

Considerations for the Monitoring and Evaluation of G2G Activities

PPL/LER Discussion Note¹

July 20, 2014

This discussion note highlights considerations for the monitoring and evaluation² of government-to-government assistance (G2G)³ activities. In addition to monitoring and evaluation, this paper discusses aspects of project design that are critical for effective monitoring and evaluation, as well as opportunities to integrate collaboration, learning, and adaptive management into G2G assistance. This discussion note complements the guidance found in ADS 201, 203, and 220 on monitoring, evaluation and learning for G2G activities. The discussion note is not new guidance, and does not replace existing guidance, but is rather meant to foster continued conversation on how to effectively monitor and evaluate G2G activities, as well as promote ongoing learning in this area. The ideas in this paper are general considerations and the extent to which they are applicable for particular G2G assistance activities will depend on the nature of the G2G assistance.

G2G Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning: Considerations during Project Design

The decision to engage in government-to-government assistance should be embedded in evidence-based strategic planning, which occurs during the development and review of Country Development Cooperation Strategies, and a project design process that identifies G2G assistance as the best means to invest USAID resources to achieve a clearly stated development purpose, taking into consideration a rigorous risk assessment and risk mitigation process.

The utility of evaluations is influenced by choices made during project design. Evidence-based project design establishes the analytical framework for testing assumptions and validating approaches in pursuit of greater programmatic effectiveness. A rigorous project design process, which effectively documents the rationale for the assistance approach in the Project Appraisal Document, in turn lays the foundation for project implementation, monitoring, and evaluation.

Additional considerations during project design include:

Understand the range of local actors and the system in which they operate. G2G assistance involves both changes in a

USAID's *Local Systems: A Framework for Supporting Sustained Development* identifies ten principles for engaging with local systems. Some principles include: recognize that there is always a system; map local systems; and design holistically. The framework emphasizes "5Rs" to make sense of local systems: Resources; Roles; Relationships; Rules; and Results.

¹ This discussion note is partially informed by the findings from a rapid review of the USAID/Afghanistan on-budget assistance program from August 19-29, 2013. It also draws on the extensive research in a USAID-commissioned paper authored by Wendy Stickel entitled, "Evaluating Capacity Development in IPR" (August 2012).

² This note focuses on monitoring and evaluation as it relates to performance. The monitoring and evaluation of risk is covered in detail in ADS 220.

³ Per ADS 220, "government-to-government assistance" is "when USAID disburses funds directly to a partner government entity, including all instances in which USAID finances a partner government entity of a bilateral foreign assistance recipient country to implement a project or project activity, including non-project assistance, using the partner government's own financial management, procurement or other systems."

partner government entity as well as changes in the system of which that entity is a part. Recognizing the broader system in which a partner government entity operates, considered together with the Public Financial Management Risk Assessment (PFMRAF) and other risk calculations (such as contextual, programmatic, and reputational risk), is an important starting point in identifying if and how to engage with that entity.

The PFMRAF is an important tool for understanding the state of public financial management and public accountability at the onset of a project. Beginning during strategic planning and continuing into project design, systems mapping, network analysis, and other analytical approaches (e.g. political economy analysis) can complement findings from the PFMRAF and be used to identify linkages between different local actors and possible entry points for engagement. Analytical approaches that provide a basis to think strategically about institutional arrangements (including knowledge, incentives, power, relationships, and social exchange) can help the project design team to identify whether there are certain sectors in which G2G engagement is a better investment of USAID resources than others and more likely to have a sustainable impact. Such approaches can also be helpful in identifying non-obvious places in the system to measure system strength and the impact of a particular intervention.

The analysis that is conducted during strategic planning and project design should also be useful in understanding the roles of other vital local actors, including civil society organizations (CSOs), community based organizations (CBOs), local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and the private sector. The project design team should carefully consider the potential roles of all of these valuable local development partners. In some country contexts, partnership with government entities may be a good choice; in others, support to local CSOs/CBOs/NGOs and the private sector, or a combined assistance approach, may be most effective. For instance, while assessing the judicial system, the project design team may identify CSOs as playing a key role in increasing accountability in the judicial sector. If so, the project design team may consider complementing its G2G assistance activity with an activity focused on the accountability role of CSOs, or trying to leverage other donor funding for this activity. Since USAID and other donors are part of the system, analytical approaches should also consider the role of donors in the system.

TIP: In developing the theory of change, consider existing evidence, such as assessments conducted during CDCS development and project design. The [*Discussion Note on Sustainability Analysis Methods for Project Design*](#) has considerations for sustainability analysis methods and implementation approaches.

Have a clear rationale and theory of change prior to choosing G2G assistance. The decision to use G2G assistance should be based on USAID development objectives in that country and embedded in a broader theory of change that explains the purpose and rationale for using G2G assistance. The theory of change, as well as any research, analysis, and stakeholder input supporting the theory of change, should be clearly documented in the Project Appraisal Document. The theory of change may be further refined during project implementation in response to emergent findings, analysis, and learning.

G2G assistance may be both a means to an end (e.g. a closer development relationship with the partner government, greater convening power to enact policy or institutional reform, or enhanced donor coordination and alignment) as well as an end in itself (e.g. more sustainable service delivery through the enhanced capacity of key government entities). Drawing on its analytical work from strategy development and project design, the Mission should consider which partner government entities are critical to broader change within the local system, as well as any contextual factors (e.g. political economy factors) that

might enable or impede G2G assistance from achieving its objectives. Within the parameters of the proposed G2G assistance approach, the project design team should identify opportunities to engage government counterparts during project design, including in doing the problem analysis, discussing solutions to identified problems, developing mutually agreed upon objectives, and identifying ways to measure those objectives. Ongoing opportunities for learning and collaborating with partner government counterparts, which allow for periodic reflection on the validity of the theory of change, should be actively built into the project design and implementation approach.

TIP: Having a clearly defined theory of change is important for identifying indicators and doing baseline measurement. In addition, evaluators rely on documentation about the theory of change in their evaluation of project/activity outcomes.

