

-1- PD-ABI 789
TSN = 88671
September 1983
M. C. Vreeland
PPC/E

PPC/E AUTOMATED DATA ON
EVALUATION PLANNING AND PERFORMANCE:
Description and Guide for Users

PPC/E has established a small automated database regarding AID's evaluation planning and performance. The purpose of this report is to familiarize Agency staff with the database and its existing and potential uses.

As of the end of FY 1983, the PPC/E database included 20 specific categories of information ("fields") which record data on the evaluation of specific AID-funded activities, as well as on evaluation reports that do not refer to specific activities but to more general programs, problems and issues. The fields include such information as when an evaluation is planned for submission to AID/Washington; the estimated and actual cost of the evaluation; when a report was actually received in AID/W; whether the evaluation is mid-term, final or ex-post; and whether it is a single-project or multi-project evaluation. As in any new database, some of the fields are experimental, and some "bugs" still have to be worked out.

General Description

The PPC/E database is stored in AID's mainframe computer and is part of the much larger programming and budgeting database maintained by PPC/PB. PPC/E is responsible for maintaining its portion of this larger database, and for initiating and monitoring any changes in it, in collaboration with PPC/PB and SER/DM. The larger PPC/PB database, including the evaluation information, is an open file -- that is, the data are available for use by responsible AID staff who need access to this information to assist them in the performance of their duties. No data in the PPC/E part database bears a security classification. It should be noted that, although the database is stored in the mainframe computer, arrangements can be made to have it "down-loaded" so that the information can be used on the increasing number of micro-computers being acquired by Agency offices, in AID/W and overseas.

By "piggy-backing" its own evaluation planning and performance data on the existing PPC/PB database, PPC/E hopes to enable the user to draw on the larger PPC/PB capacity, thereby obtaining computer-assisted reports with a richer potential for program research and analysis.

Because PPC/E data entry procedures record (as pertinent) standard AID "project numbers," users can link the evaluation planning and performance data to other databases in the Agency that are also keyed to project numbers. There are definite limitations on such links at the present time -- a predominant portion of AID activities is funded under "non-projectized" ESF, PL480, HG and other accounts; to some extent, this problem is being overcome by the standard use of non-project, or "dummy," numbers. Nevertheless, the links available through the project number key offer considerable benefits to a user; this key can give the user the ability to tap a fairly wide and rich set of information with greater historical depth and research utility.

As an initial tap on these wider benefits, six automated programs ("macros") have been developed for PPC/E by SER/DM. These macros exploit the Agency's ability to search for information among several of its databases or data files also keyed to standardized project numbers. The six macros were designed to generate the most likely or basic kinds of reports that are needed regularly or periodically by PPC/E. Among these computer-printed reports are the following: the annual AID-wide evaluation schedule; a comprehensive report of all active AID projects and their previous, current, and planned evaluations; a report indicating which projects in a specific functional area (e.g., health) have been and will be evaluated; and a report that arrays previous and planned evaluation work against the current pipeline and mortgage of all active projects in the Agency's portfolio.

It should be noted that additional macros can be prepared to meet the specific needs of users, for both single-file and multi-file searches of the data required. Users should remember that multi-file searches (searches that involve the use of more than one database or data-file) pose problems arising from differences between the files in terms of their coverage, the compatibility of their respective fields, and the currency of their data. Even so, the six initial macros prepared for PPC/E are just a beginning. By distributing this report on the PPC/E database, the office encourages potential users to submit their own requirements for exploiting the data for their own specific uses and reporting requirements. While there are probable limitations on "operationalizing" the data for certain kinds of analytical reports, these limitations should not be seen as handicaps but as opportunities for improving the Agency's ability to use ADP capabilities to serve management and programming needs.

