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## ACRONYMS AND OTHER ABBREVIATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BFS</td>
<td>Bureau for Food Security (USAID)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCRO</td>
<td>Certificate of Customary Right of Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>Capacity Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dTS</td>
<td>Development and Training Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3</td>
<td>Bureau for Economic Development, Education, and Environment, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC-LEDS</td>
<td>Enhancing Capacity for Low Emissions Development Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCC</td>
<td>Office of Global Climate Change (USAID/E3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICT4E</td>
<td>Information and Communication Technology for Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU</td>
<td>Office of Land and Urban (USAID/E3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAST</td>
<td>Mobile Application to Secure Tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MCCS</td>
<td>Municipal Climate Change Strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSI</td>
<td>Management Systems International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASA</td>
<td>National Aeronautics and Space Administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOURSIH</td>
<td>Integrated Nutrition, Hygiene, and Sanitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLC</td>
<td>Planning, Learning, and Coordination (USAID/E3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>Bureau of Policy, Planning and Learning, USAID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>Randomized Control Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOBE</td>
<td>Sustained Outcomes in Basic Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOW</td>
<td>Statement of Work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USG</td>
<td>United States Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WLSME</td>
<td>Women’s Leadership in Small and Medium Enterprise</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A woman in rural Iringa, Tanzania looks on as the Project team interviews her neighbor for the Land Tenure Assistance impact evaluation. 

*Credit: Jacob Patterson-Stein, MSI.*
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents highlights from the fourth year of the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project, a five-year contract delivering rigorous evaluations and other analytic technical assistance to a dozen technical offices in USAID’s Bureau for Economic Growth, Education, and Environment (E3) as well as other Agency operating units that work in E3 sectors.

By the end of the 2017 fiscal year, USAID had commissioned 77 activities under the Project. This includes 12 new activities that the Agency initiated over the past year. The Project supports some of the E3 Bureau’s most challenging and ambitious technical work across the diverse sectors and regions in which the Bureau is active. These analytic efforts, which range from rigorous impact evaluations to broad ‘whole of project’ type evaluations of complex portfolios, are providing critical results and lessons learned to help the Agency make evidence-based decisions and foster greater development impact.

This report is organized by common themes across the three E3 sectoral clusters (Environment, Economic Growth, and Education), and intersperses key Project activities and lessons learned that cut across the entire Bureau.

Economic Growth

In 2017, the Project conducted three studies to help USAID/E3’s Office of Land and Urban understand how a set of USAID initiatives – mobile mapping and certification of land rights, capacity-building of local land administration offices, and private agricultural producers’ farmer outreach and alignment with international standards – promote tenure security and investment decisions that can support sustainable economic growth.

In the first study, the Project examined the cost- and time-effectiveness of the Mobile Application to Secure Tenure (MAST) pilot in providing certificates of customary right of occupancy (CCROs) in Tanzania. This study was one of the first to apply comparative cost analysis to land tenure activities.

The second study, a rigorous evaluation of USAID/Tanzania’s Land Tenure Assistance activity, is testing the impact of mobile mapping and facilitation of CCROs on income, women’s empowerment, dispute prevalence, and other factors related to land use and tenure security. This year, the Project conducted the baseline survey of a random sample of LTA-supported households in assigned villages.

The final study is a pre-post qualitative evaluation of the Responsible Land-Based Investment Pilot in Mozambique. This pilot is applying the USAID-supported Analytical Framework for Land-Based Investments in African Agriculture to due diligence and community outreach activities, and farmer efforts such as land rights sensitization, land mapping, and parcel registration. The Project collected baseline data in 2017 on how application of the Framework affects perceptions of company engagement, disputes, and land management. The Project will collect endline data in Mozambique in 2018 to determine whether and how pilot activities changed perceptions.

In 2017, the Project also worked on multi-country performance evaluations of USAID’s Southern Africa Trade Hub and the West Africa Trade and Investment Hub. These qualitative evaluations provided important lessons for USAID and other donors, implementing partners, government stakeholders, and evaluators on trade facilitation programming and how to evaluate complex, multi-country activities where outcomes accrue at different points in time.

Finally, the Project conducted case studies examining the successful scaling up of agricultural innovations through commercial pathways in developing countries. This research is helping the Bureau for Food
Security understand how to enable greater scale and long-term commercial sustainability for the technologies it supports.

**Education**

During the past year, the Project supported USAID operating units on several studies to strengthen the evidence base around education programming.

The Office of Education commissioned the Project to assess the quality of USAID-funded evaluations in the education sector from 2013 to 2016. Based on a subset of these evaluations that met minimum quality standards, the Project then synthesized findings and lessons learned for topics related to USAID’s Education Strategy. To support this effort, the Project developed an evaluation quality assessment protocol and got feedback from across the Agency and the wider education community. Thirty-six experts from 21 organizations volunteered their time and expertise to review 92 evaluations for this study, with the Project leading the review process.

