

APPR: TF ()

DRAFT: OC ()

CLEAR: RC ()

UNCLASSIFIED

CLEAR: ()

CLEAR: ()

AID/PPC:OCARDUNER/PHENDERSON-OKEEFE:EP
12/21/98 2-0581/2-4976
AID/AA/PPC:TFOX

CLEAR: ()

CLEAR: ()

AID/DAA/PPC:DDIJKERMAN(INFO)
AID/M/B:JPAINTER(DRAFT)
AID/ANE:JBRESLAR(DRAFT)
AID/ENI:PMATHESON(DRAFT)

AID/PPC/CDIE:GBRITAN(INFO)
AID/AFR:JSMITH(DRAFT)
AID/AA/LAC:MSCHNEIDER(DRAFT)
AID/G:BTURNER(DRAFT)+

PRIORITY AWIDE, CIS C PRIORITY, RIGA PRIORITY, SARAJEVO PRIORITY,
BUJUMBURA PRIORITY, ASMARA PRIORITY, DAR ES SALAAM PRIORITY,+

ADM AID FROM AA/PPC, TOM FOX TO MISSION DIRECTORS AND

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS:

SUBJECT: FY 2001 RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST (R4)

USAID/W OFFICE DIRECTORS

I. INTRODUCTION

THIS CABLE PROVIDES R4 GUIDANCE FOR THE FY 2001 R4 CYCLE. THE GUIDANCE REFLECTS SIGNIFICANT CHANGES TO THE AGENCY'S MANAGEMENT FOR RESULTS SYSTEM AS PROPOSED BY AN INTER-BUREAU WORKING GROUP AND ENDORSED AT THE WORLDWIDE MISSION DIRECTORS CONFERENCE. THE OBJECTIVE IS TO RESPOND TO THE CONCERN THAT PERFORMANCE REPORTING HAS BECOME TOO COSTLY IN TERMS OF LIMITED STAFF AND DOLLAR RESOURCES AND IS NOT WELL MATCHED TO ACTUAL BUDGET DECISION-MAKING PROCESSES.

THESE CHANGES HAVE BEEN DISCUSSED WITH THE HILL AND OMB. PPC IS WORKING INTENSIVELY WITH THESE STAKEHOLDERS TO REACH AGREEMENT ON ADEQUATE AND COST-EFFECTIVE STANDARDS FOR PERFORMANCE REPORTING WHICH MEETS GPRA REQUIREMENTS AND INTERNAL AGENCY MANAGEMENT NEEDS. PPC IS ALSO WORKING

UNCLASSIFIED

WITH STATE TO IMPROVE THE MISSION PERFORMANCE AND RESULTS PLANS (MPP) PROCESS AND ITS ALIGNMENT WITH USAID PLANNING PROCESSES. RELATED AREAS OF THE MANAGEMENT-FOR-RESULTS SYSTEM WILL BE UNDER REVIEW IN COMING WEEKS AND MONTHS, INCLUDING STRATEGIC PLANNING GUIDANCE, NON-PRESENCE COUNTRY PROGRAMMING AND REPORTING, AND CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.

THE FOLLOWING SECTION-BY-SECTION TABLE OF CONTENTS IS PROVIDED TO FACILITATE USE OF THE CABLE:

SECTION:

- I. -- INTRODUCTION
- II. -- GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS
 - A. -- BACKGROUND AND ACTION REQUEST
 - B. -- BUDGET OUTLOOK
 - C. -- MPP LINKAGE
 - D. -- CHANGES TO THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT
 - E. -- WHO SHOULD SUBMIT
 - F. -- FORMATTING INSTRUCTIONS
 - G. -- SUBMISSION SCHEDULE & CONTACT POINTS
 - H. -- SUPPLEMENTAL REFERENCES
- III. -- R4 OUTLINE AND DRAFTING INSTRUCTIONS
 - A. -- COVER MEMO
 - B. -- R4 PART I: OVERVIEW
 - C. -- R4 PART II: RESULTS REVIEW
 - D. -- R4 PART III (OLD): STATUS OF THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT (NOW CONTAINED IN COVER MEMO)
 - E. -- R4 PART III (NEW): RESOURCE REQUEST
 - F. -- WORKFORCE AND OE
 - G. -- SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ANNEXES
- IV. -- SPECIAL REPORTING SITUATIONS
 - A. -- G BUREAU FIELD SUPPORT
 - B. -- BHR PROGRAMMED RESOURCES
 - C. -- CLOSEOUT AND GRADUATION
 - D. -- NON-PRESENCE COUNTRIES
- V. -- CHANGES IN WASHINGTON R4 REVIEW PROCESS
- II. GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS
 - A. BACKGROUND AND ACTION REQUEST

R4S HAVE BEEN USED TO SATISFY INFORMATION NEEDS AT SEVERAL LEVELS: BY MISSIONS TO DETERMINE IF PROGRAMS AND

RESOURCES NEED ADJUSTMENT TO MAXIMIZE IMPACT; BY REGIONAL BUREAUS TO ALLOCATE RESOURCES ACROSS COUNTRIES TO MEET DEVELOPMENT AND FOREIGN POLICY GOALS; AND BY CENTRAL BUREAUS FOR EXTERNAL AGENCY REPORTING AND BUDGET PREPARATION.

AFTER ANALYZING CURRENT PRACTICE, THE R4 WORKING GROUP, CONVOKED BY THE ADMINISTRATOR, REACHED SEVERAL CONCLUSIONS: (1) R4S GENERALLY PROVIDE MISSION MANAGEMENT WITH SUFFICIENT INFORMATION TO MANAGE FOR RESULTS AND IMPLEMENT APPROPRIATE PERFORMANCE-BASED BUDGETING; (2) R4S PROVIDE REGIONAL BUREAUS WITH MORE THAN ENOUGH INFORMATION FOR ACTUAL BUREAU MANAGEMENT AND BUDGETING NEEDS; AND (3) R4S WERE SOMEWHAT CUMBERSOME IN TRANSMITTING INFORMATION FOR AGENCY-WIDE PLANNING AND REPORTING PURPOSES. THE VIEW THAT R4S SHOULD BE THE SOLE OR MAIN BASIS FOR BUDGET DECISIONS ENCOURAGED BUREAUS TO REQUEST, AND MISSIONS TO PROVIDE, MORE INFORMATION THAN COULD EFFECTIVELY BE USED. WASHINGTON REVIEWS BECAME TOO LABOR INTENSIVE AND EXCESSIVELY FOCUSED ON DETAILED NUMERIC SCORING AND RANKING. BY CONTRAST, INSUFFICIENT EFFORT WAS GIVEN TO SYNTHESIZING REGIONAL AND GLOBAL TRENDS AND AGENCY-WIDE IMPACT.

THE COMPLETE R4 WORKING GROUP REPORT CAN BE OBTAINED ON THE AGENCY'S INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL WEBSITES WITH RELATED MISSION DIRECTORS CONFERENCE MATERIALS. PPC/CDIE TIPS NO. 12, AN ANNEX TO THE REPORT, PROVIDES UPDATED GUIDANCE ON PERFORMANCE MONITORING STANDARDS. THE CHANGES DESCRIBED BELOW SHOULD NOT BE MISCONSTRUED AS A SHIFT AWAY FROM RESULTS MANAGEMENT. RATHER, IT IS AN EFFORT TO BETTER ALIGN OUR SYSTEMS TO THE TYPES OF RESOURCE ALLOCATION DECISIONS WHICH ARE POSSIBLE, GIVEN NON-PERFORMANCE FACTORS THAT MUST BE TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT, AND THE LIMITATIONS OF EXISTING METHODOLOGIES FOR CROSS-COUNTRY AND CROSS-GOAL PERFORMANCE COMPARISONS. DESPITE SUCH DIFFICULTIES, WE REMAIN COMMITTED TO APPLYING RESULTS- BASED MANAGEMENT TECHNIQUES AT ALL POSSIBLE POINTS.

R4S WILL CONTINUE TO BE REQUIRED FOR EVERY OPERATING UNIT EVERY YEAR. MAJOR CHANGES TO BE IMPLEMENTED IMMEDIATELY INCLUDE:

- ELIMINATING PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE NOT USEFUL FOR MANAGEMENT-FOR-RESULTS DECISION-MAKING;
- REDUCING THE PRESCRIBED LENGTH OF R4 DOCUMENTS, WHILE ALLOWING LIMITED USE OF ANNEXES TO MEET SPECIAL NEEDS;

- REDUCING THE FREQUENCY OF FORMAL TRADITIONAL USAID/WASHINGTON PROGRAM REVIEWS TO ONCE EVERY THREE YEARS FOR MOST PROGRAMS, WHILE ALLOWING BUREAUS TO INCREASE THE FREQUENCY OF SELECTED COUNTRY REVIEWS WHEN SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES WARRANT;

- ELIMINATING COMPARISON RANK-ORDERING OF STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES (SO'S) ACROSS A REGION OR GOAL AREA AS WELL AS RELATIVE PRIORITY RANKINGS OF SO'S FOR A GIVEN COUNTRY PROGRAM;

- INTRODUCING A COVER MEMO FOR MISSION MANAGEMENT TO CANDIDLY HIGHLIGHT SPECIFIC ISSUES REQUIRING USAID/W ACTION;

- ISSUING MANAGEMENT CONTRACT CABLES ONLY IN YEARS WHEN SPECIFIC CHANGES TO THE CONTRACT ARE MADE. ROUTINE USE OF CABLES FOLLOWING EVERY R4 SUBMISSION WOULD BE DROPPED, AND

- STRIVING TO PROMOTE BETTER TEAMWORK BETWEEN WASHINGTON AND THE FIELD FOCUSED ON ACHIEVING RESULTS AND IMPROVING THE FLOW OF COMMUNICATION.

