

EVALUATION PLAN FOR USAID DEMOCRACY & GOVERNANCE ACTIVITIES

Social Science Research Council

8 January 2004

This memo responds to the DG office's request for more guidance on how to implement an evaluation of democratization programs, utilizing the research design created by Kenneth Bollen et al in late 2003. In the following pages, we outline a plan to implement an evaluation using cross-national longitudinal sectoral analysis, combined with country expert reports. Because the suggested budget for an evaluation is extremely restricted (<0.1% of the programs being evaluated, more than an order of magnitude less than a typical expenditure for evaluations of nonprofit organizations) and must be done retrospectively, choices of methods, operations, and scope must be made that will leave out many desired elements. An example is country contextual factors: developing a data set for contextual factors in each country studied in addition to what is suggested is simply impossible given budget constraints. Such considerations lead us to a heavy dependence on country experts (top-level academics with extensive, multi-disciplinary knowledge of countries) who can draw readily on prior research, personal and professional contacts within the countries, worldwide academic networks, etc.—in other words, indispensable assets that already exist at no cost to USAID. This is a win-win situation, but the tradeoff is to allow the contractor, advisory council, and the country experts themselves some flexibility and adaptability in implementing the evaluation: *i.e.*, any plan to operationalize the evaluation has to avoid rigidity and excessive pre-determination.

What we provide, then, is a version of the Bollen et al research design with more specific recommendations, a narrowing of methods to lower costs and increase manageability, more cost data, and a sequence for products and policy guidance. We have factored in the issues of affordability, burdens of data collection, the desire to move quickly once a decision is made to proceed, flexibility with respect to choice of specific research methods, and highly usable products.

We avoid some of the difficulties of defining the object of evaluation by beginning with subsectoral-level analysis, and refining that object to include "activities"---still undefined but used herein as the level designated in the census of activities in "rule of law" (Bollen, Appendix B, by upper-case letter headings). Activities become a central focus of evaluation once the

country experts begin their work in the countries we have specified. The theoretical aspects of democratic development are addressed as a problem of evaluation and indicators of progress, via work led by the advisory council, and we urge USAID to include field building funds directed by the advisory council to refine and improve such indicators, and, in that process, to integrate them with the agency's work.

In sum, these recommendations are built upon the Bollen, Paxton, and Morishima document, "Research Design to Evaluate the Impact of USAID Democracy and Governance Programs" (RD). This memo provides a guide for implementing the RD, particularly the alternative method (p 46), with some modifications. Also in this memo are guidance on administration, a timetable, an inventory of likely products, and a comprehensive budget (Appendix A).

An Evaluation Plan

It is our recommendation that USAID conduct a retrospective evaluation of past efforts (1993-2002) to improve democratic governance by adopting a two-track approach that has been designed to achieve the evaluation's goals in a cost-effective way and to provide in-depth assessments and policy guidance to USAID. The goal of such an evaluation is to provide independent assessments of whether USAID programs have had a significant impact in promoting democratization and good governance, and to provide USG decision makers with the analytical tools and knowledge to set policies that optimize such efforts in the future.

We believe the evaluation plan detailed below is the best option for addressing concerns raised, *e.g.*, that the evaluation design:

- provide useful comparisons without sacrificing attention to activities within subsectors;
- maximize constrained financial and human resources;
- provide empirical bases for policy guidance, and
- inform theoretical understanding of democracy promotion.

Our implementation calls for interlocking research and analytical efforts. One research track compiles data on subsectoral information, indices of democratic development, and other metrics of contextual or exogenous factors. A second, simultaneous research track utilizes country

experts to describe the general context and assess subsectoral impact. The analytical effort, which will operate within a comparative framework for quantitative and qualitative data inputs, will produce a **preliminary analysis** (at 10 months into the project) based on a cross-national database; an **intermediate analysis** (18 months) based on the cross-national database integrated with detailed subsector and activity data from the first phase of country-expert overviews; and a **final report** (42 months) providing policy guidance for decision makers, based on a second phase of country expert assessments of specific activities. Although the cross-national research track will cover all countries where USAID has been active, the country-specific research track will focus on 20-25 countries around the world over a ten-year period beginning in the early 1990s (Appendix B).

By gathering and examining data on a cross-national level *and* on a country-specific level, meaningful, comparative conclusions about country-, subsector-, and activity-level programs across regions can be drawn and will be conveyed in the final report.

The following discussion, through page 7, is organized to describe the two tracks, and then to describe in more detail the analytical process and products.