To support USAID’s effort to improve the reading skills for 100 million children in primary grades (Goal 1 of the Education Strategy), the Project also developed a methodology for measuring progress toward this goal and got feedback and buy-in from across the Agency and the wider education community. The Project is now using this methodology to prepare dozens of oral reading progress briefs for USAID that summarize ongoing achievements of Agency education activities related to Goal 1.

The Project is also supporting USAID’s Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning to examine how systems affect the achievement and sustainability of development results. The ex-post evaluation of sustained outcomes incorporates systems thinking approaches to understand what supported or hindered the sustainability of basic education results, using case studies in Ghana, Uganda, Namibia, and South Africa.

**Environment**

Over the past year, the Project worked on a dozen evaluations in the environmental field. Activities in this arena often tackle ‘wicked problems’ characterized by no clear boundaries or solutions, making them some of the most challenging for which to measure impact. The Project is applying innovative approaches, science-driven methods, and creative strategies for field data collection to evaluate several such activities.

Three of these evaluations are examining activities that include geospatial platforms or products. Two of the evaluations involve interagency agreements between USAID and a U.S. science agency. Five evaluations involve science- and technology-related interventions. These evaluations demonstrate how the Agency is a leading actor in measuring the value environmental investments, scientific partnerships, and geospatial platforms and products for development.
A farmer and her daughter stop to talk to the Land Tenure Assistance Activity impact evaluation team during survey pre-testing in Magunga village, Tanzania. Credit: Jacob Patterson-Stein, MSI.
INTRODUCTION

USAID launched the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project ("the Project") in 2013. It was designed to support the technical leadership of the Bureau for Economic Growth, Education, and Environment (E3) by way of rigorous evaluations, analytic tasks, and technical assistance to foster evidence-based project design. The E3 Bureau supports the Agency’s work in E3 sectors by providing technical leadership and assistance for high-quality project design, implementation, and monitoring, evaluation, and learning. In addition to providing support to 12 Washington-based E3 technical offices, in-country missions and other operating units in the Agency have taken advantage of the Project’s mandate to conduct evaluation and project design activities to influence Agency programming in E3 sectors worldwide.

This report summarizes key Project activities, accomplishments, and lessons learned from October 2016 to September 2017. Following a general overview, the report is organized by the common theme of the Project’s work in each of the three E3 sectoral clusters, interspersed with spotlights on high-profile topics.

CORE ACCOMPLISHMENTS IN FY17

By the end of its fourth year, the Project had initiated 77 activities – an increase of 12 activities over the past. As shown in Figure 1, the Project has completed 26 activities, and is currently designing or implementing 26 additional activities. A total of 25 activities are inactive (for example, the activity was initiated, then suspended due to changes in operating unit priorities or budget availability).

![Figure 1: Status of Activities](image)

Figure 2 shows the number of ongoing versus completed or inactive activities that the Project has initiated by E3 sector. The large number of cross-cutting activities reflects the Project’s position as a bureau-level mechanism able to support Agency learning objectives across geographic and sectoral boundaries.
The scope and technical complexity of activities under the Project vary immensely. This ranges from midterm performance evaluations of single activities to large, multi-country and multi-year evaluations spanning dozens of implementing mechanisms. Figure 3 reflects the diversity of what USAID offices are carrying out through the Project.
The Project delivered 228 products to USAID operating units in the past year. These ranged from foundational design documents (such as evaluation concept papers and design proposals) to final analytic reports, as well as consultation notes that systematically document key decision points and next steps agreed-upon with USAID activity managers. Figure 4 shows the number of products the Project delivered to each E3 technical sector in 2017.

**FIGURE 4: PRODUCTS DELIVERED IN FY17 BY SECTOR**

![Bar chart showing the number of products delivered in FY17 by sector: Economic Growth 51, Education 29, Environment 72, Cross-Cutting 60.]

The rest of this report highlights major Project accomplishments and learning over 2017 in each E3 sectoral cluster as well as cross-cutting activities.

**KUDOS ON THE PROJECT’S STRATEGIC REVIEW OF USAID’S LIMITED EXCESS PROPERTY PROGRAM (LEPP)**

“Many thanks to you and the entire team for your hard work on this project and for taking our initial questions and concerns into consideration in the preparation of this final document. It has already proven very useful to us in prepping for the new iteration of the LEPP program and we are confident it will continue to serve as a guide in the weeks and months to come.”

Activity Manager, USAID/E3 Office of Local Sustainability
FROM CAPACITY DEVELOPMENT TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: LESSONS FROM A BUREAU-WIDE STUDY

In 2014, E3 Bureau senior leadership commissioned the Project to conduct an assessment to examine the nature and characteristics of capacity development (CD) activities that the Bureau undertakes internally and externally. This study was to also identify promising practices and recommend steps to develop a Bureau-wide approach for enhancing the effectiveness of CD activities.