OPERATING UNITS AND THEIR BUREAUS ARE REQUESTED TO INITIATE THE FOLLOWING ACTIONS TO HELP IMPLEMENT THE CHANGES LISTED ABOVE:

1. PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN REVISIONS: REVIEW YOUR SO PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLANS AND RELATED SECTIONS OF GRANTS AND CONTRACTS, AND ELIMINATE PERFORMANCE MEASURES WHICH ARE NOT BEING USED FOR RESULTS MANAGEMENT. THE OBJECTIVE IS TO REDUCE THE COST AND BURDEN OF PERFORMANCE REPORTING BY ELIMINATING INDICATORS THAT ARE NOT DIRECTLY USEFUL IN ASSESSING PROGRESS IN MEETING OBJECTIVES, MAKING IMPLEMENTATION MANAGEMENT DECISIONS, OR MEETING SPECIFIC AGENCY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS. IF A GRANTEE ANSWERS TO MULTIPLE OPERATING UNITS (E.G., THE MISSION AND G OR BHR), THOSE OPERATING UNITS SHOULD WORK TOGETHER WITH THE RESPONSIBLE GRANTS OFFICER TO INSURE THAT THE GRANTEE IS NOT BURDENED WITH EXCESSIVE AND NON-OVERLAPPING PERFORMANCE INDICATORS. OPERATING UNITS CAN BEGIN THE PROCESS OF WEEDING-OUT THEIR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS WHILE PREPARING THIS R4. THIS EFFORT SHOULD BE COMPLETED WITHIN A YEAR, IF POSSIBLE BY THE DUE DATE OF THE FY 2002 R4. SEE II.D. BELOW FOR ADDITIONAL GUIDANCE ON CHANGING INDICATORS.

2. REVIEW SCHEDULE: BUREAUS WILL ADVISE OPERATING UNITS WHICH PROGRAMS WILL BE SCHEDULED FOR FORMAL PROGRAM WEEK REVIEWS IN FY 99 AND THE SCHEDULE FOR THOSE REVIEWS. THE

INTENT IS TO HOLD SUCH REVIEWS ONLY WHEN NEEDED BUT NOT LESS THAN ONCE EVERY THREE YEARS. R4S SHOULD BE SUBMITTED BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND APRIL 1 UNLESS OTHERWISE NOTIFIED BY YOUR HOME BUREAU (SEE G BELOW). INFORMATION ABOUT PROGRAM PROGRESS SHOULD CONTINUE TO BE SHARED BETWEEN THE FIELD AND WASHINGTON THROUGH E-MAILS, DESK OFFICERS, EVALUATIONS, PERIODIC CONSULTATIONS WITH MISSION STAFF AS THEY TRANSIT WASHINGTON, FIELD TRAVEL BY WASHINGTON STAFF, AND SPECIAL CONSULTATIONS WITH MISSION MANAGEMENT AS DETERMINED BY THE MISSION AND REGIONAL BUREAU.

SECTION V BELOW PROVIDES SUMMARY INFORMATION FOR R4 DRAFTERS ON CHANGES TO THE WASHINGTON R4 REVIEW PROCESS. OF PARTICULAR INTEREST TO MISSIONS AND SO TEAMS WILL BE THE ELIMINATION OF POINT SCORING OF INDIVIDUAL STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND RELATED COMPARISON-RANKINGS EXERCISES.

B. BUDGET OUTLOOK

DISCRETIONARY FUNDING IS IN VERY SHORT SUPPLY RELATIVE TO LEGITIMATE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS. THIS IS ESPECIALLY TRUE FOR DA FUNDS FOR ECONOMIC GROWTH. WE EXPECT CONTINUING FUNDING PRIORITY FOR CHILD SURVIVAL, AIDS, INFECTIOUS DISEASES, BASIC EDUCATION, AND, IN THE ECONOMIC GROWTH AREA, MICROENTERPRISE AND AGRICULTURE. WE ALSO EXPECT MORE LIMITED AND MORE TARGETED ASSISTANCE FOR NON-PRESENCE COUNTRIES. THESE PRIORITIES NOTWITHSTANDING, THE ADMINISTRATION INTENDS TO CONTINUE SUPPORT FOR POPULATION, ENVIRONMENT AND DEMOCRACY. FOR PLANNING PURPOSES, THE AGENCY IS PROJECTING THE OVERALL COMBINED LEVEL OF DA AND CS/D FUNDING TO REMAIN AT ABOUT CURRENTLY APPROPRIATED LEVELS OVER THE NEXT SEVERAL YEARS. WE ANTICIPATE LEVELS FOR EASTERN EUROPE AND THE NIS WILL DECLINE GRADUALLY. MONEY FOR THE MIDDLE-EAST PEACE PROCESS COUNTRIES SHOULD STAY FAIRLY CONSTANT OVERALL WITH SOME SHIFTING OF LEVELS AMONG COUNTRIES. FOOD AND DISASTER ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS WILL CONTINUE TO BE FUNDED AT RECENT LEVELS. PL 480 TITLE III, HOWEVER, WILL BE REDUCED FURTHER IF NOT ELIMINATED.

C. MISSION PERFORMANCE PLAN (MPP) LINKAGE

USAID AND STATE ARE COORDINATING CLOSELY TO ENSURE CONSISTENCY BETWEEN MPP'S AND THE R-4. THE MPP IS THE AUTHORITATIVE INTEGRATED INTERAGENCY COUNTRY STRATEGY DOCUMENT PREPARED BY THE COUNTRY TEAM AND APPROVED BY THE CHIEF OF MISSION. IN ADDITION TO DEFINING GOALS AND PLANNED PERFORMANCE, IT ALSO SERVES TO REPORT ON PAST PERFORMANCE AND REQUEST RESOURCES. MPP GOALS ARE BASED ON THE NATIONAL INTERESTS AND STRATEGIC GOALS CONTAINED IN THE INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS STRATEGIC PLAN (IASP). THE IASP

INCORPORATES USAID'S AGENCY STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS. NOW BEING UPDATED WITH USAID INPUT, THE CURRENT IASP DOCUMENT WILL BE DISTRIBUTED TO ALL POSTS AND WILL BE AVAILABLE ON THE STATE DEPARTMENT WEBSITE (WWW.STATE.GOV).

MPP AND R-4 PREPARATION WILL BE BETTER SYNCHRONIZED IN THIS CYCLE. STATE ANTICIPATES ISSUING MPP GUIDANCE IN FEBRUARY WITH A MID-APRIL MPP SUBMISSION DUE DATE. USAID MISSIONS ARE EXPECTED TO BE INTEGRAL PARTICIPANTS IN PREPARING THE MPP. USAID OFFICERS CAN LEND THEIR EXTENSIVE PLANNING AND RESOURCE MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE TO HELP PREPARE HIGHER QUALITY AND RIGOROUS MPPS. THE USAID COUNTRY STRATEGY AND R4 COMPLEMENT THE MPP BY PROVIDING THE DETAILED DESCRIPTION AND ANALYSIS OF USAID-MANAGED OBJECTIVES AND RELATED PERFORMANCE AND BUDGET PLANNING INFORMATION. THE MPP SHOULD, THEREFORE, SIMPLY INCORPORATE USAID STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES AND RELATED RESOURCE DATA UNDER THE APPROPRIATE MPP GOAL AND NATIONAL INTEREST. WASHINGTON AGENCIES WILL REVIEW AND APPROVE MPPS TO ENSURE AGREEMENT ON CRITICAL NATIONAL INTERESTS AND PRIORITIES AND RELATED RESOURCE REQUESTS. USAID WILL BE A FULL PARTICIPANT IN MPP REVIEWS FOR ALL COUNTRIES THAT RECEIVE, OR PROPOSE RECEIVING, USAID FUNDING AND WILL CLEAR ANY MPP-RELATED FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS THAT RELATE SPECIFICALLY TO USAID-MANAGED OBJECTIVES. STATE WILL BE INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN PROGRAM WEEK REVIEWS OF R4S WHEN SCHEDULED.

R-4 DOCUMENTS SHOULD IDENTIFY WHICH MPP GOAL AND NATIONAL INTEREST ARE SUPPORTED BY EACH USAID STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE, AND NOTE THAT THESE LINKAGES ARE CONSISTENT WITH MPPS. THE MPP WILL REQUIRE THAT EACH USAID OBJECTIVE SHOULD BE DESCRIBED UNDER ONE PRIMARY MPP GOAL (SUPPORT TO SECONDARY GOALS CAN BE INDICATED). IN SOME CASES, SUCH AS INTEGRATED HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING OBJECTIVES, WHICH COULD SUPPORT MORE THAN ONE IASP GOAL (E.G., HEALTH AND FAMILY PLANNING ARE LISTED AS SEPARATE GOALS IN THE IASP), A CHOICE WILL HAVE TO BE MADE IN DETERMINING WHICH IASP/MPP GOAL IS PRIMARY. USAID EDUCATION SO'S MAY ALSO HAVE TO BE SOMEWHAT ARBITRARILY LINKED TO ONE PRIMARY MPP GOAL EVEN THOUGH THEY MAY BENEFIT MORE THAN ONE.

