



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

MICROENTERPRISE RESULTS REPORTING

FINAL REPORT:

SEPTEMBER 2010 – MAY 2013

MAY 2013

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by DAI.

MICROENTERPRISE RESULTS REPORTING

FINAL REPORT:
SEPTEMBER 2010 – MAY 2013

Program Title:	Microenterprise Results Reporting
Sponsoring USAID Office:	USAID/E3
Contract Number:	Contract EEM-I-00- 07-0009-00; Task Order AID-OOA-TO-10-00050
Contractor:	DAI/Nathan Group (DNG), implemented by DAI
Subcontractor:	QED Group, LLC
Date of Publication:	May 2013
Author:	Alexis Nguyen

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

CONTENTS

LIST OF ACRONYMS	1
INTRODUCTION	2
Project Management	2
OVERVIEW OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS.....	4
Task A – Tracking of Estimated and Actual Obligations.....	4
Task B – Microfinance, Enterprise Development and Enabling Environment Institution Tracking	6
Task C – USAID Microenterprise Results Reporting Publications.....	7
Task D – Microenterprise Results Reporting Website.....	13
LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS	15
Task A – Tracking of Estimated and Actual Obligations.....	15
Task B – Microfinance, Enterprise Development and Enabling Environment Institution Tracking	16
Task C – USAID Microenterprise Results Reporting Publications.....	19
Task D – Microenterprise Results Reporting Website.....	20
ANNEX A – MRAA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS	23
ANNEX B – USAID MISSIONS AND OFFICES SURVEYED (FY 2010, FY 2011 AND FY 2012).....	25

LIST OF ACRONYMS

CO	Contracting Officer
COR	Contracting Officer's Representative
MRR	Microenterprise Results Reporting
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
DNG	DAI/Nathan Group - Joint Venture
GBTI II	Global Business, Trade and Investment II
PAT	Poverty Assessment Tool
PPI	Progress out of Poverty Index
DCA	Development Credit Authority
MPEP	Office of Microenterprise & Private Enterprise Promotion
E3	Bureau for Economic Growth, Education & Environment
PAICO	Policy Analysis, Implementation and Communications (PAICO) Program
LPA	Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs

INTRODUCTION

This report summarizes activities and accomplishments achieved under the Microenterprise Results Reporting (MRR) project from Sept 27, 2010 - May 26, 2013. During this time, MRR was contracted to the DAI/Nathan Group joint venture (DNG) through Task Order number AID-OOA-TO-10-00050 under the Global Business, Trade and Investment II (GBTI II) IQC, (EEM-I-00-07-0009-00). DAI was lead contractor on MRR during this time, working closely with QED Group, LLC, under subcontract to DAI.

Per the Microenterprise Results and Accountability Act (MRAA) of 2004 (Public Law 108-484), USAID must report to Congress on twelve specific reporting requirements each year (summarized in **Annex A - MRAA Reporting Requirements**). Through the MRR system and project, USAID collects and analyzes funding data on its global investments and impact in microenterprise development, and is able to respond to Congress's requirements in this regard. MRR has been managed by various implementing partners over time, most recently by DAI, working in close partnership with QED Group, LLC (who managed MRR directly from 2006 – 2010).

The MRR project has four main tasks: a) Tracking of Estimated and Actual Obligations; b) Microfinance, Enterprise Development and Enabling Environment Institution Tracking; c) USAID Microenterprise Results Reporting; d) Microenterprise Results Reporting Website. This report summarizes activities and accomplishments across these four tasks, over the life of the current project, and in the area of project management.

PROJECT MANAGEMENT

Contract and budget

The following table summarizes contract and budget information for the project, including three contract modifications received over the life of the project.

TABLE 1: HISTORY OF TASK ORDER CONTRACT AND MODIFICATIONS

Contract #/Modification #	Date	Modification	Period of Performance	Total Obligation	Total Ceiling
Contract EEM-I-00-07-0009-00; Task Order AID-OOA-TO-10-00050	September 27, 2010	N/A	September 27, 2010 – May 26, 2013	\$500,000	\$1,787,067.79

1	September 29, 2011	Incremental funding	Unchanged	\$1,000,000	Unchanged
2	May 29, 2012	Incremental funding and key personnel change (replacing Ruth Speyer with Parvati Patil)	Unchanged	\$1,500,000	Unchanged
3	March 1, 2013	Budget realignment and ceiling reduction (per reduced Scope of Work with decreased MRR reporting universe from all of USAID to sample of 36 Missions)	Unchanged	Unchanged	\$1,500,000

Deliverables

DAI has completed all of the project deliverables in a timely manner, per the table below:

TABLE 2: PROJECT DELIVERABLES

MRR project deliverables		Date submitted
1.	operations manual detailing the process for data collection, validation, analysis, and report writing within two months after award. The operations manual shall be updated annually;	11/19/2010; 1/18/2012; 10/17/2012
2.	annual work plan within two months after award outlining major MRR activities and milestones. The work plan shall be updated at least annually or more frequently if needed;	11/19/2010; 10/14/2011; 11/05/2012
3.	annually updated database and annotated tables on USAID funding of microenterprise development and support institutions for microfinance and business services;	06/30/2011; 06/30/2012; 05/24/2013

