

PN-ABP-24C

son 82697

**Strengthening Performance
Monitoring and Evaluation in A.I.D.
*A Progress Report***

**Office of Evaluation
Center for Development Information and Evaluation
Directorate for Policy
Agency for International Development**

March 1993

Table of Contents

	Page
Summary	v
Introduction	1
Background	1
Strengthening Central Evaluation Studies	2
Setting the Evaluation Agenda	2
CDIE's Approach to Conducting Evaluations	3
Progress in Conducting CDIE Evaluations	5
The Use of Evaluation Findings	5
Strengthening Program Performance Monitoring	6
What is PRISM	7
Progress in Implementing PRISM	8
PRISM Coverage of Bilateral Country Programs	8
PRISM Coverage of Central Programs	9
PRISM Coverage of Cross-Cutting Approaches and Issues	10
Level of PRISM Development in Missions	11
Status of PRISM Reporting	13
PRISM's Impact on Strategic Management	13
Strengthening Project Monitoring and Evaluation	15
Next Steps	16
Central Evaluations	16
Program Performance Monitoring	16
Project Performance Monitoring and Evaluation	17
Infusing Performance Information into Agency Management	17
Appendixes	
References	

Summary

For the past 2 years, the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) has been working to reform its management systems in order to become a more responsive, accountable, and results-oriented Agency. But to manage more strategically, for better development results, managers need a sound basis for assessing how programs are performing. A.I.D.'s efforts have therefore included a major emphasis on strengthening performance monitoring and evaluation.

Recent hard-hitting reviews of A.I.D. management by the General Accounting Office, the Presidentially appointed Ferris Commission, and a joint A.I.D./Office of Management and Budget (OMB) SWAT team have clarified the challenges A.I.D. faces and the problems that still need to be addressed. The reviews have all acknowledged A.I.D.'s progress in strengthening program and project monitoring and evaluation; all have also called for substantial further action.

Strengthening CDIE Central Program Evaluations

Unlike project evaluations that focus primarily on implementation, the central program evaluations conducted by the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) in A.I.D.'s Policy Directorate address broader performance questions that underlie the Agency's strategic planning and programming decisions. More rigorous and independent central evaluations are therefore critical to improving A.I.D.'s ability to learn from experience and to better target resources toward more significant development results. Over the last 2 years, A.I.D. has substantially increased evaluation funding and staffing, developed a comprehensive Agencywide Evaluation Studies Agenda, enhanced the analytical rigor of central evaluations, increased the number of evaluations conducted, and initiated new assessments of A.I.D.'s operations and management systems. Five new evaluation studies were completed by fall 1992 and six additional studies will be completed by the end of 1993.

Strengthening Program Performance Monitoring

A.I.D.'s Program Performance Information System for Strategic Management (PRISM) provides technical assistance, training, guidance, and analytical support to enhance the Agency's ability to clarify objectives, measure performance, and apply performance information in decision-making at all organizational levels. PRISM's first-line application is in helping Missions articulate focused strategic plans, establish corresponding performance indicators, and routinely assess program progress so that Mission decision-makers can modify strategies and tactics accordingly. The PRISM information system is built on these operational-level systems, gathering performance data from each Mission into an Agencywide database from which we report annually.

PRISM currently includes 55 Missions representing 73 percent of the countries and 77 percent of the bilateral resources for which it is currently applicable. By the end of FY 1993, PRISM will include almost all of A.I.D.'s bilateral programs; by the end of FY 1994, PRISM will also encompass all of A.I.D.'s central and regional programs.

Analysis of PRISM data has helped clarify Agencywide programming patterns and priorities, summarized expected results, related program objectives to budget resources, and provided preliminary information on actual program accomplishments. The PRISM process already appears to be affecting Mission strategic planning and management as evidenced by a sharper focusing of program strategies and an increased attention to program results.

Strengthening Project Monitoring and Evaluation

A.I.D. has continued providing leadership, coordination, guidance, and technical support for decentralized project monitoring and evaluation activities, but these efforts are now being greatly expanded, as recommended by external management reviews.

For example, CDIE is developing new evaluation guidance that clarifies roles and responsibilities for different kinds of performance monitoring and evaluation activities. We are also developing manuals, training, and technical assistance efforts to help Missions, offices, and bureaus obtain monitoring and evaluation information that best meets their, and the Agency's, needs.

Infusing Monitoring and Evaluation Information into Decision-Making

A.I.D. is taking a number of steps to ensure that monitoring and evaluation information is fully reflected in key policy, program, and budget decisions. This includes

developing new monitoring and evaluation workshops and training, new personnel performance appraisal elements, better systems for tracking A.I.D. monitoring and evaluation activities, and new automated program and project performance reporting systems. A.I.D. will also ensure that evaluation information is fully incorporated in budget and program reviews, Annual Budget and Congressional Presentation submissions, and other key decision-making arenas.

Strengthening Performance Monitoring and Evaluation in A.I.D. *A Progress Report*

Introduction

For the past 2 years, the Agency for International Development (A.I.D.) has been working to reform its management system in order to become a more responsive, accountable, and results-oriented Agency. Management improvements already underway to enable a more performance-based approach to decision-making in A.I.D. include introducing strategic planning principles, creating new program performance measurement systems, focusing and concentrating programs, strengthening evaluations, and embarking on a broad "cultural" transformation aimed at improving its ability to "manage for results."

Recent hard-hitting reviews of A.I.D. management by the General Accounting Office (GAO), the Presidentially appointed Ferris Commission, and a joint A.I.D./Office of Management and Budget (OMB) SWAT team have clarified the challenges A.I.D. faces and the problems that still need to be addressed. These reports have also acknowledged A.I.D.'s progress in reforming management systems and, particularly, in strengthening program performance monitoring and evaluation.

This progress report describes how A.I.D. has strengthened central evaluations and developed a new Program Performance Information System for Strategic Management (PRISM). It discusses how the products of these efforts are already being applied in some program, policy, and budget decisions, and it outlines further steps that need to be taken.

Background

To manage more strategically for better development results, managers need a sound basis for assessing program performance. On October 31, 1990, the A.I.D. Administrator announced a new initiative to "strengthen the role of evaluation" as one basis for better program and policy decisions and more convincing performance reporting for external accountability.

The Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) of A.I.D.'s Policy Directorate was charged with implementing the new initiative. The main efforts undertaken over the last 2 years include

- Conducting more rigorous and independent assessments of program results and operational system effectiveness
- Developing new Agencywide capacities to monitor program performance
- Strengthening technical leadership and support for monitoring and evaluation throughout the Agency
- Making monitoring and evaluation information more widely available for use in program, policy, and budget decisions at all organizational levels

To implement the initiative, a new Office of Evaluation was created within CDIE in September 1991. The direct hire professional staff of this new office has increased to 23 (with 3 additional professional staff positions currently vacant), compared with

just 9 before the initiative. Also, two major contracts were put in place by October 1991 to provide additional evaluation and program performance monitoring support services. Program funds allocated to this new office jumped to over \$5 million in FY 1992, compared with just over \$1 million per year before the initiative began.

The following sections review CDIE's progress in implementing the Evaluation Initiative and assess its effects in improving A.I.D.'s ability to "manage for results."