PPC/PC IS THE PRINCIPAL CONTACT POINT WITH STATE/RPP ON MPP/R4 COORDINATION AND WILL ASSIST IN ADDRESSING QUESTIONS THAT MAY ARISE RELATED TO GUIDANCE. REGIONAL BUREAUS WILL HAVE THE LEAD IN COORDINATING R4 AND MPP REVIEWS WITH THEIR STATE COUNTERPARTS.

D. CHANGES TO THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

WASHINGTON REGULARLY RECEIVES REQUESTS FROM THE FIELD ASKING FOR CLARIFICATION ON WHAT TYPES OF CHANGES TO THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT REQUIRE WASHINGTON RATHER THAN FIELD LEVEL APPROVAL. BUREAUS HAVE VARIED SIGNIFICANTLY IN THEIR RESPONSE OVER THE PAST THREE YEARS. THIS HAS CREATED SOME CONCERN AMONG MISSION STAFF AND PARTNERS WHO SEE DIFFERENT TREATMENTS FOR APPARENTLY SIMILAR PROGRAMS. THE FOLLOWING IS INTENDED TO PROVIDE STANDARD GUIDANCE THAT SHOULD COVER MANY SITUATIONS. VARIATIONS OR AMPLIFICATIONS OF THIS GUIDANCE, IF ANY, WILL BE PROVIDED IN WRITING BY INDIVIDUAL BUREAUS WITH CLEARANCE FROM PPC. PPC WILL WORK WITH BUREAUS TO SEEK A REASONABLE DEGREE OF CONSISTENCY AND PREDICTABILITY, KEEPING IN MIND THE NEED FOR SOME OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY.

1. CHANGES AT THE SO LEVEL: PER ADS SECTION E201.5.16D.1, OPERATING UNITS RESPONSIBLE FOR EXECUTING STRATEGIC PLANS HAVE AUTHORITY TO APPROVE MINOR CHANGES OR REFINEMENTS IN AN SO SIGNIFICANT CHANGES, HOWEVER, MUST BE FORMALLY APPROVED BY THE REGIONAL AA WITH PPC, M, AND OTHER CLEARANCES. IF IN DOUBT AS TO WHETHER A CHANGE WOULD BE CONSIDERED MINOR OR SIGNIFICANT, OPERATING UNITS ARE ADVISED TO CONSULT WITH THEIR REGIONAL BUREAU OR DP OFFICE. MINOR CHANGES SHOULD BE EXPLICITLY NOTED IN THE R4 WITHOUT REQUESTING FORMAL APPROVAL. SIGNIFICANT CHANGES WOULD BE REQUESTED IN THE R4 COVER MEMO AND APPROVED BY A MANAGEMENT CONTRACT CABLE.

2. CHANGES IN INTERMEDIATE RESULTS BELOW THE SO LEVEL: OPERATING UNITS HAVE THE AUTHORITY TO APPROVE CHANGES TO A RESULTS FRAMEWORK BELOW THE SO LEVEL. THIS GENERAL AUTHORITY MAY HAVE BEEN RESTRICTED, HOWEVER, IN MANAGEMENT CONTRACTS THAT APPROVED SPECIFIC STRATEGIC PLANS. EVEN IF NOT FORMALLY RESTRICTED, IT WILL USUALLY BE PRUDENT TO CONSULT VIA EMAIL WITH YOUR BUREAU BEFORE APPROVING CHANGES TO THE RESULTS FRAMEWORK. ANY CHANGE SHOULD BE WELL DESCRIBED AND EXPLAINED IN THE R4 DOCUMENT. IF THE HOME BUREAU DEEMS IT A CHANGE IN THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT, IT WILL CONFIRM THIS BY ISSUING A MANAGEMENT CONTRACT CABLE APPROVING OR DENYING THE CHANGE. IF NO CABLE IS ISSUED, THE OPERATING UNIT MAY CONSIDER THE CHANGE TO BE WITHIN ITS AUTHORITY TO IMPLEMENT.

3. CHANGES TO PERFORMANCE INDICATORS: SOME CONFUSION HAS EXISTED REGARDING THE NEED FOR WASHINGTON APPROVAL TO CHANGES IN PERFORMANCE INDICATORS. THE ADS ANTICIPATES THAT PERFORMANCE INDICATORS WOULD BE DEVELOPED AND FINALIZED AFTER A STRATEGIC PLAN IS APPROVED AND, THEREFORE, WOULD NOT BE PART OF THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT.

ON THE OTHER HAND, SOME MISSIONS AND BUREAUS HAVE USED PERFORMANCE INDICATORS AND SPECIFIC TARGETS AS A WAY OF PROVIDING A MORE SPECIFIC DESCRIPTION OF AN SO OR INTERMEDIATE RESULT. WHEN THESE INDICATORS HAVE BEEN APPROVED TOGETHER WITH STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES IN A MANAGEMENT CONTRACT, THEY EFFECTIVELY BECOME PART OF THE CONTRACT AND BUREAUS EXPECT TO APPROVE PROPOSED CHANGES. PER SECTION II.A. ABOVE, OPERATING UNITS ARE URGED TO REVIEW INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE AND ELIMINATE THOSE THAT ARE NOT USEFUL OR COST EFFECTIVE IN RESULTS MANAGEMENT AT THE MISSION LEVEL. OPERATING UNITS SHOULD REFER TO CDIE TIPS NO. 7 ON PREPARING A PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN FOR SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDANCE. BECAUSE SOME INDICATOR CHANGES MAY BE SEEN AS MODIFYING AN EARLIER MANAGEMENT CONTRACT, UNITS SHOULD DESCRIBE THE CHANGES THEY ARE MAKING IN THE AREA OF PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENT IN THE COVER MEMO TO THE R4. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS BELOW). HOWEVER, NO FORMAL APPROVAL FOR THESE CHANGES IS NECESSARY. BUREAUS WILL ASSESS MISSION PROGRESS IN MAKING SUCH CHANGES AND ADVISE IF CONCERNS ARISE WITH RESPECT TO EXTERNAL PERFORMANCE REPORTING OR OTHER INTERNAL MANAGEMENT NEEDS. OPTIONS FOR ADDRESSING SUCH CONCERNS, INCLUDING POSSIBLE USE OF SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTING ANNEXES AS DESCRIBED IN III.G. BELOW, WILL BE REVIEWED WITH PPC.

E. WHO SHOULD SUBMIT

ALL OPERATING UNITS ARE REQUIRED TO SUBMIT COMPLETE R4S ANNUALLY UNLESS THEY DO NOT NEED PROGRAM FUNDS AND/OR OPERATING EXPENSE FUNDS AFTER THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR. IN THE LATTER CASE, ONLY THE RESULTS REVIEW PORTION OF THE R4 MUST BE SUBMITTED.

F. ELECTRONIC FORMAT AND PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES

THE FOLLOWING STANDARDIZED FORMAT INSTRUCTIONS ARE AIMED AT ALLOWING MORE RAPID AND EFFICIENT DISTRIBUTION OF R4 SECTIONS TO APPROPRIATE REVIEWERS FOR VARIOUS EXTERNAL AGENCY REPORT PREPARATION (E.G., CP, APP, APR). PLEASE SUBMIT BOTH HARD AND ELECTRONIC COPIES OF YOUR DOCUMENT. BECAUSE OF THE Y2K UPGRADE EFFORT, ALL UNITS SHOULD BE CONVERTED TO MICROSOFT OFFICE 97 FORMATS (WORD AND EXCEL) BY THE TIME OF THIS SUBMISSION. WHERE UPGRADES HAVE NOT OCCURRED, ELECTRONIC FILES WILL BE ACCEPTABLE IN (LOTUS AND WORDPERFECT). PLEASE DO NOT COMPRESS OR ZIP FILES, AND AVOID GRAPHICS. USE ONLY THE WORKSHEETS, MACROS OR FORMATS PROVIDED BY YOUR BUREAUS. PREPARE NARRATIVES USING 12-POINT TIMES NEW ROMAN TYPEFACE.

R4S SHOULD BE SUBMITTED TO TWO LOCATIONS: YOUR REGIONAL OR

CENTRAL BUREAU AND THE USAID DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE CLEARINGHOUSE USING THE FOLLOWING EMAIL ADDRESS: CDIE_DOCUMENT_SUBMISSIONS. ALL ELECTRONIC SUBMISSIONS SHOULD USE A STANDARD FILE NAMING CONVENTION. THE FILES AND THE SUGGESTED FILE NAMES ARE:

R4CNTRY - THIS FILE WILL CONTAIN THE FULL TEXT OF THE R4
----- DOCUMENT, INCLUDING PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES AND
----- SUPPLEMENTAL ANNEXES AND WILL NOT BE SHARED WITH
----- PARTNERS AND THE PUBLIC. THE BOLIVIA REPORT ----
----- FILE, FOR EXAMPLE, WOULD BE NAMED R4BOLIV.

R2CNTRY - THIS FILE WILL CONTAIN ONLY THE RESULTS REVIEW
----- NARRATIVE AND PERFORMANCE DATA TABLES; AS IT IS
----- INTENDED FOR PUBLIC ACCESS, IT MUST NOT, REPEAT,
----- NOT INCLUDE THE COVER MEMO, OR THE NARRATIVE
----- PORTION OF THE RESOURCES REQUEST. IT MUST
----- ALSO EXCLUDE ANY REFERENCES TO "PRE-DECISIONAL" -
----- BUDGET INFORMATION. THIS FILE WILL BE MADE
----- AVAILABLE ON THE EXTERNAL USAID WEB SITE.

R2CTRDAT - THIS FILE WILL CONTAIN SPREADSHEETS CONSISTING
----- OF PRE-FORMATTED BUDGET TABLES.