4.	updated list of all institutions receiving USAID assistance for microenterprise development within six months after award;	03/31/2011; 06/30/2012; 05/24/2013
5.	annually updated historical series on USAID microenterprise funding;	06/30/2011; 06/30/2012; 05/24/2013
6.	annual report on the Agency's microenterprise activity, the contents of which will vary by year but generally will include: a narrative description of the USAID supported microenterprise activities, key results achieved by the Agency, a summary of the MRR data, and statistical annexes on key aspects of the programs	06/30/2011; 06/30/2012; 05/24/2013
7.	updated MRR web site easily accessible on both the intranet and internet within six months after award;	03/31/2011; 06/30/2012; 05/24/2013
8.	ten to twenty data reports/analyses per year for posting on any USAID website, as directed by the COTR; and	Quarterly, all prepared and submitted on schedule, detailed below under Task C
9.	quarterly reports highlighting the major achievements and challenges from the reporting period.	Quarterly, all submitted on schedule

OVERVIEW OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND ACHIEVEMENTS

TASK A – TRACKING OF ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

Task A – the tracking of estimated and actual obligations – which the MRR team refers to as “Mission level data collection” – is the first phase of MRR’s annual data collection cycle. This phase of MRR’s annual Fiscal Year data collection is to track USAID obligations by reaching out to USAID Missions and Offices who may have obligated funding towards microenterprise programming during a given fiscal year.

The table below summaries Mission-level reporting for each of the three fiscal years covered by the current MRR project (FY 2010, FY 2011 and FY 2012). While MRR surveyed 92 USAID Missions and Offices for the FY 2010 and FY 2011 reporting years, USAID reduced the MRR reporting universe for FY 2012 to a select sample of 36 Missions (which was ultimately 37 Missions, including both Sudan and South Sudan). **Annex B - USAID Missions and Offices Surveyed (FY 2010, FY 2011**

and FY 2012) presents all of the Missions and USAID Offices surveyed in FY 2010, FY 2011, and FY 2012. As stated above, USAID reduced the budget ceiling in the final year of the project, by reducing the Scope of Work (SOW) to include a smaller reporting universe of a select sample Missions/Offices for FY 2012.

TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF MISSION LEVEL DATA COLLECTION (FY2010 - FY 2012)

Fiscal Year	Number of Missions Surveyed	Number of Missions Reporting Funding to MRR	Amount of Funding Reported to MRR
FY 2010	92	69 (including 5 Missions that only reported on pending funds)	\$262 million (including \$25 million in pending funds)
FY 2011	92	54 (including 4 Missions that only reported on pending funds)	\$286 million (not including \$52 million in reported pending funds)
FY 2012	37 (including Sudan and South Sudan as separate Missions)	31 (including 2 Missions that only reported on pending funds)	\$223 million (not including \$51 million in reported pending funds)

In FY 2010, MRR captured \$262 million in reported funds (which included \$25 million in pending agreements). Historically, MRR has always included pending funds in its reporting to Congress, as these funds are budgeted and committed for microenterprise programming, (even if not yet obligated).

For FY 2011, MRR captured \$286 million in partner-obligated funds for active projects, and an additional \$53 million in pending funds. MRR did not include pending funds in the FY 2011 MRR Annual Report to Congress, as USAID had effectively “reached the earmark” of \$265 million with the obligated funds reported for that year. The team attributes the FY 2011 increase in reported funds to improved outreach and increased reporting on non-traditional microenterprise programming (namely food security).

For FY 2012, MRR captured \$223 million in partner-obligated funds for active projects, and an additional \$51 million in pending funds. MRR will not include pending funds in the FY 2012 MRR Annual Report to Congress, in order to be consistent with the approach taken the previous year.

The table below summarizes levels of reported funding against the congressionally mandated “earmark” for microenterprise funding from FY 2001 – FY 2012. In FY 2010, USAID/MRR fell short of the earmark by \$3 million, while in FY 2011, USAID/MRR surpassed the earmark by \$21 million. In FY 2012, USAID/MRR fell short of the earmark by \$42 million; however, in FY2012, only 36 USAID Missions were selected for MRR reporting, where USAID’s goal was to be able to report to Congress on roughly 80-90% of funding by reporting on a sample of Missions (as described above). The reported \$223 million is 84% of the congressional earmark of \$265 million, and 78% percent of reported FY 2011 funds, so USAID/MRR achieved the expected outcome for FY 2012 Mission level reporting.

TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF MRR REPORTED FUNDING (FY2001 - FY 2012)

Fiscal Year	2001	2002	2003	2004	*2005	*2006	*2007	2008	2009	2010	*2011	2012
Congressional Earmark (in millions)	\$155	\$155	\$175	\$200	\$200	\$200	N/A	\$245	\$245	\$265	\$265	\$265
MRR Reported Funds (in millions)	\$154	\$188	\$179	\$197	\$211	\$216	\$193	\$259	\$260	\$262	\$286	\$223

**There was not a Congressional earmark for microenterprise in FY 2007. In 2005 and 2006, there was a \$200,000,000 directive in the joint conference report, but not within the Congressional appropriations legislation itself. This kind of funding is sometimes referred to as a “soft earmark.” The U.S. Congress also did not establish a new earmark for microenterprise funding for FY 2011, so USAID operated under the earmark of \$265 million that was established by the Consolidated Appropriations Act for the FY 2010 reporting period.*

TASK B – MICROFINANCE, ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT AND ENABLING ENVIRONMENT INSTITUTION TRACKING

The second phase of MRR data collection includes partner-level outreach and tracking. During this phase, MRR collects results data from USAID implementing partners in order to report to Congress on the impact and outreach of USAID’s investments in microenterprise programming during the given fiscal year. For work under Task B, the MRR team reaches out to all of the partner institutions identified by USAID Missions during Mission-level data collection. The MRR team also incorporates partner data related to USAID’s Poverty Assessment Tool (PAT) implementation as well as Development Credit Authority (DCA) utilization. Beginning in FY 2012, MRR began to collect data obtained through partner implementation of

the Progress out of Poverty Index (PPI), to be analyzed together with reported PAT results. However, at the time of this report, no partners had yet reported PPI data.