The PPC/E database builds on previous efforts by the Agency to record its evaluation work over time through automated information procedures that support access to and use of accumulated evaluation findings. PPC/DIU has been the principal Agency unit responsible for storing substantive information about Agency evaluations, and the DIU database

(AID's central "memory") is one of the major files tapped in the six macros. An earlier PPC/E macro developed in 1979 (the "PPC/EVAL" report) was designed mainly for the purpose of helping PPC/E staff to ascertain and locate previous evaluations undertaken in specific program areas (e.g., rural roads, irrigation, nonformal education) and development strategies (e.g., private enterprise development, institutional development). Since 1980, the "PPC/EVAL" report has been available to all Agency staff through DIU. It turned out to be useful for more than research needs -- it helped in answering Congressional requests regarding evaluation in specific subject areas, and in providing AID contractors with background information that saved contractor time and Agency money.

Applications of the PPC/E Database:

The PPC/E database was established with three primary uses in mind. It was these three uses that guided the fields (categories) of information that are now included in the database. The user is reminded, however, that other uses may emerge over time, which could well require new fields or different characteristics of existing fields. Such changed requirements can best be identified through user requests, and users are encouraged to specify their requests to PPC/E, particularly in terms of how they would like to see the data presented (formatted) in a computer-printed report.

The three principal uses are designed to support the Agency's ability to meet reporting requirements arising from the Foreign Assistance Act (e.g., the so-called "Glenn Amendment" which requires A/AID to report periodically on the Agency's policy and regulations regarding evaluation) as well as to assist staff members whose responsibilities involve familiarity with the Agency's work in evaluation -- recent, ongoing and planned work.

These three uses are as follows:

- Monitoring the actual performance of evaluations as planned in a given fiscal year, and the receipt of evaluation reports in Bureaus and PPC/E as planned. Monitoring the performance of evaluations and the receipt of the resulting reports by central offices in AID/W has always been a time-consuming task for both PPC/E and Bureau evaluation offices. Most of this monitoring has involved manual records, recently assisted by word-processing capabilities; several Bureaus have expressed an interest in automating this information in computer-assisted form. In the meantime, PPC/E and Bureau evaluation offices have had to meet various, periodic reporting requirements regarding evaluation work -- reports to their colleagues, their respective office directors, their AAs; annual reports to OMB and GAO which essentially

require information covering three years -- last fiscal year, present fiscal year, and next fiscal year; and other occasional reports to Missions, counterparts and grantees about "what's going on in evaluation." Given its organizational responsibilities, PPC/E is particularly concerned, not only with the performance of evaluations, but with the receipt of the resulting evaluation reports in AID/W -- PPC/E does not count an evaluation as having been done until the report is available for acquisition by AID's central "memory," and its findings and "lessons learned" thereby made available to other Missions and Bureaus. In addition, automating this information will enable PPC/E and Bureau evaluation offices to seek answers to the following kinds of questions: Why aren't evaluations being performed or reported on as planned? Do some kinds of evaluations seem to confront special difficulties that lead to postponement or cancellation; and, if so, what are the patterns and where is additional support or guidance required?

• Determining the extent to which the Agency-wide portfolio of project and nonproject assistance is being evaluated over time, and the resulting patterns in terms of evaluation coverage. It has been extremely time-consuming -- next to impossible for some areas of nonproject assistance -- for PPC/E to pull together the information needed to determine the extent to which the Agency's portfolio has been, is being, or will be evaluated. At least for the project portfolio, this coverage was supposedly 100 percent during the early 1970s, when an annual evaluation was required for every project. But this requirement was never even approximated in practice and so, in 1978, it was dropped and in 1980, it was officially withdrawn on the recommendation of an Intra-Agency task force on evaluation. By 1980, therefore, it had become imperative for the Agency to review its evaluation coverage within a larger time frame. By automating the data on evaluation planning and performance, and by entering these data into a computer file capable of storing the data over time, the Agency can greatly ease the task of monitoring the extent to which its activities are being appropriately evaluated. Moreover, the Agency will, for the first time, be in a firm position to start evaluating its own evaluation performance -- that is, to answer such question as : Is AID directing sufficient evaluative efforts to areas representative of its current assistance portfolio? To those areas that will likely figure prominently in the future programming of AID assistance? Should we be devoting more evaluative attention to some areas than to others that have been or are being quite thoroughly assessed? In what areas do we need more summative/impact evaluation, and where should we be emphasizing process, formative evaluation or improved monitoring?