During 2015 and 2016, the Project collected extensive data for this study, including a survey of nearly 200 USAID staff, 15 office-level focus groups, 5 external expert interviews, a review of existing CD literature and selected project evaluations, and case studies of 10 activities with a CD component.

In 2017, the Project delivered the final assessment report, and USAID shared the study results as an Agency notice. The Project also delivered targeted presentations to over a dozen Agency operating units and presented key findings to influential external resources such as Devex and the International Society for Performance Improvement.

Key findings included:

- The E3 Bureau lacks a common definition or conceptual framework for CD, which limits understanding and application of the principles that underlie effective CD support.
- While CD is a core part of USAID’s work, E3 staff primarily describe it in terms of training. This raises concerns about the ability of staff to differentiate between stronger and weaker approaches to CD given a set of desired development outcomes.
- The effectiveness of CD practices often depends on how they are implemented. For example, organizational twinning can be highly effective, but the “twins” need to be well chosen, the relationships need to be mutually beneficial, and the relationship needs to be well managed. Further, incentives that may be effective for eliciting some behavior may also undermine intrinsic motivations if they are improperly structured.

The assessment identified more than 50 promising CD practices that Agency staff were using, and created a rater’s guide for scopes of work for capacity development activities, which the E3 Bureau now recommends as an optional tool for USAID staff.

“The report itself has so much that resonates with our work to build USAID staff capacity to implement the program cycle guidance, so we appreciate being able to learn from this study!!”

- USAID/PPL/LER Staff Member
GENERATING EVIDENCE TO STRENGTHEN TENURE SECURITY

Property rights have long been recognized as integral to functioning markets and a pathway to development. Without recognized and enforceable land rights, people have little incentive to invest, trade, or assume that they will be protected against theft of or harm to their land. Despite some existing empirical research, there are still key evidence gaps in understanding how best to promote land tenure security and reduce the risk of expropriation in the face of institutional capacity constraints in low- and middle-income countries.

USAID/E3’s Office of Land and Urban (LU), with the Project’s support, is conducting rigorous research and designing evidence-based programs to better understand how land rights translate to economic growth. E3/LU piloted and is now scaling mobile mapping and certification of land rights, developing the capacity of local land administration offices, and working with private agricultural producers to improve farmer outreach and align with international standards. Critically, E3/LU has designed these activities so they can be rigorously evaluated on how well they promote tenure security and investment decisions, and where they may fall short in supporting sustainable economic growth. Over the past year, the Project supported E3/LU on three of these studies.

Cost- and Time-Effectiveness Study of the Mobile Tenure Certification

From 2014-2016, USAID conducted a pilot of the Mobile Application to Secure Tenure (MAST) in Tanzania’s southern agricultural corridor. The MAST pilot developed a crowdsourcing approach to facilitate land mapping and documentation by employing youth in three villages to use an open source mobile application. The pilot streamlined the standard land mapping and documentation approach in Tanzania, which is often costly and time consuming, and prepared certificates of customary right of occupancy (CCROs) for almost 4,000 parcels. These CCROs can be critical for facilitating and formalizing rental markets, improving investment, and resolving disputes.

In 2016, the Project completed a performance evaluation of the MAST pilot, which found that the MAST mapping and verification process was widely perceived as transparent and inclusive. This evaluation also found that the way MAST and, potentially, other tenure certification efforts are communicated and rolled out to communities are critical to the success of these efforts.

Given the importance of property rights for economic growth, E3/LU also commissioned the Project to compare the cost- and time-effectiveness of the MAST pilot in providing CCROs to several similar efforts by other donors and the national government in Tanzania. By reviewing project implementation and budget details, the study estimated each project’s cost and time to deliver a CCRO. For MAST, the estimated adjusted cost was around $32 per CCRO, while the cost range for similar projects was $20 to $35. The study estimated MAST’s per unit time to initial CCRO delivery at 0.1 to 0.2 days per CCRO, compared to 0.5 to 8.4 days per CCRO across the comparison projects. The MAST approach also scored higher on key quality criteria, with potential efficiency benefits and villagers more knowledgeable and trusting in the land formalization process. While this kind of cost-effectiveness approach is common in the health and education sectors, the MAST cost- and time-effectiveness study was one of the first to attempt to apply comparative cost analysis to land tenure activities.

Impact Evaluation of the Land Tenure Assistance Activity

Drawing from evidence that MAST was well received and can be cost effective, USAID scaled up the pilot approach with the launch of the Land Tenure Assistance (LTA) activity in Tanzania. LTA aims to
clarify and document land ownership using the MAST open source application to deliver CCROs in 36 villages in Tanzania, thereby supporting local land use planning efforts and increasing local understanding of land use and land rights.

To test the impact of mobile mapping and facilitation of CCROs on income, women’s empowerment, dispute prevalence, and other factors related to land use and tenure security, E3/LU commissioned the Project to conduct an impact evaluation (IE) of LTA. This rigorous evaluation uses a clustered randomized design, with the Project collaborating with the LTA implementing partner to randomly assign 30 villages during two phases to receive the LTA activity or serve as a control for the evaluation.