ANXZZZ - FOR MISSIONS SENDING "SPECIAL INFORMATION
----- ANNEXES" (SEE SECTION III.G), PLEASE SEND A
----- SEPARATE FILE FOR EACH "SPECIAL INFORMATION
----- ANNEX". WE SUGGEST USING A THREE-LETTER CODE
----- REFERENCING THE ANNEX TOPIC IN EACH FILENAME TO
----- FACILITATE IDENTIFICATION (SEE III.G). ANNEXES
----- FOR NON-PRESENCE COUNTRIES SHOULD FOLLOW THE
----- NAMING CONVENTIONS ABOVE (R4CNTRY, ETC.).

DO NOT ASSIGN AN EXTENSION TO THESE FILES, I.E.,
R2CNTRY.DOC; ALLOW THE SOFTWARE APPLICATION TO
AUTOMATICALLY ASSIGN THE EXTENSION FOR THAT SOFTWARE
APPLICATION SO USAID/W CAN IDENTIFY THE TYPE OF FILE
SUBMITTED.

POLICY NOTICE NO. 19 OF OCT 19, 1998, REVISING ADS SECTION
210.5.16E REQUIRES THE FOLLOWING WORDING ON THE COVER PAGE
OF EACH R4:

- THE ATTACHED RESULTS INFORMATION IS FROM THE FY XXXX
RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST (R4) FOR (COUNTRY OR
OPU) AND WAS ASSEMBLED AND ANALYZED BY (USAID/OPU).

- THE R4 IS A "PRE-DECISIONAL" USAID DOCUMENT AND DOES
NOT REFLECT RESULTS STEMMING FROM FORMAL USAID REVIEWS.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE ATTACHED CAN BE OBTAINED FROM (CONTACT PERSON AND OFFICE MAKING THE DISTRIBUTION).

- RELATED DOCUMENT INFORMATION CAN BE OBTAINED FROM:

USAID DEVELOPMENT EXPERIENCE CLEARINGHOUSE
1611 N. KENT ST., SUITE 200
ARLINGTON, VA. 22209-2111
TELEPHONE: 703-351-4006 EXT. 106
FAX: 703-351-4039
EMAIL: DOCORDER@DEC.CDIE.ORG
INTERNET: HTTP://WWW.DEC.ORG

G. SUBMISSION SCHEDULE AND CONTACT POINTS

UNLESS OTHERWISE ADVISED BY YOUR REGIONAL BUREAU, ALL R4S ARE TO BE SUBMITTED BETWEEN MARCH 1 AND APRIL 1, 1999. BUREAUS WILL ADVISE OPERATING UNITS REGARDING BUREAU R4 CONTACT POINTS. IN SOME CASES, YOUR BUREAU CONTACT MAY FORWARD QUESTIONS TO YOUR PPC COORDINATOR (PARRIE HENDERSON-OKEEFE: AFR AND ENI; TOM RISHOI: LAC AND G; DEBBIE PRINDLE: ANE; AND LARRY LAIRD: BHR). QUESTIONS ADDRESSED TO PPC (AND THE ANSWERS) WILL BE POSTED ON THE PPC WEB PAGE (WWW.USAID.GOV/PPC). CASES OF CONFLICTING OR UNCLEAR SUPPLEMENTARY GUIDANCE SHOULD BE REPORTED TO OLIVIER CARDUNER, PPC/PC, FOR RESOLUTION (SEE III.G. BELOW). QUESTIONS ABOUT PERFORMANCE-INFORMED BUDGETING SHOULD GO TO BUREAU BUDGET OFFICES, COPIED TO TEDDY WOOD-STERVINOU, M/B/PA, AND THOSE RELATED TO WORKFORCE PLANNING TO BUREAU AMS OFFICES, COPIED TO MARCUS RARICK, M/B/SB. QUESTIONS ABOUT THE STRATEGIC PLAN FOR INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS (SPIA), MPPS OR THE USAID STRATEGIC PLAN SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO OLIVIER CARDUNER, PPC/PC AND COPIED TO YOUR BUREAUS.

H. SUPPLEMENTAL GUIDANCE FOR R4 PREPARATION

THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION ON R4 PREPARATION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE THROUGH YOUR BUREAU CONTACT, AND THE PPC WEB PAGE AT WWW.USAID.GOV/PPC:

1. MANAGEMENT FOR RESULTS WORKING GROUP REPORT PRESENTED AT MISSION DIRECTORS CONFERENCE.
2. R4 GUIDANCE CABLE ISSUES RESOLUTION MEMO
3. CDIE TIPS NUMBER 12 - GUIDELINES FOR INDICATOR AND DATA QUALITY.
4. CDIE TIPS NUMBER 7 - PREPARING A PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN
5. CDIE TIPS NUMBER 5 - ESTABLISHING PERFORMANCE

TARGETS

6. SAMPLES/EXAMPLES OF THE REVISED SO REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REQUESTED BELOW
7. INDICATOR TABLE MACROS (PERFORMANCE DATA TABLE MACROS IN BOTH WORDPERFECT 5.2 AND MICROSOFT WORD CAN ALSO BE DOWNLOADED FROM THE PPC/CDIE WEBSITE, "CDIE ONLINE"; HTTP://CDIE.USAID.GOV)
8. BUDGET AND WORKFORCE TABLES WITH EXPLANATIONS
9. FIELD SUPPORT TABLE

III. R4 OUTLINE AND DRAFTING INSTRUCTIONS

PLEASE NOTE NEW PAGE LENGTH LIMITS FOR EACH SECTION. THE OBJECTIVE IS TO MAKE R4S MORE ACCESSIBLE TO READERS AT ALL LEVELS OF THE USAID HIERARCHY AND BEYOND; AND TO REDUCE THE TIME NEEDED TO PREPARE AND COMPLETE DOCUMENT ANALYSIS. THE REALITY IS THAT LONG DOCUMENTS TEND NOT TO BE READ AND ARE OFTEN TOO DIFFUSE IN THE MESSAGES THEY ARE TRYING TO CONVEY. YOU ARE URGED TO STAY WITHIN THE PRESCRIBED PAGE LIMITS AND MAKE SELECTIVE USE OF ANNEXES FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AS DESCRIBED IN III.G. BELOW ONLY WHEN A CLEAR NEED AND TARGET AUDIENCE EXISTS.

A. COVER MEMO: (1-2 PAGES.) USED, AT MISSION'S OPTION AND DISCRETION, TO IDENTIFY MANAGEMENT OR RESOURCE ISSUES NEEDING SPECIFIC USAID/W ACTION/RESOLUTION.

THIS MEMO WILL BE USED BY THE OPERATING UNIT TO ADDRESS CRITICAL ISSUES OR CHANGING CIRCUMSTANCES THAT MAY ALTER THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT SUCH AS SIGNIFICANT EVENTS THAT MAY AFFECT VIABILITY OF ONE OR MORE SO'S, STAFFING ADJUSTMENTS, UNUSUAL RESOURCE REQUESTS, AND RELATED WASHINGTON FOLLOW-UP ACTIONS. ALSO USE THIS SECTION PER GUIDANCE IN II.D. ABOVE TO DESCRIBE CHANGES MADE TO PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLANS CONSISTENT WITH SECTIONS II.A.1 AND II.D. ABOVE. IT REPLACES THE PREVIOUS MANAGEMENT CONTRACT SECTION OF PAST R4S. THIS SECTION OF THE R4 IS NOT INTENDED FOR USE OUTSIDE THE AGENCY.

B. R4 PART I: OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM
---- PERFORMANCE (2-3 PAGES).

REQUIREMENTS FOR THIS SECTION HAVE NOT CHANGED, BUT ARE LIMITED TO THAT NECESSARY FOR PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF SPECIFIC SO'S AND LINKAGE TO HIGHER LEVEL GOALS. THE MISSION SHOULD INCLUDE: SUMMARY PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING THE CURRENTLY APPROVED STRATEGIC PLAN; SIGNIFICANT CHANGES THAT WOULD CAUSE YOU TO CHANGE OR ELIMINATE AN OBJECTIVE OR ACCOUNT FOR POOR PERFORMANCE (CRISIS/CONFLICT, ETC.); MOST SIGNIFICANT PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS, REGARDLESS OF THE LEVEL, SO OR INTERMEDIATE

RESULTS (I.R.); COUNTRY FACTORS THAT HAVE MOST INFLUENCED PROGRESS; OVERALL PROSPECTS FOR PROGRESS THROUGH THE BUDGET REQUEST YEAR, INCLUDING MISSION ACTIONS TO OVERCOME FACTORS IMPEDING PROGRESS; PROSPECTS FOR SUCCESSFUL CLOSEOUT OR GRADUATION, PARTICULARLY FOR COUNTRY PROGRAMS THAT WILL CLOSE DURING OR IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWING THE R4 REPORTING PERIOD. MISSIONS SHOULD INCLUDE HERE DISCUSSIONS OF THE U.S. NATIONAL INTERESTS AND GOALS THAT ESTABLISHED THE CONTEXT FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE EMBASSY'S MPP AND THE LINKAGES OF MISSION SO'S TO THE MPP.

