in evaluation methods.

5. In designing and implementing evaluation studies, maximum use should be made of host country skills and resources, e.g., local universities, consulting firms, etc.

6. Clear understanding should be reached prior to undertaking an evaluation with regard to the roles of various participants. Each person's role should be so defined that their experience will be used effectively and compatible arrangements will be agreed upon.

7. Evaluation findings should serve as guidelines rather than intractable laws. Users of the evaluative information should reach an understanding on which recommendations will be implemented with follow-up procedures established to ensure this is done.

8. Evaluation should be viewed as a learning process and not as an audit.

9. Evaluation procedures should be as simple as possible with rapid feedback on recommendations and conclusions.

10. Evaluation may occur on all levels of a project, e.g., national, regional, district, village (or community), and household levels, as appropriate.

III. The Asia Near East Bureau Evaluation Process

The ten steps in the Asia Near East Bureau's evaluation process are detailed in the following pages and address both the Bureau's and Agency's views on evaluation.

These steps are:

1. Deciding when to evaluate and in what form.

2. Data collection, monitoring and evaluation plan requirements for PIDs and PPs.

3. Developing a scope of work for an evaluation.

4. Assembling and orienting the evaluation team.

5. Backstopping the evaluation.

6. Reporting, internal review and submission procedures.

7. ANE Bureau logging, distribution and tracking systems.

8. ANE Bureau review procedures.

9. Providing feedback on reviews.

10. Follow-up on evaluation recommendations.

Step 1. Deciding When to Evaluate and in What Form

A. Determining at design stage the nature and scope of evaluation effort required.

A.I.D. no longer requires annual evaluations of all projects. 1/ The nature of the project and decisions to be reached as the project progresses, dictate the nature of and timing for evaluation. The extent of the evaluation process--both on-going and periodic-- required to ensure successful project implementation, is determined during project design and explained in the project evaluation plan.

In determining whether a project should receive extensive evaluation, the project design team and mission staff should apply the following criteria. Meeting any one could be sufficient justification for including a more elaborate evaluation plan in the project paper.

-- The project is a core activity within the mission's portfolio.

-- The project is of an experimental nature, e.g., pilot projects.

-- The project is intended to have significant impact for a large number of beneficiaries.

-- In addition to a specific development purpose, the project is also intended to expand or improve the quality of Host Country/U.S. policy dialogue and has implications for other U.S. interests.

-- The project includes a significant institution-building component.

-- Considerable funding is involved and/or the project life spans a long (5-10 year) period of time calling for several interim evaluations.

B. Scheduling an Evaluation

The design team and mission staff should plan periodic evaluations to precede key decisions points during the implementation of a project. They should help the project officer to affirm that the critical event has, or hasn't, taken place and what effect it will have on the project. An evaluation prior to a key decision point in the implementation of the project should provide information upon which decisions can be based. The focus of the evaluation will be dictated by the information required for these decisions. Evaluation schedules should be flexible to accommodate delays during project implementation.

1/ These guidelines refer to all A.I.D. development efforts as projects. When there is a need to differentiate between project and program evaluations, it will be done. Unless specifically stated otherwise, these guidelines apply equally to both.

C. Unscheduled Evaluations

Events may require an evaluation not planned in the original project design. Such evaluations should be undertaken in the following circumstances:

-- When monitoring evidence indicates that a project is having serious difficulties, e.g., implementation schedules are not being met, an amendment may be needed, or conditions which gave rise to the project no longer pertain. Multiple purposes may be served by such an evaluation, including raising the level of attention given to the project by the host government, providing the objective basis for a change in the activity, or gaining a different perspective on what is going on in a project and why.

-- When a number of projects within one country begin to show common problems, such as construction delays and poor technical assistance performance, comparative evaluations can be structured to determine why these generic problems exist.

D. Forms of Evaluation

The forms of evaluation most often used by the Asia Near East Bureau are: (1) periodic evaluations; (2) on-going monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems; (3) final evaluations/project completion reports; (4) impact evaluations; (5) special studies (and even end of tour reports). In practice, we find that many project evaluations are hybrid in form. Brief descriptions of each form of evaluation follow.

1. Periodic Evaluations

Periodic evaluations are the most common and are carried out at various points during project implementation. Such evaluations might be conducted for any of a number of reasons such as: (a) to provide information for decisions on issues which were raised during project design but could only be resolved during implementation; (b) to find solutions to intractable implementation problems; (c) to document the reason for a project's success or failure; (d) to relate progress toward outputs to the project's purpose, reassess periodically the continued relevance of the purpose and underlying assumptions, and take a preliminary look at the project's impact. Periodic evaluations rely heavily upon the existence of a good project monitoring system.

2. On-going Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System

On-going evaluation refers to data collection and analysis activities conducted at planned and regular intervals throughout the implementation period. The purpose is to provide rapid feedback to managers to inform

project decision making and to improve project implementation. Typical on-going evaluation activites include, for example, annual contraceptive prevalence surveys for population projects, quarterly analyses of infant and children's weight gain in nutrition projects, quarterly analyses of seedling survival rates in forestry projects, annual small-scale production surveys in agriculture projects or quarterly analyses of operation and maintenance activities in irrigation projects.

3. Project Completion Reports/Final Evaluations

There are two types of evaluations that may be carried out at the end of a project: (a) Project Completion Reports and (b) final evaluations. Project Completion Reports emphasize inputs, outputs, end-of-project status indicators, give a preliminary estimate of the project's impact and lessons learned. Final evaluations provide an in-depth preliminary judgement of a project's immediate impact on beneficiaries, possible economic return and lessons learned. The key differences between a Project Completion Report and a final evaluation are the intensity of the review, its scope and the resources committed to each. The Project Completion Report can be prepared by the project officer. A final evaluation may require the services of one or more contractors and involve a considerable period of time. Therefore a mission should invest in final evaluations only when it is believed significant information will be gained by conducting such an evaluation. At a minimum a Project Completion Report is required to close out a project.

4. Impact Evaluations

Impact evaluations are intended to provide the Agency with information on: (a) the types and magnitude of benefits from specific projects and programs; (b) the effectiveness of past projects and programs; and (c) the factors which influence whether or not the potential benefits of a project or program are likely to be or have been achieved. Impact evaluations should be able to isolate causal relationships and often look at goal level impacts. Because a project's benefits are often not fully realized during the course of the project, impact evaluations are often conducted several years after the project is completed.

5. Special Reviews, Assessments or Sector Studies

Special reviews examine issues which cut across one or more sectors. They may be country-specific or involve similar experience or issues in several countries. The examination of A.I.D.'s experience in a given area may be the focus of the study or the purpose may be to develop new information in an area where A.I.D.'s experience is limited. To the extent prior experience is being examined, special studies qualify as a form of evaluation. Rarely are special studies project-specific, though they may involve a review of several projects or sub-projects under an umbrella project within a given sector. They are usually issues-driven and may be focused on A.I.D. or host country policies.

6. End of Tour Reports

While not usually thought of as evaluation, End of Tour Reports provide a valuable source of information from the perspective of a project officer's experience in managing one or more projects. Such reports help provide continuity and can be of a personalized nature. Missions are encouraged to require End of Tour Reports of departing project officers. In addition, the mission could schedule inhouse reviews of all projects managed by project officers prior to their onward assignment.

E. Sources of Information

The general approach used in evaluation is determined at the time the project is designed and when the form and extent of data collection during project implementation is decided upon. The majority of A.I.D. evaluations do not involve elaborate social science research approaches. Complex research designs are usually too costly for most projects and thus are reserved for those few experimental projects for which A.I.D. is attempting to break new ground in "proving" the effectiveness of certain technological interventions or for those projects which represent a first entry into sectors for which A.I.D.'s experience is limited.

This does not mean that data cannot be made available or that limited social science research techniques can't be applied. For most projects the data base will consist of project documentation and a few key progress indicators usually reported in quarterly implementation reports. Additional data can be obtained through simple survey techniques or through the development of case studies. In most cases, however, elaborate, complicated techniques involving extensive field research is not necessary to reach fairly reliable conclusions and identify useful lessons. The following schematic provides an overview of the usual sources of information and data for most A.I.D. evaluations.

See also "Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans for Asia and Near East Bureau Projects", ANE/DP/E, 1985.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION AND DATA FOR A.I.D. EVALUATIONS

INTERNAL SOURCES

Secondary and Contextual Data (Usually available either in A.I.D. or at the USAID Mission.)

- A.I.D. Policy Papers (as pertinent)
- CDSS and NE Regional Strategies
- PIDs and Project Papers
- Project files (monthly reports, prior evaluations, memos, letters, cables, etc.)
- Project Papers and evaluations of similar A.I.D. projects
- Sector Assessments

Primary Data (Available at the USAID Mission or can be obtained through the Host Government.)

- Sector survey data
- Periodic data collected against key indicators
- Host Country, USAID Mission, contractor and project beneficiary interviews

EXTERNAL SOURCES

Secondary and Contextual Data (Often available at the USAID Mission, the US Embassy, Counterpart Agencies, Other donors, etc.)

- Host country development plans and policies
- Host country project records, reports
- Private sector organizations' reports
- Books, periodicals and journals
- Research studies
- Other bilateral/multilateral donor project and program documentation
- Informant reports/expert opinions
- World Bank reports/studies.

Primary Data (Often unavailable or inadequate unless the project design makes specific provision for collection during project implementation.)