A unique aspect of this study is that the Project, in coordination with the LTA implementing partner, the Iringa District Land Office, and the government of Tanzania, conducted a reconnaissance trip to assess the potential pool of villages for inclusion in LTA and the evaluation ahead of randomization. This trip built support from key government stakeholders for the evaluation and assessed potential implementation challenges.

In 2017, the evaluation conducted a baseline survey of a random sample of households in assigned villages, with an endline survey to place in 2021.

Performance Evaluation of the Responsible Land-Based Investment Pilot

While land tenure security is a necessary component for fostering economic growth in low-income countries, increasing agricultural productivity and outside investment are also key factors. The private sector has a critical role to play in enhancing returns to agriculture, specialization through outgrowing of cash crops, and market access. In many low-income countries, however, commercial and government-supported agro-processors or raw material buyers have a history of troubled relations with smallholder farmers.

To provide practical guidance on how private sector investors can comply with international soft law guidelines on responsible land-based investment while reducing potential risks to their investments, a USAID-supported partnership produced the “Analytical Framework for Land-Based Investments in African Agriculture.” To test practical applications of the Framework and facilitate better private sector engagement with farmers, USAID launched the Responsible Land-based Investment Pilot. In Mozambique, the Pilot is working with a sugar producer to apply the Framework to due diligence and community outreach activities, along with farmer-level efforts such as land rights sensitization, land mapping, and parcel registration. This Pilot is one of the first donor-funded applications of the Framework and presents an opportunity to see how international soft law guidance is operationalized in a context where land rights and tenure security are uncertain.
To better understand how application of the Framework affects perceptions of company engagement, disputes, and land management, E3/LU commissioned the Project to conduct a pre-post qualitative evaluation of the Mozambique pilot. The Project completed baseline data collection in June 2017. It found low perception of tenure security, limited rights for women over land use, and resignation that expropriation was a common occurrence. Through group discussions with farmers and interviews with key stakeholders such as farmer association leaders, the Project found that there are informal dispute resolution mechanisms, but little trust in official institutions due to corruption and opaque decision-making processes. Farmers are keenly interested in having their land documented, and many hope that working with the sugar company will result in higher income and greater local economic growth. The Project will collect endline data in Mozambique in 2018 to see whether and how Pilot activities changed perceptions.
SYNTHESIZING EVIDENCE FROM TRADE HUB ACTIVITIES

A key challenge in development policy is utilizing the comparative and competitive advantages that low-income countries have in producing raw and processed goods for export. While free-on-board trade from Sub-Saharan Africa to advanced economies such as the U.S. and European Union is significantly higher now than it was 20 years ago, it has seen dramatic declines since 2011. USAID has designed several “Trade Hubs” that work to address these challenges through a cross-cutting sectoral approach to facilitate and strengthen trade. The Trade Hubs in East, Southern, and West Africa work to support regional trade and transportation by simultaneously tackling multiple value chains and sectors with technical assistance, grants, training, and facilitation of the African Growth and Opportunity Act.

Over the past year, the Project conducted multi-country performance evaluations of the Southern Africa Trade Hub and the West Africa Trade and Investment Hub. These multi-country qualitative evaluations provided important lessons for USAID as well as other donors, implementing partners, government stakeholders, and evaluators on trade facilitation programming and how to evaluate complex, multi-country activities where outcomes accrue at different points in time.

- **Management matters.** One of the main takeaways of the Project’s evaluations of the Trade Hubs in Southern and West Africa is that key management decisions and organization are critical to effectively implement cross-cutting trade activities. Management issues — location of the implementer’s office, handling of staff turnover, and fostering effective coordination between Trade Hub representatives and key national and regional stakeholders — play a critical role in how Trade Hub activities are implemented and whether there is sufficient buy-in from individuals and organizations whose support is critical to sustainable progress.

- **Invest in monitoring.** Both the Southern and West Africa Trade Hubs faced challenges in monitoring activities, mainly, anticipating needs and addressing the logistical hurdles of operating across multiple countries. The Trade Hub approach is not new. The West Africa Trade and Investment Hub was the third iteration of the program. USAID and its implementing partners can draw on many past lessons learned from similar activities to inform the design and implementation of future projects.

- **Carefully define the scope.** The Project’s evaluations found that setting realistic programmatic goals for implementation, given the complexity of trade within a regional context, can make the difference between falling short, meeting, or exceeding expectations. These Trade Hubs pose a challenge for evaluators since they coexist in multiple spaces with subtle differences in contexts. Finding the right interview subjects is always important, but combining this with a mix of implementation data, budgetary information, third-party sources, structured observations, unannounced site visits, and other data sources that may not always be utilized in traditional qualitative approaches should be considered to minimize bias and capture the complexity of Trade Hub programming.