OPERATING UNITS SCHEDULED TO EXIT BY FY 2000 TO 2002 ARE REQUESTED TO PROVIDE INFORMATION ON PROGRAM CLOSEOUT OR GRADUATION. BUILDING ON APPROVED OR DRAFT CLOSEOUT PLANS, USE THE R4 TO CONVEY EXPECTED PROGRESS ACROSS THE PERIOD LEADING TO CLOSEOUT. REINFORCE YOUR DISCUSSION OF EXPECTED PROGRESS AND MANAGEMENT ACTIONS WITH THE FOLLOWING: (1) ASSESSMENT OF REALISTIC PROSPECTS FOR ACHIEVING EACH OBJECTIVE WITHIN THE REMAINING TIMEFRAME; (2) MANAGERIAL AND RESOURCE ADJUSTMENTS TO REINFORCE PROSPECTS FOR SUCCESS; (3) MECHANISMS FOR ADVANCING SUSTAINABILITY; AND (4) STATUS OF CLOSEOUT PLAN PREPARATION, APPROVAL OR IMPLEMENTATION.

C. R4 PART II: RESULTS REVIEW BY SO: (2-3 PAGES OF TEXT PLUS 3-4 DATA TABLES PER RESULTS FRAMEWORK). INFORMATION PROVIDED HERE WILL BE THE BASIS OF CP NARRATIVE.

INFORMATION IN THIS SECTION SHOULD INCLUDE:

- BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE SO: WHAT IS THE MISSION TRYING TO ACHIEVE? GENERALLY, THIS WILL CONSIST OF A CONCISE STATEMENT-OF-CHANGE PLANNED AT THE SO LEVEL, PRINCIPAL INTERMEDIATE RESULTS NECESSARY TO ACHIEVE THE SO, AND ULTIMATE CUSTOMERS.

- SUMMARY PERFORMANCE STATEMENT: CLEARLY STATE THE MISSION'S SELF-ASSESSMENT OF THE SO AS EITHER ON-TRACK, EXCEEDING EXPECTATIONS, OR NOT MEETING EXPECTATIONS (ONE OF THESE THREE MUST BE USED). ADD A BRIEF EXPLANATION OF SUMMARY RATINGS FOR MIXED-PERFORMANCE SO'S, WHERE PROGRESS ON SOME I.R.'S WAS ON-TRACK OR BETTER, AND PROGRESS ON OTHERS DID NOT MEET EXPECTATIONS.

- PERFORMANCE OVER THE PAST YEAR RELATIVE TO PLANS: SIGNIFICANT CHANGES (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) ON THREE-TO-FOUR INDICATORS SELECTED BY THE MISSION FROM THE SO'S PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN, BECAUSE THEY MOST ACCURATELY DEPICT PERFORMANCE IN THE REPORTING PERIOD, SHOULD BE DISCUSSED. THE ACHIEVEMENT OF INDICATOR TARGETS IS NOT NECESSARILY EQUIVALENT TO THE ACHIEVEMENT OF RESULTS, SO TEXT SHOULD BE CLEAR HOW

ACHIEVEMENTS IN THE SELECTED INDICATORS DEMONSTRATES THAT RESULTS ARE BEING ACHIEVED. FOCUS ON RESULTS WHERE CHANGE HAS BEEN MOST MEANINGFUL: THE SO, PRINCIPAL I.R.'S, AND/OR LOWER-LEVEL I.R.'S. YOU ARE REQUESTED TO USE SUMMARY OUTPUT DATA IF HIGHER LEVEL RESULTS DATA IS NOT AVAILABLE OR INCOMPLETE. DISCUSS LONGER-TERM SO PERFORMANCE TRENDS WHEREVER IMPORTANT TO PROVIDE PERSPECTIVE ON RECENT PROGRESS. NOTE WHEN MORE FORMAL, LARGER SCALE, EVALUATIONS CONTRIBUTED TO YOUR OVERALL ASSESSMENT.

- WHEN DISCUSSING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE, MISSIONS SHOULD PROVIDE INFORMATION (QUALITATIVE OR QUANTITATIVE) WHICH GIVES A SENSE OF USAID'S RELATIVE ROLE AND CONTRIBUTION TO OVERALL PERFORMANCE OVER THE PAST YEAR (ATTRIBUTION). IT IS IMPORTANT TO AVOID APPEARING TO CLAIM AS OUR OWN, RESULTS THAT ARE LARGELY BASED ON EFFORTS OF OTHERS. NOTE IN A SENTENCE OR TWO, THE KEY ACTIVITIES BEING FUNDED BY USAID, AND THE PRINCIPAL CONTRACTORS, GRANTEEES OR AGENCIES IMPLEMENTING THE OBJECTIVE. (NOTE: THE SPECIFICITY REQUESTED ON ACTIVITIES AND IMPLEMENTORS FACILITATES THE PREPARATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION ACTIVITY DATA SHEETS.)

- SINCE RESULTS AT THE SO LEVEL NORMALLY REFLECT THE EFFORTS OF MULTIPLE PARTNERS, INFORMATION ON INVOLVEMENT AND PROGRESS (OR LACK THEREOF) OF THE HOST COUNTRY AND OTHER DONORS IN AREAS THAT SIGNIFICANTLY AFFECTED PROGRESS TOWARD THE SO WILL PROVIDE CONTEXT TO USAID'S RELATIVE CONTRIBUTION TO CHANGE.

- REGARDING EXPECTED PERFORMANCE THROUGH THE BUDGET REQUEST YEAR, INCLUDING ANTICIPATED BENCHMARK ACHIEVEMENTS (AND/OR THE MOST IMPORTANT BREAKTHROUGH NECESSARY FOR USAID TO HAVE AN IMPACT ON THE SO) AND OUTLOOK FOR PROGRESS ON SO'S AND KEY I.R.'S THAT HAVE NOT MET EXPECTATIONS, THE MISSION SHOULD INDICATE WHAT WILL FAIL TO BE ACHIEVED SHOULD REQUESTED FUNDING NOT BE FORTHCOMING, BUT PLEASE DO SO WITHOUT REFERENCING "PRE-DECISIONAL" BUDGET LEVELS IN THE RESULTS REPORTING SECTION OF YOUR R4. CITE FACTORS SUCH AS MISSION PROGRAM ADJUSTMENTS, CHANGED POLICY ENVIRONMENT, AND RECENTLY-RESOLVED ISSUES. HERE IS WHERE A MISSION CAN INDICATE HOW IT IS MANAGING FOR RESULTS. NOTE IN A SENTENCE OR TWO, NEW KEY ACTIVITIES LIKELY TO BE FUNDED BY USAID, IF ANY.

- FOR MISSION ADJUSTMENTS TO THE SO PLAN AND RESULTS FRAMEWORK THAT DO NOT REQUIRE A STRATEGY REWRITE OR AMENDMENT, E.G., MODIFICATION OF AN I.R., PERFORMANCE INDICATOR, OR TARGET, NOTE WHICH OBJECTIVES OR I.R.'S HAVE BEEN SELECTED FOR CLOSEOUT OR TERMINATION FOR PERFORMANCE REASONS.

- DATA TABLES FOR THREE-TO-FOUR PERFORMANCE INDICATORS PER SO

RESULTS FRAMEWORK ONLY, SHOULD BE SELECTED FROM THE MISSION'S (SO TEAM'S) PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN (PMP) BECAUSE THEY MOST ACCURATELY DEPICT PERFORMANCE (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE). IF INDICATORS SELECTED FROM THE PMP ARE BEING REPORTED ON FOR THE FIRST TIME, PLEASE INDICATE WHY THEY ARE MORE USEFUL. REPORTING UNITS CONTINUE TO BE STRONGLY ENCOURAGED TO MAKE FULL USE OF THE "COMMENT" SECTION OF EACH DATA TABLE TO ELABORATE ON THE INTERPRETATION OF THE REPORTED DATA-- PARTICULARLY TO ADD QUALITATIVE INTERPRETATION TO QUANTITATIVE DATA AND QUANTITATIVE SIGNIFICANCE TO QUALITATIVE DATA--AND THE DEGREE TO WHICH ACHIEVEMENT OF A TARGET IS ATTRIBUTABLE TO USAID. THE COMMENT SECTION PROVIDES CONTEXT TO THE DATA. THE PROBABILITY OF MISUSE OR MISINTERPRETATION OF DATA RISES DRAMATICALLY WHEN THERE IS NO CONTEXT. FURTHER POSSIBLE INCLUSIONS TO THE COMMENT SECTION ARE: WHETHER AND HOW THE OPERATING UNIT ASSESSED THE RELIABILITY OF PERFORMANCE DATA PROVIDED BY OTHERS (E.G., CONTRACTORS, HOST GOV.), PLANS TO VERIFY AND VALIDATE PERFORMANCE DATA, AND SIGNIFICANT DATA LIMITATIONS AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS FOR MEASURING PERFORMANCE RESULTS AGAINST ANTICIPATED PERFORMANCE TARGETS.

SUPPLEMENTARY FORMATTING GUIDANCE:

TO FACILITATE SUBSEQUENT USE OF THIS SECTION FOR THE CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION, WE SUGGEST THAT YOU STRUCTURE THE INFORMATION FOR THIS SECTION UNDER THE FOLLOWING CP FORMAT HEADINGS: SUMMARY, KEY RESULTS, PERFORMANCE AND PROSPECTS, POSSIBLE ADJUSTMENT TO PLANS, OTHER DONOR PROGRAMS, MAJOR CONTRACTORS AND GRANTEES.