Strengthening Central Evaluation Studies

This section reviews progress in strengthening CDIE's capacity to undertake central evaluation studies and increase their impact on program and policy decision-making.¹

A broad program of independent, rigorous evaluation studies is critical to improving A.I.D.'s ability to learn what works well and what does not, so that resources can be better targeted to achieve greater development impact. With the announcement of the Administrator's Evaluation Initiative came a significant increase in staff and resources for CDIE's program of central evaluation studies. Unlike project evaluations, which tend to focus primarily on implementation issues (and which remain the responsibility of the Missions and bureaus responsible for the projects), CDIE's program evaluations examine program results and focus on the broad performance issues that should underlie the Agency's strategic planning and programming decisions (see Box 1). The increase in resources for this function has enabled CDIE to enhance its standards for analytical rigor, increase the number of program evaluations it conducts, and move into a new area of inquiry—assessment of A.I.D.'s operations and management systems.

Box 1. Dimensions of Performance

What Performance Issues do CDIE Evaluations Address?

- **Effectiveness:** CDIE evaluations examine effective use of program products and services.
- **Impact:** Evaluations examine longer range development results in influencing quality of life, incomes, or behavior of people.
- **Efficiency:** Program outcomes in relation to costs are examined.
- **Sustainability:** The sustainability of program activities and benefits following the end of A.I.D. involvement is examined.
- **Relevance:** Evaluations also examine program objectives and approaches in light of changing development problems and trends.
- **Replicability:** They examine whether program activities and benefits have spread to other communities.

Setting the Evaluation Agenda

Central to ensuring the relevance of CDIE's evaluation work is the Administrator's Evaluation Studies Agenda—a description and schedule of central evaluation studies to be conducted over the next 3 years (Administrator's Evaluation Studies Agenda: FY 1992-1994). Updated annually, the Agenda is vetted in draft throughout A.I.D./Washington and field Missions, and with OMB, to ensure that the workplan addresses the issues that strategic decision-

¹ For a summary of some of the important findings from recent CDIE-sponsored central evaluation studies, see chapter 3 of the "Annual Report to the Administrator on Program Performance," March 1993.

makers and program planners alike see as most important. Criteria for selection of topics for the Agenda are

- The relevance of the topic to strategic decision-making and the likelihood that the results will be utilized
- The importance of the topic in terms of the size of planned budgets
- The feasibility of conducting a meaningful evaluation (Are data available and program experience adequate?)
- The adequacy of CDIE resources (staff and budget) to perform the study well
- Balance/coverage of the Agenda across the important program areas of A.I.D.'s portfolio

A listing and schedule of the CDIE studies underway or planned for FY 1993-1995 appear in Table 1.

CDIE's Approach to Conducting Evaluations

CDIE evaluations are of several types. Most focus on assessing the performance and development results of A.I.D. programs, falling within the broad sectoral categories of policy reform and public sector management; private sector development; human services; agriculture and natural resources management and the environment; and other programs, such as capital infrastructure and democratic initiatives. In addition, CDIE also now conducts assessments of the effectiveness of A.I.D.'s operations and management systems.

CDIE evaluations employ a range of approaches, from desk studies that synthesize findings from existing evaluation reports and other literature, to intensive field-based assessments that involve sending teams to evaluate programs in a series of six to eight countries. Some evaluations combine these methods, undertaking them in phases.

The Evaluation Initiative called for commitment to certain standards or principles, the most important of which are

- Achieving greater relevance and utilization of evaluation findings by A.I.D. managers

- Requiring more rigorous methods and empirical evidence to support evaluation findings
- Assuring greater independence and objectivity

In order to make these commitments a reality, CDIE prepared detailed guidelines for conducting evaluations that incorporate these principles into explicit procedures and methods (Office of Evaluation 1991, 1992). CDIE evaluators have participated in training workshops and are incorporating these guidelines in their work. Rigorous and objective evaluations are essential for producing credible and convincing studies on which managers can base decisions; they have been promoted in CDIE through

- Maintaining independence through sole sponsorship of studies
- Undertaking more systematic evaluation planning, including greater attention to methodology
- Requiring team planning workshops
- Selecting teams on the basis of evaluation and technical expertise and screening them for potential conflicts of interest
- Allowing adequate time for fieldwork
- Stressing the importance of gathering empirical evidence to support findings
- Directing teams to investigate both positive and negative aspects of performance
- Encouraging stakeholders involvement but not obtaining their clearance
- Employing external advisory panels to provide independent reviews of evaluation findings and methods

How CDIE aims to promote the use of its evaluations is discussed later in this section.

Progress in Conducting CDIE Evaluations

Since beginning active implementation of the Evaluation Agenda late in FY 1991, CDIE has

- Begun 11 new evaluation studies

Table 1. Schedule of Evaluation Studies: FY 1993-1995

	1993	1994	1995
Economic Policy Reform and Public Sector Management			
1. Social Safety Nets	■ ■		
2. Methodological Approaches to Policy Reform	● □ □ ■		
3. Managing the Policy Reform Process	● ● □ □	■ ■	
4. Financial Sector Reform	● ● □ □	□ □ ■ ■	
5. Legal, Regulatory Constraints to Policy Reform		● ● □ □	■ ■
6. Policy Reform at Macro, Sector, and Project Levels			● □ □ □
Private Sector Development			
1. Export and Investment Promotion Services	■ ■ ■		
2. Export Promotion, Growth, and Poverty	● □	■	
3. Privatization and the Public Interest	● ●	□ □ □ ■	■
4. Private Provision of Social Services		●	□ □ □ ■
Agriculture, Natural Resources, and the Environment			
1. Forestry and Biodiversity Programs	□ □ □ □	■ ■	
2. Sustainable Agriculture and the Environment	● ● □ □	□ □ ■ ■	
3. A.I.D. Investments in Agriculture		■	
4. Agribusiness	● ●	□ □ ■ ■	
5. Energy Conservation		● □ □	□ ■ ■
6. Food Aid for Development	● ●	●	□ □ ■ ■
Human Services			
1. Child Survival	□ ■ ■		
2. Population	□ ■ ■		
3. Basic Education		● ●	
4. AIDS Prevention and Control		□ □ □ ■	■
5. Health Care Financing		● ● □	□ □ ■ ■
Other Programs			
1. Capital Projects	□ □ □ □	□	
2. Legal Systems Development	□ □ □ □	■ ■	
3. Civil Society	● ● □	□ ■ ■	
4. Disaster Assistance		● □ □	■
5. Decentralization		●	● □ □ ■
Operations and Management Assessments			
1. Performance Based Budgeting	■ ■		
2. Development Through NGOs	● ● □ □	■ ■	
3. Control and Accountability		□ □ ■ ■	
4. A.I.D.'s Use of Technical Assistance		● ● □	□ □ ■
5. Development Through U.S. Universities			● ● □ □

Key: ● = study in design □ = data collection and analysis ■ = synthesis and dissemination

- Completed the data collection and analysis (and in some cases the report writing) for three program evaluations and two operations and management assessments:

Social Safety Nets

Export and Investment Promotion Services

Assistance to Panama

A.I.D.'s In-Country Presence

Performance Based Budgeting

The findings and management implications of these studies and other recent evaluation work are presented in chapter 3 of the "Annual Report on A.I.D. Program Performance." Six additional studies will be completed during 1993.

The Use of Evaluation Findings

Producing a steady stream of relevant, empirically based evaluation results is one thing. But the effort will be a waste of resources unless the results are widely disseminated and actually used to set priorities for Agency programs. CDIE promotes the utilization of its evaluations by involving stakeholders, effectively disseminating findings, articulating the management implications of those findings, and monitoring their utilization.