• Facilitating AID/W's ability to answer queries regarding its recent, ongoing and planned evaluation work. Based on its experience during the last three years. PPC/E can expect to receive a wide variety of requests for information which require reference to recent, ongoing and planned evaluations. Some come from Congress, some from the White House, some from other executive offices and other government agencies. As mentioned above, annual reports are required by OMB and GAO, and action on these requests has been assigned to PPC/E. Grantees and borrowers, Missions, AID/W Bureaus and offices often ask PPC/E for information about what evaluative work is being carried out, and when they can expect a report that will be useful to them in designing their program or project, and in convincing their counterparts (mostly in the form of giving their counterparts additional leverage to convince their own leaders and managers). The two distinguishing features of these requests are: 1) their focus on the "most recent" information about AID's evaluation work; and 2) their focus on particular programs/topics, particular issues, or particular functional or program accounts. By automating its data on evaluation planning and performance, the Agency is in a position to use the facilities of this database to sort and retrieve information quickly and with great savings in staff time. Although, in most cases, the computer-assisted report is only the first step in answering these requests for information, it constitutes a substantial saving for an experienced AID staff member who is assigned action for these queries.

The above three uses were the most pressing ones, but there are some other potential applications. These are described below, under "Available Reports (Macros) " and "On-Line Uses."

Field Definitions:

As of the end of FY 1983, 20 fields were included in the PPC/E database. A list of the data elements in the PPC/PB database, including PPC/E's 20 data fields, is attached.

The following describes the type of information recorded in each field, as they appear in the list of PPC/PB data elements.

1. LASTEVP: Originally designed to record information on the last evaluation planned for an activity, this field has been left empty in anticipation of receiving FY 83/84 data once the FY 84/85 plans were received. Once FY 83/84 planning data are permanently stored in permanent fiscal year fields, this field can be withdrawn or used for other purposes. Note that this field is not used to record a Mission or Office report that an evaluation was undertaken; a Mission may claim to have undertaken an evaluation, whether or not an actual report was ever submitted to AID/W -- this information is contained in the field FUTREST.

3. CURREVPL: Records the ending month and year of the fiscal year quarter during which an evaluation report is planned for submission to AID/W during the first of the two years covered by the current Annual Evaluation Plan.

4. CURREVRC: Records the publication month and year of an evaluation report received at any time during the first fiscal year covered by the current Annual Evaluation Plan, whether or not the evaluation was planned for submission to AID/W according to the current Annual Evaluation Plan.

5. NEXTEVPL: Records the ending month and year of the fiscal year quarter during which an evaluation report is planned for submission to AID/W during the second of the two years covered by the current Annual Evaluation Plan.

6. FUTREVPL: Records evaluations planned beyond the two years covered by the current evaluation plan. While rarely used, this field can be important in recording data about longer-range evaluation plans of Missions and offices, to the extent that this information is available.

7. LASTEST: Originally designed to report data on the estimated cost of an evaluation reported under LASTEVRC. Can be dropped or used for other purposes once the information is stored in permanent fiscal year fields to be created.

8. LASTACT: Originally designed to record information on the actual cost of an evaluation reported under LASTEVRC. Can be dropped or used for other purposes once the information is stored in permanent fiscal year fields.

9. CURREST: Reports the estimated cost of an evaluation as planned in CURREVPL. Costs are reported in thousands of U.S. dollars. In the case of multi-project evaluations, the cost is simply divided among the number of projects to be covered by the evaluation, and the smaller amount entered against each project number.

10. CURRACT: Reports the actual cost (in thousands of U.S. dollars) of an evaluation submitted to AID/W as reported in CURREVRC. For multi-project evaluations, the cost is divided by the number of projects involved.