Articulate the project’s capacity development objectives. When developing a project with a G2G component, project teams should articulate whether capacity development is an explicit (e.g. primary objective of assistance efforts) or implicit (i.e. secondary or corollary) objective. Some projects, as informed by available evidence and the theory of change, may call for the targeted capacity development of key individuals/offices within the partner government entity; other projects may be better served by a focus on institutional capacity more broadly (e.g. technical, public financial management, human resources) or a more expansive value chain approach targeting key opportunities for improvement across the service delivery system. Capacity development objectives, including the outputs and outcomes contributing to these objectives, should be reflected in the project’s logic model (Project LogFrame or others). Prior to developing the project’s logic model, or as a complement to it, the project design team may consider developing a visual map or diagram that helps the team to think through the feedback loops between different capacity development objectives and the multiple (and not always well understood) potential pathways, and associated constraints, toward achieving desired capacity objectives.

Some considerations when identifying the project’s capacity development objectives include:

- What capacity is needed in particular entities, sectors, or sub-sectors to achieve and sustain desired development results (e.g. what capacities are needed to create accountability for service delivery at the local level, and where could/should these capacities reside)?
- At what level(s) should capacity development efforts optimally be focused (e.g. when does it make sense to create demand-side/vertical accountability versus supply-side/horizontal accountability)?
- Where are other donors focusing their capacity development efforts? How can mission programs build upon or complement the capacity development programming of other donors?

EXAMPLE: USAID/Serbia’s experience with G2G assistance suggests that it can be difficult to fully define capacity development needs, and match these needs to appropriate milestones, in advance. To the extent feasible, it can be helpful to have flexibility in mechanisms to adjust for capacity development activities over the life of the project. Some training originally envisioned may not be needed, while other critical capacity needs that are important to the achievement of project objectives, such as in human resources, strategic planning, or soft skills development, may only become evident during the course of implementation.

- What is the appropriate sequencing of capacity development efforts (e.g. what degree of budget transparency is needed before developing capacity for meaningful citizen review)?
- What is the appetite within the partner government entity for capacity development? What factors, internal to the partner government entity or inherent to government more broadly, may enable or inhibit capacity development efforts?
- Is there sufficient support from the enabling environment, as well as the appropriate incentives, to translate individual and organizational capacity into organizational performance?

USAID's **Local Solutions** initiative emphasizes holistic strategies and designs that analyze the wider local system and engage deliberately with various local partners through direct funding, indirect funding, and non-financial means. The purpose is to strengthen selected, strategic partners and support new relationships as a pathway to improved sustainable development results co-produced through local systems. The development hypothesis is that direct engagement with local organizations can lead to increased capacity, accountability and performance, ultimately increasing development impact and the sustainability of development results.

Defining a project's capacity development objectives during project design does not imply that they must remain static for the duration of project implementation; in fact, capacity development objectives and approaches will likely be adjusted in response to emergent findings and learning. Some capacity needs may only be identified or understood as project implementation proceeds. Further, different actors may have varied understanding and perspectives on what capacity deficiencies exist, how to address these deficiencies, and what defines good performance. These differing viewpoints provide an opportunity for learning and reflection with stakeholders.

Recognize potential tension between desired objectives. Tension may exist between a focus on the delivery of services and the efforts needed to strengthen the capacity of a system to effectively deliver services in the longer term. Emphasis on immediate results can result in the partner government entity being used as a pass through, with much of the actual work done by consultants. Depending on the objectives that USAID seeks to achieve within a given project, in some cases a focus weighted toward immediate service delivery gains may be appropriate. In others, objectives may be better served by a longer-term focus on capacity development, even if it means slower gains in service delivery in the short-run. Integrating technical assistance and capacity development into projects without a clear understanding of "capacity development *of what*" and "capacity development *for what*" risks undermining project objectives and having technical assistance that is not as targeted, efficient, and focused as it could be.

At the same time, even if an activity is targeted at developing individual or organizational capacities, the mission can still track metrics about institutional performance and the beneficiary service delivery experience. The mission can, for instance, establish a baseline for service delivery-related indicators that are expected to be of interest later in the life of the project. If over time the mission finds that service delivery is not improving, USAID can use this information to probe further into the downstream effectiveness of its capacity development, as well as examine whether there are bottlenecks closer to the point of service delivery that may require attention in future interventions.

Considerations for Measuring the Performance of G2G Activities

G2G assistance agreements are negotiated with a partner government to achieve a particular development outcome. Like other forms of USAID assistance, G2G agreements should follow ADS 203, which covers Agency guidance on performance monitoring, evaluation, and learning. ADS 220 has additional guidance related to monitoring, evaluation, and learning for G2G assistance.

The nature of the negotiated relationship of a G2G agreement means that G2G assistance can require considerable upfront discussion, collaboration, and negotiation with the partner government, including with regard to monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities. Preliminary indicators, data collection methodologies, and data collection responsibilities should be discussed with partner country counterparts during project design and reflected in the G2G agreement. Mission staff will need to carefully negotiate the terms of the monitoring and evaluation components of G2G programming, recognizing that there may be sensitivities around this topic. Monitoring and evaluation should be of value for the partner government's own internal learning and capacity development, as well as a means to foster transparency and accountability.

Additional considerations for measuring the performance of G2G activities include:

EXAMPLE: In Afghanistan, the Ministry of Public Health (MoPH) has a robust Health Management Information System (HMIS) that routinely collects output and outcome level data (e.g. midwives trained, MoPH health posts, TB case detection rate, etc.). USAID and other donors have provided extensive technical assistance and support to strengthen the quality of the MoPH's HMIS data so that the data can be used by MoPH, USAID, and other health sector stakeholders for reporting, monitoring, and policy making purposes.

Engage the partner country in identifying indicators to measure progress and performance. Like other USAID activities, G2G assistance activities should have a set of performance indicators that will be collected over the life of the activity to measure progress toward intended results. Per ADS 203.3.6, "wherever possible, aligning indicators and data collection processes and timing with existing [partner government] systems contributes to aid effectiveness goals and minimizes the reporting burden on USAID's partners." (See adjacent text box for an example of how donors in Afghanistan are using Ministry of Public Health data).