Involving Stakeholders. A stakeholder is anyone with an interest in the results of an evaluation. Stakeholders in A.I.D. usually include senior management, technical offices, and the bureaus and Missions where CDIE case studies are conducted. Outside stakeholders can include OMB, Congress, GAO, and technical specialists in the subject matter of the evaluation. By involving key stakeholders in the agenda-setting process

and in reviews of evaluation concept papers, designs, and draft reports, CDIE can ensure that its evaluations address relevant questions and do so fairly and that there is a ready audience waiting for the results of each evaluation.²

Disseminating Results. CDIE has revamped its publication series in the past year to concentrate resources on the effective dissemination of results to target audiences. A new policy statement on the dissemination of CDIE evaluations has recently been approved, safeguarding their independence and credibility (see Appendix A). Increased emphasis has gone to Program and Operations Assessment Reports, which synthesize evaluation results and present findings to strategic decision-makers and program managers. These Assessment Reports are based on Technical Reports, which present the findings of country case studies and other data collected and analyzed in the course of an evaluation. (Technical Reports are distributed to narrow technical audiences.) Increased emphasis is also going to evaluation summaries like the eight-page Evaluation Highlights and the two-page Bulletin for Senior Managers, which present the most important actionable findings to key audiences inside and outside the Agency.

At the same time, CDIE greatly increased its emphasis on oral briefings as a means of disseminating evaluation results. Over the past several months, for example, briefings on the evaluation of Export and Investment Promotion Services have been held for A.I.D.'s Administrator and senior management, A.I.D.'s regional bureaus, A.I.D.'s economists, and OMB staff prior to publication of the *Assessment Report*. Similarly, briefings on a second CDIE evaluation, examining A.I.D.'s In-Country Presence,

²

CDIE welcomes stakeholder's perspectives on what are the most important topics and issues for evaluation, comments on factual correctness of evaluation findings, statements, and empirical evidence. Alternative interpretations or conclusions of key stakeholders (e.g., the Mission, regional bureau being evaluated) are sometimes included as a footnote or an appendix to the evaluation report. However, CDIE does not offer stakeholders the opportunity to clear or approve any aspects of its work and avoids cosponsoring evaluations with A.I.D.'s operational units in order to maintain independence.

were made to the Administrator, senior staff, regional bureau leadership, and OMB staff.

Highlighting Management Implications. All CDIE Assessment Reports, Evaluation Highlights, Bulletins for Senior Managers, and briefings now feature management implications of an evaluation's findings. By drawing explicit and actionable management implications, CDIE seeks to increase the likelihood that findings will be put to use.

Collaborating With Others to Promote Use of Findings. Once evaluation results have been effectively disseminated, CDIE alone cannot ensure that they are well utilized. The impact of evaluation findings should be measured, in part, by changes in A.I.D. policies and program priorities. The Policy Directorate's Office of Policy Analysis and Resources and the Operations Directorate need to be fully engaged in this process. In the case of management and operations assessments, it will also require the active participation of the Finance and Administration Directorate. The approach taken with the first evaluation completed under the Evaluation Initiative, an assessment of export promotion services programs, (described in Box 2) may serve as a model for future collaborative approaches for using CDIE evaluation findings for Agency program decisions. Other options are for Annual Budget Submission (ABS) reviews, country strategy reviews, and project design reviews to more systematically examine projects and programs in light of evaluation findings. During the second quarter of FY 1993, CDIE plans to draft Agency guidelines for the utilization of evaluation findings, including the roles and responsibilities of the three directorates.

Strengthening Program Performance Monitoring

The Program Performance Information System for Strategic Management (PRISM) was created to improve A.I.D.'s ability to clarify objectives, measure performance, and apply performance information in decision-making at all organizational levels. As

Box 2. Using Evaluation Findings Export Promotion Services

As a first experiment with the possibilities of using evaluation findings to directly inform programming decisions, the Policy Directorate recently reviewed the Agency's budget database for the trade and investment promotion portfolio to determine how many projects might potentially be affected by the findings of CDIE's evaluation of Export and Investment Promotion Services. The review identified 170 activities, representing about \$200 million in annual obligations, that operated in this subject area. The Operations Directorate is currently conducting a series of portfolio reviews with the regional bureaus to determine the extent to which projects conform to or conflict with the findings and recommendations of the evaluation and to recommend corrective action where needed.

such, PRISM both reflects and supports many of A.I.D.'s broader management reforms and helps translate these reforms into action.

Although strategic planning of one form or another has been practiced by a number of Missions for some time, Agencywide development of the PRISM effort has been under way since April 1991. During this time, CDIE, which manages PRISM, has worked with the regional bureaus, several offices of the central bureaus, and more than 50 Missions to strengthen strategic planning and performance monitoring throughout the Agency.

What Is PRISM?

PRISM is a program performance monitoring, reporting, and management information system for both A.I.D.'s senior managers in Washington and field decision-makers. PRISM's first-line application is in field Missions that have primary responsibil-

ity for implementing U.S. assistance programs. PRISM helps Missions and offices articulate focused strategic plans, establish corresponding performance measurement systems, and routinely assess program progress toward achieving expected results so that Mission decision-makers can modify strategies and tactics accordingly. PRISM is built on these operational-level systems, with performance data from each Mission entered into an Agencywide database, which is used for the Annual Program Performance Report.

PRISM calls for the routine collection of data by Missions to measure their actual progress in achieving program outcomes and strategic objectives (see Box 3). By routinely gathering data to measure and compare actual progress with the targets or expected results established at the outset of the strategic planning process, Missions can obtain "early warnings" when programs are not going as planned. Gaps between actual and targeted performance alert Mission managers to the need for more in-depth evaluations to find out why programs are succeeding or failing, which can lead to program adjustments or termination (and shifting of funds to more promising program areas within the Mission's portfolio).

CDIE's central PRISM database organizes the hundreds of strategic objectives and program outcomes submitted by Missions and offices into a common framework that categorizes or "clusters" similar or related strategic objectives for purposes of analysis, comparison, and reporting Agencywide. This framework was developed through a participatory process that involved a broad spectrum of regional bureau participants and technical experts.

CDIE is responsible for analyzing and reporting annually to senior management on program performance Agencywide, using this database. The intent is that A.I.D./Washington senior managers will, within a few years, be using these PRISM analyses for such purposes as

- Understanding how individual Missions are progressing relative to their planned or expected outcomes in order to keep a cen-

Box 3. Key PRISM Concepts

A *strategic plan* is typically developed using objective tree logic. It consists of (1) one or more (but usually two or three) strategic objectives, (2) the program outcomes necessary to achieve each strategic objective, and (3) indicators that will show whether or not the strategic objectives and the program outcomes have been achieved. The indicators must be tangible and measurable. Therefore, a strategic plan must also specify (4) baseline data for each indicator, (5) expected results or targets for each indicator to be achieved within a certain timeframe, and (6) appropriate data sources for each indicator. This will permit the Mission and bureau to compare actual results with expected results over time.

An *objective tree* is a logical framework linking different levels of results or outcomes according to a causal theory, that is, a certain set of activities will result in certain program outcomes that will achieve a strategic objective.

A *strategic objective* is an objective that is developmentally significant, within a Mission's manageable interest to achieve within a 5- to 8-year time frame, and measurable as an intended result.

A *program* is the entire set of development activities aimed at achieving a strategic objective.

A *program outcome* represents a concrete near-term result (2-5 years) directly attributable to A.I.D. activities that contributes to the achievement of a strategic objective.

An *indicator* is a measure to track progress toward achieving program outcomes or strategic objectives.