11. NEXTEST: The estimated cost of an evaluation planned under NEXTEVPL. For multiproject evaluations, the cost is divided by the number of projects involved, and the smaller cost entered against each project number.

12. FUTREST: Records the month and year of the most recent evaluation of a project as reported in the Annual Evaluation Plan. Since not all such reports are submitted to or received by AID/W, this information is of use in acquiring missing or delinquent reports.

13. EVALTTYPE: Describes the type of activity to be evaluated, in general program terms, as indicated in the current Annual Evaluation Plan: One in nine single-character numeric codes can be used, as follows:

1 = country project or subproject: for evaluations that address a single project or subproject in a country, having an assigned project number

2 = country multi-project: assigned to every project involved in a multi-project evaluation.

3 = country sector: for evaluations that address an entire sector or subsector in a country; for example, assessments of past and present performance of all assisted activities in the agricultural sector; in the electricity subsector.

4 = country program: for evaluations that address discrete programs in a given country, including country-specific PL480, HG, disaster relief; all comprehensive or representative "country program assessments"; and special issues (e.g., WID) that cut across an entire country program.

5 = other country non-project assistance: includes all other forms of country-specific non-project assistance, including ESF (non-projectized components), CIPs, and "sector" loans and grants.

6 = regional projects and subprojects: as identified by regional geographic codes, whether managed in overseas offices or centrally.

7 = worldwide projects: includes evaluations of projects and grants managed by central Bureaus, notably S&T and FVA. In the case of multi-project evaluations of such projects, the code is assigned to each project involved.

8 = inter-country evaluations: for evaluations that address similar issues or activities in two or more countries; "impact" evaluations managed by PPC/E are assigned this code, as are regional Bureau efforts to evaluate similar activities (e.g., participant training) in two or more countries in a region.

9 = special issues: for evaluations that may be carried out from time-to-time at the request of senior staff, and that address Agency-wide issues above and beyond a given project, program or sector (e.g., management performance, experience with FAR, development strategies).

14. EVALTIME: Describes when, in the life of an activity, the evaluation is being planned. One of five single-character numeric codes can be used:

1 = interim: the evaluation is carried out sometime during the implementation of an activity, or mid-term during its life.

2 = final: the evaluation is carried out at the end of an activity, just prior to its termination, or for the explicit purpose (as stated in the current Annual Evaluation Plan) of assisting the design of a follow-on or next-phase activity.

3 = ex post: the evaluation is carried out after a project has ended, following its most recent PACD.

4 = combined: the evaluation involves several activities at various stages of implementation and completion.

5 = monitor: used in those cases where the current Annual Evaluation Plan states that the "evaluation" is to monitor project implementation or status, as distinct from an interim evaluation.

15. MISC1: A single-character numeric code used to enable the computer to group together projects involved in a multiproject evaluation, in a computer-printed report.

16. MISC2: Identifies the AID organizational unit initiating and responsible for the evaluation. One of the following codes is applied:

1 = Mission

2 = subregional office (e.g., REDSO/EA; Caribbean Regional)

3 = regional office (e.g., AFR/RA, LAC Regional; ASIA Regional)

4 = AID/W Bureau-level: for evaluations planned as a Bureau-wide effort, to meet a requirement of the AA (even though action may be assigned to a specific office).

6 = PPC/Impact: assigned to impact and related evaluations managed by PPC/E.

7 = other AID unit

8 = combined: for evaluations initiated and managed by more than one unit. The principal example is PL480 evaluations which are often, but not always, shared by the relevant Mission and FVA/FFP.

17. MISC3: A four-character numeric field not currently being used. It should probably be used to record the month and year of the most recent PACD for a project, as reported in the current Annual Evaluation Plan. This information would be very useful for a computer-assisted report that would enable PPC/E to ascertain those activities that are nearing termination and for which there is neither a past nor a planned evaluation. The initially programmed ending date for an activity, recorded as the most recent estimated completion date in FM, is not satisfactory for this purpose.