MRR achieved a high partner-reporting response rate over all three fiscal years covered by the current project. Dating back to FY 2007, partner-level response rates have sometimes dipped as low as 66%, demonstrating the challenge in assuring partner-level reporting to MRR, however MRR achieved response rates of more than 80% in all three reporting years covered by this project (FY 2010 – FY 2012).

To reflect the USAID's more integrated approach to microenterprise development, and to improve partner-level response rates, the MRR team designed and introduced a new, consolidated survey approach in FY 2011, (replacing the earlier system of multiple survey types - including microfinance, enterprise development, and policy/enabling environment). Where a partner might have received three MRR surveys in the past, they now receive one consolidated survey, significantly streamlining the reporting process. The MRR team observed a faster turnaround time on partner survey responses, and a decrease in "help desk" support or communication. Therefore, the consolidated survey does appear to minimize the time required on behalf of the partners, and to ease the overall MRR "reporting burden". The consolidated survey also allows the MRR team to allocate more time to data verification than in previous years, as more partners respond sooner, and more easily.

TASK C – USAID MICROENTERPRISE RESULTS REPORTING PUBLICATIONS

Under Task C, the MRR team produces the MRR Annual Report to Congress, which is due to Congress on June 30 each year. The team also produces the MRR Methodology and Statistical Annexes each year, which is not submitted to Congress, but includes information on the MRR methodology, as well as additional data not presented in the Congressional report, (due to page limits and Congressional requirements and specifications on the MRR report itself). The table below provides links to each MRR Annual Report to Congress and the associated Annexes for FY 2010 – FY 2012.

TABLE 6: MICROENTERPRISE RESULTS REPORTING ANNUAL REPORT TO CONGRESS AND METHODOLOGY AND STATISTICAL ANNEXES (FY 2010 – FY 2012)

MRR Publication	Date	Link
Microenterprise Results Reporting Annual Report to Congress, Fiscal Year 2010	June 2011	http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACS778.pdf
Microenterprise Results Reporting Methodology and Statistical Annexes, Fiscal Year 2010	August 2011	http://transition.usaid.gov/our_work/economic_growth_and_trade/micro/MRR_FY10_Methodology__Statistical_Annexes_82211_Final.pdf
Microenterprise Results Reporting Annual Report to Congress, Fiscal Year 2011	June 2012	http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PDACT959.pdf
Microenterprise Results Reporting Methodology and Statistical Annexes, Fiscal Year 2011	July 2012	http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PNADZ289.pdf
Microenterprise Results Reporting Annual Report to Congress, Fiscal Year 2012	May 2013	Not yet available at the time of this report
Microenterprise Results Reporting Methodology and Statistical Annexes, Fiscal Year 2012	May 2013	Not yet available at the time of this report

Under Task C, the team also assists the MPEP office with information from the MRR database, running “ad-hoc” reports in response to inquiries from Congress and others, as/when the need may arise. Since the MRR database holds microenterprise related data dating back to 1996, USAID will occasionally turn to the MRR team for unplanned/unscheduled queries of historical data. MRR responds to these kinds of requests on an as-needed, “ad hoc” basis throughout the year. While the contract mentions 10 – 20 of these “reports” per year, this is an estimate, as it is difficult to predict when or how many of these kinds of “ad hoc” reports/analyses USAID may need to request per year. This deliverable is to allow for these unplanned, unscheduled queries of the MRR database, and for the MRR team to be responsive to these impromptu kinds of questions as the need may arise. In general, these are new, but simple queries to the database, run against historical data already present in the database that is to be analyzed in a specific way, in response to a new question or need. Normally, these kinds of requests take no more than one day to respond to, as it is a matter of the MRR Database Administrator designing a new query against the database, with the MRR Information Analyst and/or Team Leader then packaging and analyzing the data to share with USAID. Anything that would require more time than this, and/or involve new software development, (i.e. revising surveys, modifying the database structure), and/or collecting new data should not factor into this line item, as these reports are limited to queries of data that is already available in the MRR database.

As of the time of this report, the team had prepared the following items in response to USAID queries (any of which can be recreated by the Database Administrator or MRR Information Analyst, as the queries now exist in the database):

Number	Year	Date	Query/Report
1	1	10/27/2010	analysis of USAID microenterprise obligations in Afghanistan and the MENA region between FY 2003 – FY 2009
2	1	11/18/2010	analysis of USAID funding towards livestock, dairy and other animal husbandry activities worldwide in FY 2009
3	1	02/10/2011	list of all USAID partners and sub-recipients (FY 2009) prepared for the MPEP office in response to an inquiry from Results Educational Fund
4	1	03/10/2011	analysis of funding for microfinance in Africa in FY 2009 – FY 2010