IF YOU FEEL THE NEED TO GO BEYOND THE 2-3 PAGE LIMIT FOR THIS SECTION TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON A PARTICULAR SO FOR A SPECIFIC TARGET AUDIENCE, YOU MAY APPEND TO THE R4 DOCUMENT AN INFORMATION ANNEX FOR THAT PURPOSE AS EXPLAINED IN III.G. BELOW. THE INTENDED TARGET AUDIENCE SHOULD BE NOTED AT THE TOP OF THE ANNEX TO ENSURE IT IS PROVIDED. WHILE USE OF SUCH ANNEXES IS PERMITTED, IT IS NOT ENCOURAGED. INFORMATION PROVIDED IN SUCH AN ANNEX WILL NOT BE USED BY USAID/W TO AUGMENT THE PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT OF AN SO IN THE RESULTS REVIEW PORTION OF THE R4. LENGTH SHOULD BE LIMITED.

D. R4 PART III (OLD): STATUS OF THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT

IT WAS THE INTENTION OF THE ADS THAT THIS SECTION OF THE R4 WOULD PROVIDE THE OPPORTUNITY TO UPDATE AND/OR REVALIDATE THE STATUS OF THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT BETWEEN BUREAUS AND THEIR OPERATING UNITS. AS A RESULT OF THE STREAMLINING EFFORT, CIRCUMSTANCES THAT ALTER THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT WILL NOT BE

COVERED IN THE BODY OF THE R4, BUT SHOULD INSTEAD BE DISCUSSED CANDIDLY IN THE COVER MEMO DESCRIBED ABOVE.

E. R4 PART III (NEW): RESOURCE REQUEST: (2 PAGES OF TEXT.
- RESOURCE TABLES ADDITIONAL.)

THIS SECTION IS LARGELY UNCHANGED FROM LAST YEAR. IT SHOULD CONTAIN:

- A BRIEF RATIONALE FOR PROGRAM RESOURCE LEVEL AND SO ALLOCATIONS, INCLUDING REASONS FOR SIGNIFICANT INCREASES/DECREASES IN OYB/CP LEVELS ESTABLISHED ON THE BASIS OF THE PAST YEAR'S R4.
- DISCUSS WAYS IN WHICH PERFORMANCE-INFLUENCED RESOURCE DECISIONS, ESPECIALLY FOR SO'S NOT MEETING EXPECTATIONS AND REPEAT POOR PERFORMERS;
- DISCUSS THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PROGRAM REQUEST TO OE AND STAFFING REQUIREMENTS, INCLUDING "CRITICAL" STAFFING REQUIREMENTS AND JUSTIFICATION FOR RESOURCE REQUESTS (PROGRAM FUNDS, WORKFORCE, OR OE) THAT EXCEED BUREAU-ASSIGNED CONTROL LEVELS.
- FOR EACH SO, EXPLAIN ANY INCONSISTENCIES BETWEEN PIPELINE LEVELS AS OF SEPTEMBER 30, 1998, AND AGENCY FORWARD FUNDING GUIDELINES PIPELINES SHOULD COVER 12-TO-24 MONTHS OF PLANNED EXPENDITURES, I.E., OBLIGATIONS GENERALLY SHOULD FUND PROJECTED EXPENDITURES THROUGH THE END OF THE FISCAL YEAR FOLLOWING THE YEAR IN WHICH FUNDS ARE OBLIGATED. DESCRIBE ANY CORRECTIVE ACTION BEING TAKEN, AND PROVIDE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF HOW PIPELINE LEVELS PROJECTED THROUGH THE PLANNING PERIOD WILL BE CONSISTENT WITH THE FORWARD FUNDING GUIDELINES.
- INCLUSION OF G FIELD SUPPORT TABLE. WITH MINOR MODIFICATIONS TO FOCUS ON THE OUTYEARS AS OPPOSED TO THE OYB, THE FIELD SUPPORT TABLE WILL BE THE SAME AS LAST YEAR'S. THIS TABLE ESTIMATES THE VOLUME AND TYPE OF SERVICES--FIELD SUPPORT AND BUY-INS--THAT WILL NEED TO BE PROVIDED BY THE G BUREAU. IT NEEDS TO LIST SERVICES TO BE PROVIDED THROUGH G-MANAGED CONTRACTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AND GRANTS, WITH A HIGH-SIDE ESTIMATE OF THE LEVEL OF RESOURCES NEEDED TO FULLY FUND THESE SERVICES. THE TABLE PROVIDES A DISTINCTION FOR: (A) FUNDS THAT ARE PART OF THE UNIT'S PLANNING LEVEL, BUT DESIGNATED FOR OBLIGATION AND MANAGEMENT BY THE G BUREAU; AND (B) FUNDS THAT ARE PART OF THE UNIT'S PLANNING LEVEL AND OYB AND OBLIGATED OR SUBOBLIGATED BY THE UNIT THROUGH G BUREAU MECHANISMS (UNIT OBLIGATION, GENERALLY REFERRED TO AS BUY-IN). IN ADDITION,

PLEASE SPECIFY THE FOLLOWING IN THE FIELD SUPPORT TABLE: (1) THE SO FOR WHICH THESE SERVICES ARE NEEDED, (2) THE NAME AND NUMBER OF THE G BUREAU ACTIVITY TO BE USED, (3) THE LEVEL OF PRIORITY THE UNIT PLACES ON THE FIELD SUPPORT AND BUY-IN SERVICES, (4) THE DURATION OF THE FIELD SUPPORT AND BUY-IN SERVICES; AND (5) THE NAME OF THE ENTITY OBLIGATING THE FUNDS--G OR OPERATING UNIT. FOR FY 2000 AND FY 2001, MISSIONS SHOULD THINK CREATIVELY ABOUT WHAT TYPES OF SERVICES ARE NEEDED, EVEN IF THE G BUREAU DOES NOT APPEAR TO HAVE AN EXISTING MECHANISM AT THE PRESENT TIME. OPERATING UNITS SHOULD DESCRIBE IN A FOOTNOTE SERVICE REQUESTS THAT GO BEYOND EXISTING G BUREAU MECHANISMS.

F. WORKFORCE AND OE

THERE ARE FOUR BASIC DATA SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR WORKFORCE AND OPERATING EXPENSES:

1) WORKFORCE (TABLE WF-XXXXX.WK4 USED BY EACH OPERATING UNIT IN WASHINGTON AND OVERSEAS), SHOWING THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE VARIOUS TYPES OF WORKFORCE (END OF YEAR ON-BOARD LEVELS) BY SO/SPO AND BY MANAGEMENT CATEGORIES. TOTALS MUST BE IN WHOLE NUMBERS;

2) OPERATING EXPENSES (TABLE OE-XXXXX.WK4 USED BY OVERSEAS OPERATING UNITS AND TABLE--USED BY WASHINGTON OPERATING UNITS), SHOWING THE PROPOSED USE OF OE AND TRUST FUND RESOURCES BY RESOURCE CATEGORY FOR THE FY 99 ESTIMATE, FY 2000 AND FY 2001 TARGET AND REQUEST LEVELS. FOR OVERSEAS OE TABLES, IDENTIFY THE U.S. DOLLARS USED FOR LOCAL CURRENCY PURCHASES AND THE EXCHANGE RATE USED IN COMPUTATIONS.

3) TRUST FUND AND FSN VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PAYMENT/WITHDRAWAL INFORMATION (TABLE TF-FSN.WK4 USED ONLY BY OVERSEAS OPERATING UNITS) SHOWING A) AVAILABILITY OF LOCAL CURRENCY TRUST FUNDS AND B) DEPOSITS TO AND WITHDRAWALS FROM THE FSN VOLUNTARY SEPARATION ACCOUNT. PLEASE NOTE THAT IF AN OVERSEAS UNIT SHOWS OBLIGATIONS UNDER OBJECT CLASS 12.1 ON THE OE TABLE FOR FSN VOLUNTARY SEPARATION (FSN DIRECT HIRE OR FSN PSC), THEN THE FSN VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PORTION OF THIS TABLE MUST BE SUBMITTED. THE OE TOTALS ON THIS TABLE MUST MATCH THE TOTAL FSN VOLUNTARY SEPARATION AMOUNTS ROE FSN DIRECT-HIRE AND FSN PSCS ON THE OE TABLE. ALSO, EXCHANGE RATES USED IN COMPUTING THE DOLLAR EQUIVALENT OF LOCAL CURRENCY TRUST FUNDS MUST BE PROVIDED--THIS INFORMATION IS REQUIRED TO BE INCLUDED IN THE AGENCY'S CONGRESSIONAL PRESENTATION.

4) CONTROLLER OPERATIONS (TABLE CO-XXXXX.WK4). THIS IS IN THE SAME FORMAT AS THE OVERSEAS OE TABLE, BUT IS TO REFLECT

ONLY THOSE COSTS ASSOCIATED WITH THE OFFICE OF THE CONTROLLER AT OVERSEAS MISSIONS.

WITH THE EXCEPTION OF SOME REFORMATTING OF THE WORKFORCE TABLE, ALL TABLES ARE THE SAME AS LAST YEAR. SEPARATE SPECIAL SCHEDULES WILL BE PROVIDED TO M, G, GC, AND LPA FOR THEIR "ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSE COST CENTER" BUDGET ACCOUNTS.

M/B WILL ISSUE FY 1999 OE AND U.S. DIRECT-HIRE WORKFORCE LEVELS TO BUREAUS (INCLUDING LEVELS AVAILABLE FOR OVERSEAS MISSIONS), FY 2000 TARGETS, AND FY 2001 TARGETS AT A LATER DATE.