After mutually agreeing upon a set of objectives, USAID and the partner government entity should collaboratively discuss and identify metrics that can be used to measure progress toward those objectives. Certain indicators that are of high priority or interest to the government, or which are already being collected by the government, may be suitable for USAID performance monitoring purposes.

The mission should make sure that jointly-defined indicators are responsive to USAID's need to measure strategy and project results. If the partner government voices concerns about indicators and measurement approaches, this could signal an area of fundamental disagreement in the project objectives, or highlight the need to re-visit the appropriateness of proposed indicators and data collection methodologies.

Consider the range of approaches to measure “systems strengthening,” “capacity development,” and other challenging-to-measure objectives. When engaging the partner country in discussions around measurement, it is important to keep in mind that not all aspects of the G2G partnership may be amenable to being measured with a set of performance indicators. The systems mapping or network analysis conducted during project design likely yielded rich insights about the roles, relationships, resources and formal and informal rules between different actors in the system. These factors have a bearing on whether USAID is ultimately able to achieve the objectives it sets out to achieve. Obstacles to effective capacity building, and improved and sustained performance, are not always easily visible. Similarly, capacity development is often a non-linear, emergent process and it can be difficult to fully predict the outcomes that can be expected over a particular timeframe.

To more fully capture the range of outcomes of USAID assistance, project design teams may complement traditional performance monitoring approaches, which focus on a set of defined indicators, with monitoring approaches that recognize the complex aspects of processes such as capacity development and systems strengthening (see adjacent resources box for a link to PPL/LER’s Complexity-Aware Monitoring Discussion Note). These complementary approaches do not replace the need to do performance monitoring, but they can be helpful in identifying unintended results and developing a fuller understanding of the outcomes of USAID assistance. Evaluation complements performance monitoring and can also be used to examine the effectiveness of the assistance approach in achieving its intended objectives and be used to probe into unintended consequences or outcomes.

Clarify expectations in the G2G agreement. Per ADS 203.3.6, in cases in which USAID is working with partner government entities, “Missions must pay careful attention at the project design stage as well as prior to any award negotiations to clarify roles and responsibilities with regard to indicator definitions, collection methodologies, and reporting” noting that “...carefully defining indicators and considering data collection methods in the project design stage is even more critical in these implementation arrangements [with partner government entities].” Prior to signing a G2G agreement, it is important to have clear expectations between USAID and the partner government entity concerning G2G project objectives, desired results, resources, and timeline, as well as the extent to which the partner government will be involved in project monitoring and evaluation. The government’s specific roles and responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation should be clearly specified in the G2G agreement.

RESOURCES: Numerous donors have come up with approaches to try to measure capacity development. For example, the World Bank has developed a list of [intermediate capacity outcomes](#) and [institutional capacities](#) for public institutions. Pact’s [Organizational Performance Index \(OPI\)](#) captures an organization’s performance across four domains: effectiveness, efficiency, relevance, and sustainability. Certain sectors have developed sector-specific tools and resources (see this [example](#) from the health sector on Health System Assessments). [USAID’s Complexity – Aware Monitoring Discussion Note](#) provides principles and approaches for monitoring the complex aspects of projects, which may include aspects of capacity development and systems strengthening.

EXAMPLE: In Senegal and Zambia, the mission Education Teams have engaged Ministry of Education staff and departments in field work leading to the identification of organizational performance levels necessary to deliver services for improved reading performance.

Source: USAID G2G Education Toolkit (Feb 2014) . Bureau of Economic Growth, Education and Environment.

TIP: For instance, areas in which to clarify expectations in the G2G agreement could include: expectations with regard to periodic performance monitoring; formal joint implementation reviews to assess progress toward meeting objectives; approaches for troubleshooting problems and constraints; expectations for partner engagement; and expectations for collaboration and learning.

In G2G agreements, performance monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities may take a different form than in awards to implementing partners (see **Annex One** for an overview of some of the differences in monitoring and evaluation between awards to implementing partners and G2G agreements). The Mission will need to determine the partner government's role in the monitoring and evaluation of the G2G activity, based on the nature of the activity, the government's capacity, and other relevant factors. The partner government's involvement in monitoring and evaluation should be discussed during project design, taking into consideration any capacity and technical assistance needs that should be built into the project's design. The involvement of the partner government in monitoring and evaluation can be important both to build the government's capacity in monitoring and evaluation as well as to improve the sustainability of the activity.

Understand M&E roles and responsibilities vis-à-vis USAID, the partner country government, and any third party technical assistance contractor. G2G monitoring requires clearly identifying the appropriate balance in the respective roles and responsibilities of USAID, the partner government, third-party technical assistance providers, and third party M&E stakeholders. Depending on partner government capacity, the mission may decide to complement its G2G assistance with third party technical assistance focused on building the government's monitoring and evaluation capacity.

In some G2G assistance activities, there may be a role for third party entities that provide additional oversight and quality assurance (e.g. a local architectural and engineering firm for infrastructure projects, civil society organizations for social accountability monitoring, etc.) or third party stakeholders that are engaged in activity monitoring and oversight through means such as public expenditure tracking, social audits, citizen scorecards, and other means.

Actors that may have a role in activity monitoring include:

- Partner government actors, such as:
 - Technical office responsible for implementing the activity within the partner government entity
 - Other offices within the partner government entity or agencies in the partner government that have performance, oversight, reporting and/or M&E responsibilities
 - Any sub-national entities (both NGOs and government entities) to which the partner government entity "contracts" services
 - Ministry of Finance and other government entities that manage donor funds and reporting and provide oversight
- Third-party technical assistance providers that directly support the partner government in monitoring and evaluation, such as:
 - Third-party technical assistance contracted by USAID to provide support to the partner government entity for activity implementation and M&E