18. MISC4: Another four-character numeric field not currently being used. It should probably be used to record the "geographic" code of the Mission or office in whose current Annual Evaluation Plan a particular evaluation appears. When the database was set up, it was erroneously assumed that all the activities involved in a particular evaluation schedule would either bear the respective geographic code or else that a dummy number could be assigned. This has not proved to be the case; for example, Missions often plan to evaluate regional projects and subprojects, as well as central projects under which activities are being carried out in their respective countries. Therefore, this field would be needed for computer-assisted reports on what units are planning to evaluate what projects and subprojects, besides their own.

19. MISC5: A 25-character alpha/numeric field designed to record the contract number of the principal contractor, if any, involved in an evaluation recorded in CURREVRC. No allowance is made to record the fact that more than one contractor might be involved in a given evaluation (which is sometimes the case).

20. MISC6: A 25-character field designed to record brief, miscellaneous notations or comments on an evaluation included in the current Annual Evaluation Plan. It can be used, for example, to record such data as a reported cancellation or postponement of a planned evaluation. Portions of the field (e.g., the first three characters) might be used to record coded data on certain aspects of a received evaluation, such as its overall quality, or aspects of its research design or methodology. Or it might be used to short-hand reasons why an evaluation was carried out that was not in the initial evaluation plan.

Please remember that the above fields were designed principally to describe aspects of evaluations planned and/or received, especially during the first year of the most current Annual Evaluation Plan. Once an evaluation report is actually received in AID/W and processed into PPC/E/DIU's automated "memory," many other aspects about that evaluation are entered into DIU's database and can be accessed via the computer.

Moreover, as can be seen from the attached list of data elements in the larger PPC/PB database, a great number of information categories regarding recent and active projects are already being covered. These are available to help the user in sorting out various characteristics of the projects for which evaluations are being planned or received. For example, this information includes both the "primary technical code" and the "subcategory code," which describe certain characteristics of a project; the functional assistance account or accounts under which a project is funded; its obligation and expenditure status; and selected "special issues" associated with active projects.

Because the above twenty fields were designed to record data from the most current Annual Evaluation Plan, the database has to be cleared once a year to make way for the data contained in the next annual plan. For the purpose of enabling computer-assisted observations, over the next five years or so, of correlations between planned and actual evaluation work, between estimated and actual costs, and of contractor use, PPC/E intends to store in permanent fiscal year fields the data contained in the following fields: CURREVPL, CURREVRC, CURREST, CURRACT, and possibly MISC5. By "Saving" and storing data once a year from these five fields, and especially from the CURREVRC and CURRACT fields, the Agency will be in a position to review, over time, the extent to which its project (and much of its nonproject) portfolio is being evaluated and how much this evaluation work is costing the Agency. In addition, some other fields (e.g., EVALTYPE) may be considered for permanent addition to the central automated "memory."

NOTE: More detailed field descriptions and guidance for coding and data entry are available.

Available Reports (Macros):

Six "macro" programs have been developed for PPC/E that produce computer-assisted reports. These reports are described in the following paragraphs.

REPORT #1, OPTION A ("Part A"): "Evaluation of AID's Portfolio."

This report is an organized "dump" of everything PPC/E has entered into the database regarding what it "knows" (in an automated sense) about evaluation planning and performance for all projects included in the PPC/PB database. The report prints out all active AID projects (including any nonproject assistance evaluations entered under dummy numbers); indicates certain items about the project (e.g., the project number, project title, funding and expenditure status); and reports its evaluation coverage (e.g., what evaluations have been done, and what evaluations are being planned, if any). Full reporting on all fields still awaits PPC/DI's transfer to AID's mainframe computer of data on evaluation reports received in the central "memory" and processed into a separate non-AID computer.