Track One: Cross-National Level

The initial task of the cross-national research track is analyzing the impact of USAID program expenditures at the country- and subsector-level globally. This task involves the following steps:

- The research director (contractor) would compile data on existing indicators of democratic development as a whole and in part, socio-economic development, and institutional features, as elaborated in the RD.
- USAID would continue its census of activities for all subsectors and by compiling data on subsector-level expenditures from such sources as Results Review and Resource Request (R4) reports, Performance Measurement Plans (PMPs), W253 reports, and Budget Office reports; and
- Compiling information on other donors, by making high-level requests to several major development agencies for data on country- and subsector-level expenditures by year. (The specific agencies would be determined after further consultation within DG and a survey of likely correspondents.) This would be supplemented by information from relevant mission staff as to the involvement of other agencies in relation to USAID activities in a country.
- Finally, a web-based survey sent to all mission officers will gather subjective assessments of USAID DG subsector activities for postings during the 1993-2002 period, based in part on the draft survey in the RD, Appendix F.

This data compilation would be used in the preliminary analysis that examines the relationships between democratic development at the country- and subsector-level on the one hand, and USAID expenditures, similar expenditures by other actors, and exogenous factors on the other. The results of the web-based survey will be used not only as another indicator of USAID effort, but also as a means to identify supplemental countries for the first phase of country-expert overviews and provide further information for the experts.

The cross-national database would later be augmented by evaluations of subsectoral- and activity-level impact from the first phase of country-expert overviews, and then used for an intermediate analysis at the country-, subsector-, and activity-levels across regions.

Track Two: Country Level

This research track is designed to provide in-depth information at the country level and information at the subsector-level that will be used in the intermediate (and final) analysis. We envision two phases of country-level overviews. Experts sent to the 20-25 selected countries¹ would describe the general context and assess the overall impact of activities within each subsector according to criteria established by the research director and others, and this work—completed by about the sixteenth month of the project—would provide the major new data for the intermediate analysis. Following that analysis, experts would return to the countries to examine specific, common activities to better understand factors leading to the “success” or “failure” of that activity.

More specifically, the *first phase* involves the following tasks:

- *Countries and criteria:* A task force—appropriate personnel from USAID, the advisory council, and the contractor—would select the countries for expert review. (See Appendix B for a preliminary and representative list of selected countries.) The task force also would develop a template of evaluation criteria to be used by the country experts to achieve optimal objectivity and comparability of these country reports. These criteria would be based upon the DG Results Framework for determining how successful activities are in meeting intermediate results (RD, p 84) under each subsector, and the project's overall comparative framework.

¹ The hedge on the exact number of countries is twofold: first, selection criteria established by the task force may alter the number, as might supplementary data (e.g., questionnaire responses); second, cost considerations, since the difference between 25 and 20 overviews is about 7 percent of the entire project budget.

- *Data gathering:* Country experts would spend a total of 90 days in each of the selected countries gathering information needed to provide a qualitative analysis of the general context and exogenous factors; analyze existing R4 reports, PMPs, and other contractor reports available at the mission in order to evaluate the “success” of a USAID activity according to the pre-established criteria; draw upon the expertise of relevant mission officers, past and present, through Web-based questionnaires and follow-up interviews; interview key local personnel involved in USAID-funded activities, local academics, and other actors; and write an overview of the context and USAID activities. Appropriate local researchers will assist the country experts.

The overview of general context and exogenous factors would be structured to provide more details on, and a “reality check” of, the indicators of democratic development and exogenous factors in the preliminary analysis. The expert would produce a single-country qualitative analysis of the same relationships examined in the cross-national research track. The country expert reports would be peer reviewed. This deeper and expanded information on context and subsectoral impact would be used for the cross-national research track’s intermediate analysis.

A *second phase* of country-level research stems from the results of the intermediate analysis and a midstream assessment, which would identify specific common activities across countries and regions for closer examination. Country experts would return to all or a subset of the original 20-25 countries to examine specific activities in terms of indicators and process, in order to better understand factors leading to the “success” or “failure” of that activity relative to the same activity in another country.

Analysis and Reporting

The evaluation process will produce three major analytical reports and a series of country overviews and activity analyses. The major reports include a preliminary cross-national subsectoral analysis; an intermediate analysis using augmented subsectoral data; and a final report that aggregates policy-relevant findings from the first two reports as well as the activity analyses.