- M&E platform contracted by USAID to support the Mission’s monitoring and evaluation practices and build local M&E capacity
- Third-party stakeholders, such as:
 - Third-party entities engaged in monitoring, oversight, quality assurance, and accountability roles (e.g. local engineering firms, CSOs, etc.)
 - Activities implemented by third-parties that are incorporated into the overall project and contribute to the outcomes sought by USAID and the partner government (e.g. award to convene a multi-stakeholder dialogue about service delivery standards, award to strengthen capacity of citizen groups to monitor and provide feedback around relevant sector outcomes, award to strengthen capabilities of local businesses with a role in select value chains regulated by the partner government, etc.).
- USAID mission, including:
 - Designated G2G Activity Manager
 - Office of Financial Management
 - Project Design Team
 - Program Office
 - Respective Technical Office(s)
 - The Mission’s Monitoring & Evaluation POC
 - Others

Each actor engaged in monitoring needs to understand the delegation of roles and responsibilities. In determining an appropriate balance of roles and responsibilities, the Mission should consider the partner country government’s internal monitoring and evaluation capacity, including its capacity to collect data, maintain data quality controls, and provide activity oversight. The Mission should be clear as to how it will work with the partner government to address any capacity constraints affecting its ability to effectively perform its monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities. **Annex Two** provides an example of a template that can be used to outline monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities for each actor. All designated roles and responsibilities should fall within the scope of ADS policy and appropriate mission orders.

Develop an M&E plan for the G2G activity. As in grants and contracts, G2G activities should have an Activity M&E Plan in place that shows how progress toward results will be measured. The development of this Activity M&E Plan will generally require working collaboratively with the partner government. Depending on the level of capacity of the partner government entity, this M&E plan can be primarily developed by the partner country entity (with final approval from USAID) or jointly developed between the entity and USAID. If a third-party technical assistance contractor will be involved in supporting the implementation of the G2G activity, the contractor may also be involved in working with the government to develop the M&E plan. Depending on the nature of the assistance agreement, in some cases the Mission may want to incorporate the M&E plan as a milestone or pre-condition to disbursement of funds.

RESOURCE: USAID’s [ProgramNet](#) online peer-to-peer learning platform has helpful resources on [monitoring, evaluation, and learning and adapting](#) that can be used when developing project and activity M&E plans.

Consider the broader range of indicators that can be used to measure and message the progress of the G2G partnership. There can be a considerable initial start-up time and investment needed to get a new G2G partnership off the ground. Depending on the findings of the PFMRAF, certain partner country institutions may have numerous conditions precedent that need to be met prior to the disbursement of funds. Conditions precedent and benchmarks/milestones can be opportunities to move the ball on important issues, track reform efforts, and have a mutually agreed upon recourse if certain steps are missed or skipped. The Stage 2 risk matrix from the PFMRAF or other like assessments (e.g. the Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability (PEFA) Framework) may be a source of metrics that can be tracked as conditions precedent or key benchmarks/milestones during the life of the activity. In some cases, indicators that are used to track progress may also serve as disbursement benchmarks.

The time and resources invested in working with ministries to successfully address conditions precedent can, itself, be seen as a form of technical assistance and capacity development. Missions engaged in such efforts may consider integrating pre-implementation metrics (possibly using the risk assessment as a baseline) to better document the progress that takes place even before activity implementation begins. These pre-implementation metrics can be useful in showing early, tangible results of the G2G assistance partnership.

Considerations for Evaluating G2G Assistance Activities

Projects with a G2G component follow the evaluation requirements outlined in ADS 203.3.1.3. For required evaluations, the evaluation team lead must be an independent expert from outside USAID, and the evaluation team lead should not have a relationship with the partner government that would pose conflict of interest, perception of bias, or threat to the objectivity of the evaluation findings.

Additional considerations for the evaluation of G2G assistance activities include:

Identify evaluation questions that will inform Mission, Agency, and partner government decision-making and learning. During project design and implementation, the Mission has the opportunity to identify priority evaluation questions to inform its implementation approach, promote engagement with the partner government around important issues, and contribute to broader Mission and Agency learning. The evaluation of G2G assistance is an important opportunity to learn from and strengthen the evidence base underlying G2G assistance, be accountable to external stakeholders, and ask evaluation questions that are useful to the Mission and the partner government entity for management, decision-making, and learning. Missions should engage the partner government in identifying priority evaluation questions that are also of interest and utility to the government. Evaluations should be timed to inform key decisions and provide timely information. See **Annex Three** for illustrative G2G evaluation questions.

TIP: The ADS 220 revision recommends considering evaluation questions around the effectiveness and sustainability of G2G assistance. Remember that if you want to evaluate for effectiveness and/or sustainability, this should be built into the project design. An evaluator will look at effectiveness and sustainability in reference to the criteria the mission defined during project design to understand progress made toward achieving objectives.

Recognize the difficulty of evaluating for impact and attribution. In most cases, impact evaluation will not be an appropriate form of evaluation for G2G assistance activities given the lack of a valid counterfactual. In other words, there is no control group for a Ministry of Education or a country's

Parliament to understand what would have happened in the absence of USAID assistance. G2G assistance will, in most cases, be most amenable to evaluation approaches that recognize the complexity of the environment in which USAID is operating as well as the multiple actors that may contribute to changes in capacity and other development outcomes. Generally, a rigorous evaluation methodology with a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods will be optimal. Unless there is a particular pilot intervention that a partner government entity is implementing with intent to scale (e.g. a Ministry of Education piloting the use of performance-based incentives for teachers) or other unique circumstances in the implementation approach (e.g. an intervention that is phased or rolled-out over time), then in most cases evaluation will be evaluating for USAID *contribution* to certain performance and capacity outcomes rather than *attribution*. If an impact evaluation is planned, planning for the impact evaluation should begin during project design and be articulated in the Project M&E and Learning Plan.

Use evaluation as means to strengthen local evaluation capacity. G2G assistance can support the capacity of the partner government to undertake the evaluation of G2G activities and use the results generated. In cases in which an evaluation is not required and is instead being undertaken by the Mission for management or learning purposes, jointly undertaking evaluations with the government may be a possibility and provides an opportunity to strengthen the partner country’s internal evaluation capacity. The PFMRAF, combined with other assessments, should be helpful in identifying appropriate entities within the partner government (e.g. statistical or research agencies) or within the government entity (e.g. an independent evaluation or audit office) with which USAID could partner on G2G evaluation efforts. When conducting evaluations, missions should also consider opportunities to build local evaluation capacity by engaging locally-based evaluation firms or researchers (see ADS 203.3.1.7 for guidance on “Participation in Evaluations”).