Observation	Participant or non-participant. The latter could be developed as part of regular site visits by project staff.
Survey	- Through interviews or by using structured questionnaires.
Other	- Case studies of before/after conditions - Record keeping by project staff in the form of journals, etc. - Group sessions to stimulate discussion re project experience and lessons learned.

Step 2. Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan Requirements for PIDs and PPs

The following guidelines provide an overview of ANE Bureau requirements for Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans in PIDs and PPs. Detailed guidelines are contained in "Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans for Asia and Near East Projects," ANE/DP/E, 1985, and must be consulted by the Project Design Team prior to preparation of the PID or PP Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan.

A. Project Identification Document (PID)

ANE Bureau policy requires a Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for all DA AND ESF projects, the amount of detail and intensity of approach being determined by the nature of the project. A fully developed Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan is not required at the PID stage. Missions will be expected to follow Handbook 3 which requires a discussion of the linkage between what the project proposes to achieve (the EOPS) and the means by which the mission plans to measure and evaluate the results against the stated objectives. In addition, the PID should attempt to describe briefly the types of data already being collected and the mission's initial thinking on the form and scope of the Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for the project.

B. Project Paper (PP)

An outline for Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans required for all field and AID/W projects follows. See "Guidelines for Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans for Asia and Near East Projects", ANE/DP/E, 1985, for detailed discussion. In particular, see Appendix I of this paper for sample data collection, monitoring and evaluation plans in the following sectors: agricultural research, irrigation, social forestry, the private sector, population and health.

C. ANE BUREAU DATA COLLECTION, MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLANS

(Outline)

1. THE USERS OF THE INFORMATION

This section should specify:

-- the users of the information (counterpart field and planning staff, A.I.D. staff); and

-- users' organizational affiliation.

2. PROJECT GOALS, PURPOSES, INPUTS, OUTPUTS

This section should reference the logframe and the section of the project paper which discusses purposes, goals, inputs and outputs.

3 MANAGERS' PRIORITY QUESTIONS

This section should identify managers :

-- priority output questions; and

-- priority purpose/goal questions.

Specifying high, medium and low priority questions may help ensure that only genuinely needed information is collected.

4. KEY INDICATORS AND ADMINISTRATIVE DATA TO ANSWER MANAGERS' QUESTIONS

This section should set forth:

-- key indicators which will be used to answer managers' questions;

-- which existing administrative records (i.e., from which agency) will be used to provide information on these indicators and the procedures for doing so;

-- whether new formats for administrative data will have to be designed and how these will be developed.

5. OTHER APPROPRIATE METHODS

For questions which require more intensive investigation over the life of project, this section should specify:

-- the combination of methods that will be used for gathering and analyzing data to answer managers' questions;

-- the type of data that will be gathered;

-- how frequently these studies will be conducted and by whom (M&E unit or local firms, universities or research institutions).

6. COUNTERPART SUPPORT AND INVOLVEMENT

This section should identify:

-- the counterpart implementing agencies which will be involved in data collection;

-- the nature and level of their involvement (provision of staff to prepare administrative data, or for the M&E unit, approximate numbers, type, etc.)

-- the institutional location of the M&E unit(s).

7. FEEDBACK PROCEDURES

This section should specify:

-- the specific procedures which will be used to generate feedback.

8. THE BUDGET

This section should identify specific budget line items to support the M&E system or it should reference the overall project budget which includes this information. Budget line items might include:

A.I.D.

-- long-term technical assistance (e.g., resident M&E advisor--24 to 26 months);

-- short-term technical assistance (short-term consultancies to advise on or participate in specific data collection and analysis efforts);

-- training in data collection and methodologies: long-term (university training); short-term (seminars, workshops, conferences); and

-- commodities: calculators, computers if appropriate.

HOST COUNTRY

-- counterpart agency field staff to fill out administrative data forms: for example, 100 field staff;

-- counterpart agency supervisors: for example, 10 supervisors;

-- office space for M&E units: for example, 3 district M&E units, 1 central unit;

-- staff for M&E units: for example, 4 Ph.D.s, 8 M.A.s; and funds for data processing, if appropriate.

9. EVALUATION SCHEDULE

This section should specify:

-- the points in the project life at which external evaluations will be conducted;

-- the purpose of these evaluations; and approximately, the type of empirical data, generated by the M&E system, which will be available for review by the evaluation teams.

Step 3. Developing a Scope of Work for an Evaluation

A. Introduction

In developing the scope of work, it should be remembered that a successful evaluation depends on the explicit understanding of the roles and responsibilities of each actor involved in the evaluation (host country, implementing agency and mission). The reasons for and the scope of the evaluation should be clearly spelled out. Mutual understanding of the roles and responsibilities depends on how well the scope of work details the responsiblities of everyone.

Obtaining host government input and agreement on the scope is a critical step. If the host government views the evaluation as an A.I.D. controlled exercise, it is not likely to feel any commitment to implementing the evaluation recommendations. If, on the other hand, the host government feels that its questions and issues are being addressed by a team it has helped select and in whom it has confidence, there is a greater likelihood that it will pay attention to the report. While gaining host country approval of scopes is time consuming, missions are encouraged to obtain counterparts input, as well as approval, if at all possible.

B. ANE Bureau Review of Evaluation Scopes of Work

The ANE Bureau Project Review Committee may review scopes of work initiated by Asia Near East missions on a selective basis. The purpose of these reviews is to ensure that major ANE Bureau project, policy or technical issues will be addressed by the evaluation. The Project Review Committee will, in most cases, review scopes of work for evaluations that are related to expected or required ANE Bureau actions, including increases in life of project funding or substantial deobligations, project extensions or amendments, and follow-on projects. In addition, the Project Review Committee may review scopes of work for evaluations that offer opportunities to obtain information relevant to future Bureau planning, Congressional interests and other missions' interests and needs for information on similar project activities.

As part of its annual evaluation planning, ANE/W will attempt to identify those evaluations for which a project committee review of the scope is contemplated. Before the initiation of an ANE/W review, the project backstop officer will inform the mission of the intent and purpose of the PRC review. Upon completion of the review, the PRC comments and suggestions will be cabled to the field. In the event the mission does not concur in the PRC suggestions, the mission has final authority over the content of the evaluation scope of work.

C. Outline for Asia Near East Bureau Evaluation Scopes of Work

The following provides a general framework for developing a scope of work for most evaluations. This outline can be adjusted to fit particular requirements at the mission's discretion.

RECOMMENDED FORMAT FOR AN EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

- -

Name of Country (USAID) or Office (ANE Bureau)
Sponsoring the Evaluation

Title of Project or Program
(or Title of Proposed Evaluation Report)

EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

I. ACTIVITY TO BE EVALUATED:

Identify the activity that will be evaluated. For example, if one or more A.I.D. assisted projects are to be evaluated, state the project number, title, cost, life-of-project dates, and most recent PACD for the project or projects to be examined. Modify appropriately if the evaluation is to cover a program, or only selected components of one or more projects.

II. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION:

Specify the planning, programming or implementation reason for the evaluation, the specific issues (managerial, financial, technical) the evaluation team should address (e.g., those factors which seem to be impeding implementation progress), and the specific agencies which are expected to use the results of the evaluation. Provide information on the following questions: To what uses will the evaluative information be put (e.g., upcoming decisions or longer-term planning needs requiring this information)? When will the information be needed to enable its practical use? Who are going to be the immediate users of the findings and recommendations? Are there other anticipated users?

Refer to the appropriate Project Paper evaluation plan.

Indicate whether the current ANE Bureau Evaluation Plan has scheduled the evaluation.

III. BACKGROUND:

The sponsoring mission or office should outline in no more than two pages a brief history to date of the activity to be evaluated, and what is generally agreed upon by A.I.D. and the borrower/grantee as the present status of the activity (i.e., what has happened, what the activity is achieving).

Include names of key organizations and individuals involved in the activity (spell out acronyms of organizations).

IV. STATEMENT OF WORK:

State in explicit, empirical 2/ terms the questions that the sponsors of the evaluation need answered, and that the evaluators have to focus their investigations on these questions, and are expected to provide answers to them.

State between five and ten questions (no more) and indicate their priority to the user. Expand on these essential questions by identifying subordinate questions or issues.

State that the evaluators will be required to provide in a final report the following:

-- their findings (i.e., the "evidence");

-- their conclusions (i.e., their interpretation of the evidence and their best judgement based on this interpretation);

-- their recommendations based on their judgements.

Require the evaluators to distinguish clearly between their findings, their conclusions (that is, their interpretations and judgements), and their recommendations.

A listing of specific, explicit questions, together with an indication of priorities, is crucial for getting a report that tells the intended users what they need to know. A scope of work that merely says: "The evaluation team shall address the following subjects -- matters, concerns, issues -- or the extent to what a project has achieved its inputs, outputs, purpose and goal" is likely to produce a rambling evaluation report that fails to pinpoint the aspects of the project most needing attention and to provide useful information.

2/ An "empirical" question is one that demands a descriptive, factual answer based on analysis of the data, such as: To what extent have yields and production increased as planned? What evidence is there that institutional capacity has increased in the ways projected in the project paper? What are the key agronomic and non-agronomic factors which inhibit adoption of new technologies? However, most managers and decision-makers tend to ask "non-empirical" questions, such as: Does this kind of project or program work? Is it effective or efficient? Is it having an impact? Is the project or program still relevant to our development aims? If the sponsoring mission or office needs the assistance of an evaluation specialist to help them formulate their information needs in empirical and "evaluable" terms -- which is often the case -- then the scope of work should include this requirement. As a practical matter, such assistance should be arranged for in advance of the evaluation itself.