This report, which can be obtained at any time during the year except for the period during which data from the most recent Annual Evaluation Plan is being entered, provides PPC/E and other users a ready reference to the actual and planned evaluation coverage of its portfolio.

REPORT #1, OPTION B ("Part B"): "AID Evaluation Plan for Fiscal Year ____."

This report prints out only those active projects (and any additional evaluations entered under dummy numbers) that appear in the current (most recent) Annual Evaluation Plan. The macro was designed to print out, in a single 8 1/2 by 11" report, the consolidated annual evaluation schedules as submitted to PPC/E by all Bureaus. The information is sorted by Region/Mission and by Central Bureau. The report was intended to serve as an annex to the "AID Evaluation Plan" for a given fiscal year, greatly easing the onerous manual work involved in pulling together the evaluation schedules submitted annually by Agency Missions and offices. While the macro asks the user for a cut-off date for the report, this cut-off date is always the first fiscal year covered by the current Annual Evaluation Plan for which data have been entered.

REPORT #2: "Evaluations by Appropriation Account, Sub-Category or Primary Technical Code."

This report sorts all projects contained in the current Annual Evaluation Plan in one of three ways -- their appropriation account(s), their sub-category codes(s), and their primary technical code(s). The purpose of the report is to help the user determine those types of activities on which currently planned evaluation work is being focused, and the extent to which this focus is representative of the overall portfolio (and its general future direction).

The user is prompted by the computer to specify which of the three options is desired, and the user must enter one of the three pertinent codes -- A, S, or T. Before selecting a code, the user should be familiar with the coding systems they represent.* The user should also be aware of the fact that a given project may be assigned more than one code -- for example, a project may receive funding from more than one appropriation account, or may be assigned more than one technical or sub-category code. This report will save PPC/E a great amount of time in answering the question : On what types of activities is AID planning to devote its evaluation work during the next two years?

REPORT #3: "Evaluation of Projects According to Their Initial Obligation Year."

This, and the following, report help the user to look back a bit into the Agency's program, year by past year, to ascertain whether older or more mature projects have ever been evaluated. The historical depth of the report is limited by the fact that the PPC/PB database begins with projects active as of 1979. Nevertheless, over time, this report can help the user to identify older, still active projects that are good candidates for evaluation and to array these against evaluation plans contained in the most current Annual Evaluation Plan. The user specifies the cut-off year of the initial obligation, and the cut-off month and year for any evaluations received, usually the month and year when the report is being requested. For example, in February 1984, a user can obtain one or more printouts, based on the initial year of obligation for all projects still active in 1984, on known evaluations for these projects and any planned evaluations for these projects.

* Information on two of these coding systems are readily available in AID Handbooks: (A) Appropriation Account Codes, and T (Technical Activity Codes); a description of S (Sub-category Codes) is available from PPC/PB. Given the nature of AID's enterprise, and the complex nature of many of the activities it supports through U.S. assistance, the majority of active projects will likely have more than one code in any of the three categories. By employing these three coding systems, PPC/E is simply adopting a usual "tri-angulation" process, giving the user three automated ways to zero in on projects and activities of potential interest to the user, and saving the user a lot of time and manual effort. Unless the user is absolutely sure about which code is pertinent, PPC/E suggests that the user enter separate requests for all three; there will be a lot of overlap, but there will also be some pertinent "marginal" projects.

This report is useful in identifying older and mature projects that have never been evaluated, as well as projects that are too new to be candidates for evaluation. The information in the report is sorted by Mission/office, giving PPC/E an initial idea of the efforts being made by particular Missions and offices to evaluate their respective activities.

REPORT #4: "Evaluation of Older Projects According to Appropriation Account Sub-Category, or Technical Code."

This report does the same search as in #3, except that it sorts the information, not by region/Mission, etc., but by one of the three categories of development activity described in Report #2 -- appropriation account, sub-category, or technical activity code. The report enables PPC/E to determine the development sectors in which older active projects have not been evaluated and/or for which no plans have been made for their evaluation. Patterns that may emerge from this kind of report can alert PPC/E to the probable need for further action, guidance and support.