5	1	03/10/2011	analysis of funds designated for human and institutional capacity building in microfinance institutions (FY 2009 – FY 2010)
6	1	03/10/2011	analysis of percentage of microenterprise funds awarded through grants and cooperative agreements (FY 2009 – FY 2010)
7	1	03/10/2011	analysis of outreach to women and the very poor (FY 2009 – FY 2010)
8	1	5/27/2011	analysis of rural client percentages in Enterprise Development and Microfinance for Bureau for Food Security
9	1	08/19/2011	list of reported FY 2010 obligations from Associate Awards under FIELD support mechanism, prepared for MPEP office
10	1	9/14/2011	analysis of USAID funding for microfinance and enterprise development from FY 2001 – FY 2010, including numbers of countries and clients reached
11	2	12/01/2011	analysis of USAID funding for microfinance in FY 2008, FY 2009 and FY 2010, including information on region, partner, and partner type
12	2	12/21/2011	analysis of microfinance funding to Sudan and Kenya in FY 2008, FY 2009 and FY 2010, including information on sub recipients, i.e. local partner microfinance institutions
13	2	01/04/2012	provided MPEP office with information on MFI partner operational and financial sustainability
14	2	02/06/2012	provided PAT team with information on USAID/Ghana partner reporting in years FY 2007 – FY 2010
15	2	05/07/2012	provided PAT team with data on FY 2011 PAT reporting to facilitate their communication with partners specifically as it relates to PAT
16	2	06/06/2012	provided PAT consultant with data on FY 2010 PAT reporting and FY 2010 PAT survey (with interim

			period where USAID is without a PAT implementation partner, the MRR team has provided some additional support in this area)
17	2	06/15/2012	provided PAT consultant with feedback from MRR reporters on PAT implementation and results
18	2	6/29/2012	provided USAID with data needed for CGAP funder survey, including all microfinance-related funding reported to MRR for FY 2011
19	2	7/30/2012	prepared report for MPEP on top reporting Missions in FY 2011 according to three percentages of total reported FY 2011 funds (80%, 85% and 90%)
20	2	08/07/2012	prepared report for MPEP on FY 2011 Mission reporters along three thresholds (\$5 million and above, \$4 million and above, \$2 million and above)
21	2	08/16/2012	prepared list for MPEP of FY 2011 reporting Missions according to threshold of \$4 million and above, plus all Feed the Future focus countries.
22	3	09/27/2012	provided MPEP with analysis of all missions surveyed in FY 2011 to include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mission and Bureau names (including all Missions and Bureaus surveyed for MRR FY 2011) • FY2011 reported funding ("Responded, but no data to report"/ "Not reported"/amounts reported) • Reporting Status (Reported/Responded/Not Reported) • Year the mission last reported microenterprise funds to MRR • Notes from Missions on reporting status if they did not have data to report for FY2011.
23	3	11/01/2012	assisted MPEP in responding to questions from US Congress on historical costs associated with MRR
24	3	12/21/2012	responded to request from MPEP office for historical data on USAID investments in microfinance institutions
25	3	1/31/2013	provided historical data on outreach to the poor for MPEP office presentation/panel discussion at the Microcredit Summit Campaign
26	3	2/12/2013	provided MPEP with historical data on microfinance and youth (FY 2001 – FY 2010)

27	3	3/12/2013	analysis of data on funds to microfinance and value chain development in FY 2011
28	3	4/2/2013	provided data to MPEP office for potential map of microenterprise projects for USAID website

Since the project's third year, (Sept 27, 2012 – May 24, 2013), contained only eight months, it is to be expected that the project would complete fewer of these kinds of "ad hoc" reports in its final year, (given the shorter period). The project also underwent a budget cut in its final year, and the requisite reduction in team size and project scope. With that, however, the team did respond fully to all requests for these kinds of unscheduled reports and analysis in its final year, albeit only seven, given the shorter period.

TASK D – MICROENTERPRISE RESULTS REPORTING WEBSITE

Under Task D, the MRR team manages the MRR website, which is an integrated online database system where USAID Missions and partners report their data to MRR. The team oversees the maintenance of this website and provides technical support to all users.

Website Domain and Hosting

From the outset of the project, DAI has maintained the MRR website domain name (mrreporting.org) through eNom Central, and has hosted the MRR website at Peer 1 hosting.

Website maintenance and development

Over the life of the project, DAI worked with partner software development firm WolfeReiter for MRR website maintenance and software development. The table below summarizes website maintenance and development work undertaken over the course of the project.

TABLE 7: SUMMARY OF MRR WEBSITE MAINTENANCE AND MODIFICATIONS

Vendor	Period of Performance	Description of Scope of Work
WolfeReiter	December 2010 – December 2011	Monthly maintenance (including technical and user support for MRR team, "de-bugging" of unhandled exceptions, and monitoring hosting)

		environment)
WolfeReiter	February – March 2011	Finalize data migration from old MRR website to the new (began under previous Task Order)
WolfeReiter	November 2011	Update Mission-level data entry functionality and dashboard
WolfeReiter	February – March 2012	Develop consolidated partner-level survey (replacing previous system of multiple survey types, which included Enterprise Development, Microfinance, Policy, and PAT)
WolfeReiter	December 2011 – December 2012	Monthly maintenance (including technical and user support for MRR team, “de-bugging” of unhandled exceptions, and monitoring hosting environment)
WolfeReiter	January – February 2013	Update consolidated partner-level survey to accommodate new requirements from USAID/MPEP for FY 2012 data analysis

WolfeReiter’s second annual MRR website maintenance Purchase Order ended on December 15 2012. Given that the current MRR project closes in May 2013, DAI did not renew the monthly maintenance agreement with WolfeReiter. After WolfeReiter completed the partner level survey revisions in February 2013, DAI obtained all updated source code and website documentation from WolfeReiter, and managed website maintenance in-house for the remainder of the project. This was possible due to a personnel change on the project whereby DAI filled the vacated Database Administrator role with two personnel from DAI’s Office of Information Management and Technology (one of whom is a software engineer able to assist with website maintenance as needed).

LESSONS LEARNED AND RECOMMENDATIONS

TASK A – TRACKING OF ESTIMATED AND ACTUAL OBLIGATIONS

USAID communication with surveyed Missions – Since the MRR email address and personnel are non-USAID, there seems to be an increased level of buy-in and responsiveness when someone from within USAID participates in MRR communication to the field, to either introduce the data collection cycle and the MRR team and/or to assist in follow up with non-responding Missions.