V. METHODS AND PROCEDURES:

This section of the scope of work should identify the data collection methodologies that will be used. This can be clarified by the sponsoring mission or office by obtaining the advice of an evaluation specialist familiar with both current state of the art in evaluation and the practical circumstances in which the evaluation will take place.

The methods and procedures must also take into account the funds budgeted for the evaluation.

The methods selected for the evaluation, the associated procedures, and the cost, are based primarily on the questions asked by the users. The conceptualization, or research plan, for an evaluation is likely to vary from case to case. In A.I.D.'s experience, however, there are some practical matters that can be taken care of through a scope of work, and still allow for the flexibility that evaluators will need. These are:

-- duration and time phasing of the evaluation (e.g., whether one or more team members, including an evaluation specialist, should be available in advance for preparatory work, or later to see the report through its final drafting);

-- any requirement for team members to work a six-day week;

-- national holidays, working hours, communications/travel problems, and language problems that may affect the team's activities; note availability of local translators;

-- availability and location of data that may be useful in measuring changes or impacts in the area addressed by the project or program; list documents that team members should receive and be familiar with before the team begins its investigation (provided by the mission or the ANE Bureau;

-- characteristics of the beneficiary population that may affect interviewing procedures (e.g., gender, ethnic group, homogeniety);

-- an estimated division of time spent between research in the U.S., in-country capital city interviews and document review, field site visits, and analysis and report writing. Note any hardship or rigorous conditions (health, climate, roughness of travel, field site living conditions) that may affect the selection of team members;

-- availability of data-processing equipment, word-processors, etc.;

-- other administrative/logistical support to be provided by the sponsoring mission or office (if not otherwise included in the PIO/T);

-- state whether all or a portion of the scope of work is appropriate for small 8 (a) minority and women owned firm contract.

-- the amount of time required to review scholarly studies or A.I.D. documents before leaving for the field.

VI. COMPOSITION OF EVALUATION TEAM:

The composition of the evaluation team should flow from, rather than determine, the statement of work. Too often, the user selects team members on the basis of qualifications related to the technical aspects of the project or program, when such individuals lack the skills needed to design and carry out an evaluation. Especially for a major project or program, an evaluation specialist should be included on the team. When extensive field work in rural areas is envisioned, or when economic issues are a focus, include a development anthropologist, rural sociologist, development economist or political economist. At all times, seek a multi-disciplinary team, and one that includes an appropriate male/female balance. Identify language requirements, if any.

Indicate the composition of the evaluation team. Will it comprise representatives of the host-country borrower/grantee, host country's external contractor, beneficiary groups, USAID, ANE Bureau, US external contractor, US implementing contractor? As a general rule:

-- the team for a final or ex-post evaluation should never include the USAID staff, host country agency personnel, or members of the contracted US organization or technical team who are directly managing and implementing the project or program. There are just too many potential conflicts of interest. On the other hand, these people should be used as major sources of information, and as sounding boards for the team's analysis. (US contractors implementing the project are, of course, encouraged to carry out their own self-evaluations.)

-- the team for an interim evaluation should preferably include individuals directly involved, or at least persons representing their interests. They can gain a great deal from interaction with external

evaluators on the team during the evaluation process, and in turn can help the latter understand the objective of the project or program as currently defined. The team can work out interviewing procedures that minimize the effects of the officials' presence on the interviewees.

Specify the skills, background and experience that the team leader should have.

VII. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS:

1. Format of the report. State that the evaluation team should prepare a written report containing the following sections:

-- Basic Project Identification Data Sheet. (See outline on page 24.);

-- Executive Summary. Three pages, single spaced. (See outline on page 25);

-- Body of the Report. The report should include a description of the country context in which the project was developed and carried out, and provide information (evidence and analysis) on which the conclusions and recommendations are based. It is often advisable to specify the general length of the body of the report (e.g., no more than 40 pages), and allow the evaluators to include details in appendices;

-- The report should end with a full statement of conclusions and recommendations. Conclusions should be short and succinct, with the topic identified by a short sub-heading related to the questions posed in the Statement of Work. Recommendations should correspond to the conclusions; whenever possible, the recommendations should specify who, or what agency, should take the recommended actions;

-- Appendices. These should include at a minimum the following:

(a) The evaluation Scope of Work;

(b) The pertinent Logical Framework(s), together with a brief summary of the current status/attainment of original or modified inputs and outputs (if these are not already indicated in the body of the report);

(c) A description of the methodology used in the evaluation (e.g., the research approach or design, the types of indicators used to measure change, how external factors were treated in the analysis). Evaluators may offer methodological recommendations for future evaluations;

(d) A bibliography of documents consulted.

Other appendices may include more details on special topics, and a list of agencies consulted.

If the mission or office wants the evaluation team to draft the A.I.D. evaluation abstract (see Step 6.E, A.I.D. Evaluation Summary) this requirement must be included in this section.

2. Submission of Report. The Scope of Work should specify both what portion or version of the report (e.g., a preliminary draft) will be presented to the sponsoring mission or office upon completion of the field portion of the evaluation, and when the final draft will be submitted to the sponsor for formal review. If a mission intends to include the host country or the ANE Bureau in a review of a preliminary draft, additional time will have to be built into the Scope of Work. The Scope of Work should state that the evaluation team leader will be responsible for seeing the report through to professional completion by an agreed to date. If all or a portion of the evaluation report is to be translated by the evaluation team (i.e., under the contract to the sponsor), specify those portions.

3. Debriefing(s). Specify the timing and audience(s) for debriefings by the evaluation team or team leader.

VIII. FUNDING:

Estimate the cost of the evaluation, and state how the cost will be met (e.g., project funds, PD&S funds, other sources).

The following outline for completing the Basic Project Identification Data Sheet and the Executive Summary must be attached to the Scope of Work.

BASIC PROJECT IDENTIFICATION DATA

(Outline)

1. Country:

2. Project Title:

3. Project Number: (Grant and/or Loan?)

4. Project Dates:

   a. First Project Agreement:
   b. Final Obligation: FY-- (Planned/Actual?)
   c. Project Assistance Completion Date (PACD):

5. Project Funding:

   a. A.I.D. Bilateral Funding (Grant and/or Loan):
   b. Other Major Donors:
   c. Host Country Counterpart Funds:

   TOTAL:

6. Mode of Implementation: (Host Country or A.I.D. direct Contract? Include name of contractor.)

7. Project Design: (Organizational names of those involved in the design of the project, i.e., the Government of Sri Lanka, USAID/Colombo, and the International Science and Technology Institute (ISTI)

8. Responsible Mission Officials: (For the full life of the project.)

   a. Mission Director(s):

   b. Project Officer(s):

9. Previous Evaluation(s):

10. Cost of Present Evaluation:

	Person Days	Dollar Costs
a. Direct Hire:		
(1) AID/W TDY:		
(2) USAID staff:		
b. Contract:		
c. Other:		

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY OUTLINE

The Executive Summary is a three page, single-spaced document containing a clear, concise summary of the most critical elements of the report. It should be a self-contained document that can stand alone from the report. The summary should be written in such a way that individuals unfamiliar with the project can understand the project's basic elements and how the findings from the evaluation are related to it without having to refer to other documents.

1. Name of mission or ANE Bureau office initiating the evaluation, followed by title and date of full evaluation report.

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

3. Purpose of the evaluation and methodology used: . Why (and if a single project or program evaluation, at what stage - interim, final, ex post) was the evaluation undertaken? Briefly describe the types and sources of evidence used to assess effectiveness and impact.

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

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

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

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

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

Step 4. Assembling and Orienting the Evaluation Team

A. Team Composition

The composition of an evaluation team will depend upon its purpose. For some evaluations, it is possible that only one evaluator (direct hire or contractor) working with the people involved with the project, including the project officer, will be able to meet the needs of the mission and the Bureau. However, to achieve the depth and range required of most evaluations, a team of experts is normally required. Therefore this section focuses primarily upon the planning and implementation of evaluations that require the services of a number of people (host country or expatriate consultants) brought together for the sole purpose of conducting a specific evaluation.

As a matter of practice, Asia Near East missions are encouraged to do routine evaluations in-house in collaboration with their host country counterparts. Whether an evaluation is to be conducted solely by host country officials and mission personnel (internal) or will use a combination of mission/host country and non-mission personnel (external) is first determined during project design and reaffirmed in the mission's annual evaluation plan. Scarce project resources should be reserved for external evaluations addressing critical decisions affecting the success of the project, e.g., decisions which may lead to redirection or redesign, technical issues which require outside technical expertise to resolve, possible follow-on activities, etc. Some of the advantages and disadvantages of internal vs. external evaluation teams are:

Internal Evaluations

Advantages	Disadvantages
Team is familiar with the program and staff operations.	Objectivity and candor may be questioned.
Team is familiar with A.I.D.'s evaluation procedures.	Possibility of organizational role conflict.
Avoids time-consuming procurement negotiations.	Difficulty in releasing staff from daily assignments.
Opportunity to build host country staff evaluation capacity.	
Less costly.	

External Evaluations

Advantages	Disadvantages
Greater objectivity.	Team may be perceived as "auditors" and arouse anxiety among project/mission staff.
Free of organizational bias.	May be unfamiliar with A.I.D.'s policies/procedures for project development and evaluation.
Higher profile with host country decision makers.	Requires time for contract negotiations, orientation, and monitoring.
Time available for intensive evaluation.	More apt to demonstrate insufficient knowledge of local political, cultural, and economic environment.
Familiar with recent advances in technology.	More costly.