Considerations for Collaboration, Learning, and Adaptive Management in G2G Activities

All projects that have a G2G component should ideally have a collaboration, learning, and adapting (CLA) approach that encourages learning throughout project implementation. The CLA approach provides an opportunity to outline processes for Mission and partner government collaboration, analysis, and reflection so that activities remain effective, relevant, and responsive to emergent opportunities. Project design is an important opportunity for the project team to identify ways in which CLA will be integrated into the project and its activity components. The integration of CLA may also be informed by the mission’s CDCS.

Examples of opportunities that may be integrated into the mission’s CLA approach for G2G assistance include:

- Periodic portfolio reviews with partner government partners, other donors, and stakeholders to reflect upon the implementation experience, successes, challenges, and opportunities;

EXAMPLE: In 2011 and 2012, the USAID Zambia Education Team organized and joined Ministry of Education officials from central, provincial, and district levels on field visits to over 100 schools in all ten provinces. The objective of the visits was to assess conditions and ask school heads and teachers what was needed for pupils to improve their learning performance. This intensive field work generated a collective set of insights, stories, and understandings about what was needed as a basis for program strategies and objectives.

Source: USAID G2G Education Toolkit (Feb 2014). Bureau of Economic Growth, Education and Environment.

- Joint assessments of capacity development outcomes with the partner government entity;
- Critically reflecting on the theory of change with the partner government and other stakeholders, including any unexpected or emergent factors that are creating or closing windows of opportunity; and
- Re-visiting analyses conducted during project design to assess if and what changes have occurred and if assumptions still hold.

Similarly, formal reviews and assessments can be carried out in a collaborative manner. In some cases, new findings and learning may prompt the Mission to re-assess the implementation approach, outputs, and expected outcomes in collaboration with the partner government and other stakeholders.

Share your Experiences!

We look forward to hearing from you about your experiences with monitoring and evaluating G2G activities, and collaborating and learning with partner government counterparts. What are your reactions to the ideas in this discussion note? Based on your experiences with G2G assistance, what has worked well? What has not worked well? What have you learned? What examples can you share? What questions do you have? Where are your knowledge gaps?

Please share your thoughts via the following [online ProgramNet discussion forum](#). Comments can also be sent to Christine MacAulay (cmacaulay@usaid.gov) and Lacy Kilraine (lkilraine@usaid.gov).

RESOURCE: USAID's [Learning Lab](#) has resources on integrating collaboration, learning, and adapting into mission programming. The site also provides a forum for virtual learning and exchange. The [Program Cycle Learning Guide](#) has considerations for [facilitating capacity development](#), including the [capacity development of local partners](#), and other resources on [convening stakeholders](#) and using approaches that [strengthen country systems](#) and build local capacity.

**Annex One. How G2G Agreements differ from Awards to Implementing Partners:
Performance Monitoring, Evaluation, & Learning in the Program Cycle**

This table provides an overview of some of the potential differences between awards to implementing partners and G2G agreements with regard to performance monitoring, evaluation, and learning in the USAID Program Cycle.

Program Cycle Component	Award to an Implementing Partner	Government-to-Government Assistance Agreement
<p>Performance Monitoring</p> <p>Roles and Responsibilities</p> <p><i>What are the respective roles of USAID and the partner government in monitoring, evaluation, and learning?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection and reporting responsibilities are specified in the solicitation. Expectations regarding performance monitoring, reporting, data quality assurance, etc. are further defined in the award and Activity M&E and Learning Plan. • For roles and responsibilities for contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, mission staff should consult appropriate ADS policy, relevant regulations, and Mission Orders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Missions should pay careful attention during the project design stage to clarify monitoring roles and responsibilities of the partner government entity, including with regard to indicator definitions, data collection methodologies, and reporting. Defining monitoring roles and responsibilities can require considerable upfront discussion, collaboration, and negotiation with the partner government. • Preliminary indicators, data collection methodologies, and data collection responsibilities should be discussed with partner government counterparts during project design and included, as appropriate, in the G2G agreement. Where possible, consider opportunities to align data collection processes with existing government systems. • The government’s specific roles and responsibilities should be clearly specified in the G2G agreement. Within the agreement, specify expectations regarding periodic performance monitoring, reporting, formal joint implementation reviews, and expectations for collaboration and learning. • Consider the respective roles and responsibilities, and appropriate balance, of the different actors that will be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of the G2G activity, including USAID, the partner government

Program Cycle Component	Award to an Implementing Partner	Government-to-Government Assistance Agreement
		<p>implementing entity, and any third party contractors and CSOs/CBOs, etc. that are involved in monitoring and project implementation. Each actor engaged in monitoring and evaluation needs to be clear about the delegation of responsibilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prior to signing the G2G agreement, the Mission should be also clear as to how it will work with the partner government implementing entity to address any capacity constraints that could affect its ability to effectively perform its monitoring and evaluation responsibilities. • Roles and responsibilities should be within the scope of ADS policy, relevant regulations, and Mission Orders.
<p>Identifying Performance Indicators</p> <p><i>How will progress and performance toward the objectives of the G2G partnership be measured?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • At the project level, the project design team identifies performance indicators during project design, with particular attention to higher level performance indicators, and incorporates any indicators that the implementing partner will be expected to collect in the solicitation. • At the activity level, the implementing partner suggests additional performance indicators in the proposal and the Activity M&E and Learning Plan, which is approved by the USAID COR/AOR. • During project design, the project design team identifies the project’s critical assumptions and context indicators to monitor those assumptions. • If any complex, emergent outcomes (e.g. capacity development, systems strengthening) will be an explicit objective of the activity, consider 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The project design team identifies performance indicators during project design in collaboration with the partner government, with particular attention to higher level performance indicators. The project design team engages the partner government in jointly identifying performance indicators for mutually agreed upon objectives. Consider approaches for measuring the project’s specific capacity building objectives. • Consider performance indicators that are of interest to both the partner government and USAID. At the same time, jointly defined indicators should still meet USAID’s need to measure progress toward strategy and project results. • Project design also provides the opportunity to work with the partner government to identify critical assumptions and context indicators to monitor those assumptions. • In addition to performance and context indicators, the