Past USAID research conducted by MSI has shown that for every dollar of USAID trade facilitation assistance, there is a multiplier effect in the value of a country’s exports. Training, institutional support, and promotion of the African Growth and Opportunity Act are just a few ways USAID’s trade portfolio promotes regional and international trade. Making this progress sustainable, developing local support, and fostering agile management of these programs will help countries in sub-Saharan Africa and beyond benefit from trade.
COLLECTING AND ANALYZING EVIDENCE TO IMPROVE EDUCATION RESULTS

Supporting Evidence-Based Learning for Education Programming

Evaluation Quality Review

In 2016, USAID/E3’s Office of Education commissioned the Project to take stock of what has been learned on topics of interest related to the Agency’s Education Strategy. The study examined 92 USAID-funded evaluation reports from 2013-2016 that addressed education interventions relevant to the Education Strategy. The study’s objectives were to:

• Develop a tool for appraising the quality of evaluation reports that is responsive to USAID’s cross-sector guidance on evaluations as well as being sector-specific to education evaluations;
• Ensure that the information resulting from the application of this tool can be used to identify areas of strength and weakness in USAID-funded evaluations in the education sector; and
• Review findings and lessons learned from the evaluations to inform future USAID programming in education in early grade literacy, workforce development and higher education, and access to education – especially in crisis and conflict environments.

Figure 5 depicts the evaluation review process. The Project and the Office of Education collaborated to identify organizations involved in the implementation and evaluation of education programs to nominate staff to serve as volunteer reviewers. This ‘crowdsourcing approach’ enabled the Project and USAID to gather broad feedback on the review tool, disseminate the evaluation quality framework, and provide an opportunity for members of the education evaluation community to read and discuss each other’s evaluations. Ultimately, 36 reviewers from 21 organizations participated as volunteer reviewers.

The Project developed an online platform for each evaluation to be reviewed by two reviewers and reconcile any differences in scoring. The Project also hosted an event at MSI in which reviewers met to discuss their reviews and provide feedback on the tool and web platform.

Synthesis of Evaluation Findings and Lessons Learned

Sixty-nine of the 92 evaluations met minimum quality criteria set by the Office of Education, and those evaluations were included in a synthesis of findings and lessons learned related to topics of interest under each of the three Education Strategy Goals.

For the synthesis, the Project first identified project modalities, reviewed results for the main outcomes under each Education Strategy Goal, and assessed the strength of the body of evidence in terms of consistency, context, quality and size. The Project then summarized findings and lessons learned related to a range of results for each Goal, including learning outcomes, classroom instruction, teacher training, community engagement, entrepreneurship, countering violent extremism, and institutional capacity. The Project also summarized findings and lessons learned on cross-cutting themes such as gender, disability, innovative finance, and sustainability.

While USAID’s Education Strategy was released in 2011, the Agency’s Implementation Guidance took over a year to finalize, and most of the projects examined in the set of evaluations started after this time – with many lasting through 2019 and beyond. Thus, findings and lessons learned related to the Education Strategy will continue to unfold in the coming years.
FIGURE 5: A CROWDSOURCING APPROACH TO ASSESS EVALUATION QUALITY

- Identify the study selection to be reviewed
  - Team provides USAID list of evaluations
  - 92 evaluations are selected for inclusion in the review study
  - Additional documents are identified through database review

- Study Selection
  - Confirmed reviewers invited to participate in an online orientation session
  - Study team assigns evaluation agents to reviewer and completion timeline
  - Invited organizations nominate staff to participate in the review
  - All USAID evaluation and implementation partners invited to participate in the review

- Expert Review
  - Assign evaluation reports to expert reviewers
  - Study team produces descriptive statistics & conducts analysis
  - Study team produces a summary report

- Data Analysis and Reporting
  - Study team facilitates sessions where reviewers meet to produce consensus review
  - Analyze the expert review data
    - USAID utilizes the results when considering future guidance notes, webinars, and other products
  - Data analysis of expert review data informs future work

- Utilization of Results
  - Data from the Protocol determines reports included in a synthesis and lessons learned
  - Only evaluations identified in expert review are synthesized
  - Quality of Future Evaluations Improved
Supporting Accountability for USAID’s Education Strategy

The Project also partnered with the Office of Education to develop a methodology for counting progress toward Goal 1 of USAID’s Education Strategy: improving the reading skills of 100 million children in primary grades. This included a vigorous consultative process to develop the methodology and accompanying report for this count. The Project team presented at USAID meetings, workshops, and conferences to gather feedback from a wide range of stakeholders, including auditors from the U.S. Government Accountability Office, E3 Bureau leadership, members of the Basic Education Coalition, participants at the Comparative and International Education Society annual conference, and members of the Global Reading Network Community of Practice. The Project also used an online survey to obtain feedback from USAID missions on the methodology. The draft methodology was also reviewed by an education statistician from the University of Maryland. Finally, the Project co-presented the methodology with an Office of Education representative at the 2015 USAID Global Education Summit.