The qualifications of individual team members required for the evaluation are determined by the broad issues that must be addressed. These issues, as well as the desired technical background of team members, are detailed in the scope of work. If an external evaluation is called for, missions should give special consideration to small 8(a) minority and women owned firms in requesting contractor assistance.

B. Team Orientation

To prepare a team for an evaluation, the project officer and/or project backstop officer should determine whether a Team Planning Meeting (TPM) is called for. The TPM is an an attempt to improve the performance of consulting teams. It is an organized process in which team members meet in order to define and plan work required, and organize themselves to accomplish it. Team Planning Meetings cover two dimensions: (a) task functions -- what is to be done; and (b) team building -- how the team members can make themselves into an effective temporary team that will enable them to do the work. Team Planning Meetings have been found to be especially useful in preparing evaluation teams for situations in which there is disagreement among USAID, the contractor and/ or counterparts concerning aspects of project design and implementation. Team Planning Meetings have been found to help produce realistic recommendations that are accepted by all parties.*

* For more information on TPM, see "Facilitator Guide for Conducting a Team Planning Meeting", WASH Technical Report No. 32, November 1985.

Even if a TPM is not conducted, external evaluation teams should be thoroughly briefed and provided basic resource materials as soon as possible after the team is selected. The ANE Bureau can provide copies of some of the relevant documents and, if desired, can arrange orientation prior to the team's departure. The content of the orientation is to be discussed with the mission to avoid duplication. ANE Bureau and/or mission orientations should include the following topics. Note, with few exceptions, the mission is considered to be best qualified to brief the team on Items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7.

1. Project background
2. How project addresses overall sector goals
3. Operational structure of the project
4. Project experience to date
5. Reasons for conducting the evaluation
6. Scope of the evaluation
7. Extent of host country (or other donor) participation in the evaluation
8. ANE Bureau's evaluation process and procedures
9. Logistical support to be provided in the field including identification of primary mission and host country contacts

Documentation provided to the team should include:

Project Paper

Authorization documents and ANPAC reporting cables

Grant Agreement inclusive of all amendments

Contractual documents

Copies of all prior evaluations whether internal or external

Project status reports

Project data collected (see p. 3)

Annual workplans

Sector Assessments

Audits

Free access to all nonclassified files

In deciding the location of the team's orientation, the mission project and evaluation officers should consider how much time, if any, team members should be allowed in the United States to review materials that are relevant to the evaluation but not available in the host country. Time allotted for this purpose must of course be budgetted for in the PIO/T.

If an ANE Bureau orientation is desired, the evaluation team could also be provided with copies of evaluations of similar projects to help stimulate different lines of inquiry.

Step 5. Backstopping the Evaluation

Because of the lead times built into A.I.D.'s procurement process, detailed planning for implementation of scheduled evaluations should begin as early as possible. Such planning should begin when the mission's annual evaluation plan has been agreed upon. This planning period can be condensed when the evaluation is to be conducted solely by A.I.D. and host country officials, however, much of the planning for either an internal or external evaluation is similar if the evaluation is to be successful.

The objective of these preparations is to select the people best qualified to evaluate the project, to ensure logistical and clerical support is available when needed, to ensure that the team has reviewed the relevant scholarly and professional literature recently, and to provide the evaluation team access to the people and information required to analyse and make recommendations concerning improvement in the project. Planning an evaluation is time consuming. The officer responsible must have the time to make these arrangements and be prepared to play an active role in the evaluation.

While conditions within each mission and country vary to such a degree that no single guide can cover all of the problems involved in organizing an evaluation, the following checklist should be helpful. Since some of the steps on the checklist can be carried out simultaneously, they are grouped in chronological rather than rank order.

A. When a Decision to Evaluate Has Been Made

1. Clearly assign the responsibility for conducting the evaluation.

2. Reach agreement with the host government concerning reasons for the evaluation, a tentative date and the role of local officials.

3. Reserve funding for the evaluation (preliminary).

B. Two (2) Months Prior to the Evaluation

1. Develop with host government participation (if possible) a preliminary scope of work defining the focus of the evaluation, the length of time it will take, and the personnel (mission, AID/W TDY, contract, host country) needed to conduct the evaluation. If a literature review is called for the project backstop officer should attempt to ensure that it is done in a way that does not require payment of per diem.

2. Identify potential sources able to provide the required expertise (in-house, contract, IQC, small 8(a) minority and women owned firms, or AID/W TDY) defined in the preliminary scope of work.

3. Agree with host country on specific time frame for the evaluation. This time frame must take into account leave schedules and holidays, both for local and US personnel, time of the year, during school year or during vacation period, etc.) and any other variable that may constrain or support the evaluation effort.

4. Draft a PIO/T, if needed, to fund the evaluation.

5. If requested, submit draft PIO/T, including the scope of work, to the ANE Bureau for review.

6. Decide whether a Team Planning Meeting will be held and which office should plan and conduct the meeting.

C. Issue Final PIO/T

Because of the lead time required to contract for and to organize an evaluation team, the PIO/T must be received by the Contracts Office at least four (4) weeks prior to the anticipated start of an evaluation conducted by an IQC firm. Please allow for eight (8) weeks if an 8(a) firm or a personal services contract, exceeding $10,000, is used.

D. One Month Prior to Evaluation

1. Organize the information/scholarly literature required for the evaluation team into a suitable form.

2. If a Team Planning Meeting will be held, prepare the agenda, schedule the meetings and distribute necessary background information.

3. Identify source and funds for secretarial support the evaluation team will need.

4. Identify and secure office space and required vehicles for the period of the evaluation.

5. Develop a preliminary itinerary and schedule appointments for the team with the host government.

6. Make hotel, in-country travel and other reservations as necessary.

7. Obtain host country clearances for team members.

E. Ten Days Prior to the Evaluation Team's ETA

1. Reconfirm all logistical arrangements, appointment schedules, etc., planned for the team.

2. Conduct Team Planning if called for in A.I.D./W or if planned for the field, and ensure all arrangements are made.

3. Have required information/documents available for the evaluation team. Adequate copies should be prepared to ensure team members do not have to wait to start work until another team member has read an important project document.

F. Upon Arrival of the Evaluation Team

The following should be performed by the mission project officer responsible for monitoring the project.

1. Meet with the team and clarify what the mission and the host country want. This initial meeting is important to ensure that the team fully understands the mission's priorities for the evaluation.

2. Accompany the team to meetings with mission, other donors, and especially host country officials and properly introduce the team. Make it clear that the mission supports the team's efforts.

3. Maintain the degree of contact necessary to ensure the team is working well and is receiving the support and cooperation it needs to evaluate the project.

Step 6. Reporting, Internal Review and Submission Procedures

A. "Final" Evaluation Report

The "final" evaluation report consists of two documents, the evaluation team report and the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary. The evaluation team report should be responsive to the team's scope-of-work and, to the extent possible, follow a prescribed format to focus the team's findings. (See Step 3, page 17). The A.I.D. Evaluation Summary is required for all ANE Bureau evaluations. Submission of this report signifies mission acceptance of the evaluation team's findings and should not be used as a stand-alone report. In all cases a copy of the evaluation team report must be attached.

B. A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (Overview)

The A.I.D. Evaluation Summary has two parts. Part I contains information to support future A.I.D. management action and facilitates processing of the evaluation into A.I.D.'s automated "memory". It includes a requirement for a brief abstract and cost information. Part II is a self-contained summary of key elements of the evaluation team report and will be used to brief senior Bureau management on current evaluation activities. The A.I.D. Evaluation Summary will thus serve several purposes. These are:

- As a record of the decisions reached by responsible officials so that the principals involved in the activity or activities evaluated are clear about their subsequent responsibilities;

- As notification that an evaluation has been completed, either as planned in the current Annual Evaluation Plan or for ad hoc reasons;

- As a summary of the evaluation's findings for use in answering queries and for further research;

- As a brief record of lessons learned for use in planning and reviewing other activities of a similar nature. The A.I.D. Evaluation Summary and the evaluation team report are processed by PPC/CDIE into the Agency's automated "memory" for later access by planners and managers.

C. Internal Review Procedures

For field initiated evaluations, the Mission Evaluation Officer (or other officer designated by the mission) is responsible for ensuring the evaluation team report receives a critical in-house review. A suggested mission framework for internal review of evaluation team reports is contained in Section V.B (pages 60-61) of these guidelines. After the internal review of the team report, the Mission Evaluation Officer (or other officer designated by the mission) is responsible for ensuring the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (Parts I and II) is completed. He or she may assign all or part of this task

to others, e.g., the evaluation team can be required in their Scope of Work to complete the abstract. The Executive Summary required in evaluation team reports includes all of the requirements for Part II Summary of Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations and, at the mission's or office's discretion, can be copied directly onto the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary form.

For ANE Bureau managed regional projects, the project officer, as chairman of the Project Review Committee, is responsible for completing all required documentation after completion of the PRC review of the evaluation team report and a "final evaluation team report" is accepted. This work should be accomplished in close collaboration with the Bureau's Evaluation Division, ANE/DP/E. The A.I.D. Evaluation Summary facesheet should show clearances by members of the PRC and be signed off by the responsible Office Director.

D. Submission Guidelines

For field initiated evaluations, the Mission Evaluation Officer (or other officer designated by the mission) is responsible for ensuring the "final" evaluation report (the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary, Parts I and II, with the evaluation team report attached) is submitted to the ANE Bureau in a timely fashion. The "final" evaluation report is due in the ANE Bureau sixty (60) days after the mission receives the "final evaluation team report." For contractor prepared reports, "final evaluation team reports" refers to the final report submitted to the mission according to the terms of the contract. For reports prepared by AID/W TDY evaluators, "final evaluation team report" refers to the final team report submitted to the mission for completion of required documentation, e.g., the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary.