An *expected result* is the amount of change to be achieved within an explicit timeframe (established as a target in the strategic plan) and against which performance (actual results) is compared.

tral watch list of problematic programs requiring special attention, diagnosis, and corrective actions

- Knowing which program approaches or strategies typically used by A.I.D. Missions achieve their objectives and which ones do not and using this information to shift resources to the better performing strategies
- Comparing current Mission objectives, programs, and resource flows against possible new Agency mandates or earmarks in order to clarify how the portfolio and budgets may need to be redirected
- Comparing targets set by individual Missions against possible Agencywide targets in order to help decide when a particular Mission program should be "graduated," having fully achieved its intended results
- Recognizing and rewarding Mission progress in gathering and using performance monitoring and evaluation information for strategic management
- Reporting convincingly on program performance to outside oversight agencies, such as Congress and OMB, to fulfill A.I.D.'s commitment to be fully accountable for results

Progress in Implementing PRISM

Over the past year, A.I.D. has made substantial progress in establishing program performance information systems for strategic management in field Missions. Currently, PRISM includes 55 Missions that are implementing strategic planning and program performance monitoring and reporting systems. This compares with 48 Missions in FY 1991, and 9 Missions the year before. In addition to expanding the number of Missions covered by PRISM, progress has also been made in the levels of development of Mission systems. It is important to understand, however, that most Missions are still in the early phases of establishing such systems and that tracking actual program performance against planned targets will by its very nature take time.

Collaborating closely with the regional bureaus, CDIE has supported PRISM development Agencywide through

- **Guidance** in selecting strategic objectives that are both developmentally significant and within Missions' manageable interest, in choosing appropriate indicators to measure progress toward expected results, and in measuring and reporting on program performance
- **Training** and workshops to elucidate PRISM concepts and methods, program performance measurement and reporting procedures, and strategic planning principles
- **Technical assistance** to help Missions and offices establish strategic plans and program performance monitoring and reporting systems
- **Creation of a central PRISM database** to analyze Agencywide program performance

During FY 1992, CDIE participated in 39 technical assistance trips (TDYs) to help Missions clarify Mission strategic objectives, consolidate program strategies and resources around these objectives, and develop systematic means for getting and using program performance information. An additional 40 Mission TDY's are planned for FY 1993.

PRISM Coverage of Bilateral Country Programs

The 55 Missions included in PRISM in FY 1992 represent about 73 percent of the A.I.D. countries and 77 percent of the bilateral resources for which PRISM is currently applicable. This includes more than 90 percent of applicable bilateral resources in the Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Near East regions and more than 60 percent of applicable bilateral resources in Africa, where funding is distributed among a much larger number of relatively small programs. Table 2 summarizes PRISM coverage by region.

Within the coming year, efforts will be made to expand PRISM coverage of the rest of A.I.D.'s bilateral development programs.

Table 2. Missions and Bilateral Resources Covered by PRISM as Percent of Applicable Programs and Resources, FY 1992

Region	Number of Missions Currently included in PRISM	As Percent of Applicable Country Programs ^a	Resources Covered by PRISM as Percent of Applicable Resources ^b
Africa	20	60	62
Asia	10	83	98
LAC	19	90	92
Near East	6	67	91
Total	55	73	77

^a Applicable programs exclude very small programs, programs in base-rights countries (e.g., Israel and Turkey), and programs in Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States (NIS), where it is currently inappropriate to apply PRISM. Including these programs, PRISM currently covers 66 percent of all A.I.D. countries and 57 percent of total bilateral resources.

^b Bilateral resources of country programs covered by PRISM as a percentage of the bilateral resources of currently applicable programs. Bilateral resources include all Development Assistance, Economic Support Funds, Development Fund for Africa, and Public Law (PL) 480 assistance provided bilaterally and excludes regional and centrally funded programs.

However, programs in a few countries may never lend themselves to the kind of strategic planning and performance measurement embodied in PRISM. Programs in Israel, Turkey, and other countries where A.I.D. lacks a resident Mission, for example, represent relatively straightforward resource transfers that lack specific development objectives, indicators, and targets. In addition, some very small programs (especially in Africa) consisting of one or two modest projects aimed at very limited development results, may not warrant PRISM coverage.

Recently developed U.S. assistance efforts in Eastern Europe and the Newly Independent States (NIS) present a different set of problems. These programs currently lack fully operative systems of country-specific Missions and represent arenas where A.I.D. has limited influence on program strategy and priorities vis-a-vis other U.S. Government agencies. Objectives formulated for these programs to date primarily represent categories of assistance rather than national or regional development results, and most

performance tracking continues to be at the project or activity level. CDIE has begun working with Europe Bureau (EUR) and the NIS Task Force staff to help clarify program strategies and develop alternative performance monitoring approaches.

PRISM Coverage of Central Programs

PRISM intends to cover not only Mission activities, but also activities managed by central and regional offices in A.I.D./Washington. Work has already been undertaken with several central offices (e.g., Bureau for Food and Humanitarian Assistance, Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance [OFDA], Office of American Schools and Hospitals Abroad [ASHA], and Office of Food for Peace [FFP]; Bureau for Private Enterprise, Office of Investment [PRE-I]; Bureau for Research and Development, Office of Women in Development [R&D/WID]; and regional bureau programs) and more systematic coverage will begin in FY 1993. However, strategic planning and performance monitor-

ing for central and regional programs involves a number of important differences from country programs.

Most of A.I.D.'s development activities are planned or coordinated by Missions, and country programs have been the basic unit of analysis for most development objectives encompassed by PRISM. From this perspective, many of the activities undertaken through regionally and centrally funded projects, and through food aid, represent additional resources available to Missions in pursuing their own development objectives.

In other words, providing technical support services to Missions is itself a major objective for most central and regional offices. While these services contribute to development results, the results themselves usually fall outside of these offices' manageable interests and remain the responsibility of Missions. Even so, central and regional offices still need their own objectives and indicators to articulate the kinds of services and support they will provide, identify the criteria for measuring performance in providing these services, and track the quality and quantity of services delivered.

Some central and regional offices also pursue their own development objectives that are not otherwise reflected in Mission programs. Disaster mitigation and response by OFDA and support for hospitals and schools abroad by ASHA are obvious cases in point, as are some central bureau research activities. To the extent these activities lay claim to substantial resources and a central place in A.I.D.'s agenda, separate strategic objectives and performance indicators will be needed.

Other central office activities contribute to Mission programs while also addressing wider global concerns. Many activities funded by the Research and Development Bureau, for example, provide technical services to Missions while simultaneously pursuing research objectives that are of primary concern to audiences outside the countries where the research is taking place. Activities that combine attention to national development problems with transnational or global issues, such as climatic warming and narcot-

ics trafficking, are also of this type. To be effectively managed, such global objectives and related performance indicators need to be carefully distinguished from support services objectives and indicators.

Finally, there are some areas, such as population, where a very substantial portion of program activities in developing countries are funded and carried out through centrally (or regionally) funded projects. In such cases, country-level strategic objectives might best be seen as shared between the Mission and the relevant central office. If most of the resources come from central offices, or if numerous countries without A.I.D. Missions are involved, such activities might best be treated and monitored as global objectives.

PRISM Coverage of Cross-Cutting Approaches and Issues

Some central and regional offices seek to reorient or improve a wide range of programs and projects carried out by others within the Agency. The activities of the Women in Development Office (WID) and some of the activities of the Bureau for Private Enterprise are designed in this way. Other A.I.D. offices, such as Food for Peace (FFP), Participant Training, and Private and Voluntary Cooperation are concerned with particular kinds of development activities that contribute to numerous substantive programs. PRISM does not include special strategic objectives for such activities, but rather assumes that their impact will ultimately be felt through improvements in the substantive programs they affect. At the same time, these offices still need to have clear objectives, strategies, indicators, and expected results for managing these activities.