A *preliminary analysis* would focus on how much change in democratic development at the country and subsector-level to attribute to the impact of USAID programs by examining the relationships between democratic development indicators, USAID expenditures, USAID Mission

Officer assessments, other donor expenditures, and exogenous factors.²

For the indicators of democratic development, several sources are possible. At the country level, either Freedom House, Polity IV, or Bollen's index would be appropriate measures (listed in RD, Appendix H). At the subsectoral level, different indicators of democratic development should be used for each subsector. For "rule of law" and "governance" (accountability and corruption) subsectors, we recommend the World Bank's "Governance Matters" series.³ For "elections and political parties," we recommend the Arthur Banks *Handbook* series. Appropriate indicators for "civil society" are in less abundance, although it could be possible to expand on DG's own "NGO Sustainability Index" for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia. Not incidentally, this evaluation is an opportunity to develop better indices for some of the sectors, particularly civil society, under the direction of the advisory council.

Data on other variables that might affect democratic development in countries are available from a variety of other sources such as the World Bank, the United Nations, or a variety of other international data sets.

This broad-gauge, preliminary analysis would be conducted in order to provide valuable guidance on the effectiveness of USAID programs at global and regional levels; provide insights into each of the four subsectors at global and regional levels; assess the impact of other donors and exogenous factors; and indicate how useful a more complete database incorporating detailed activity information for all countries would be.

The *intermediate analysis* would incorporate information from the expert overviews, and be synthesized with the data and inferences of the preliminary analysis. This richer body of data on a smaller set of countries would allow for analysis of activities that goes beyond expenditures

² In general and specific terms, the analysis will be:

Δ democracy indicator = f (USAID effort; other donor effort; Δ exogenous factors)

Δ Freedom House = f (USAID total expend; USAID MO assessments; other donor total expend; Δ HDI, WDI)

Δ World Bank indicator = f (USAID subsector expend; USAID MO assessments;
of "rule of law" other donor subsector expend; Δ HDI, WDI)

³ D. Kaufmann, A. Kraay and M. Mastruzzi, *Governance Matters III: Governance Indicators for 1996–2002* (Washington, D.C.: World Bank Institute, May 2003).
<http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/governance/pdf/govmatters3.pdf>

in describing subsectoral impacts, thus making it possible to compare country-level programs across countries, and subsectors across countries, in addition to identifying a set of common activities across countries that would benefit from further assessments.

As this suggests, the intermediate analysis would essentially build on the preliminary analysis by adding an indicator of the “success” or “failure” of USAID activities, as measured by the extent to which those activities meet intermediate results for each subsector in accordance with the DG Results Framework.⁴

The intermediate analysis would provide much more specific guidance on the effectiveness of USAID programs at the subsector and activity level; consider more closely (and systematize) the extent and limitations of other donors and exogenous factors; and highlight “good” and “bad” practices for the most common activities, which would allow for follow-up comparative analysis.

The *activity analyses* that are driven by the intermediate analysis would examine the sequencing, outputs, outcomes, and impacts, in addition to tracing the process of the activity and accounting for exogenous factors. The individual analyses would then be used by experts at the project home for comparative analysis of “good” and “bad” practices across regions, countries, subsectors, and activities. (More neutral terms would be used.)

A *final analysis* synthesizes the findings from the preliminary analysis, the intermediate analysis, and the comparative activity analyses, with refinements to each and as a composite picture of the impact of USAID activities. The goal would be to provide strong, empirically based policy guidance—making specific recommendations for pursuing or eliminating lines of activity based on the success or failure that the evaluation revealed; flagging activities that bear close watching; and building a deeper understanding of the interaction between activities within subsectors and across subsectors. This final report will undergo extensive review by the task force and outside experts, both for methodological soundness and policy relevance and realism.

⁴ Similar to the preliminary analysis, the intermediate analysis will be:

Δ democracy indicator = f (USAID effort; other donor effort; Δ exogenous factors)

Δ Freedom House = f (USAID total expend, USAID total “success”; other donor total expend; Δ HDI, WDI)

Δ World Bank indicator = f (USAID subsector expend, USAID sector “success”;
of “rule of law” other donor subsector expend; Δ HDI, WDI)

Administration

The personnel requirements include the prime contractor and subcontractors, advisory council, and USAID staff. The prime contractor should be a respected and independent academic institution that has no association, past or present, with any of the DG projects being evaluated. An experienced project director will handle logistics and administration, and have overall authority; and a research director with highest-quality qualitative and quantitative analytical skills will be responsible for the intellectual direction and analysis. The project director and research director, in consultation with the DG evaluation coordinator, will select all analysts, country experts, the advisory council, and other external staff to support the analytical effort and generate products. The country experts will be drawn from the contractor's academic networks and will meet highest standards of scholarship; direct research experience in the selected countries, strong contacts to epistemic networks, independence, and quantitative skills will be the standards of selection. They will likely be post-docs in early stages of their careers. The ten-person advisory council will utilize those who served for the RD, but may be supplemented and/or rotated to increase its breadth. USAID staff will be selected by the DG office in accordance with its own procedures. The task force will consist of the advisory council, two or three senior level DG officers, the research director, and the project director.