Please note, if the mission fails to submit the evaluation documentation within sixty (60) days, the Bureau may call a Project Review Committee to review the report in draft to bring issues to the attention of senior Bureau management. The mission would be advised if this option is to be used.

These guidelines, including time limitations, apply equally to evaluations of ANE Bureau managed regional projects. The project officer is responsible for the submission of these reports.

Copies of the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (Parts I and II) and attachments(s), including the evaluation team report, should be sent to the following:

- ANE Bureau Project Backstop Officer
- ANE/DP/Evaluation Division
- SER/MO/PM, Room B930 NS, AID/W

If a mission wishes SER/MO/PM to reproduce copies and return them to the mission, a covering memo should be attached stating: "In addition to regular distribution of the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary, please reproduce_____copies and pouch to the following address:_____Attention:_____". A similar procedure can be used for ANE Bureau managed regional evaluation reports.

In cases where more than one project backstop officer is involved or where the identity of the project backstop officer is unknown, both ANE Bureau sets should be sent to ANE/DP/E to determine the appropriate project or action officer.

E. A.I.D. Evaluation Summary Form (detailed guidelines for completion)

The A.I.D. Evaluation Summary replaces the PES. It is to accompany all evaluation reports. The Evaluation Summary (ES) form consists of two parts and may not exceed the six (6) pages provided (exclusive of attachments). Detailed guidelines for completing this form follow:

Part I, Page (Facesheet)

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT: Indicate, as appropriate, USAID/Mission or ANE Bureau Office Symbol. Include ES Series Number, i.e., 85-5. Each ANE mission maintains its own control over Mission ES Series Numbers. ANE/DP/E maintains control over ES Series Numbers for ANE managed regional projects

B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT ANE BUREAU EVALUATION PLAN? If the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary is being submitted close to the date indicated in the current ANE Bureau Evaluation Plan (or if the final draft of the evaluation team report was submitted close to that date), check "yes". If it is being submitted late or is carried over from a previous year's plan, check "slipped". If it is not included in this year's or last year's plan, check "ad hoc".

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

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

E. ACTION DECISION APPROVED BY MISSION OR ANE BUREAU OFFICE DIRECTOR: What is the mission or office going to do based on the findings, conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation, when are they going to do it, and who will be responsible for the actions required? List key decisions, actions to be taken, unresolved issues and any items requiring further study.

F. DATE OF MISSION OR ANE BUREAU OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: Date when the internal mission or ANE Bureau office review of the evaluation team report was held or completed. Note, this date does not refer to the ANE Bureau review of mission submitted "final" evaluation reports.

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS: As appropriate, the ranking representative of the borrower/grantee can sign beside the A.I.D. Project or Program Officer. Note, Mission or ANE Bureau Office Director signature signifies Agency acceptance of the evaluation report.

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART I

(BEFORE FILLING OUT THIS FORM, READ THE ATTACHED INSTRUCTIONS)

IDENTIFICATION DATA

A. REPORTING A.I.D. UNIT (Mission or AID/W Office)

(ES #)

B. WAS EVALUATION SCHEDULED IN CURRENT FY ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN?

yes ☐ slipped ☐ ad hoc ☐

C. EVALUATION TIMING

interim ☐ final ☐ ex post ☐ other ☐

D. ACTIVITY OR ACTIVITIES EVALUATED (List the following information for project(s) or program (s) evaluated; if not applicable, list title and date of the evaluation report)

Project #	Project/Program Title (or title & date of evaluation report)	First PROAG or equivalent (FY)	Most recent PACD (mo/yr)	Planned LOP Cost ('000)	Amount Obligated to Date ('000)

ACTIONS

E. ACTION DECISIONS APPROVED BY MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE DIRECTOR

Action(s) Required	Name of officer respondible for Action	Date Action to be Completed

APPROVALS

F. DATE OF MISSION OR AID/W OFFICE REVIEW OF EVALUATION: mo ___ day ___ year ___

Report Date: mo ___ DAY ___ YR ___

G. APPROVALS OF EVALUATION SUMMARY AND ACTION DECISIONS:

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

Part 1, Page 2

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

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

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

- o Too much information on design, implementation and current status, discouraging reader interest before the reader can determine if there are important findings of interest.
- o A "remote" tone or style prevents the reader from getting a real flavor of the activity or activities evaluated.

In sequential sentences, the abstract should convey:

- o The programming reason behind the evaluation and its timing;
- o The purpose and basic characteristics of the activity or activities evaluated;
- o A picture of the status of the activity or activities as disclosed in the full evaluation report;
- o An idea of the research method and types of data sources used by the evaluators;
- o The most important findings and conclusions;
- o Key lessons learned.

Avoid the passive tense and vague adjectives. Where appropriate, use hard numbers. (An example of an abstract follows.)

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

ABSTRACT EXAMPLE

Project aims to help Government of Zaire (GOZ) establish a self-sustaining primary health care (PHC) system in 50 Rural Health Zones (RHZ). The project is being implemented by the Church of Christ in Zaire and the GOZ's PHC office. This mid-term evaluation (8/81-4/84) was conducted by a GOZ-USAID/Z team on the basis of a review of project documents (including a 4/84 project activity report), visits to 9 RHZ's, and interviews with project personnel. The major findings and conclusions are:

- This well managed and coordinated project should attain most objectives by its 1986 end.

- Progress has been good in establishing RHZ's, converting dispensaries into health centers, installing latrines (over double the target), and training medical zone chiefs, nurses, and auxiliary health workers. Long-term training has lagged, however, and family planning and well construction targets have proven unviable.

- The assumption that doctors and nurses can organize and train village health committees seems invalid.

- User fees at health centers are insufficient to cover service costs. A.I.D.'s PRICOR project is currently studying self-financing procedures.

  Because of the project's strategic importance in Zaire's health development, it is strongly recommended to extend it 4-5 years and increase RHZ and health center targets, stressing pharmaceutical/medical supplies development and regional training for nurses, supervisors, and village health workers.

The evaluators noted the following "lessons."

- The training of local leaders should begin as soon as the Project Identification Document is agreed upon.

- An annual national health conference spurs policy dialogue and development of donor subprojects.

- The project's institution-building rather than directly service nature has helped prepare thousands of Zairois to work with others in large health systems.

H. EVALUATION ABSTRACT (do not exceed the space provided.

ABSTRACT

I. EVALUATION COSTS

1. Evaluation Team

Name	Affiliation	Contract Number OR TDY Person Days	Contract Cost OR TDY Cost (US$)	Source of Funds

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

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

COSTS

Part II, Pages 3-5

SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS: 3/ The summary should not exceed the three pages provided. It should be self-contained and avoid "in-house" jargon. Spell out acronyms when first used. Avoid unnecessarily complicated explanations of the activity or activities evaluated, or of the evaluation methodology. This information can be found in the evaluation team report for the interested reader. Get all the critical facts and findings into the summary since a large proportion of the readers will go no further. Cover the following elements, preferably in the order given (don't forget to fill in the date at the bottom of page 3):

1. Name of mission or ANE Bureau office initiating the evaluation, followed by title and date of full evaluation report.

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

3. Purpose of the evaluation and methodology used: Why (and if a single project or program evaluation, at what stage - interim, final, ex post) was the evaluation undertaken? Briefly describe the types and sources of evidence used to assess effectiveness and impact.

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

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

6. Lessons learned (for other activities and for A.I.D. generally). This is an opportunity to give A.I.D. colleagues advice about planning and implementation strategies, i.e., how to tackle a similar development problem, key design factors, factors pertinent to management and to evaluation itself. There may be no clear lessons. Don't stretch the findings by presenting vague

---

3/ The outline of the Executive Summary for the evaluation team report (see Step 3, Page 24) is identical to this outline and can thus be copied directly onto the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary form at the Mission's discretion.

generalizations in an effort to suggest broadly applicable lessons. If Items 4-5 above are succinctly covered, the reader can derive pertinent lessons. On the other hand, don't hold back clear lessons even when these may seem trite or naive. Address:

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

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

A.I.D. EVALUATION SUMMARY PART II

J. SUMMARY OF EVALUATION FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS (Try not to exceed the 3 pages provided)
Address the following items:

- o Name of mission or office
- o Purpose of activity (ies) evaluated
- o Purpose of the Evaluation and Methodology Used
- o Findings and Conclusions
- o Recommendations
- o Lessons learned

SUMMARY

Date this summary prepared:

SUMMARY (continued)

SUMMARY (continued)

Part II, Page 6

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

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION, ANE BUREAU OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE: This section summarizes the comments of the mission, (ANE Bureau office in the case of ANE Bureau managed regional projects), and the borrower/grantee on the evaluation team report. It should enable the reader to understand their views about the usefulness and quality of the evaluation, and why any recommendations may have been rejected. It can cover the following questions:

- To what extent does the evaluation meet the demands of the scope of work? Does the evaluation provide answers to the questions posed? Does it surface unforeseen issues of potential interest or concern to the mission or office?

- Did the evaluation have sufficient time in the field to fully understand the activity, its impacts, and the problems encountered in managing the activity?

- Did any of the evaluators show particular biases which staff believes affected the findings? Avoid ad hominem discussions but cite objective evidence such as data overlooked, gaps in interviews, or statements suggesting a lack of objectivity.