Some cross-cutting themes are of particular interest to external audiences and are subject to special, often congressionally mandated, reporting requirements. While PRISM has not been specifically designed to meet all these reporting needs, it is relevant to several of them. CDIE has, for example, collaborated closely with WID to ensure that gender-disaggregated data are incorporated in PRISM to the greatest extent possible. CDIE and the WID office are currently ana-

lyzing PRISM performance data for use in this spring's Report to Congress on Women in Development. Similarly, CDIE has worked closely with FFP to assess the utility of PRISM data for biannual, congressionally mandated food security reporting. PRISM can also play a role in other cross-cutting areas, such as assessments of poverty alleviation and the management of earmarks.

Level of PRISM Development in Missions

The 55 Missions currently in the PRISM system are at different stages in implementing their program strategies and performance information plans. CDIE identified five levels of development for tracking their implementation progress:³

Level 1: Mission has identified strategic objectives and program outcomes, most or all of which meet Agency (PRISM) standards.⁴

Level 2: Mission has defined indicators that meet Agency (PRISM) standards for most or all of its strategic objectives and program outcomes.

Level 3: Mission has set targets for expected results, has gathered relevant baseline data for all its strategic objectives and program outcomes, and has identified likely sources for future performance data.

Level 4: Mission's annual program performance reports provide data on actual results for most or all of its strategic objectives and program outcomes.

Level 5: Mission is systematically using program performance information for strategic management.

This year we have worked to move Missions at least to the point where they have clarified their strategic objectives and program outcomes and have decided on specific indicators for measuring performance against those objectives (Level 2). Table 3 shows progress achieved to date: 39 Missions at Level 2 or above are ready to implement performance measurement and monitoring plans and 15 Missions at Level 3 or above are actively managing for results by setting performance targets, gathering baseline data, tracking performance, and using performance information in management decisions. Substantial progress has been made since last year when only 21 Missions had achieved Level 2 or above.

In general, Missions in Africa and Latin America, which have been engaged in this process the longest, have achieved higher levels of development than Missions in the Near East, which are relatively new to the PRISM process, or in Asia, which require modifying preexisting plans to meet PRISM standards. Both Near East and Asia Bureaus, however, expect to have most or all of their Missions on board by spring 1993, and PRISM technical support trips (TDYs) have already been scheduled to meet this objective.⁵

Early PRISM technical assistance to Missions stressed strategic planning and helping Missions articulate their strategic objectives, program outcomes, and performance indicators. In FY 1992, emphasis shifted to helping Missions refine indicators and targets, select data sources, and begin collecting and analyzing performance data. In FY 1993, the focus will be increasingly on helping Missions implement more systematic procedures for gathering, using, managing,

³ This five-level rating scale, developed by CDIE, is "progressive" in the sense that a Mission cannot advance to a higher level without first having attained the lower levels. For example, a Mission cannot advance to Level 3 without first having attained Levels 1 and 2.

⁴ In the case of Asia, Level 1 includes Missions with strategic plans that predate Agencywide standards. They are now actively modifying their strategic plans to meet PRISM standards.

⁵ For more details on the status of individual Missions' progress, see Appendixes B and C to this report and McClelland and Horsch 1992.

**Table 3. Progress in Implementing PRISM Systems, FY 1992
Number and Distribution of Missions by Level and Region**

Region	Total	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5 ^a
Africa	20	4 (20%)	12 (60%)	2 (10%)	0 (0%)	2 (10%)
Asia	10	9 (90%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Near East	6	3 (50%)	2 (33%)	1 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
LAC	19	0 (0%)	10 (53%)	1 (5%)	5 (26%)	3 (16%)
Total	55	16 (29%)	24 (44%)	5 (9%)	5 (9%)	5 (9%)

^aThe five Missions that have attained Level 5 deserve special mention: They are Mali, Malawi, Bolivia, Ecuador, and Guatemala.

and reporting program performance information, that is, moving most Missions to Levels 3-5.

This substantial *quantitative* progress in implementing program performance information systems does not, however, necessarily mean that all Missions have well-thought-out strategies, focused objectives, and valid indicators. A recent, preliminary review of the *quality* of Mission strategic plans, for example, indicated that (see also Brown 1992):

- Many Missions' strategic objectives don't yet meet PRISM standards to be both significant and achievable within a 5- to 8-year time frame; some appear to be too ambitious or too broad to be within the Mission's manageable interest, while others may not be ambitious enough.
- Many Missions' strategic objectives still lack clarity and are not logically linked to lower level program outcomes. That is, they do not appear to clearly result from the program outcomes identified to achieve them.
- Some Missions have not yet clarified how individual project activities and resources will contribute to identified program outcomes and strategic objectives.
- In some cases, objectives are framed to encompass multiple program outcomes (i.e., to encompass a wide range of

loosely related Mission activities), without articulating a cohesive, logical, and results-oriented strategy. In other cases, Mission strategies articulate a narrower set of activities and program outcomes, but do not clearly link them to significant strategic objectives.

- Many Missions have not yet systematically eliminated those activities which do not contribute to the achievement of their strategic objectives.
- Some Missions are having trouble setting appropriate, realistic targets or expected outcomes against which to measure future progress.
- Composite objectives, which encompass many, seemingly diverse activities, are sometimes presented with a "laundry list" of indicators. This makes it difficult to assess Mission performance, since many of these indicators are unrelated and different indicators could simultaneously move in different directions.
- Relatively few indicators disaggregate or distinguish program performance by gender, ethnicity, or geographic region, even when activities are clearly focused on particular targeted populations.

PRISM guidance, technical assistance, training, and review and feedback efforts during FY 1993 will focus on helping Missions resolve these difficulties and improve

the quality of their strategic planning and performance monitoring systems.

Status of PRISM Reporting

While considerable progress has been made in establishing PRISM systems in Missions and offices, assembling these data for Agencywide analysis and reporting remains difficult.

Since there is not yet any consistent Agencywide programming or reporting framework, each bureau reported on objectives, indicators, and results somewhat differently in FY 1992. Documents varied widely in format and substance across bureaus and even across Missions within a bureau. Different bureaus had different reporting requirements at different times.⁶ Some bureaus had well-established program performance review procedures, while others remained more eclectic. Some bureaus spent months assessing and correcting Mission data; others forwarded data to CDIE as soon as they were received. Most bureaus did not clearly indicate whether Mission plans had been formally reviewed or approved.

Agencywide efforts, led by the Operations Directorate and supported by CDIE, are already under way to adopt consistent program and project reporting formats and schedules. One approach would add program performance elements to Annual Budget Submission (ABS) reporting—the Program Focus Table in the FY 1994 ABS, for example, makes a start in this direction. Prompt implementation of an automated Portfolio Monitoring System, incorporating annual program (PRISM) level reporting, will be even more useful, reducing paperwork burdens while greatly improving the consistency of program and project management and reporting.

During 1992, CDIE developed and tested a prototype of an automated program/project monitoring and reporting system that generated strong interest from field Missions. This prototype is now being translated (by the Office of Information Resources Management [IRM]) into an Agencywide system that will be piloted in Missions next spring and fully operational next fall.

Another problem confronting CDIE efforts to analyze and report on program performance Agencywide is the great diversity of objectives, program outcomes, and indicators used by Missions and the lack of standardization that would facilitate comparative analyses across countries. This spring CDIE and bureaus will review Mission experience with different program performance measures to identify preferred indicators for core program areas that would enable greater future comparability across Missions where possible and appropriate.