Program Cycle Component	Award to an Implementing Partner	Government-to-Government Assistance Agreement
	<p>opportunities to complement traditional performance monitoring approaches with complexity-aware approaches.</p>	<p>mission may want to identify milestones, benchmarks, and/or pre-implementation metrics that serve as additional indications of progress and performance in the G2G partnership or which serve as disbursement benchmarks.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If any complex, emergent outcomes (e.g. capacity development, systems strengthening) will be an explicit objective of the G2G partnership, consider opportunities to complement traditional performance monitoring approaches with complexity-aware approaches.
<p>Project M&E and Learning Plan</p> <p><i>What is the Mission’s approach for monitoring, evaluation, and learning over the life of the project?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on guidance in ADS 201 and ADS 203, the project design team develops the Project M&E and Learning Plan during project design, as an Annex to the Project Appraisal Document (PAD). • The Project M&E and Learning Plan serves as a reference over the course of project implementation. It provides the framework for monitoring and evaluation across all mechanisms contributing to a project, including indicators that will be collected by multiple mechanisms, data collection methodologies, evaluation questions, the project learning approach, etc. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Based on guidance in ADS 201 and ADS 203, the project design team develops the Project M&E and Learning Plan during project design, as an Annex to the Project Appraisal Document (PAD). • The Project M&E and Learning Plan serves as a reference over the course of project implementation. When one of the mechanisms of a project is a G2G agreement, the Project M&E and Learning Plan will likely reflect some of the partner government’s thinking around indicators, data collection, methodologies, evaluation questions, the project learning approach, etc. • If the project will have multiple mechanisms associated with the G2G component (e.g. a third party contract providing technical assistance to the government), the Project M&E and Learning Plan should specify what role the partner government will have in working with USAID to jointly monitor progress across the project components.

Program Cycle Component	Award to an Implementing Partner	Government-to-Government Assistance Agreement
<p>Activity M&E and Learning Plan</p> <p><i>What is the Mission's and partner government's plan for monitoring, evaluation, and learning of the G2G component of the project?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Activity M&E and Learning Plan is developed by the implementer and must be submitted to the USAID COR/AOR within 90 days of the award. • The implementing partner incorporates performance indicators identified in the RFP, as well as can suggest additional performance indicators (which can also be suggested in the proposal). • USAID COR/AOR reviews the Activity M&E and Learning Plan and associated indicators, collaborates with the partner to make revisions, and approves the Activity M&E and Learning Plan. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Each G2G assistance activity should have an Activity M&E and Learning Plan. Depending on the level of capacity of the partner government entity, the Activity M&E and Learning plan can be primarily developed by the partner government entity (with final approval from USAID), jointly developed between the entity and USAID, or developed with the support of a third party technical assistance contractor. • In the case of a G2G activity, the Activity M&E and Learning Plan will generally focus on the specific tasks being implemented by the government; any third party contractors hired by USAID to work with the government will have their own M&E and reporting requirements, in accordance with ADS 203. • Depending on the nature of the assistance agreement, in some cases the Mission may want to incorporate the M&E plan as a milestone or pre-condition to disbursement of funds. • The Mission should clarify both timeframe and who will be involved in the approval of G2G Activity M&E and Learning Plans, if this is not already specified in the Mission's <i>Mission Order on Performance Monitoring</i>.
<p>Activity Level Monitoring</p> <p><i>What is the process for regularly monitoring progress toward the objectives of the G2G partnership? What is the process for addressing</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • COR/AOR is responsible for making sure that implementation is on track and that data reported in a timely, consistent, and accurate manner, in collaboration with the project manager. The COR/AOR is responsible for data quality, including data quality assessments, and conducting site visits. In some cases, missions may have M&E platforms that provide additional support for aspects of monitoring that are not inherently governmental. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The G2G POC (COR/AOR equivalent for G2G assistance) is responsible for making sure that implementation is on track and data reported in a timely, consistent, and accurate manner, in collaboration with appropriate mission counterparts and based on mission processes and procedures for G2G assistance. The data quality standards and data quality assessment requirements of ADS 203 apply. • Depending on the monitoring and evaluation capacity of the

Program Cycle Component	Award to an Implementing Partner	Government-to-Government Assistance Agreement
<p><i>performance concerns, troubleshooting, and making course corrections?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The implementer is also responsible for reporting good quality data to USAID, including by making sure that they are receiving good quality data from sub-contractors. Many implementers have an M&E specialist to help manage activity M&E and reporting. The implementer’s role in data quality assurance should be budgeted for and described in the award. COR/AOR works with the implementer (and, if needed, OAA and the RLA) to mitigate potential issues with poor quality or inaccurate data. 	<p>partner government entity, USAID may contract a third party technical assistance provider to directly support the government on M&E, including related to data collection and data quality assurance.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> USAID should be clear prior to signing the agreement about the approach it will take to work with the government to address any performance and data quality concerns. Expectations regarding site visits, data quality assessments, reporting, and other accountability measures should be explicitly communicated and agreed upon prior to signing the agreement.
Evaluation		
<p>Evaluation Questions</p> <p><i>Which questions are of the most interest to USAID and the partner government to inform implementation, decision-making, and learning around the G2G activity as well as G2G assistance more broadly?</i></p>	<p>If USAID determines that an evaluation related to the activity/project will be undertaken because it is: (1) required per ADS 203 (e.g. large or “proof of concept”/pilot); or (2) desired for other management and/or learning reasons (see ADS 203):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation questions should be meaningful for management, decision-making and learning. The implementer and external experts may be consulted when developing evaluation questions (consult OAA regarding conflict of interest issues). All required evaluations (see ADS 203.3.1.3) must be led by an external team lead (i.e. one external to USAID and who has no fiduciary relationship with the implementer). 	<p>If USAID determines that an evaluation related to the activity/project will be undertaken because it is: (1) required per ADS 203 (e.g. large or “proof of concept”/pilot); or (2) desired for other management and/or learning reasons (see ADS 203):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation questions should be meaningful for management, decision-making and learning. Consider evaluation questions about the effectiveness and sustainability of the use of partner government systems in meeting assistance objectives and the effectiveness of capacity building support to partner government entities. The partner government should be involved in discussions with USAID to identify priority evaluation questions. If the evaluation is required (see ADS 203.3.1.3), then the evaluation must be led by an external team lead. For non-required evaluations, the government may have a greater role in participating in the evaluation as a means to build internal evaluation capacity.