IN ADDITION TO THE TABULAR INFORMATION, EACH OPERATING UNIT MUST PROVIDE NARRATIVE EXPLAINING THE IMPACT OF FY 2000 AND FY 2001 TARGETS ON THEIR OPERATIONS. THE OE AND WORKFORCE TABLES ALSO PROVIDE UNITS WITH THE ABILITY TO REQUEST LEVELS DIFFERENT FROM THE FY 2000 AND FY 2001 TARGET LEVELS (REQUEST LEVELS). IF A UNIT SUBMITS A REQUEST LEVEL IN ADDITION TO THE TARGET LEVEL FOR FY 2000 AND/OR FY 2001, THE NARRATIVE MUST THOROUGHLY JUSTIFY THE NEED FOR THE REQUEST LEVEL AND IDENTIFY THE SPECIFIC ACTIONS (WHETHER PROGRAM OR OE RELATED) WHICH WOULD BE TAKEN IF THE UNIT WERE TO BE HELD TO THE TARGET LEVEL.

G. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION ANNEXES

AS NOTED AT THE END OF SECTION III.C. ABOVE, MISSIONS THAT DESIRE TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL INFORMATION TO SPECIFIC TARGET AUDIENCES ON PROGRAM RELATED MATTERS MAY, OF THEIR OWN ACCORD, USE AN ANNEX FOR THIS PURPOSE.

BUREAU MAY REQUEST ADDITIONAL REPORTING FOR PURPOSES OTHER THAN ASSESSING COUNTRY SO PERFORMANCE (SUCH AS REGIONAL TREND ANALYSIS, REPORTING ON MULTI-COUNTRY INITIATIVES, AND SPECIAL EXTERNAL REPORTING NEEDS THAT MAY VARY YEAR-TO-YEAR). THIS REPORTING WILL BE PROVIDED THROUGH SUPPLEMENTAL ANNEXES SO AS TO FOCUS THE MAIN R4 TEXT ON PERFORMANCE VIS-A-VIS AGREED UPON STRATEGY OBJECTIVES. A FOLLOW-UP CABLE IS PLANNED FOR JANUARY WHICH WILL INCLUDE ALL REQUESTS FOR SUPPLEMENTARY REPORTING FROM WASHINGTON FOR THIS R4 CYCLE. PPC AND THE INTER-BUREAU R4 WORKING GROUP WILL STRIVE TO KEEP THESE REQUIREMENTS CLEAR, LIMITED AND VOLUNTARY. OPERATING UNITS SHOULD ADVISE PPC/PC IF THEY RECEIVE REQUESTS FOR R4 REPORTING WHICH DOES NOT APPEAR TO HAVE BEEN SPECIFICALLY APPROVED BY PPC. REQUESTS WILL CLEARLY IDENTIFY THE UNIT MAKING THE REQUEST, THE USE TO WHICH INFORMATION WILL BE PUT AND SPECIFIC QUESTIONS WHICH UNITS WOULD BE ASKED TO ADDRESS. UNLESS SPECIFICALLY STATED OTHERWISE, THIS ADDITIONAL REPORTING WILL BE CONSIDERED VOLUNTARY.

THE ONLY MANDATORY ANNEXES IDENTIFIED AT THIS POINT INCLUDE THE TITLE II SUPPLEMENTARY PERFORMANCE DATA REQUIRED BY BHR FOR STAND-ALONE NON-EMERGENCY TITLE II PROGRAMS, AND THE NON-PRESENCE REPORTING ANNEXES. ONLY SOME MISSIONS ARE AFFECTED BY THESE REQUIREMENTS. SEE SECTION IV.B AND D BELOW FOR DETAILS.

IV. SPECIAL REPORTING SITUATIONS

A. G BUREAU FIELD SUPPORT

THE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT OF GLOBAL BUREAU FIELD SUPPORT (SERVICES AND COMMODITIES REQUESTED AND FUNDED BY OPERATING UNITS) WILL BE CAPTURED AND REPORTED IN MISSION STRATEGIC OBJECTIVES.

B. BHR PROGRAMMED RESOURCES

BHR IS SEEKING WAYS TO SIMPLIFY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR PL-480 PROGRAMS TO PARALLEL CHANGES TAKING PLACE WITH DOLLAR-FUNDED PROGRAMS. ON NOVEMBER 30, 1998 GUIDANCE WAS ISSUED TO COOPERATING SPONSORS (CS) AND MISSIONS ON RESULTS REPORTING FOR TITLE II PROGRAMS. THIS GUIDANCE REQUESTED THAT CS RESULTS REPORTS BE MADE AVAILABLE TO MISSIONS BY JANUARY 30TH (AND TO BHR/FFP BY MARCH 1ST) SO AS TO SERVE AS INPUT IN PREPARATION OF THE R4S AS NEEDED. TO HELP MEET CONGRESSIONAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR TITLE II AND TITLE III RESOURCES, THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN R4 DOCUMENTS:

1. INTEGRATED PROGRAMS: IN CASES WHERE TITLE II/III AND DOLLAR-FUNDED ACTIVITIES ARE INTEGRATED TO SUPPORT ONE OR MORE STRATEGIC OR SPECIAL OBJECTIVES, THE SO PERFORMANCE NARRATIVE MUST INCLUDE A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE CONTRIBUTION AND EFFECTIVENESS OF PL-480 RESOURCES TO ENHANCED FOOD SECURITY IN THE COUNTRY USING APPROPRIATE QUANTIFIABLE INDICATOR DATA FROM THE PERFORMANCE MONITORING PLAN. BHR/FFP HAS AN ILLUSTRATIVE LIST OF INDICATORS FOR THIS PURPOSE AND CAN ADVISE, IF NECESSARY, ON WHICH ONE OF YOUR EXISTING INDICATORS WOULD WORK BEST.

THE SO PERFORMANCE NARRATIVE CONTAINED IN THE R4 WILL FORM THE BASIS OF THE AGENCY'S PERFORMANCE ASSESSMENT FOR INTEGRATED PROGRAMS. BHR REVIEW OF PREVIOUSLY APPROVED ACTIVITY (PAA) SUBMISSIONS WILL CONTINUE.

COOPERATING SPONSORS AND MISSION SO TEAMS ARE EXPECTED TO WORK TOGETHER IN REVIEWING THE UTILITY AND COST/BENEFIT OF PERFORMANCE INDICATORS FOR THE ENTIRE SO INCLUDING INDICATORS

USED BY TITLE II SPONSORS AS SPECIFIED IN PRIOR AGREEMENTS. AGREEMENT ON ELIMINATION OF CS INDICATORS WILL BE CONFIRMED THROUGH PAA REVIEWS WITH MISSION INPUTS, THROUGH OTHER CONSULTATIONS WITH MISSIONS AND BHR/FFP, AND IF NECESSARY, THROUGH GRANT OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AMENDMENTS.

2. STAND-ALONE PROGRAMS: WHEN NON-EMERGENCY TITLE II AND TITLE III RESOURCES DO NOT CONTRIBUTE DIRECTLY TO A STRATEGIC OR SPECIAL OBJECTIVE, MISSIONS ARE ASKED TO INCLUDE A SPECIAL INFORMATION ANNEX TO THE R4 PER SECTION III.G. ABOVE WHICH ADDRESSES IN 1-2 PAGES THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION: (1) THE CONTRIBUTION OF THESE RESOURCES TO FOOD SECURITY IN THE COUNTRY; AND (2) THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE PROGRAMS SUPPORTED WITH THESE RESOURCES IN ACHIEVING RESULTS AGREED UPON IN THE RELEVANT DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITY PROPOSAL (DAP). THE CS REPORTS ON TITLE II ACTIVITIES SHOULD BE REFERENCES IN THE ANNEX PROVIDED DIRECTLY TO BHR/FFP IN ADDITION TO THE MISSIONS. BHR/FFP WILL USE THIS INFORMATION, ALONG WITH PAA SUBMISSIONS, TO MAKE FOOD RESOURCE ALLOCATION DECISIONS. CS ARE ENCOURAGED TO FOLLOW THE GUIDANCE IN SECTION II.A.1. OF THIS CABLE RELATED TO ELIMINATING PERFORMANCE MEASURES THAT ARE NOT USEFUL FOR USAID/CS MANAGEMENT PURPOSES AND/OR WHICH ARE NOT COST EFFECTIVE TO COLLECT. AGREEMENT ON ELIMINATION OF CS INDICATORS WILL BE CONFIRMED THROUGH PAA REVIEWS WITH MISSION INPUTS, THROUGH OTHER CONSULTATIONS WITH MISSIONS AND BHR/FFP, AND IF NECESSARY, THROUGH GRANT OR COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS AMENDMENTS.

3. OTHER PROGRAMS: BHR WILL REPORT ON TITLE II EMERGENCY, DISASTER AND TRANSITION ASSISTANCE (IDA) RESULTS AND RESOURCE NEEDS, AND MAY CONTACT RELEVANT OPERATING UNITS FOR ASSISTANCE IN DOING SO. BHR WILL ALSO REPORT ON PVC GRANTS TO STRENGTHEN THE CAPACITY OF USAID'S PVO AND CDO PARTNERS AS WELL AS ASHA GRANTS.

C. CLOSEOUT AND GRADUATION

IN KEEPING WITH APPROVED CLOSEOUT PLANS, IF NOT PREVIOUSLY REPORTED OR IF THERE ARE CHANGES IN WHAT WAS PREVIOUSLY REPORTED, PLEASE REPORT THE FOLLOWING IN A SPECIAL INFORMATION ANNEX PER SECTION III.G. ABOVE: (1) BRIEF SCHEDULE FOR TERMINATION OF PRINCIPAL ACTIVITIES; AND (2) RECOMMENDATIONS TO CONTINUE SELECTED ACTIVITIES AFTER CLOSEOUT WITH RELATED RATIONALE AND PLAN (ON AN EXCEPTION BASIS).