Embed the MRR project within USAID – it may be worth investigating having the MRR team sit at USAID as is the case on some other DC-based projects, (GDA, Grand Challenges, for example). Since MRR's key function involves heavy liaising with USAID Missions and personnel, this could greatly facilitate the process of identifying Mission-level personnel, and communicating with them more effectively.

USAID participation in determining contact people in the Missions – MRR contact people are not always responsive, so MRR often reaches out to secondary contacts, and/or to USAID Desk Officers to identify the appropriate people in the Missions. This can be difficult, as even Desk Officers are sometimes unfamiliar with MRR, and are not always inclined to respond. To have USAID's more direct involvement in identifying and naming these contact people might improve the Mission-level response rate, time and efficiency.

Office Director level involvement in the Missions – it is not always clear that there is senior level awareness and buy-in regarding MRR within the Missions. While the Office Director level personnel would not be tasked with actually collecting and entering the data, it would probably improve response rates to have their more senior level involvement in assigning the appropriate people and assuring that the reporting happens in a timely manner. Also, now that MRR is collecting data from various program types (food security, microenterprise, microfinance, health, environment, etc.), it might be more effective to involve a senior level person in the Mission who could help assure that we are reaching all relevant people (and funds). MRR is able to do this to the degree possible by explaining our process to the contact people that we do have, but it would probably be more effective if someone from higher up within the Mission itself were involved.

Discrepancy in reported funding – On occasion, there is disagreement between the implementing partner and the relevant USAID Mission as to the obligated funding reported by the Missions. Since MRR only collects data on funds for microenterprise activities, the reported funds are not always the full obligated amounts. Some Missions work with their partners to determine the appropriate amount of funding to report to MRR, while some do not. In some cases, partners will

have questions about the amount of funding that is associated with their project in MRR, and do not agree with USAID's estimates. When these cases arise, the MRR team works to address the discrepancy, communicating with the Mission and/or partner as needed, but it can be difficult to re-engage the Missions on this after the fact (as Mission level reporting occurs months prior to partner level reporting each year). This could be improved with increased collaboration between the Missions and their designated partners on the MRR process overall, perhaps whereby the partners are required to participate in the Mission level data verification process, somehow signing off on the amount reported to their project(s). This might also increase partner level buy-in on reporting in general, so that they are not surprised later in the year when MRR assigns them a results level survey.

Duplicate implementing mechanism numbers – The MRR system currently does not have a way of preventing the creation of duplicate entries for implementing mechanism numbers. This can be problematic for Mission level data, as reporters will sometimes create new entries for projects/implementing mechanisms that already exist in the system, generating multiple entries for the same entity. The MRR team catches all of these during data verification, and scrubs and cleans the back end on an on-going basis to correct for any duplicate entries, but it would be worth investigating ways to systematically avoid duplication of the implementing mechanism numbers. The current MRR team investigated this possibility during the contract period, but the project's budget for website development and software updates was not sufficient for this kind of change, especially given the budget cut to the project in Year 3.

TASK B – MICROFINANCE, ENTERPRISE DEVELOPMENT AND ENABLING ENVIRONMENT INSTITUTION TRACKING

USAID communication with surveyed partners – Similar to the first point above under Task A, it may improve partner level reporting to introduce communication to the partners from within USAID somehow. Some partners are hesitant to respond, especially in cases where their COTR or AOTR is not aware of MRR. This is less of an issue in more traditional microenterprise projects, who may already be familiar with MRR, but with the newer reporters and non-traditional projects (food security, health, etc.), it could be effective to include some kind of introductory communication from someone within USAID.

Include MRR in contractual documents – While it would be difficult to predict which projects would need to report to MRR at the SOW and contract development phase, it would be beneficial to MRR if there were a way to include it somehow – if

not specifically in the relevant contracts, perhaps some mention in the general ADS that *if* a project is contacted for MRR reporting, that they are obligated to comply. It is impossible to predict all of the projects that will be contacted, (as programs evolve and may develop microenterprise related components in years two and three, etc., and because of the evolving nature of MRR, not to mention the definition of microenterprise). However, it is suggested that USAID investigate including some conditional language about MRR in the ADS, or project contract documents. Suggested wording could be along the lines of:

- “if identified and contacted for reporting to MRR, the implementing partner must comply”;
- or “if support to microenterprise and/or reducing poverty is within the scope of a project, it is required that the implementing partner include plans for reporting to MRR in its M&E planning/Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP), and respond accordingly to MRR if/when contacted”.

PAT/PPI reporting – Implementing partner reporting on percentage of funds to the very poor, and uptake/compliance on PAT implementation and reporting has been historically very low. The MRR survey asks all surveyed partners whether they have implemented a PAT during the fiscal year in question, (and if “yes”, they are then prompted to provide their results). The vast majority report “no”. The system prompts reporters who respond “no” to provide an explanation as to why – with the majority of reporters saying that “PAT is not part of our agreement/contract”. Other responses include “USAID did not ask us to implement PAT”. (In FY 2010, only 13 projects reported PAT results, followed by ten in FY 2011, and then four in FY 2012). It is recommended that USAID develop some increased enforcement around PAT, (as mentioned above, perhaps including in contractual documents and/or ADS language), as well as increased awareness and buy-in from the USAID Missions, who are in a direct management relationship with the implementing partners. PAT implementation can be expensive and time consuming, so should be planned and budgeted for early on in a project, ideally even during proposal development. USAID has recently begun to accept PPI reporting in addition to PAT, so this should be widely communicated to Missions and partners well in advance. This was not possible for FY 2012 reporting, as the decision was not finalized until FY 2012 had already closed, but for FY 2013, which is underway at the time of this report, it should be widely communicated that PPI is not officially accepted for reporting on percentage of funds to the very poor.