Demands on the time of USAID Mission Officers should be minimized. For this evaluation project, we anticipate that the Mission Officers will: provide guidance on locating needed documents; identify relevant local researchers and personnel from organizations that participated in USAID activities; and respond to two web-based surveys that should take 20-30 minutes each. Country experts will identify local researchers—who will prepare dossiers for country experts from USAID mission files—and applications for security clearance will be facilitated by USAID missions.

The advisory council plays a role of aiding the research director in final selection of countries; ensuring rigor and comprehensiveness in the cross-national analysis; establishing a template for country expert overviews; making the midstream assessment a pivotal period in maximizing short-term results (the intermediate analysis) and drawing lessons from the initial phases of the project to complete the work successfully; ensuring that products meet high standards; and building a field of democratization evaluation and theory that can be durable, multinational, and multi-institutional.

"Products" of all kinds should be issued in the name of the contractor institution, with the relationship to USAID and the role of the advisory council clearly stated. These products—reports, occasional papers, articles, a Web site hosting all generated data and analysis, conferences and workshops, etc.—will be streaming from the project on a continuous basis. Speed of delivery and standards of acceptability are essential to field building and the fundamental credibility of the project's independence. As a result, *the contractor should administer all outputs and dissemination* during the 46 months suggested for the project.

Institutional learning processes will be engineered throughout the project for USAID DG staff and Mission Officers. This will include evaluation methods, use of data and data collection techniques, analytical tools, communications, cooperation with outside experts and agencies, overcoming barriers to implementation, and so on. Dedicated periods of 2-3 weeks at the time of the midstream assessment (month 19) and at the time of the final analysis and report (months 44-46) will be instituted with internal seminars in Washington, Web instruments and Webcasting for Mission Officers, field guides and handbooks, and one-on-one consultations.

Timetable

The activities described in this timetable can begin immediately. Numbers on left are months from start. "Products" are marked with an asterisk.

- 1 Advisory council meets with DG senior staff to review evaluation plan, make adjustments, review the status of data collection, reach agreement on criteria for and composition of initial country selection.

- 1 Data collection by DG personnel to focus on sub-sector expenditures in country-study list, 1993-2002, and census of activities.

- 2 Contractor selected (possibly later but assumed in second month in this timetable). Project director and research director meet with DG senior staff and advisory council (the "Task Force") in 2-3 day meeting to negotiate methods and deployment of resources, chart the entire course of the evaluation, and finalize country list.

Advisory council tasked with articulating "state of the field" definitions for progress in democratic development in the context of USAID programs, due in two months.

- 3 Questionnaires for USAID mission directors 1993-2002 in selected countries to be finalized and posted on closed Web site; DG office circulates instructions for responding to questionnaire within two months.

Selection of country experts by project director commences, to be completed in six weeks.

Research director commences the collection and processing of data for cross-national sub-sectoral analysis, to be completed in six months.

- 3-4 Survey of non-U.S. development agencies and multilaterals for benchmarking activities and data collection, done by research director and DG personnel. Secure terms of cooperation and schedule for implementation; first tranche of data (sub-sector level expenditures) requested delivered in four months.

- 4 Advisory council reports on democratic development definitions and indicators. *

Research director generates research goals, protocols, and methods for country overviews; reviewed by Task Force. This directive for country overviews includes parameters of data mining in USAID missions, and is to be negotiated with DG for appropriateness and feasibility.

- 5 Census of activities and projects completed within DG for all sub-sectors.

Results from questionnaire to USAID democracy officers compiled by research director, with follow-ups as needed.

6 Recruitment of country experts finalized. DG office produces centrally-held data, reports, past evaluations, etc., for country experts to read in advance of country site visits.

7-8 Comparative analytical framework for the evaluation project formulated, with review by Task Force. Research director prepares training protocols for country experts, who visit Washington for training in small groups in preparation for their 90-day visits, which will be done on basis of availability and opportunity over the coming seven months.