PRISM's Impact on Strategic Management

To assess PRISM's impact on program decision-making, we reviewed a sample of FY 1992 communications between Missions and A.I.D./Washington and interviewed selected CDIE and regional bureau staff. Approximately 170 documents were considered, including Africa Bureau API reports, Latin America and the Caribbean AP/PODS, program performance reports from other bureaus, PRISM TDY reports, bureau issues cables, Mission strategy and performance reviews, program focus narratives from FY 1994 ABSs, and Agency and bureau guidance on program reporting and program performance measurement.

As previously noted, most Missions are not yet routinely and systematically utilizing program performance data in strategic deci-

⁶

This year, CDIE used the following: for Africa, the Assessment of Program Impact (API) documents submitted in the fall of 1991; for Asia, the Program Performance Information (PPI) cables submitted in May 1992; for Latin America and the Caribbean, the FY 1993-94 Action Plan (AP) documents submitted in spring 1992; and for the Near East, PRISM TDY trip reports or Mission-supplied documents.

sion-making. Indeed, most Missions are just now establishing baselines and setting targets against which their future performance will be measured. Most of PRISM's impact to date has therefore been on what might be called results-oriented *strategic planning*, the systematic consideration of expected results in programming, rather than results-oriented *strategic management*, the systematic use of actual results in decision-making.

While these preliminary data are by no means comprehensive, they suggest that Missions began applying a more results-oriented approach to programming decisions in FY 1992. For example

- Twenty-four Missions significantly modified their strategic plans by clarifying, adding, or dropping objectives.
- Eight Missions substantially redesigned activities to enhance their contribution to strategic objectives.
- Eighteen Missions planned to phase out activities that were not sufficiently relevant to objectives.
- Ten Missions justified new activities because they were specifically needed to achieve strategic objectives.

There are also early indications that Missions are gearing up to use performance information for strategic management. Several Missions, for example, emphasized the linkages between future programming decisions and performance indicator data in their performance reporting, and eight Missions modified their performance monitoring plans specifically to obtain more results-oriented data for program decision-making. Other Missions highlighted available data on results, analyzed why preliminary results did not meet Mission expectations, revised monitoring plans to obtain better performance data, or developed new "Mission orders" on monitoring and evaluation. Even more significant, several Missions created new management structures, reorganizing offices or creating strategic objective committees to better manage their programs for development results (see Box 4).

At the bureau level too, there is a clear awareness of and responsiveness to A.I.D.'s

Box 4. Strategic Objective Teams

Several Missions are developing new organizational forms for strategic planning and management. In January 1992, for example, USAID/Guatemala established "strategic objective teams" to coordinate activities associated with each of the Mission's five strategic objectives. The work of the teams was in turn managed by a monitoring and evaluation group, chaired by the Mission director and including the deputy director and team leaders.

As part of the Mission's semiannual portfolio review, each team developed a strategic context for individual project reviews. The teams analyzed progress towards strategic objectives and the status of systems for tracking performance. Reports were presented by each team leader in half-day sessions during the semiannual reporting process.

The teams provided useful analytical support for the traditional exchanges between project managers and the Mission director, as noted in a subsequent reporting cable to the Latin America and the Caribbean Bureau. Strategic decisions were better informed and attention was concentrated on program impact issues. Teams are now developing clearer long-term management responsibilities for strategic objectives. They typically cut across existing organizational units in the Mission (an example of "matrix management").

USAID/Ecuador not only formed strategic objective teams, but also a policy reform team to coordinate reform activities across strategic objectives. The team developed a three-part matrix detailing the relationship of policy reforms to each strategic objective and prioritizing their contribution to the achievement of strategic objectives. The clear articulation of policy reform goals, stakeholders, expected impacts, and A.I.D. leverage has already proven a useful resource in helping the Mission manage its policy reform activities more strategically.

renewed emphasis on managing for results. The PRISM effort itself was informed by earlier pioneering work begun in the Africa Bureau under the Development Fund for Africa, to articulate Mission objectives in terms of “people-level” impacts and to require annual reporting on program performance. Both the Africa and LAC Bureaus, for example, provided feedback to all of their Missions on the quality of program performance reports. LAC formed indicator working groups to provide better feedback on indicator selection and to enhance the bureau’s understanding of performance measurement in the field—an effort that CDIE is now actively following up Agencywide. All of the regional bureaus are instituting new programming and review procedures emphasizing the quality, significance, and achievability of Mission objectives and the analysis of development results.

Strengthening Project Monitoring and Evaluation

In addition to strengthening program monitoring and evaluation, the Evaluation Initiative also mandated stronger leadership, coordination, guidance, and technical support for A.I.D.’s decentralized project monitoring and evaluation activities. While project monitoring and evaluation was not one of CDIE’s initial priorities under the Evaluation Initiative, efforts are now being greatly expanded, as outlined in A.I.D.’s SWAT Team Implementation Plan.

Over the past 2 years, however, CDIE has continued providing support for project monitoring and evaluation, including

- Coordinating assistance to Missions under five development information and evaluation Indefinite Quantity Contracts (IQCs) and competing five new IQCs awarded in the fall of 1992
- Summarizing field evaluation activities reported through the ABS and revising ABS reporting requirements
- Reviewing Mission project monitoring and evaluation activities and linking them

to program performance reporting through PRISM TDYs

- Developing guidelines and scopes of work for special evaluation studies through which Missions could better link project monitoring and program performance data

In May 1992 CDIE also completed a biannual review of 286 Mission evaluations (Hageboek et al 1992) conducted in FY 1989-1990, which found that

- The majority (87 percent) of Mission evaluations were snapshots that looked at performance only at a single point in time.
- Most Mission evaluations relied on expert judgment, rather than on more rigorous evaluation designs.
- Only a small fraction of evaluation teams included individuals with formal evaluation skills.
- Only about one-third of Mission evaluations examined the fit between a project and broader strategies and objectives.
- While 93 percent of the evaluations concluded that projects were succeeding, only 40 percent assessed project achievement at the project purpose level (or above) and only 43 percent addressed sustainability issues.

More generally, while most Mission evaluations successfully addressed implementation issues of concern to Mission managers, they provided little basis for assessing Agencywide project performance.

As recommended in the SWAT team report, A.I.D. is now committed to gathering, using, and reporting more comprehensive information on Agencywide project-level performance. This will require new evaluation guidance that distinguishes formative project evaluations (conducted by and for Missions) from more summative project performance monitoring (for reporting progress annually to A.I.D./Washington) and clarifies requirements for project/activity completion reports that use these longitudinal project performance data, along with other evaluative information, to reach overall judgments about project accomplishments at the time of project completion. We will also improve our

ability to monitor field evaluation activities, expand monitoring and evaluation training and technical assistance, and continue working to more fully infuse monitoring and evaluation information in Agency decision-making.

Next Steps

A.I.D. is making substantial progress in strengthening monitoring and evaluation, but much remains to be done. Emphasis in the coming months will be on completing ongoing CDIE central evaluation studies identified in the Agenda, on refining and extending program performance monitoring and reporting, on strengthening project-level evaluations and on infusing such performance monitoring and evaluation information more fully in Agency decision-making. Full implementation of the actions outlined below will also require the additional budgetary and staff resources specified in the A.I.D./OMB SWAT Team Implementation Plan.

Central Evaluations

After devoting much of the past 18 months to hiring new staff, developing new procedures for the design and implementation of evaluations, and mounting a new generation of studies, CDIE must now deliver a steady stream of operationally relevant, empirically based evaluation results.