- Did the evaluation employ innovative methods which would be applicable and useful in evaluating other projects known to the mission of office? Note the development of proxy measures of impact or benefit, efforts to construct baseline data, techniques that were particularly effective in isolating the effects of the activity from other concurrent factors.

- Do the findings and lessons learned cited in the report generally concur with the conclusions reached by A.I.D. staff and well-informed host country officials? Do lower priority findings in the evaluation warrant greater emphasis?

ATTACHMENTS

K. ATTACHMENTS (List attachments submitted with this Evaluation Summary; always attach copy of full evaluation report, even if one was submitted earlier)

MISSION COMMENTS ON FULL REPORT

L. COMMENTS BY MISSION, AID/W OFFICE AND BORROWER/GRANTEE

Step 7. ANE Bureau Logging, Distribution and Tracking Systems

A. Logging:

ANE/DP/E maintains the official ANE Bureau log for evaluation reports. Under the new guidelines for submission of the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary, missions are required to send copies of evaluation reports to the project backstop officer, to ANE/DP/E and to SER/MO/PM for distribution. To insure that evaluation reports received in AID/W have been logged in, the project backstop officer should verify with ANE/DP/E that an advance copy has been received.

B. Distribution:

The project backstop officer is responsible for internal ANE Bureau distribution of evaluation reports. To the extent the SER/MO/PM standard distribution is incomplete, the project backstop officer is responsible for any additional distribution required to insure a thorough review is possible. (See step 8, page 48.) The standard SER/MO/PM distribution is as follows:

External to the ANE Bureau	ANE Bureau		
PPC/CDIE/DI	AA/ANE	(1)	
PPC/CDIE/PPE	ANE/DP	(1)	
PPC/PDPR	ANE/DP/PL	(2)	
S&T/PO	ANE/DP/E	(3)	
FVA/PPE	ANE/PD	(3)	
BIFAD/S	ANE/TR	(3)	
PRE/PPR	ANE/SA	(2)	only
	ANE/EA	(2)	respective
	ANE/E	(2)	country
	ANE/MENA	(2)	reports
	GC/ANE	(1)	

Step 8. ANE Bureau Review Procedures

A. Forms of Review

The review process ensures that evaluation reports are read and acted upon by the ANE Bureau. The project backstop officer is responsible for assuring that all evaluations submitted by missions are reviewed either formally or informally. In determining the form or level of review, the project backstop officer should consult with members of the Project Review Committee and other Asia Near East Bureau staff who are concerned with the sector, country, or issues involved. The various forms and levels of review are as follows:

1. Informal Reviews

There are three forms of informal reviews. These are:

a. Team Debriefing: Team debriefings usually occur prior to the receipt of the final evaluation team report to allow interested individuals to hear first hand from the evaluation team about their impression and preliminary findings.

b. Technical Reviews of Draft Reports: Technical reviews of draft reports are required for Bureau managed evaluations prior to granting of approval for payment of services rendered under A.I.D. contract.

c. Desk Reviews: Desk reviews will generally be conducted for routine evaluations that raise no significant issues, lessons learned, or need for ANE Bureau follow-up action. The project backstop officer, in consultation with Bureau staff, decides whether or not a desk review is adequate. This consultation can be verbal or by memorandum. A meeting of the Project Review Committee is not necessary. The backstop officer informs the mission that the evaluation has been received, that it is being informally reviewed, and advises the mission of any concerns.

2. Project Review Committee (PRC) Reviews: For project or program evaluations, the project backstop officer should take the initiative in proposing a PRC review if he/she determines this is warranted. Conversely, PRC members may ask the project backstop officer to schedule a review. A PRC should be considered, for example, if the evaluation identifies major implementation problems or innovative or successful implementation approaches, recommends follow-up actions requiring AID/W action or approval or discusses lessons or methodologies useful for the design ore evaluation of similar projects. The basic PRC membership should include the following:

Principal TR or PD project backstop officer (Chairman)
Alternate TR or PD project backstop officer
ANE/DP/E
ANE/DP/PL (country backstop)
Country Desk Officer
GC/ANE
PPC/PDPR

3. ANPAC Reviews: An ANPAC review is the exception rather than the rule and will be held only under certain circumstances, e.g., the evaluation raises major issues such as the future of the project or program or proposes project revisions, amendments or follow-on projects which require ANPAC decision.

B. Timing of Reviews

Evaluation reports are subject to review in the ANE Bureau ninety (90) days after the receipt of the final evaluation team report by the mission. Ideally a "final" evaluation report including the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary, Parts I and II, should be available in the ANE Bureau by the end of this period. In those few instances where this is not the case, the ANE Bureau may review the draft evaluation team report (i.e., the report as submitted by the contractor). Reviews of draft evaluation team reports are exceptions and thus participation by non-A.I.D. observers will usually be limited. Missions should be advised in advance when such reviews are contemplated and their comments solicited.

C. ANE Bureau Review Guidelines

Evaluation reports provide a source of information for subsequent decisions. Therefore, both the ANE Bureau and the mission reviews of evaluation reports should focus not only on the substance of the report but also on the quality of the information upon which these decisions will be based. Missions are asked to comment on the quality of the evaluation in the Mission/Host Country section of the A.I.D., Evaluation Summary, (Part II, Section L). Questions which the ANE Bureau should consider in reviewing the quality of the evaluation, include the following:

1. Are the issues clearly identified?

2. Does the narrative support the conclusions reached?

3. Are the recommendations realistic? Has the mission responded to all of the recommendations?

4. How reliable are the data? If the data were unreliable, does the evaluation clearly indicate this?

5. Are conclusions based primarily on professional judgement so identified?

6. Did the evaluation team adhere to the scope of work? Was the methodology used appropriate? If the scope of work or methodology was changed during the evaluation is this change clearly explained and appropriate?

7. Are lessons learned clearly presented and useful?

8. Does the report address prior evaluation recommendations, if applicable?

9. Has all of the required documentation been submitted?

Step 9. Providing Feedback on Reviews

The ANE Bureau will review all evaluations and report to the mission the results of the review within forty-five (45) days of the evaluation being received in the ANE Bureau. The Bureau project backstop officer is responsible for drafting, and clearing with the appropriate offices, the evaluation reporting cable. Reporting cables are required for all evaluations submitted by the field. When an evaluation report is reviewed in conjunction with an ANPAC review of a PID/PP or PP amendment, comments on the review of the evaluation may be included as part of the ANPAC reporting cable for the PID/PP or PP amendment.

Reporting cables should be concisely written and well-organized. The cable should clearly summarize the important issues, and distinguish other points as secondary. The reporting cable should include the following:

1. In the opening paragraph, the project title(s) and number(s), the date and the form of the review, i.e., ANPAC, PRC, or Desk.

2. Adequacy of the report. (see Step 8 Part B).

3. The major issues discussed and any recommendations or suggestions which should be relayed to the mission.

4. Other comments or concerns raised during the review process.

Step 10. Follow-up On Evaluation Recommendations

Too often recommendations made as the result of an evaluation are not always implemented. Subsequent evaluations often contain similar, if not identical, recommendations that are also ignored. The reasons for the selective implementation of the evaluation recommendations generally does not show up in the project files. To ensure that the Bureau is making optimal use of its evaluation efforts, the Bureau requires the following procedures be implemented by all Asia and Near East missions.

-- Whenever an evaluation reveals a logframe requires revision, the original logframe, as well as proposed changes, must be included as an annex to the evaluation team report. Note: Radical change may require prior ANE Bureau concurrence and possible PP or authorization amendments in accordance with the Redelegation of Authority guidelines.

-- Establishment of a system for follow-up on the implementation of critical evaluation recommendations.

-- When missions do not agree with particular evaluation recommendations, they should discuss their differences in the Mission Comments Section (Part II, Section L) of the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary.

-- In the scope of work instruct the evaluation team to address actions taken on previous evaluation recommendations in a separate section. (See Step 3.)

IV. Annual Mission Evaluation Plans

Annual Mission Evaluation Plans are to be submitted with Mission Action Plans. Mission Evaluation Plans are to consist of three parts: (a) an evaluation schedule according to the format found on page 56; (b) a list of evaluations completed in the preceeding fiscal year; and (c) a description of major upcoming activities and/or major findings integrated into the Action Plan narrative. A separate evaluation plan narrative is not required.

Annual evaluation planning calls for integrating the overall information needs required for broad program strategy development with information needs for effective project management. While some project specific evaluations can be designed to serve both needs, in many cases, innovative evaluation approaches are required. Quite often this involves conducting sector assessments with emphasis on evaluation experience to date or multi-project evaluations that yield information which can be generalized to the sector or across several sectors. Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plans can also be designed to yield key data which can be used to verify short term program objectives identified in Action Plans. Both program and project levels of concern must be addressed in the Annual Evaluation Plan.

A. STEPS IN PREPARING AN ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN:

STEP ONE: Develop a Forward "Decision Schedule"

- Broad programming decisions (e.g., upcoming CDSS revision, key decision points in borrower/grantee development planning);
- Portfolio decisions (e.g., upcoming extensions, terminations, follow-ons and phases)
- Relationship to most recent Action Plan

STEP TWO: Define Key Questions Related to Decision Schedule

- "Strategic" issues
- Questions relating to Action Plan benchmarks
- Project/program-specific questions (review/validate/modify project paper evaluation plans, additional questions posed by project managers)

STEP THREE: Assign Priority to Questions

- Identify overlapping and residual questions
- Cluster related questions
- Ensure priority to Action Plan benchmark measurements

STEP FOUR: Develop Evaluation Strategy to Get Timely Answers

- Comprehensive program assessment?
- Sector or multi-project evaluations?
- A mixed strategy?