First tranche of data from non-U.S. development agencies compiled and tracked with internal USAID reporting, including information from democracy officers.

In 20-25 countries selected for first wave country analysis, USAID missions hire (in cooperation with research director and country experts) local researcher to begin preparation for country visits, preps to be completed within two to four months.

9-10 Cross-national analysis completed, reviewed by Task Force, revised over the coming month as a result of review, and published as preliminary analysis. * Additional country selection for country expert overviews may be necessary as a result. Research and project directors brief USAID officials, congressional staff, outside policy professionals, and non-U.S. development agency officers on findings and implications.*

10 Country expert overviews commence.

11 Advisory council begins new review of democracy development indicators based on cross-national analysis; new research commissioned in post-doc competition to improve, supplement, and/or create new indicators.

Research director and/or analyst visits about 10-12 of the selected countries.

11-12 Begin process of comparisons with non-U.S. development agencies on strategies, results, methods of evaluation, etc., to forge and formalize on-going cooperation, information sharing, and institutional learning. Task force initiates and the project director implements this process through series of workshops.

13-14 Multilateral workshops results in series of published papers, strategy documents, and informal briefings.* Further information is mined from this process to help with attribution of USAID activities.

15-16 Country expert overviews completed; peer review of overviews. Intermediate analysis effort begins, led by research director and with regular participation of Task Force leading to intermediate analysis.

- 18 Intermediate analysis completed. Briefings for USAID, State Department, Members of Congress and aides, policy professionals, non-U.S. development agencies, etc.* Initial policy guidance document generated for review and comment within USAID.
- Publication of country overviews on Web site.
- 19 Midstream assessment. Reevaluation of comparative analytical framework; identification of activities for in-depth examination. Selection of countries (if fewer than or different from original set.) Institutional learning processes is convened for USAID.
- 20-21 Reorientation of country experts (replacements if necessary). New protocols for phase two country research.
- 22 Phase two of country assessments commence.
- First phase of research on democracy development indicators and theory completed; papers published; workshop on results with other institutions.*
- 23-24 Research director and/or analyst visits 10-15 countries.
- 25-28 Country assessments completed and submitted. Peer review. Major, final analytical effort begins with Task Force guidance.
- 28-36 Country experts publish independent scholarship on democratic development based on the evaluation project's results; volumes, joint symposia, academic conference presentations, etc., ensue as organized activities of the project or independently.*
- 36-40 Review of final analysis by Task Force, other USAID, academics, etc.
- 42-44 Final analysis published. Briefings to Congress, State Department, USAID, other non-U.S. agencies, policy professionals. Dissemination activities with various audiences.*
- 45-46 Institutional learning process for USAID with project and research directors.

Products

The evaluation project would result in a substantial number of written products and related briefings intended for USAID, academic, and international development agency audiences.

- The *preliminary analysis* would focus on how much change in democratic development at the country and subsector-level to attribute to the impact of USAID programs by examining the relationships between democratic development indicators, USAID expenditures, USAID Mission Officer assessments, other donor expenditures, and exogenous factors. This analysis makes a valuable contribution toward gauging the impact of USAID subsectors across regions, individual subsectors across regions, taking into account the effect of other donor expenditures and exogenous factors. These findings would stimulate discussions about the relative effectiveness of USAID programs as a first step toward revising policy. This analysis would be the subject of an advisory council meeting and internal USAID review. It would be published on the project Web site and in hard copy, distributed to appropriate congressional staff, USAID administrators, State Department officials, and non-U.S. development agency personnel involved in the benchmarking exercises, and to non-governmental policy professionals.
- The *country-expert overviews* would analyze the general context, exogenous factors, and activity impact with respect to specific criteria established by the advisory council, and then analyze relationships between variables following the analytical model from the cross-national research track. The overviews would be stand-alone reports available on the project website, and could also be the basis for scholarly publications by the experts.
- The *intermediate analysis* assesses subsectoral impacts, thus making it possible to compare country-level programs across countries, subsectors across countries, as well as identify a set of common activities across countries that would benefit from further assessments. This analysis would provide much more specific policy guidance on the effectiveness of USAID programs at the subsector- and activity-level; consider more closely the extent and limitations of other donors and exogenous factors; and highlight “good” and “bad” practices for the most common activities, which would allow for follow-up comparative analysis. These findings would be reviewed by the advisory council meeting and USAID staff, and in official venues, but in addition would be the subject of forums at key policy research venues in Washington, DC, the U.N., and Brussels.
- The *activity analyses* would examine specific activities in terms of indicators and process, in order to better understand factors leading to the “success” or “failure” of that activity relative to the same activity in another country. The analyses would be stand-alone reports available on the USAID website, and would lead to a series of internal USAID briefings in Washington, DC, and at selected regional meetings of mission officers.