REPORT #5: "Evaluation According to USAID-Funded Project Cost":

This macro prints out a report of all active projects according to their most recent combined U.S. loan/grant life-of-project funding, and sorts the information according to specified funding intervals, (e.g., \$1 through \$100,000; \$100,001 through \$500,000, etc.). These intervals were based on a general review of the recent characteristics of AID funding for individual projects, loans and grants; it is quite possible that these intervals will require adjustment. In the meantime, this report gives PPC/E, for the first time, a fairly good measure of whether AID is putting its evaluation dollars on where its development program mouth is. This is a very "dirty" macro, because of disagreements on a definition of current LOP funding.

REPORT #6: "Evaluation of AID's Pipeline."

The report generated by this macro is the most tentative of all six reports (the most ambitious, the most "bug"-ridden, and doubtless the most controversial). It was designed to enable PPC/E to array past and planned evaluation work against the current "pipeline" and "mortgage" of all active projects (and non-project assistance as entered via dummy numbers). The hypothesis underlying this macro is that older projects with substantial unexpended pipelines as well as some heavily mortgaged, front-end-loaded projects are major candidates for evaluation, for several reasons. The report lists all active projects, their respective pipeline and mortgage percentages, and their past and planned evaluations.

The above reports have to be requested in what is called a "batch" job. While the same report could be obtained in an immediate "on-line" form, it would require the services of an analyst familiar with the databases involved to sit down at a terminal and enter a similar program; and it would require said analyst to do the same thing over again every time one of the reports was needed. In asking for the above "macros", PPC/E assumed that it would have to use these reports several times during the year ; often on short notice.

"On-Line" Uses:

The above six macros are "batch" jobs. The database, however, is open for "on-line" use. Given a terminal with a hook-up to the mainframe computer, and given an approved ID, a qualified and responsible AID employee can gain access to the database. The computer language used -- the INQUIRE language -- is easy to learn, and there are a variety of queries that do not require extensive programs, but rather some fairly simple user commands that can retrieve information from the database "on-line." The following are some examples of the kind of information that a user can expect to receive directly; the examples are given in the form of exemplified user questions, derived from actual PPC/E experience.

- "I'd like to know whether any of these three projects has ever been evaluated, and if there are any plans to evaluate them. I've got a project number for one of them, but for the other two, all I know is that they're supporting a rural health program in Senegal. Have any of them been evaluated; are there any current plans for their evaluation?"

- "The Mission is in the middle of developing a new project, involving a fairly innovative approach for this country. We've received some printouts and bibliographies from DIU. What we'd really like to know is what other Missions have tried the same thing recently, whether they've done any recent evaluations, so that we can contact them directly."

- "I have to pull together some information for the CP on the utilization of evaluation in new projects being funded under the 106 Account. Can you give me some information about what projects funded by this account have been evaluated recently?"

- "The (Congressional) Committee requires an answer to the following questions: Does AID evaluate ESF programs? If so, what ESF-funded activities have been evaluated during the last two fiscal years?"

● "Our Bureau is considering taking a thorough look at all its ESF-funded activities, including some CIP programs. Have any other Bureaus or Missions undertaken a similar recent assessment? Which ones?"

In addition, the following questions are pertinent to PPC/E's needs:

● PPC/E is considering undertaking impact evaluations in the following three topics. What evaluations are Missions already planning in the topical areas this year and next year?

● We have to prepare reports to GAO (in March) and OMB (in May) on AID's "program" evaluations planned for this fiscal year and next fiscal year, including information on actual and estimated costs. What recent and planned evaluations fall into the category of "program" evaluation that should be considered in preparing these reports?

● DIU wants to ensure that it has received copies of all evaluation reports submitted during FY 1984. What reports have been received by Bureaus during this period, which were not received by DIU?

● How much is AID planning to spend on evaluation work in FY 85?