STEP FIVE: Establish Two-Year Evaluation Schedule

- Assess feasibility (e.g., resources -- A.I.D., host country, contracted)
- Formalize borrower/grantee participation
- Include special requirements for data collection/analysis.

STEP SIX: Assign Responsibility for Action

- Project Managers
- Program Officer
- Evaluation Officer
- Mission or ANE Bureau Office Director

STEP SEVEN: Tell Managers When They Can Expect Answers

B. INTEGRATING THE EVALUATION PLAN NARRATIVE INTO THE ACTION PLAN:

The evaluation plan narrative is to be an integral part of the Action Plan. A separate Evaluation Plan Narrative is not required. The following information should be included in the Action Plan: (a) discussion in Section II.B -- Actions for the Coming Year -- of major evaluations which will be undertaken prior to new design activities and (b) identification in a brief paragraph in Section C.3 of the Action Plan of any major evaluation findings that raise questions concerning the objectives or assumptions of the CDSS.

C. ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN SCHEDULES:

Instructions for completing the Annual Evaluation Plan Schedules (Table: List of Planned Evaluations) are as follows: (Refer to sample for clarity.)

1. Mission Evaluation Officer. At the bottom of the first page of the table, indicate the name of the Mission Evaluation Officer, title, and estimate the proportion of that individuals's annual time (e.g., 10 percent, 25 percent) devoted to evaluation work.

2. Project List. (Column 1). List all evaluations planned for FY 19-- and 19--, by appropriation category or sector. For evaluations of single projects, enter project number and title. For multi-project evaluations, list the identifying numbers and titles of the projects involved. For other evaluations (e.g., PL 480, sector or country evaluations, HG), enter title of the evaluation. As a separate category, identify evaluations of centrally funded activities (i.e., non-bilateral funds) being implemented in your country that require collateral mission or Bureau support.

3. Last Evaluation (Column 2). Enter date (month/year) and number (A.I.D. Evaluation Summary, Part I.A) of the most recent previous (if any) evaluation completed for the listed projects/activities. This information should be provided for projects included in a planned multi-project evaluation or planned evaluations of single projects.

4. Evaluation Dates for FY 19-- and 19--. (Column 3). Enter the fiscal year quarter when the evaluation is planned to start and the fiscal year quarter when the completed evaluation report and summary will be sent to the ANE Bureau. If the current estimate for FY 19-- is different from the previous ANE Bureau's Evaluation Plan, indicate the change with an asterisk.

5. Reason/Issues (Column 4). For project evaluations, enter:
   a. current planned activity completion date (PACD),
   b. a brief statement as to why the evaluation is planned (e.g., upcoming decisions or events for which the evaluation information will be needed), and
   c. key questions and issues (e.g., whether you expect the host country will be able to maintain and sustain project services after A.I.D. funding terminates, or what to do when it is determined that a project may not meet its objectives).

6. Funding (Column 5).
   a. Estimate the funding required (in whole thousands of dollars) for each planned evaluation listed.
   b. Enter the expected source(s) of funds for each evaluation, if any (e.g., project budget, PD&S, central project, mission OE; ANE Bureau OE; TSFS).
   c. Indicate estimated mission person-days involved in planning, undertaking, reviewing the evaluation. If only person-days are indicated, it will be assumed that the evaluation is an entirely "in-house" effort.

7. Collateral Assistance Needed (Column 6). Identify the types of assistance the mission anticipates it will need to prepare for and carry out each of the evaluations planned. This information should include TDY assistance, contractors, or other missions. Indicate the number of person days for each form of assistance. The total number of person days should correspond to the amount and category of funds requested.

SAMPLE

TABLE VII - LIST OF PLANNED EVALUATIONS
FY 1985 ANNUAL BUDGET SUBMISSION
COUNTRY/OFFICE: USAID/MOROCCO

SAMPLE

Project List (Project No. & Title)	Last Eval Completed (Mo./Yr.)	FY 1985 Start (Qtr)	FY 1985 To AID/W (Qtr)	FY 1986 Start (Qtr)	FY 1986 To AID/W (Qtr)	Reasons/Issues	Funding Source	Funding ($000)	USAID Person Days	Collateral Assistance
Selected Development Problems										
Social Services Training (608-0157)	4/84 (84-5)			1	2	PACD: 8/86 The project aims to improve the quality and range of skill-training opportunities for low-income Moroccan youth and thereby increase their employability; and to improve the administrative and management capability of the Ministry of Handicrafts and Social Affairs. This end of project evaluation will assess the effectiveness of project activities in achieving originally defined goals and objectives; and the socioeconomic impact of project activities on the target beneficiaries.	PDAS	20	30	IQC 60 Person days
							Mission DE	6		AID/W TDY, HE/TECH/HRST 30 person days.
Social and Economic Research (608-0154)	--	1*	3*			PACD: 7/85 The project is designed to encourage and support Moroccan experts to undertake social and economic research which can contribute to development programs designed to reach the poor majority. The evaluation will assess types and progress of research activity funded to date; and provide information which will help USAID determine future project direction, i.e. extended project life and/or complementary, follow-on project.	Mission DE	4	10	AID/W TDY, TECH/SARD 15 person days.
							Project	16		IQC 45 person days.
(Ted Jonas, MEO 15% of time)										

V. The Mission Evaluation Process: Roles and Responsibilities

Missions are responsible for establishing and managing their own evaluation systems. In accordance with Agency guidelines, the Mission Director is responsible for evaluations conducted within the mission. This responsibility is normally delegated to a staff officer who serves as the manager of the evaluation process. Mission evaluation officers usually have other assignments which have priority over evaluation. In almost all cases, the role of the mission staff evaluation officer is defined by the officer occupying the position. This in turn is influenced by that officer's prior experience and personal attitude toward evaluation.

The first step in establishing a mission evaluation process is the clear understanding of the role of the mission evaluation officer. This officer, with support from other members of the mission, should be assigned the responsibility and authority to:

(1) Develop, coordinate and implement the mission's evaluation procedures and plans;

(2) Assist project officers in the preparation of project evaluation plans both during project design and during implementation;

(3) Maintain a mission record of evaluation findings and lessons learned for possible future utilization;

(4) Prepare A.I.D. Evaluation Summaries, Parts I and II;

(5) Develop, to the extent possible, contacts with host government evaluation offices and personnel to encourage greater cooperation in project evaluations and possibly establish evaluation training programs.

Provided below is a description of a model mission evaluation process that can be adapted as appropriate. This model is fully consistent with long standing Agency guidelines; most Asia Near East missions already conform to most of the elements below.

A. Responsibilities

Agency guidelines identify the Mission Director as the final authority and primary mission evaluation officer. He/she makes the final decisions.

The Project Officer is the person primarily responsible for evaluating his/her project and/or managing the evaluation thereof.

The mission evaluation officer is the evaluation process manager. Ideally, this person's responsibilities should include all of the five items listed above. At a minimum he/she, in cooperation with project officers, will: establish the mission evaluation plan and schedule; help project personnel analyse the actual as compared to the planned progress in accordance with the project's implementation plan; provide assistance as necessary regarding appropriate evaluation methodology and documentation; and maintain liaison with the Asia and Near East Bureau's evaluation division and potential evaluation contractors. The evaluation officer, therefore, should have a chance to review projects when they are in the design stage to ensure the project design sets the stage for later evaluation. Finally, the evaluation officer should be responsible for arranging and following up on the mission's internal evaluation reviews.

B. Project Evaluation Review

1. Organization:

Reviews of evaluations at the mission level should be designed as collaborative efforts to strengthen a project. It has been found that a group similar to the Bureau's Project Review Committee is the most effective means of developing constructive responses to evaluations.

Such a committee might be composed of the following members:

Chairman: Mission Director or Deputy Director
Program Officer
Evaluation Officer
Controller
Project Officers
Contract Officer, Legal Officer, and
Mission Economist, if available

These members may be supplemented by other interested parties. Whenever possible, appropriate host country officials should be encouraged to participate.

Prior to an evaluation review, the project officer should meet with the mission evaluation officer to discuss the format for the review as well as the methodology and substance of the evaluation itself. While the Executive Summary of the final evaluation team report can form the basis for a review at senior mission management levels, the body of the report must receive a full review by appropriate mission technical staff.

The project officer should distribute copies of the evaluation team report to the intended participants. The project officer and the evaluation officer should collaborate in the preparation of the A.I.D. Evaluation Summary (Parts I and II) as soon as possible after the mission review in order to enhance the prospects for any necessary follow-up on findings and action decisions arrived at and to facilitate early submission to the ANE Bureau.

2. Purpose:

If the evaluation review is successful, the participants will come away with answers to the following questions:

a. What has the project achieved to date?
b. How does this achievement compare with previous plans?
c. What is the likelihood of the project achieving its purpose?
d. Is it likely that the project will have the expected impact on a programming goal?
e. What unplanned changes have occurred and what are their effects?
f. What lessons have been learned?

In addition to these evaluative questions, the review has to answer three forward-looking questions:

a. What alternatives to the current plan merit consideration?
b. Could the same purpose be achieved more efficiently by other means?
c. What changes would improve the project?

The evaluation review needs to consider:

a. Specific issues raised by the evaluation.
b. Important issues raised by the ANE Bureau or others.
c. Lessons learned through the evaluation process itself.