Over the next 12 months, findings will be disseminated for the following evaluations:

- Social Safety Nets
- Methodological Approaches to the Assessment of Policy Reform
- Managing the Policy Reform Process
- Export and Investment Promotion Services
- Export Promotion, Growth, and Poverty
- Child Survival
- Population
- Capital Projects
- Legal Systems Development
- Performance Based Budgeting

Other evaluation studies that will be under way during the upcoming year include

- A.I.D.'s Use of Nongovernmental Organizations
- Financial Sector Policy Reform
- Privatization
- Forestry and Biodiversity
- Sustainable Agriculture and the Environment
- Agribusiness
- A.I.D. Investments in Agriculture
- Basic Education
- Civil Society
- Control and Accountability

At the same time, CDIE will focus management attention on two important procedural areas: (1) reducing the length of time still required to report, review, edit, and publish evaluation results; and (2) developing and gaining approval for Agency guidelines for the utilization of evaluation results.

Program Performance Monitoring

More systematic program performance monitoring is already generating much useful information for results-oriented management. To fully meet the Agency's needs, however, this information will need to be more comprehensive, more refined, and more focused on decision-making. Plans for the next 2 years include

- Making further adjustments to Mission objectives and indicators to ensure that they represent significant and measurable results and are within Missions' manageable interests
- Expanding performance monitoring coverage to most remaining field programs
- Clarifying objectives and indicators for A.I.D.'s central and regional programs and expanding PRISM coverage to significant central and regional programs
- Establishing more detailed Agencywide guidelines and procedures for selecting program performance objectives and indi-

cators and for gathering, reporting, and using performance information

- Providing increased oversight, review, and feedback on the quality of Mission performance monitoring systems
- Adopting consistent, Agencywide performance reporting formats and schedules

Project Performance Monitoring and Evaluation

The A.I.D./OMB SWAT team and other external management reviews identified the need for A.I.D. to conduct more objective and systematic project performance monitoring and to report more comprehensively on project results. These efforts will be carefully linked to the existing PRISM system, so that the relationship among project activities, program outcomes, and strategic objectives is clearly evident. Steps planned to strengthen project monitoring and evaluation over the next 2 years include:

- Developing new project performance monitoring and evaluation guidance
- Allocating additional resources to strengthen project monitoring and evaluation capabilities in the field
- Expanding training, technical assistance, methodological support, and oversight and review responsibilities for project monitoring and evaluation activities
- Developing a project performance database linked to PRISM
- Reporting annually on A.I.D.'s project performance

Infusing Performance Information into Agency Management

External reviews also emphasized that A.I.D. needed to ensure that monitoring and evaluation findings were available and used in all important program, project, and budget decisions. Specific actions that will be taken over the next 2 years (some of which are already under way) are as follows:

- Developing consistent, automated Agencywide management information and reporting systems encompassing project implementation, project performance, and program results
- Ensuring that relevant performance monitoring and evaluation findings are used and that CDIE is represented in all major program and budget reviews
- Including appropriate information on program and project performance in external reporting, including Annual Budget Submissions, Congressional Presentations, and other justifications for program, project, or budget decisions
- Developing and implementing a new Agencywide monitoring and evaluation workshop and including adding monitoring and evaluation components in all relevant A.I.D. training
- Including monitoring and evaluation as a core element in all personnel performance appraisals
- Allocating substantially more resources to monitoring and evaluation Agencywide and better tracking of the use of those resources

APPENDIX A

Policy on Publication and Dissemination of Evaluation Products of CDIE's Office of Evaluation

Increasing A.I.D.'s capacity to manage for results requires that the lessons of the Agency's experience, failures as well as successes, be unearthed and reported accurately, regularly, and forthrightly. In announcing his Evaluation Initiative early in FY 1991, the A.I.D. Administrator stressed the need for a "strong and independent evaluation function" that would "present findings with greater candor." Independence and candor are crucial to CDIE's credibility, and that credibility, both within and outside the Agency, is essential if evaluation findings are truly to be the basis for A.I.D. managing and accounting for results.

To safeguard that credibility, CDIE's independence will be protected by the following publication and dissemination policies:

- ***Noncensorship.*** CDIE evaluation reports will not be edited by A.I.D. management. CDIE will circulate draft reports selectively, within and outside the Agency, to ensure factual accuracy, analytical rigor, and balanced perspective. But the head of CDIE will be the final authority for determining the content of a CDIE report.
- ***Public Domain.*** Distribution of a CDIE evaluation report will not be restricted. Once a product meets the standards of CDIE for quality and objectivity, it goes into the public domain. The CDIE director will determine the readiness of an evaluation product for dissemination. Publication and dissemination may, however, be timed for maximum effectiveness in light of other related initiatives.

APPENDIX B

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992^a					
	PRISM LEVELS^b				
Missions	1	2	3	4	5
AFRICA					
Focus Countries:					
Benin					
Burundi ^c	X				
Ghana	X	X			
Guinea	X	X			
Madagascar					
Mali	X	X	X	X	X
Mozambique	X	X			
Nigeria					
Rwanda	X				
Senegal	X	X	X		
Tanzania	X	X			
Uganda	X	X			
Zambia					
Zimbabwe					

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992 ^a					
Missions	PRISM LEVELS ^b				
	1	2	3	4	5
Watch List Countries:					
Cameroon	X	X			
Chad ^c	X	X			
Cote d'Ivoire					
Kenya	X	X	X		
Malawi	X	X	X	X	X
Niger	X	X			
Non-Focus Countries					
Angola					
Botswana ^c	X	X			
Burkina Faso					
Cape Verde					
Central Afr. Rep.					
Comoros					
Congo					
Djibouti					
Ethiopia					

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992^a

PRISM LEVELS^b

Missions	1	2	3	4	5
Gambia	X	X			
Guinea-Bissau	X				
Lesotho	X	X			
Mauritius					
Namibia					
Sao Tome					
Seychelles					
Sierra Leone					
South Africa					
Swaziland	X	X			
Togo ^c	X				
ASIA					
Bangladesh	X ^d				
India	X				
Indonesia	X ^d				
Mongolia	X ^d				
Nepal	X	X	X		
Pakistan	X				
Philippines	X				
Sri Lanka	X ^d				

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992^a					
Missions	PRISM LEVELS^b				
	1	2	3	4	5
Thailand	X ^d				
Afghanistan ^c	X ^d				
Cambodia					
Laos					
LATIN AMERICA AND CARIBBEAN					
Argentina	X	X			
Bahamas					
Belize	X	X			
Bolivia	X	X	X	X	X
Brazil	X	X			
Chile	X	X			
Colombia	X	X			
Costa Rica	X	X	X	X	
Dom. Rep.	X	X			
Ecuador	X	X	X	X	X
El Salvador	X	X			
Guatemala	X	X	X	X	X
Guyana					

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992^a					
Missions	PRISM LEVELS^b				
	1	2	3	4	5
Haiti					
Honduras	X	X	X	X	
Jamaica	X	X	X	X	
Mexico	X	X	X		
Nicaragua	X	X			
Panama	X	X	X	X	
Paraguay	X	X			
Peru	X	X	X	X	
Uruguay	X	X			
Venezuela					
NEAR EAST					
Egypt	X	X	X		
Jordan	X	X			
Morocco	X	X			
Oman	X				
Tunisia	X				
West Bank/Gaza					
Yemen	X				

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992 ^a					
PRISM LEVELS ^b					
Missions	1	2	3	4	5
Lebanon					

NOTE: Country list represents those countries listed in the FY 1993 Congressional Presentation, "Fiscal Year 1993 Summary Tables"; since then, country allocations may have changed and some countries may no longer be receiving A.I.D. funding.