The Project is now applying the approved methodology to reading assessment data that USAID collects worldwide. The team produces a count for each activity individually and then aggregates results across activities to produce a global count toward Goal 1, which the team updates each quarter for USAID.

To disseminate results from this count, the Project also produces Oral Reading Fluency Progress Briefs. These briefs provide the Agency, host-country governments, and implementing partners with visually appealing summaries of key findings on progress made by activity beneficiaries in developing reading skills. These briefs are also helping inform the future design, implementation, and evaluation of education activities.

Bolstering the Dissemination of Evidence for Education Technology Interventions

The Office of Education has taken a lead role in galvanizing the international donor community to improve the evidence base for information and communication technology for education (ICT4E) interventions. To support this effort, the Project helped the Office of Education redesign the website for the Mobiles for Education (mEducation) Alliance to serve as a dissemination hub for ICT4E-focused evidence, including:

- 6 landscape reviews by mEducation Alliance members or other stakeholders that give snapshots of ICT4E-related activities across multiple learning areas.
- 5 symposia materials from the annual mEducation Alliance keystone event.
- 19 seminars collecting learning from thought leaders in the mEducation Alliance.
- 4 evaluation guidance materials, including presentations, exercises, and concept notes.
- 13 key studies capturing the most rigorous evidence from evaluations of ICT4E interventions.
Using Systems Thinking to Investigate the Sustainability of Education Outcomes

The Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning has taken a lead role in examining how systems affect the achievement and sustainability of development results. The Project is supporting this effort by conducting an evaluation of sustained outcomes in basic education. This ex-post evaluation incorporates systems thinking approaches to examine factors affecting sustainability related to programmatic characteristics (e.g., design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation) and contextual features (e.g., local systems).

The Project is conducting and synthesizing four case studies of completed activities in Ghana, Uganda, Namibia, and South Africa to understand what supported or hindered sustained outcomes in basic education programming.

Staff from the Shimoni Core Primary Teachers’ College in Uganda, as part of the data collection for the sustained outcomes evaluation in Uganda. Credit: Jindra Cekan, MSI.
UNDERSTANDING THE CONDITIONS FOR SUCCESSFUL SCALING UP THROUGH COMMERCIAL PATHWAYS

USAID and other donors have invested substantial resources in research and initial dissemination of innovations to help smallholder farmers and achieve food security. To realize the potential impact of these investments, technologies need to reach significant scale. Yet, there are few examples in the last 25 years of sustainable large-scale adoption of new agricultural technologies. The big question for the international development community is how to achieve large-scale, lasting, and sustainable adoption of agricultural innovations. What drivers, strategies, and activities do donor projects need to incorporate to successfully scale up agricultural innovations through commercial pathways?

To inform how the Agency can achieve greater scale and long-term commercial sustainability for the technologies it supports, the Bureau for Food Security commissioned the Project to conduct case studies examining the scaling up of agricultural innovations through commercial pathways in developing countries. The Project found that key drivers for such successful scaling include:

- **The innovation having a strong business case for all value-chain actors**, from upstream production and distribution to downstream marketing and processing of increased outputs.

- **A donor project or set of projects that create the foundations for the market to become self-sustaining by building a critical mass of early adopters and strengthening the value chain or market system.** This type of programming includes: (i) covering the costs of refining innovation packages, including ensuring feasibility, usability, and viability for adopters; (ii) demonstrating the business case for all actors; (iii) mitigating risk (e.g., providing discounts or promotions for early adopters); (iv) awareness-building activities; (v) ensuring that there are actors with the capacity and incentives to produce and supply the innovation through a distribution, sales, and marketing system, and downstream linkages as needed; (vi) addressing financing, input quality, and certification and compliance; and (vii) as needed, providing a commercially sustainable long-term source of technical assistance or extension support. Since strengthening the value chain can take years, it is highly preferable that scaling up be integrated into the project from the outset.

- **Lead IPs that have strong business skills and experience and an entrepreneurial, opportunistic philosophy.** Organizations with technical capacity can provide support to refine, adapt, and modify innovations.

- **Flexible partnerships between IPs and other actors, especially commercial actors.** IPs need to have the flexibility to choose the best partner for a given task or role, whether the partner is a non-governmental organization, or in the public or private sector. For commercial scaling, private-sector partnerships are essential, must be created on a money-making basis, and include capital investment from commercial partners. The best results are obtained when commercial actors are also prepared to invest their own money, and it is important that contract terms do not undermine the leverage of IPs in negotiating such partnerships.

"Thank you…for this important contribution to our understanding of scaling in agriculture. I also very much appreciated the specific thoughts on changes in project design and implementation that would facilitate scaling. I hope that USAID, other donors, governments and project implementers take these recommendations on board. I think the new approach they suggest is critical to improving the effectiveness and reach of aid programs in the Ag sector."