Program Cycle Component	Award to an Implementing Partner	Government-to-Government Assistance Agreement
<p>Types of Evaluation</p> <p><i>Which type of evaluation is most appropriate to evaluate G2G activities?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The type of evaluation (i.e. evaluation methods, level of rigor, etc.) depends on the nature of the evaluation questions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The type of evaluation (i.e. evaluation methods, level of rigor, etc.) depends on the nature of the evaluation questions. While impact evaluation may be appropriate in a limited number of cases, in most cases it is expected that G2G assistance will be more amenable to evaluation approaches that recognize the complex aspects of the environment in which USAID is operating and looks at the contribution, rather than attribution, of USAID assistance to outcomes. Generally, a rigorous evaluation methodology with a combination of qualitative and quantitative evaluation methods will be optimal.
<p>Evaluation Implementation</p> <p><i>What are some of the considerations before and during the implementation of an evaluation of a G2G activity?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Given USAID's extensive work with local partners, many USAID activities/projects collaborate with partner governments. As such, many evaluations of non-G2G activities/projects will still involve partner governments in some way. Depending on the nature of the project or activity being evaluated, the partner government may be contacted to participate in the evaluation process, or be otherwise informed about the evaluation process. The involvement of local evaluators on the evaluation team is encouraged. The Mission should have a clear dissemination and utilization plan for all completed evaluations and inform relevant stakeholders, including partner government counterparts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> When the activity being evaluated is a G2G activity, additional care is needed to communicate expectations about the partner government's involvement (or lack thereof) in the evaluation early in the evaluation process. During the evaluation, partner government counterparts may be called upon to serve as key informants, participate in focus groups, or fill out surveys as part of the evaluation. The involvement of local evaluators on the evaluation team is encouraged. Since the partner government is a key stakeholder in the evaluation process, USAID should inform the partner government of the approximate timeline for the evaluation as well as discuss the dissemination approach, including when and how findings will be shared with the government and utilized to inform project implementation.

Program Cycle Component	Award to an Implementing Partner	Government-to-Government Assistance Agreement
Learning		
<p>Collaborative Learning Approach</p> <p><i>How will collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) processes and practices be integrated into projects that have a G2G component?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A robust CLA strategy will help the Mission to actively learn from project and activity implementation and adaptively manage their activities in response to emergent findings. • Expectations regarding CLA should be incorporated in the award and refined in the Activity M&E and Learning Plan and contribute to the Mission’s broader CLA approach. • Identify opportunities for collaboration and joint learning with stakeholders both during project design and actively throughout project implementation. • New findings and learning may prompt the Mission to re-assess the implementation approach, outputs, and expected outcomes in collaboration with the implementing partner and other stakeholders, including, potentially, partner government stakeholders. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All projects that have a G2G component should ideally have a CLA approach. G2G assistance is an important opportunity to learn from knowledge gained. In a G2G activity, the CLA approach may include, for example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ periodic meetings, joint assessments and portfolio reviews with the partner government and other donors and stakeholders; ○ critically reflecting on the theory of change in collaboration with the partner government, including any unexpected or emergent factors that are creating or closing windows of opportunity; ○ re-visiting analysis conducted during project design to re-assess assumptions; and ○ analysis of how learning can feed into the Mission’s implementation and adaptive management approach. • Identify opportunities for collaboration and joint learning with the partner government both during project design and actively throughout project implementation. • New findings and learning may prompt the Mission to re-assess the implementation approach, outputs, and expected outcomes in collaboration with the partner government and other stakeholders.

Annex Two: Monitoring & Evaluation Roles and Responsibilities: Illustrative Framework

This table provides an illustrative framework for outlining the various roles and responsibilities of the different actors that may be involved in the monitoring and evaluation of a G2G activity. Roles and responsibilities can vary by G2G activity, even at the same mission, depending on the nature of the activity, the capacity needs of the partner government entity, and other factors.

		Illustrative Roles and Responsibilities		
		Oversight of, or monitoring progress toward, certain outputs or milestones	Monitoring progress toward achieving outcomes	Evaluation
Potential Actors Involved	Questions to Ask	<p><i>Outputs are immediate, tangible, and verifiable (e.g. work plan developed, technical assistance provided, stakeholder meeting held)</i></p>	<p><i>Outcomes are the higher level project objectives identified in the project's logic model (e.g. new human resources practices adopted, service delivery improved) and usually take some period of time to achieve</i></p>	<p><i>Evaluation is the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of programs and projects as a basis for judgments to improve effectiveness and/or inform decisions about current or planned programming (e.g. were the objectives achieved? why or why not?)</i></p>
USAID/Mission <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Office M&E • Technical Offices M&E • G2G Activity Manager (i.e. COR/AOR equivalent for G2G) • OFM • RLA • Project Design Team 	<p><i>How will responsibilities for M&E be delegated across the Mission and across offices?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Office and Tech Offices → Identifying appropriate milestones, monitoring of outputs • OFM → Costing milestones • RLA → Reviewing milestones in accordance with legislative and legal provisions • G2G Activity Manager → Verifying milestones in consultation with PO, OFM 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Office and Tech Offices → Identification of outcome-oriented performance indicators (e.g. civil service skills, knowledge gained, capacity metrics) in collaboration with partner government entity, data quality assurance • Tech Office → Setting targets, data quality assurance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Program Office and Tech Offices, G2G Activity Manager → identification of evaluation questions, evaluation SOW development, evaluation procurement, evaluation management, evaluation utilization
Partner Government Entity <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Entity leadership • Entity Technical Office • Entity M&E Unit • Project Management or Support Unit (PMU) 	<p><i>What capacity exists in the partner government entity to do monitoring and oversight? Who will be responsible for M&E? Is there a civil service M&E team that can play a supporting role?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical unit and leadership → Collaboration and agreement with USAID in identifying appropriate milestones. • Technical Office → Activity M&E and Learning Plan. Responsible for monitoring milestones and reporting progress to USAID. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PMU → Routine performance monitoring • PMU and M&E Office → Data verification, other data collection, verification, and reporting to USAID 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation conceptualization, SOW development, utilization