VI. Host Country Involvement

Common sense, experience and all past Agency/Bureau guidance provide compelling reasons for gaining the highest possible level of host country participation in project evaluations.

We seek an evaluation process that results in:

> An opportunity for organized USAID-Host Country cooperative study, thought, discussion and recording of what a given assistance project or program is accomplishing, how it works or doesn't and why. The objective is to make necessary changes in course and objectives or for application in future development efforts.

Unfortunately, participation by host country personnel in the majority of A.I.D.'s evaluations has been uneven. This problem varies from country to country. The perception prevails, however, that many host countries equate evaluation to audit and inspection, and that evaluation as a learning process is an American management tool which will take time to transfer to the local environment. Missions generally have not consistently sought to engage host country personnel or agencies in dialogue and action regarding joint evaluations.

Clearly, more rigorous attention to overcoming these weaknesses is required. As a start, evaluation plans in Project Papers should discuss the degree of host country interest in and capacity for participation in planned evaluations of the project, including, particularly, host country capacity for collecting and analyzing data relevant to evaluation and economic analysis. Missions are also required to provide the full text of the project evaluation plan to the host country either as an annex to the Project Agreement or in a Project Implementation Letter (PIL). Where countries show weak interest and capacity, missions should include in the project evaluation plan a discussion of what they propose to do to address these weaknesses. For example, where the type of project or magnitude of investment warrants it, training elements to improve host country evaluation capacity should be integrated into the project.

To assess the host country evaluation capacity, the mission must first understand the host country's concept of evaluation and who, if anyone, is charged with the responsibility for evaluating development efforts. The mission should gather this minimum information and make contact with these officers. The preliminary results of such contact should be an informal exchange of information designed to strengthen the local evaluation capacity. When appropriate, the mission may wish to develop more formal training courses for local evaluators or even offer limited participant training for officials whose roles are critical to the host government's evaluation process. In addition, missions should consider using local universities, management training institutions and local consulting firms as sources of personnel to carry out evaluations. Such institutions could also provide resources for the development of evaluation training workshops for host country staff.

VII. Utilization of Prior Experience/Lessons Learned

A. Utilization of Prior Experience in Project Design and Implementation

In accordance with Agency guidelines, lessons learned from evaluations are to be utilized in the design and implementation of the Bureau's program. These guidelines establish a system for the end-use check on the extent to which evaluation materials are in fact being utilized. This involves a requirement that missions request relevant evaluation materials early in the design process from the ANE Bureau. The extent to which these materials or other information obtained by the mission are used is to be reflected in the Project Identification Document (PID) in the form of a bibliography. In addition, as part of the PRC/ANPAC review/reporting process, additional materials may be identified for use in preparation of the Project Paper (PP). The PP must also contain a bibliography of reference materials. Project backstop officers in the ANE Bureau are responsible for the actual collection and provision of the design and evaluation materials.

B. Identification of Lessons Learned During Evaluation

A primary objective of these guidelines is to facilitate establishment of an evaluation process that will produce useful lessons for improved project implementation and design. Lessons learned are a vital part of every evaluation and should receive special attention during both the ANE/W and mission review processes. Therefore lessons learned must be given a high profile in evaluation reports. They should describe causal relationship factors that proved critical to project success or failure, including necessary political, policy, and social and bureaucratic preconditions within the host country and A.I.D.. It is vital that the evaluation provides a clear understanding of the project implementation process and everything that has a direct or indirect impact on that process.

Lessons can be learned about A.I.D.'s and the Host Country's administrative/ management dynamics with particular attention to regulations, patterns of behavior (e.g., hierarchical), attitudes, budgets (and budgetary process), personnel (their skills and attitudes), infrastructure, power, politics and policies. How have any of these elements affected provision and utilization of inputs and production of planned outputs? What techniques or approaches proved most effective or had to be changed and why?

Lessons learned should be clearly stated with the necessary detail provided to understand the process by which the lessons have emerged. Unless this detail is present, lessons often appear as truisms and are consequently of little use in adapting them from one project to another.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

SECTION II: Applicability of the Guidelines

II. 1. Design and Evaluation of A.I.D. Assisted Projects, "A.I.D.'s Evaluation Mandate" pp 127-129

SECTION III: The Asia Near East Bureau Evaluation Process

Step 1. Deciding When to Evaluate and in What Form

General:

III. 1. AID Handbook 3, Figure: "The A.I.D. Project Cycle" (September 1982), pp 12-16.

Periodic Evaluations:

III. 2. Design and Evaluation of A.I.D.-Assisted Projects, "A.I.D. Evaluations", pp 133-136.

III. 3. AID Handbook 3, Appendix 12B: "General Guidelines for Evaluations Conducted During Implementation", pp 12B1-12B7.

III. 4. Ibid., Appendix 12C. "Adaptation of Evaluation Procedures for Particular Types of Projects," pp 12C1-12C3.

III. 5. A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook, Chapter III-C "How to do a Routine Evaluation using the Logical Framework Method" (August 1980 Draft), pp 12C 1-7

III. 6. Guidelines for the Evaluation of Capital Projects, Annex B: "Special Capital Project Considerations A.I.D. - PPC/DPRE/PE, (January 1975), pp 15-25.

Project Completion Reports/Final Evaluations:

III. 7. AID Handbook 3, Chapter 14D3: "Final Monitoring Activities and the Project Assistance Completion Report", pp 14-7 - 14-9.

Impact Evaluations:

III. 8. Design and Evaluation of AID-Assisted Projects, "Impact Evaluations", pp 240-247.

Special Studies:

III. 9. AID Evaluation Handbook (Draft), Chapter IV: "Guidelines for a Special Evaluation", (August 1980), pp 1-4.

Sources of Information:

III. 10. Evaluation Handbook (A.I.D. MC 1026.1) Chapter VI "Measurement, Data Collection and Analysis", pp 47-59.

III. 11. Collection and Analysis of Data, a general discussion synthesizing many sources, including:

A. Select the subject group to be studied
B. Prepare the research proposal
C. Develop a data analysis plan
D. Design, the data collection instrument
E. Collect and analyze the data

Step 2. Preparing a Data Collection, Monitoring and Evaluation Plan During the Design of the Project

III. 12. Design and Evaluation of AID-Assisted Projects, "Evaluation Planning", pp 137-139.

III. 13. AID Handbook 3, Appendix 3K, "Elements of An Evaluation Plan" (September 1982), pp 3K1-3K4.

III. 14. Project Evaluation Guidelines, MO 1026.1, Supplement I, Figure: "The Logical Structure of a Technical Assistance Project", (third edition, August 1974), p 7.

III. 15. Project Evaluation Guidelines, A.I.D. "Project Design Summary - Logical Framework".

III. 16. AID Evaluation Handbook Chapter II "The Project Design and Evaluation" (Draft August 1980)

III. 17. Manager's Guide to Data Collection, Chapter One: "The Manager's Role" (November 1979), pp 1-9.

III. 18. AID Evaluation Handbook (Draft), Chapter III A: "How to Make an Evaluation Plan", pp 1-5.

III. 19. Evaluation Handbook (MC 1026.1), Supplement II, Appendix C: "Selected Output Indicators", pp 76-78

III. 20. Ibid, Appendix D: "Suggested Social Indicators", pp 79-86.

III. 21. Ibid, Appendix E: "Indicators - Alliance for Progress", pp 87-102.

Step 3. Developing a Scope of Work for An Evaluation

III. 22. AID Evaluation Handbook (Draft), Chapter III-B: "How to Make a Scope of Work for An Evaluation", (August 1980), pp 5-7.

III. 23 Sample SOW: "Interim Project Evaluation, Jordan: Groundwater Resources Investigation Project Number 278-0243.

III. 24 Design and Evaluation of AID Assisted Projects", "Developing a Scope of Work for an Evaluation", p. 155.

Step 4. Assembling and Orienting the Evaluation Team

III. 25 Evaluation Handbook, (MC 1026.1), Supplement II, Chapter V: "Selection of Evaluations", pp 41-45.

III. 26 Manager's Guide to Data Collection, Chapter Two C: "Selecting a Study Team", pp 18-20.

III. 27 State Telegram 333797: "Early Alert System to Identify Direct Contracting Opportunities for Small 8(a) Minority and Women-Owned Firms" (November 23, 1983).

III. 28 Facilitator Guide for Conducting a Team Planning Meeting, WASH. Technical Report, No. 32, November 1985.

Step 6. Reporting, Internal Review and Submission Procedures

III. 29 AID Handbook 3, "12G Evaluation Reporting" pp 12-13.

III. 30 Evaluation Handbook (A.I.D. MC 1026.1) "Timing and Submission of Report from Consultant" pp 45-46

III. 31 Example of Beneficiary Impact Statement: An Attachment to USAID/Indonesia PES's CICA 1978-80.

SECTION V: The Mission Evaluation Process: Roles and Responsibilities

V. 1 The Design and Evaluation of A.I.D. Assisted Projects, "The Mission Evaluation Review", pp 214-218.

SECTION VI: Host Country Involvement

VI. 1 Host Country Participation: Increasing Host Country Participation in A.I.D. Project Evaluations.

VI. 2 A.I.D. Evaluation Handbook 2nd edition MC 1026.1 "Joint Evaluation with Cooperating Countries", pp 61-67.

SECTION VII: Utilization of Prior Experience/Lessons Learned

VII. 1 Examples of "Lessons Learned".

NOTE: Copies of the material contained in this bibliography are available upon request from the Asia Near East Bureau's evaluation division (ANE/DP/E).