- Former USAID/BFS Chief Scientist
USING EVALUATION TO IMPROVE SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY, INNOVATION, AND PARTNERSHIPS

Over the past year, the Project worked on a dozen evaluations in the environmental field. Activities in this arena often tackle ‘wicked problems’ characterized by no clear boundaries or solutions, making them some of the most challenging for which measure impact. The Project is applying innovative approaches, science-driven methods, and creative data collection strategies to evaluate a number of these activities.

Three of these evaluations are examining activities that include geospatial platforms or products. Two of the evaluations involve interagency agreements between USAID and a U.S. science agency. Five evaluations involve science- and technology-related interventions. These evaluations demonstrate how the Agency is a leading actor in measuring the value environmental investments, scientific partnerships, and geospatial platforms and products for development.

Innovation in Measuring Value

The development field has few examples of non-market valuation methods being applied to measure the value of donor investments, especially with respect to investment in geospatial data and technology. Environmental sectors are full of goods and services that have no clear prices or markets, such as clean air, biodiversity, and data. This creates uncertainty in the value of the benefits of such goods and services and limits the ability of agencies like USAID to make evidence-based decisions about where its investments can have the greatest benefits for target populations.

Working to overcome this challenge, USAID/E3’s Office of Global Climate Change commissioned the Project to conduct one of the first evaluations that uses non-market valuation methods to assess the value of an Agency-funded geospatial tool. Under the performance evaluation of the joint USAID-NASA program SERVIR, the Project is implementing two innovative methods, contingent valuation and damage and loss avoidance, to assess the value of two SERVIR science application products. The Project was able to measure what components of the products had the highest value and for whom. This allows for efficient allocation of current and future funding of related products. The innovation of this approach is that non-market valuation can be used to evaluate geospatial products in development and measure what aspects of such products are of greatest value. This will help ensure that such products are efficient and well targeted to achieve intended results.

Geospatial Tools and Development

Over the past year, the Project worked on evaluating several USAID initiatives with prominent geospatial platforms or tools, including SERVIR, the U.S. Global Development Lab’s GeoCenter, and the USAID-Department of Energy interagency agreement. As the Agency invests in the geospatial capacity of technical staff in mission (which the GeoCenter supports) and supports tools that use real-time satellite data (which SERVIR does through regional hubs and partnership with NASA), the need for new approaches to measure such platforms and products increases. The Project’s evaluations of these initiatives are producing findings that highlight not only the utility of these efforts but will also define future needs and parameters for the Agency to receive and use the latest scientific data. Online databases and portals are changing the ways in which communities receive information for decision-making and share on-the-ground knowledge of the effects of USAID activities.
Science Partnerships

As USAID partners with scientists in partner countries as well as through U.S. universities and science-related agencies, there is a need to understand issues and lessons around the effectiveness of these partnerships. Two Project evaluations are examining USAID partnerships with other U.S. government agencies: SERVIR (with NASA) and the interagency agreement with the U.S. Department of Energy. Evaluation results to date show a need for these agreements to clarify terms and mental models about the causal model to success. Each agency brings its own perspective and strengths, as well as views about how to define and attain impact. The evaluations are reinforcing the need for common language, expectations, and frameworks between agencies jointly working on projects. Initial investments in joint results framework can have a multiplier effect on partnership results as well as strengthen future collaboration.
LESSONS FOR BUILDING EVALUATION STAKEHOLDER BUY-IN

Behind every good evaluation finding is a strong stakeholder base. Access, honesty, and coordination between relevant USAID stakeholders, activity implementing partners, and evaluation teams are necessary for understanding how an activity affected beneficiaries, why certain outcomes may have occurred while others did not, and how best to tackle future development challenges.

The Project has developed many lessons learned about stakeholder outreach through the evaluations it has carried out to date. Three lessons stand out as critical for gaining evaluation buy-in:

- **Communication** between implementing partners, USAID, and the evaluation team;
- **Fostering** dynamic evaluation teams; and
- **Including** local government representatives in the evaluation process.

**Promote Communication between Evaluation and Implementation Teams**

A reasonable amount of professional distance is necessary between third-party evaluation teams and activity implementation teams to avoid potential conflicts of interest. However, the notion that these parties should be firewalled and not communicate beyond formal responses to reports and sharing necessary data is misguided. For certain evaluation designs, such as randomized control trials (RCTs), evaluation and implementation teams need to be in regular contact as early as possible to establish ongoing collaboration.

The Project’s experiences on several IEs reinforce this lesson. For example, as part of an ongoing RCT of a complex water and sanitation activity in Cambodia, the Project’s evaluation team held an evaluation workshop with the activity implementing partner and USAID mission and Washington-based staff to develop ideas about potential evaluation designs. By including the implementing partners before implementation started, the Project included them early enough in the evaluation design process to consider their input, rather than going through an extended iterative comment process. This workshop was also an opportunity for all sides to collaboratively learn.