<p>Implementing Partner Contracted by USAID to provide Technical Assistance to Partner government</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support in building partner government technical capacity • Support to M&E Unit • Other TA support 	<p><i>What role will the TA provider have with regard to data collection, verification, and reporting to USAID? How will the third party TA provider work with civil service staff in the partner government entity to support M&E capacity?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support partner government entity in meeting Conditions Precedent • Support partner government entity to develop the Activity M&E Plan • Training of partner government in M&E 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Data collection and verification • Data quality assurance • Training of government partner in data collection and data quality assurance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support for SOW development and evaluation implementation • Jointly conduct evaluations and assessments with government partners in “learning by doing” approach
<p>Partner government IPs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-national government entities • NGOs implementing activities on behalf of the government 	<p><i>What role will government IPs have in data collection, reporting, quality assurance, and data verification? What checks and balance are in place to ensure data quality?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification of progress toward milestones 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Routine performance monitoring 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participation in evaluation conceptualization, implementation
<p>Other 3rd Party M&E Provider</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • USAID M&E Platform • Local Research/Survey Firms • Partner government M&E-focused ministry or office • NGOs/CSOs/CBOs 	<p><i>What additional support is needed from 3rd parties for tasks such as establishing baselines and targets, collecting data, and doing routine performance monitoring, activity oversight, and providing data quality assurance?</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Verification and oversight • Training/capacity development of partner government in M&E • Training/capacity development of third party monitors (e.g CSOs/CBOs for social accountability monitoring) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Work with USAID and partner government to collect baselines and establish targets • Data collection • Support for data quality assurance • M&E support for partner government 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluation implementation • Dissemination of evaluation findings • Support the development of the government’s internal evaluation capacity

Illustrative Oversight Tasks	Illustrative Performance Monitoring Tasks	Illustrative Evaluation Tasks
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification of milestones • Costing of milestones • Verification of conditions precedent • Monitoring of certain outputs • Funds Disbursement • Financial Reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development and definition of performance indicators • Establishment of baselines and targets • Determination of data collection methods • Data quality assurance • Review and analysis of performance data • Data utilization for adaptive management, decision-making, and learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developing evaluation questions • Evaluation SOW development • Evaluation procurement • Evaluation management and coordination • Evaluation implementation • Utilization of evaluation findings

Annex Three: Illustrative G2G Assistance Evaluation Questions⁴

Project Questions

USAID Objectives

- Is the project meeting the intended capacity-development objectives it set out to achieve (note: requires a well-defined theory of change)? Are there any alternative explanations for observed outcomes? Are there any unintended consequences of USAID's assistance to the partner government entity?
- Which aspects of the project design are influencing the sustainability of development results?
- What contextual factors are likely to influence the ability of the organization/institution/system to sustain development results?
- How can/does the G2G activity foster greater government transparency and accountability and/or strengthen government-civil society relations?

Development Effectiveness

- To what extent has capacity development led to improved organizational performance in core development functions? To what extent are these changes expected or unanticipated relative to the theory of change that informed the capacity development activities? In what ways have dynamics in the local system constrained or enabled the performance changes anticipated by the theory of change?
- Is "learning by doing" leading to sustained changes in organizational performance? Are these changes being institutionalized? What factors will be important in translating improved organizational capacity into sustained performance?

Risk

- To what extent has the risk assessment informed the project implementation approach? Were there any risks that were not identified or addressed during project design that seriously affected project implementation? How effectively has the mission responded to or adapted the project in response to anticipated and realized risks?

Strategic Questions

Implications for Mission

- What have been the operational and strategic costs and benefits of a shift toward Local Solutions for the Mission at the strategic level? How has the shift to direct assistance through

⁴ Note: Useful evaluations are generally limited in scope (i.e. avoid very broad and general questions), and are informed by a small number of targeted and meaningful evaluation questions that can reveal important insights about project implementation. As such, this Annex is meant merely to provide some ideas about areas of G2G assistance in which missions might consider probing further with evaluation; an evaluation should contain no more than a few of these questions, and any questions should be tailored for the mission context.

the partner country government and/or local organizations changed mission operations and roles and strategic choices?

Selectivity and Focus

- With which partner country entities has USAID had the most success using G2G assistance? Which factors have contributed to some G2G partnerships being more effective than others?
- How effective have the Mission’s technical assistance/capacity building programs been in achieving intended objectives? Which factors have contributed to some TA/capacity building interventions with partner country institutions being more effective than others?⁵

Development Effectiveness

- How has G2G affected USAID’s role and interaction as a development partner with the host country and other donors?
 - To what extent has G2G created opportunities for the mission to have “a seat at the table” in discussions with the partner country and/or other donors?
 - Has the use of G2G assistance increased USAID’s scope for influencing the larger enabling environment for public sector performance?
 - How has G2G shaped the expectations the host country? To what extent is it creating fulfilled/unfulfilled expectations?
- Is there any evidence that a shift to localized aid in a given sector has facilitated greater alignment with partner country development policies and/or coordination with other external funding procedures?

Donor Coordination

- Has the use of localized aid strengthened common ground among donors in prioritizing reforms? Has it increased incentives/opportunities for donor coordination (e.g. joint pooling of resources, donor-to-donor resource transfers)?
- To what extent has G2G expanded partner country scope for aligning and coordinating donor funds in a specified sector? Has the shift to localized aid permitted increased government efficiencies in funds management in that sector?

Risk

- How effectively have risk mitigation strategies, as designed, responded to identified and previously unidentified risks?

⁵ Some factors could include, for instance, leadership, quality of relationship with the partner country government, depth of institutional/political economy analysis, sequencing, quality of technical assistance, Mission-partner relationships, and sectoral focus.