More formalized relationship between PAT and MRR – To streamline and improve communication with partners, (and USAID), it would be beneficial to more closely link the PAT and MRR teams, information and processes. The PAT and

MRR personnel do collaborate regularly, even though on separate teams and contracts, but for improved efficiency and information sharing, a more formalized collaboration may be beneficial.

Simplify subrecipient data reporting – It would be useful to update the way subrecipient information is captured in the MRR website. When implementing partners enter information on new and multiple subrecipient organizations, the process can be difficult and time-consuming (particularly for large projects with big grant programs and many grantees, for example). To ease this process, the MRR survey should be capable of accepting an Excel version of the subrecipient information with pre-determined fields, so all the data is uniformly captured in the MRR website. Another consideration is to remove the requirement that implementing partners report separately on funding to each of their subrecipients, and that they be allowed to report aggregated data (on amounts of funding subgranted and/or subcontracted in the fiscal year in question). In the past, MRR required that partners report on results data in a disaggregated fashion, by subrecipient, but this is no longer the case (prime partners now report results data in an aggregated fashion). For this reason, it is no longer necessary that MRR obtain the same level of detailed information for each subrecipient. As long as MRR obtains sufficient subrecipient data to allow USAID to respond to MRAA Reporting Requirement 4 (“the level of funding provided through grants, contracts and cooperative agreements that is estimated to be subgranted or subcontracted”), this section of the partner survey can probably afford to be simplified.

Word version of completed partner survey report – It would be useful to be able to extract a completed partner survey report in a Word document for any fiscal year. This is not possible on the website now. Instead, to share a completed survey, it is possible to access the summary page and share it via screenshot, or else by printing, scanning and emailing as an attachment. It would be useful to be able to easily generate a Word version of edited/completed partner surveys, to better facilitate the data verification and communication process with partner reporters.

Align MRR with standard USAID indicators - Partners are better able to report when the data requested aligns with indicators that they are already tracking for their quarterly reporting to their relevant Missions, so deviating from the standard USAID indicators should be minimized as much as possible. On occasion, implementing partners will ask that MRR share the MRR survey with them much earlier in the year, so they may incorporate the requested data into their M&E systems. This is actually not possible given that MRR cannot predetermine which partners will be identified for reporting through the Mission-level data collection process each year, and because there are usually updates to the partner survey each year that can take well

into the year to finalize with USAID and to program into the website/survey itself. For all of these reasons, it makes sense to simplify the data requested and to align it as closely as possible with the standard USAID indicators, such that partners are not surprised by the data that is being requested of them in MRR.

TASK C – USAID MICROENTERPRISE RESULTS REPORTING PUBLICATIONS

Simplify the MRR Annual Report to Congress – to assure that USAID is able to meet its Congressional reporting requirements, it is advisable to limit the report to that which is required by the MRAA legislation. Adding new, unrequired fields to the surveys increases the reporting burden on partners, increases the cost of the reporting process overall, potentially undermines the quality of the data and database overall, and complicates the report’s internal review and clearance process – undermining the ability of USAID to meet its annual, congressional reporting deadline of June 30th. For example, while due to Congress on June 30 each year, the FY 2011 MRR Annual Report to Congress was not submitted to Congress until late August, (although the MRR team submitted a complete draft to USAID one week ahead of the agreed upon review schedule, on June 7th). This delay was due to rounds of revisions (requested well after the report had already cleared MPEP) on sections of the report that are not congressionally mandated - namely the comparison of cost per beneficiary by technical area. It is also important to note that MRR is a web-based system, and that software development labor is very expensive. (In order to allow for the revisions to the website and database related to this analysis for the FY 2012 report, the project had to forego other updates to the website that the team believes would have greatly streamlined and facilitated the data entry process for Missions, and the survey assignment process for implementing partners). The MRR project budget does not include adequate funds for significant levels of survey and database revisions, so it is important to carefully select what kinds of software development the project undertakes, and to attempt to streamline and simplify the survey and reporting process, rather than adding unrequired fields and analysis that potentially undermine the quality of the data, increase cost to USAID, and inhibit USAID’s ability to report to Congress in the most timely manner possible. To minimize cost and reporting burden while facilitating production of the highest quality congressional report in the most timely manner, it is advised that USAID keep the MRR report to the 12 reporting requirements contained in the MRAA legislation (summarized in Annex A).

Goal setting - According to MRAA Reporting Requirement 11, Performance Monitoring System, “the monitoring system shall include performance goals for the assistance and express such goals in an objective and quantifiable form, to the

extent feasible”. Prior to FY 2010, USAID carried forward largely the same goals from year to year. It became clear around FY 2009 that these goals were no longer realistic, due to shifts in USAID’s microenterprise programming approach and partner universe. For FY 2010, FY 2011 (and possibly FY 2012, which is not yet finalized), USAID/MRR has retroactively set the annual goals by averaging the results from the two previous years. A recommendation would be to proactively set goals for each year much earlier in the process, basing them on information about the countries and programs active in the fiscal year in question, rather than results from projects that reported in the two previous years.