D. NON-PRESENCE COUNTRIES (NPC)

THE NUMBER OF USAID-FUNDED ACTIVITIES IN NON-PRESENCE COUNTRIES IS CREATING INCREASED MANAGEMENT VULNERABILITY AND

DEMANDS FOR MORE COUNTRY LEVEL R4-LIKE REPORTING (THREE ENI NPC PROGRAMS ALREADY HAVE FULL R4'S PREPARED EVERY YEAR). WE ARE SEEKING TO ENSURE THAT EVERY NPC PROGRAM WITH DEFINED COUNTRY-LEVEL STRATEGIC OR SPECIAL OBJECTIVES IS SUBJECT TO R4 REPORTING. AT THE REGIONAL BUREAUS' DISCRETION, THIS REPORTING MAY CONSIST OF A FULL R4 OR AN ABBREVIATED R4-LIKE DOCUMENT AS OUTLINED BELOW.

USAID REGIONAL OFFICES AND BILATERAL MISSIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN ASSIGNED SPECIFIC OVERSIGHT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR NPC PROGRAMS WITH COUNTRY-LEVEL OBJECTIVES NON-PRESENCE COUNTRIES BY THEIR REGIONAL BUREAUS, ARE REQUESTED TO PREPARE EITHER A FULL OR ABBREVIATED (CONSULT WITH YOUR BUREAU TO DETERMINE WHICH) R4 SUBMISSION FOR EACH NON-PRESENCE COUNTRY. IN THE CASE OF ABBREVIATED R4 REPORTS, THESE MAY BE INCLUDED AS AN ANNEX TO THE OPERATING UNITS' OWN R4 DOCUMENT (ONE ANNEX PER NPC). MISSIONS WITH BILATERAL OR TWINNING RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TITLE II PROGRAMS ARE ALSO REQUESTED TO SUBMIT A SUPPLEMENTAL ANNEX AS DISCUSSED IN SECTION IV.B.2. ABOVE (STAND-ALONE PROGRAMS). MISSIONS WHO ARE UNABLE TO COMPLY WITH THIS NEW REQUEST SHOULD CONSULT WITH THEIR REGIONAL BUREAU FOR ASSISTANCE. REGIONAL BUREAU WILL MAKE A FINAL DETERMINATION REGARDING WHICH NPC COUNTRIES WILL BE COVERED BY R4 REPORTS THIS YEAR BY ABBREVIATED R4-LIKE SUMMARIES. DUE TO THEIR LINKAGES WITH REGIONAL STATE BUREAUS AND THE MPP PROCESS, USAID REGIONAL BUREAUS WILL LIKELY BECOME ULTIMATELY RESPONSIBLE FOR NPC REPORTING. THEY SHOULD, THEREFORE, CONSIDER POSSIBLE FUTURE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS WHEN APPROVING NPC ACTIVITIES IN THEIR REGION.

THE FOLLOWING ITEMS SHOULD BE COVERED IN 2-4 PAGES FOR THE ABBREVIATED R4-LIKE NPC ANNEXES:

- A PROGRAM OVERVIEW, OUTLINING THE OBJECTIVES BEING PURSUED (WHEN THESE EXIST) AND/OR ACTIVITIES BEING IMPLEMENTED.
- AN INDICATION OF THE LINKAGES BETWEEN USAID-FUNDED INTERVENTIONS AND THE MPP GOALS FOR THAT COUNTRY. THIS IS AS CRITICAL FOR NPCs AS FOR PRESENCE COUNTRIES.
- A DISCUSSION OF SIGNIFICANT PROGRAM ACHIEVEMENTS AND HOW THESE ARE CONTRIBUTING TO MPP GOALS.
- RELATED DATA TABLES FOR INDICATORS AND RESOURCE REQUESTS.

V. CHANGES IN WASHINGTON REVIEW OF R4S

THE FOLLOWING PROVIDES SUMMARY INFORMATION TO MISSIONS ON CHANGES TO THE R4 REVIEW PROCESSES IN WASHINGTON. THIS IS NOT A COMPREHENSIVE LIST, BUT IS INTENDED TO PROVIDE A BETTER UNDERSTANDING OF THE CHANGED CONTEXT IN WHICH R4'S WILL BE

REVIEWED.

THIS YEAR, THERE WILL BE NO NUMERICAL SCORE CALCULATED BY WASHINGTON REVIEWERS FOR EACH OBJECTIVE. INSTEAD, READERS WILL NOTE THE MISSION'S SELF-ASSESSMENT AND ONLY REQUEST FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONS IF THERE ARE SIGNIFICANT REASONS TO DOUBT THE OVERALL SELF-ASSESSMENT. THIS SHOULD SIGNIFICANTLY REDUCE THE NEED FOR DETAILED BACK AND FORTH DISCUSSIONS ON INDICATORS AND INDICATOR METHODOLOGY. THE OVERALL MISSION SUMMARY ASSESSMENT (MET, EXCEEDED OR FELL SHORT) WILL CONSTITUTE THE PERFORMANCE SUMMARY FOR THAT SO. QUESTIONING OF ASSESSMENTS WILL OCCUR ONLY IF THEY APPEAR TO LACK CANDOR AND BE WELL OUT OF ALIGNMENT WITH USAID/W EXPECTATION, WHICH IS TYPICALLY BASED ON A GENERAL KNOWLEDGE FROM TDYS, EVALUATIONS, AND REPORTS FROM OTHER SOURCES.

THE THREE NON-PERFORMANCE FACTORS THAT INFORM THE BUDGET PROCESS--NEED, COUNTRY COMMITMENT, AND FOREIGN POLICY--WILL CONTINUE TO INFORM BUDGET ALLOCATION DECISIONS, BUT NO ATTEMPT WILL BE MADE TO CONVERT THESE INTO NUMERICAL SCORES. PPC AND THE REGIONAL BUREAUS WILL PROVIDE INFORMATION ON NON-PERFORMANCE FACTORS. A SUMMARY TABLE WILL BE PREPARED BY EACH BUREAU SHOWING FOR EACH SO THE FINAL PERFORMANCE SUMMARY AND THE THREE NON-PERFORMANCE CATEGORIZATIONS. NO EFFORT WILL BE MADE TO CREATE A COMPOSITE SUMMARY SCORE INCORPORATING ALL FACTORS. THE SUMMARY TABLE WILL BE USED BY BUREAUS AS A STARTING POINT FOR RESOURCE ALLOCATION DECISIONS.

THE PRESUMPTION FOR BUDGET ALLOCATION PURPOSES IS THAT ALL APPROVED OBJECTIVES ARE IMPORTANT TO THE AGENCY AND SHOULD RECEIVE THE RESOURCES NEEDED TO SUSTAIN PROGRESS. IN THE SHORT-TERM (ONE-TO-TWO YEARS), DIFFICULTIES IN ACHIEVING EXPECTED PROGRESS ON A PARTICULAR SO SHOULD RESULT IN INCREASED MANAGEMENT ATTENTION AT BOTH MISSION AND WASHINGTON LEVELS. IF, AFTER REASONABLE EFFORTS, PROGRESS IS NOT IMPROVED, THEN IT FOLLOWS THAT THE BUDGET PLANNED FOR THAT SO MAY BE REDUCED, TEMPORARILY SUSPENDED, OR EVEN REALLOCATED COMPLETELY AND THE SO TERMINATED OR SIGNIFICANTLY REDESIGNED. SUCH DECISIONS WILL BE ARRIVED AT COLLABORATIVELY BY MISSION AND WASHINGTON MANAGEMENT.

OBJECTIVES WHOSE PERFORMANCE SIGNIFICANTLY EXCEEDS EXPECTATIONS WILL LIKELY RECEIVE SPECIAL ATTENTION IN AGENCY ANNUAL PERFORMANCE REPORTS (APR). HIGH PERFORMANCE WILL NOT NECESSARILY JUSTIFY A CLAIM FOR ADDITIONAL RESOURCES BEYOND THAT NEEDED TO ACHIEVE AGREED UPON RESULTS.

THOSE MISSIONS SELECTED BY THEIR BUREAUS FOR A FULL PROGRAM WEEK (ROUGHLY ONE-THIRD OF COUNTRY PROGRAMS) CAN EXPECT A FULL

AND DETAILED REVIEW OF THEIR PROGRAM. THOSE NOT SUBJECT TO A PROGRAM WEEK REVIEW SHOULD, NEVERTHELESS, BE MINDFUL OF THE NEED TO MAINTAIN ADEQUATE INFORMATION FLOW WITH WASHINGTON.

MISSIONS SHOULD NO LONGER EXPECT REGULAR ANNUAL MANAGEMENT CONTRACT CABLES. RATHER, THESE WILL BE PREPARED ONLY WHEN THERE ARE SPECIFIC CHANGES TO THE MANAGEMENT CONTRACT INITIATED WITH APPROVAL OF THE COUNTRY (OR UNIT) STRATEGIC PLAN.

THE ADS WILL BE REVISED WHERE NECESSARY (E.G., 203.3.5.F, AND 201.5.12.C, AMONG OTHERS) TO REFLECT CHANGES IN THE R4 DOCUMENTATION AND REVIEW PROCESS.

VI. MINIMIZE CONSIDERED FOR ASMARA, DAR ES SALAAM, NAIROBI, KINSHASA, AND TIRANA. YY

AID/GC:STISA(DRAFT)
S/RPP:TGREENTREE(DRAFT)
AID/ES:RCONROY Y

NAIROBI PRIORITY
KINSHASA PRIORITY
RIGA PRIORITY
TIRANA PRIORITY Y