^aThe documents reviewed are as follows:

Africa: Assessment of Program Impact (API), submitted October 1991

Asia: Program Performance Information (PPI), submitted as cables in May 1992

LAC: Action Plan (AP) for FY 1993-94, submitted in spring 1992

Near East: Trip reports, submitted in spring 1992, except for Oman (Strategy Plan) and Tunisia

^bEach level is defined as follows:

LEVEL 1: Mission has strategic objectives and program outcomes, most or all of which meet Agency (PRISM) standards

LEVEL 2: Mission has indicators that meet Agency (PRISM) standards for most or all of its strategic objectives and program outcomes

NOTE: Missions must have achieved a Level 2 designation to be included in the Administrator's FY 1992 target of 75 percent coverage

LEVEL 3: Mission has performance standards (i.e., expected results) and relevant baseline data for most or all of its strategic objectives and program outcomes, and it has identified likely data sources

LEVEL 4: Mission's annual program performance reports provide data on actual results for most or all of its strategic objectives and program outcomes

LEVEL 5: Mission is systematically using program performance information for strategic management

^c Missions without program performance contracts, with contracts under revision, or programs "in flux," as of June 1992

^d Missions at Level 1 that have strategic plans with strategic objectives but no program outcomes

24

APPENDIX C

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992 ^a												
Missions	SO	SO/IN	SO/BL	SO/ER	SO/DS	SO/AC	PO	PO/IN	PO/BL	PO/ER	PO/DS	PO/AC
AFRICA												
Focus Countries:												
Benin												
Burundi ^b	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		X	
Ghana	X	X	X		X		X	X	X		X	
Guinea	X	X			X		X	X			X	
Madagascar												
Mali	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mozambique	X	X					X	X				
Nigeria												
Rwanda	X	X	X				X	X				
Senegal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Tanzania	X	X			X		X	X		X	X	
Uganda	X	X			X		X	X			X	
Zambia												
Zimbabwe												
Watch List Countries:												
Cameroon	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Chad ^b	X	X			X		X	X	X			

2

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992^a

Missions	SO	SO/IN	SO/BL	SO/ER	SO/DS	SO/AC	PO	PO/IN	PO/BL	PO/ER	PO/DS	PO/AC
Cote d'Ivoire												
Kenya	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Malawi	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Niger	X	X			X		X	X			X	
Unique Countries:												
Angola												
Ethiopia												
South Africa												
Other Countries:												
Botswana	X	X			X		X	X				
Cape Verde												
Gambia	X	X			X		X	X			X	
Guinea-Bissau												
Lesotho	X	X			X		X	X			X	
Namibia												
Swaziland	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Togo ^b	X	X	X				X	X	X	X		
Small\Fixed Countries:												
Burkina Faso												

22

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992^a

Missions	SO	SO/IN	SO/BL	SO/ER	SO/DS	SO/AC	PO	PO/IN	PO/BL	PO/ER	PO/DS	PO/AC
Cent. Afr. Rep.												
Comoros												
Congo												
Djibouti												
Mauritius												
Sao Tome												
Seychelles												
Sierra Leone												
ASIA												
Bangladesh	X	X	X	X								
India	X	X										
Indonesia	X	X	X	X								
Mongolia	X	X					X	X				
Nepal	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Pakistan							X	X	X	X		
Philippines							X	X	X	X		
Sri Lanka	X	X										
Thailand	X	X	X	X								
Afghanistan ^c							X	X	X	X		

1

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992^a

Missions	SO	SO/IN	SO/BL	SO/ER	SO/DS	SO/AC	PG	PO/IN	PO/BL	PO/ER	PO/DS	PO/AC
Cambodia												
Laos												
NEAR EAST												
Egypt	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Jordan	X	X					X	X				
Morocco	X	X					X	X				
Oman												
Tunisia												
West Bank/Gaza												
Yemen	X	X					X	X				
Lebanon												
LAC												
Argentina	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Bahamas												
Belize	X	X			X		X	X			X	
Bolivia	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	^
Brazil	X	X					X	X				
Chile	X	X			X		X	X			X	

25

PRISM STATUS REPORT: FY 1992^a

Missions	SO	SO/IN	SO/BL	SO/ER	SO/DS	SO/AC	PO	PO/IN	PO/BL	PO/ER	PO/DS	PO/AC
Colombia	X	X					X	X				
Costa Rica	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Dom. Rep.	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Ecuador	X	X			X		X	X	X	X	X	X
El Salvador	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Guatemala	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Guyana												
Haiti												
Honduras	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Jamaica	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Mexico	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Nicaragua	X	X			X		X	X			X	
Panama	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Paraguay	X	X					X	X				
Peru	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Uruguay	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	
Venezuela												

VA

NOTE: Country list represents those countries listed in the FY 1993 Congressional Presentation, "Fiscal Year 1993 Summary Tables"; since then, country allocations may have changed and some countries may no longer be receiving A.I.D. funding.

^aThe documents reviewed are as follows:

Africa: Assessment of Program Impact (API), submitted October 1991

Asia: Program Performance Information (PPI), submitted as cables in May 1992

LAC: Action Plan (AP) for FY 1993-94, submitted in spring 1992

Near East: Trip reports, submitted in spring 1992, except for Oman (Strategy Plan) and Tunisia

^bMissions without program performance contracts with regional bureau, with contracts under revision, or with programs "in flux," as of June 1992

SO: Mission has strategic objectives;

SO/IN: 50 percent or more of Mission's strategic objectives have indicators

SO/BL: 50 percent or more of Mission's SO indicators have baseline data

SO/ER: 50 percent or more of Mission's SO indicators have expected results

SO/DS: 50 percent or more of Mission's SO indicators have data sources

SO/AC: 50 percent or more of Mission's SO indicators have actual results

PO: Mission has program outcomes

PO/IN: 50 percent or more of Mission's program outcomes have indicators

PO/BL: 50 percent or more of Mission's PO indicators have baseline data

PO/ER: 50 percent or more of Mission's PO indicators have expected results

PO/DS: 50 percent or more of Mission's PO indicators have data sources

PO/AC: 50 percent or more of Mission's PO indicators have actual results

NOTE: To be rated at Level 2, Mission must have satisfied all of the following six criteria: SO/BL, SO/ER, SO/DS, PO/BL, PO/ER, and PO/DS.

du

References

- Brown, Keith. 1992. "An Assessment of Strategic Objectives Frameworks: The Development and Practical Application of Relevant Analytic Tools." Washington, D.C.: Office of Evaluation, A.I.D. October. Draft Report.
- Center for Development Information and Evaluation. 1992. *Administrator's Evaluation Studies Agenda: FY 1992-1994*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Development Information and Evaluation, A.I.D. June.
- Hageboek, Molly, et al. 1992. "A Review of the Quality and Coverage of A.I.D. Evaluation, FY 1980-1990." Washington, D.C.: Office of Evaluation, A.I.D. May.
- McClelland, Donald and Karen Horsch. 1992. "PRISM: A Status Report of Mission Progress." Washington, D.C.: Office of Evaluation. A.I.D. October.
- Office of Evaluation. 1991. *Team Planning Notebook for Field-based Program Assessments*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Development Information and Evaluation, A.I.D. September.
- Office of Evaluation. 1992. *Procedures Guidebook for Conducting CDIE Evaluations*. Washington, D.C.: Center for Development Information and Evaluation, A.I.D. June.