TASK D – MICROENTERPRISE RESULTS REPORTING WEBSITE

Remove requirement that Missions report by allocation, collecting data by obligation only – The current MRR website was designed and built in 2008, based on specifications from USAID at that time. The current MRR team observes that parts of the website could be restructured to simplify reporting for the website users (USAID and partner level reporters). In terms of simplifying the USAID Mission-level reporting process, MRR recommends that the requirement to report by allocation be removed altogether. Currently, the website requires Mission level reporters to cluster funds together into allocations (grouping funds to multiple projects into allocations based on funding origin and account), after which they divide the allocated funds into separate obligations by project. MRR recommends that the website be restructured so that reporters start with entering data by project/obligation, (to include data on funding origin and account) and that any required clustering by funding account and origin be done separately, through the MRR team analysis process. The current MRR team investigated this possibility during the contract period, but the project’s budget for website development and software updates was not sufficient for this kind of change, especially given the budget cut to the project in Year 3.

Group partner contacts by implementing mechanism (not by partner and location) – The second structural change that would improve the MRR website is to remove the clustering of partner contacts by partner location, and to instead assign contacts by implementing mechanism. Currently, the website groups MRR reporting contacts by partner organization and location (so by DAI/Afghanistan, or CARE/Ethiopia, or CRS/Indonesia for example). This is problematic in cases where an organization has multiple projects in the same country, which is often the case.

Assign partner level questionnaires by implementing mechanism only (not grouping by partner and location) – Related to the issue above, partner level questionnaires should be assigned only by project/implementing mechanism. While each project does have its own survey linked specifically to its implementing

mechanism number, the website groups partner level surveys for different projects into a shared “partner dashboard” based on partner name and location. So, if a DAI project in Afghanistan logs into the MRR website to complete their assigned survey, the website brings them to a “dashboard” page with all of the surveys assigned to DAI projects in Afghanistan. This can be confusing to the reporters, and is problematic for partner follow up, as the MRR team often does not know which people are associated with which project.

Consider removing requirement for username and password – To facilitate ease of access to the website, USAID/MRR might consider removing the requirement for username and passwords. Instead of requiring a user name and password for users to access their dashboards and data entry, it is possible to set up web links that would have a limited access time, but that could be shared among those individuals who are actively collaborating on their MRR reporting.

Eliminate or update “Reports” tab - The MRR website has a “Reports” tab which is rarely used. The original intention when this tab was designed (prior to the current contract), was that USAID and/or the public would be able to access the MRR website and run their own reports/queries on the data. While it is rather clear to the MRR team that users do not access this functionality often (if at all), it would be useful to determine the actual usage statistics, and then to investigate whether it makes most sense to maintain and update the queries/reports that are available, or do away with the “Reports” tab completely. Given resource/budget constraints on the current project, this has not been a priority area, but with some resource allocation, this tab could be improved.

ANNEX A – MRAA REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

1	<p>Funding: The number of grants, cooperative agreements, contracts, contributions, or other form of assistance provided under section 252 [the section of the law authorizing USAID to provide microenterprise assistance], with a listing of:</p> <p>(A) the amount of each grant, cooperative agreement, contract, contribution or other form of assistance;</p> <p>(B) the name of each recipient and each developing country with respect to which projects or activities under the grant, cooperative agreement, contract, contribution, or other form of assistance were carried out; and</p> <p>(C) a listing of the number of countries receiving assistance authorized by section 252.</p>
2	<p>Central Mechanisms: The amount of assistance provided under section 252 through central mechanisms.</p>
3	<p>Development Credit Authority: The name of each country that receives assistance under section 256 [the section of the law pertaining to the Development Credit Authority and credit instruments] and the amount of such assistance.</p>
4	<p>USAID Funding Recipients: The level of funding provided through contracts; the level of funding provided through grants, contracts, and cooperative agreements that is estimated to be subgranted or subcontracted, as the case may be, to direct service providers; and an analysis of the comparative cost-effectiveness and sustainability of projects carried out under these mechanisms.</p>
5	<p>Matching Assistance: It is the sense of Congress that USAID should include in the report required by section 258 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 [as added by section 6 of this Act] a description of all matching assistance [as described in paragraph (1)] provided for the prior year by recipients of microenterprise development assistance under such title.</p>
6	<p>Funds for Very Poor Clients: The percentage of assistance furnished under section 252 that was allocated to the very poor based on the data collected using the certified methods required by section 254 [the section of the law outlining the requirement for USAID to develop client poverty assessment methods and require their use by awardees by October 2006].</p>
7	<p>Estimated Number of the Very Poor reached with assistance provided under section 252.</p>
8	<p>Poverty Assessment Methods: The process of developing and applying poverty assessment procedures required under section 254.</p>
9	<p>Funds to Assist Victims of Trafficking and Exploitation: Information on the efforts of the Agency to ensure that recipients of United States microenterprise and microfinance development assistance work closely with non-governmental organizations and foreign governments to identify and assist victims or potential victims of severe forms of trafficking in persons and women who are victims of or susceptible to other forms of exploitation and violence.</p>
10	<p>Poverty and Race/Ethnicity: An estimate of the percentage of beneficiaries of assistance under this title in countries where a strong relationship between poverty and race or ethnicity has been demonstrated.</p>
11	<p>Performance Monitoring System: The results of the monitoring system required under section 253 [see A-D below].</p> <p>(A) The monitoring system shall include performance goals for the assistance and expresses such goals in an objective and quantifiable form, to the extent feasible.</p> <p>(B) The monitoring system shall include performance indicators to be used in measuring or assessing the achievement of the performance goals described in paragraph (1) and the objective of the assistance authorized under section 252.</p> <p>(C) The monitoring system provides a basis for recommendations for adjustments to the assistance to enhance the sustainability and the impact of the assistance, particularly the impact of such assistance on the very poor, particularly poor women.</p> <p>(D) The monitoring system adopts the widespread use of proven and effective poverty assessment tools to successfully identify the very poor and ensure that they receive adequate access to microenterprise loans, savings, and assistance.</p>
12	<p>Additional Information: Any additional information relating to the provision of assistance authorized by this title, including the use of poverty assessment methods required by section 254, or additional information on assistance provided by the United States to support microenterprise development under this title or any other provision of law.</p>