- The *final analysis* would aggregate the policy-relevant lessons learned from the preliminary analysis, the intermediate analysis, and the comparative analysis of the reports on “good” and “bad” activity practices. The goal would be to provide specific policy guidance on lines of activity; the analysis would also address findings related to exogenous factors that have demonstratively positive effects on democratic development, thus producing further guidance for revising or adopting new policy initiatives. This major document would be the focus of internal USAID and State Department briefings, congressional briefings, and forums at key policy research venues in Washington, DC, Europe, and elsewhere.

In addition, two lines of work that are not essential to the success of the evaluation effort, but are highly recommended, would also yield useful products.

The first is *field-building scholarship* on the democracy development indicators commissioned by the advisory council, yielding theoretical articles and perhaps new indices.

The second are the *benchmarking activities* with non-U.S. development agencies. At the low end, these activities would produce data for use in the USAID evaluation. More concerted efforts could yield much more in-depth cooperation on calculating impacts, reviewing norms and strategies, comparing approaches, and so on, carried out collectively in workshops, through papers, and the like; the other agencies should be able to cost-share for these activities, making this quite feasible with leadership from the U.S. project director.

The Web site, created and maintained by the contractor, is a product in itself, will host all written products and additional, related materials and interactions, and be intended as a permanent resource on the issues engaged in this evaluation project.

Appendix A. Budget projections

A. Project administration	
1. Personnel ¹	1,200,000
Project Director	
Research Director (0.5)	
Project Coordinator	
Research Analyst (0.67)	
Program Assistant	
Consultants	
2. Office space, communications, supplies, etc.	100,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	1,300,000
B. Research Costs ²	
1. Advisory Council honoraria (10)	200,000
2. Country experts (25)	600,000
3. Local academics (25)	35,000
4. Peer review	50,000
5. Purchase of data	50,000
6. Field building grants	100,000
7. Miscellaneous	15,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	1,050,000
C. Travel & accommodations ³	
1. Country experts	550,000
2. Advisory council	120,000
3. Staff	80,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	750,000
D. Products	
1. Publications and Website	40,000
2. Workshops, forums	50,000
3. Other	10,000
<i>Subtotal</i>	100,000
Contingency	60,000
Total, Contractor Direct Costs	3,260,000

Appendix B. Country Selection

Below is our recommended list of 25 target countries for the country-expert overviews. The task force would select at least 20 at the start of the evaluation project. Using data from Appendices G1 – G4 in the “Research Design” report, these countries were chosen according to the following criteria:

- Most active overall, as seen in
 - * the top 25 highest average program expenditure per activity across all sectors or the highest number of activities across all sectors; AND
 - * among the top 25 highest average program expenditure per activity in at least three sectors.

Supplemented by

- Non-duplicates with expenditures in all four sectors and at least one appearance in the top 25 highest average program expenditure per activity in individual sectors.

Albania	Haiti
Armenia	Indonesia
Azerbaijan	Kazakhstan
Bolivia	Kenya
Bosnia	Kosovo
Bulgaria	Mongolia
Cambodia	Nigeria
Colombia	Romania
Croatia	Serbia
Dominican Republic	South Africa
DR Congo	Ukraine
Georgia	Zimbabwe
Guatemala	

The regional distribution is: 3 Asia & Near East, 12 Europe & Eurasia, 5 Latin America and the Caribbean, and 5 Africa. Note that we have removed Egypt, Russian, and the West Bank/Gaza because exogenous factors are simply too overwhelming. The distribution is skewed toward E&E and away from ANE somewhat, but this reflects USAID DG emphasis in terms of expenditures and projects.

The general perspective on this set of filters is that (a) expenditure levels reflect USAID’s assessment of the importance or opportunity in a country; (b) a large number of activities is a slightly different demonstration of commitment; and (c) expenditures in 3-4 sectors promotes comparability.

We recommend that the evaluation cover the years 1993-2002. The time frame must be limited for budget considerations, and a ten-year scope is appropriate. Data, mission officer and other actor availability and memory suggest this recent time frame.

John Tirman
Program Director
Social Science Research Council
2040 S St., NW
Washington DC 20009
202-332-5572 ext 10
202-332-9051 fax
tirman@ssrc.org
www.ssrc.org