ANNEX B – USAID MISSIONS AND OFFICES SURVEYED (FY 2010, FY 2011 AND FY 2012)

	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012
1	Afghanistan	1	Afghanistan	1	Afghanistan
2	Albania	2	Albania	2	Bolivia
3	Angola	3	Angola	3	Cambodia
4	Armenia	4	Armenia	4	Colombia
5	Azerbaijan	5	Azerbaijan	5	DR Congo
6	Bangladesh	6	Bangladesh	6	East Timor
7	Belarus	7	Belarus	7	Ethiopia
8	Benin	8	Benin	8	Georgia
9	Bureau for Food Security	9	Bureau for Food Security	9	Guatemala
10	Bolivia	10	Bolivia	10	Guyana
11	Bosnia	11	Bosnia	11	Haiti
12	Brazil	12	Brazil	12	Iraq
13	Burundi (captured through USAID/East Africa as of FY 2011)			13	Jamaica
14	Cambodia	13	Cambodia	14	Kenya
15	Central Asian Republics	14	Central Asian Republics	15	Kosovo
16	Colombia	15	Colombia	16	Kyrgyzstan
17	Caribbean Regional Program	16	Caribbean Regional Program	17	Lebanon
18	Dominican Republic	17	Dominican Republic	18	Liberia
19	DR Congo	18	DR Congo	19	Macedonia
20	East Timor	19	East Timor	20	Malawi
21	Ecuador	20	Ecuador	21	Mali
22	Eastern Europe Bureau	21	Eastern Europe Bureau	22	MPEP
23	Egypt	22	Egypt	23	Moldova

	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012
24	El Salvador	23	El Salvador	24	Nepal
25	Ethiopia	24	Ethiopia	25	Nicaragua
26	Georgia	25	Georgia	26	Pakistan
27	Ghana	26	Ghana	27	Peru
28	Guatemala	27	Guatemala	28	Philippines
29	Guinea	28	Guinea	29	Regional Development Mission for Asia
30	Guyana	29	Guyana	30	Rwanda
31	Haiti	30	Haiti	31	South Sudan
32	Honduras	31	Honduras	32	Sri Lanka
33	India	32	India	33	Sudan
34	Indonesia	33	Indonesia	34	Tanzania
35	Iraq	34	Iraq	35	USAID/East Africa
36	Jamaica	35	Jamaica	36	Zambia
37	Jordan	36	Jordan	37	Zimbabwe
38	Kazakhstan	37	Kazakhstan		
39	Kenya	38	Kenya		
40	Kosovo	39	Kosovo		
41	Kyrgyzstan	40	Kyrgyzstan		
42	LAC Bureau	41	LAC Bureau		
43	Lebanon	42	Lebanon		
44	Liberia	43	Liberia		
45	Macedonia	44	Macedonia		
46	Madagascar	45	Madagascar		
47	Malawi	46	Malawi		
48	Mali	47	Mali		
49	Mexico	48	Mexico		
50	Moldova	49	Moldova		
51	Mongolia	50	Mongolia		

	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012
52	Montenegro	51	Montenegro		
53	Morocco	52	Morocco		
54	Mozambique	53	Mozambique		
55	Namibia	54	Namibia		
56	Nepal	55	Nepal		
57	Nicaragua	56	Nicaragua		
58	Nigeria	57	Nigeria		
59	Office of Democracy and Governance	58	Office of Democracy and Governance		
60	Office of Development Partners	59	Office of Development Partners		
61	Office of Environment and Science Policy - Global Climate Change	60	Office of Environment and Science Policy - Global Climate Change		
62	Office of HIV/AIDS	61	Office of HIV/AIDS		
63	Office of Infrastructure & Engineering - Information and Communications Technology	62	Office of Infrastructure & Engineering - Information and Communications Technology		
64	Office of Microenterprise Development	63	Office of Microenterprise and Private Enterprise Promotion		
65	Office of Natural Resource Management	64	Office of Natural Resource Management		
66	Office of Population and Reproductive Health	65	Office of Population and Reproductive Health		
67	Office of Women in Development	66	Office of Women in Development		
68	Pakistan	67	Pakistan		
69	Panama	68	Panama		
70	Paraguay	69	Paraguay		
71	Peru	70	Peru		
72	Philippines	71	Philippines		
73	Regional Development Mission for Asia	72	Regional Development Mission for Asia		
74	Russia	73	Russia		
75	Rwanda	74	Rwanda		

	FY 2010		FY 2011		FY 2012
76	Senegal	75	Senegal		
77	Serbia	76	Serbia		
78	Sierra Leone	77	Sierra Leone		
79	South Africa	78	South Africa		
80	Sri Lanka	79	Sri Lanka		
81	Sudan	80	Sudan		
82	Tajikistan	81	Tajikistan		
83	Tanzania	82	Tanzania		
84	Turkmenistan	83	Turkmenistan		
85	Uganda	84	Uganda		
86	Ukraine	85	Ukraine		
87	USAID/East Africa	86	USAID/East Africa		
88	USAID/West Africa	87	USAID/West Africa		
89	Uzbekistan	88	Uzbekistan		
90	West Bank /Gaza	89	Vietnam		
91	Zambia	90	West Bank /Gaza		
92	Zimbabwe	91	Zambia		
		92	Zimbabwe		