For performance evaluations of activities that are midway or at the end of implementation, there are many opportunities for building trust and finding mutual areas of interest between evaluation and implementation teams. For example, in a recent Project performance evaluation of a trade activity in Vietnam, the implementer and evaluation team spent four days together as part of a scoping exercise. This allowed the implementer to show the evaluation team exactly how their work is being carried out on the ground and helped build rapport between the two parties.

An important aspect of collaboration between the evaluation and implementation teams is the development of an institutional relationship. Team members on either side may change, but having a relationship based around overlapping priorities of each party can help mitigate potential disruptions.

**IDEAS FOR CONNECTING EVALUATION AND IMPLEMENTATION TEAMS**

- Collaborate on a shared blog or social media campaign to engage and encourage each other and outside stakeholders.
- Talk early and often and consider in-person meetings to the extent possible.
- Build institutional, not just individual, relationships through standing meetings.
For example, regular calls or meetings with USAID, the evaluation team, and the implementing partner can give new team members an easy entry point into an existing collaboration, as well as offer those pivoting to different roles a way to ensure a smooth transition. For an RCT of a land tenure activity the Project is implementing, stakeholders in USAID, the evaluation team, and implementing partner have changed in the two years since the evaluation was designed. Despite these transitions, the organizations have maintained regular check-ins and worked together to handle changes to the timeline in a way that helps the implementing partner meet targets and the evaluation team maintain the rigor of the RCT.

“Two Pizza Teams” and Stakeholder Outreach

The composition of evaluation teams should reflect the methodological needs and sectoral knowledge of the activity under study. USAID’s requirements for positions such as team leader provide a starting point for developing a competent evaluation team. However, the two-by-two evaluation model – two consultants spending two weeks in country – is not sufficient for generating useful findings. There is a growing recognition that teams with broader competencies can lead to a better understanding of the effectiveness of development assistance.

Research on team structures at Amazon and elsewhere found that “two-pizza teams” (i.e., teams that can be fed by two pizzas) were often the most effective size. Having too many team members can muddle things, while too few members can lead to important insights being missed or overlooked. Some of the most effective and efficient teams are less like a pyramid and more like a mosaic. On several large, multi-country evaluations, the Project found that local leadership within a team can be critical for gaining access to key informants, allowing team members to act on information and remain agile in the field, and helped team leads focus on core responsibilities. For example, a recent multi-country Project evaluation of a USAID trade activity in West Africa included a team lead based in Ghana, a deputy team lead who shuttled between two Francophone countries, and local evaluation specialists based in countries of activity implementation. This broader structure allowed for more flexible and rapid data collection as stakeholders became available. The evaluation team was able to leverage its local contacts and connect with knowledgeable informants throughout the evaluation process.

For certain evaluation approaches, finding the right team members may require working with local research institutions, such as think tanks and universities. This could mean hiring a local professor as the team leader who could, for example, guide the analysis, assist with survey design, or provide feedback on interview respondent lists. This type of engagement can better generate local buy-in to ensure that evaluation results have a broader audience in partner countries. USAID and evaluation teams should also see their relationship as a collaborative one, and work with missions to find relevant contacts for potential team members or advisors. Providing opportunities to publish in peer-reviewed journals, be involved in dissemination activities, and attend workshops can help incentivize busy professionals to assist evaluation teams and create buy-in for the evaluation process.

All Evaluations are Local

The level of involvement from local government, non-government, and civil society actors in an evaluation will depend on the nature of the activity being evaluated, the evaluation design, and other factors unique to each study. In evaluation designs, the local government is often assumed to be inherently interested in an evaluation and listed as a secondary audience for the final report. However, local officials are often busy and may have limited knowledge or interest in an activity or evaluation results. Meeting with national-level officials as well as local leaders to explain an evaluation – ideally in their native language – can help to quickly build trust and generate organic interest in findings.

Beyond simply meeting with local officials, bringing them into the evaluation process can provide the
evaluation team with a forum for explaining complex designs or give officials a chance to explain their work and the local context. The type of evaluation design workshops mentioned above are an easy opportunity to develop local buy-in. Scoping trips can also provide the chance for open discussion and real-time feedback. For example, as part of an ongoing RCT in rural Tanzania, the Project worked with the activity implementing partner and local and national government officials on a month-long scoping trip to meet with village leaders, hold group interviews, and assess proposed implementation sites as part of the evaluation and implementation design. Long days walking through villages and driving on bumpy roads through rural areas provide a natural opportunity for all sides to learn from each other and find overlapping areas of interest.

**PROMISING PRACTICES FOR MANAGING SUCCESSFUL IMPACT EVALUATIONS**

Some evaluations seek to measure change in development outcomes and to attribute that change to a specific intervention. USAID’s 2011 Evaluation Policy recognizes that experimental methods generate the strongest evidence for evaluations. Because IEs require technical precision, which may conflict with the desire of implementing partners and local stakeholders for some autonomy in deciding intervention locations and recipients, the IE planning and design can be as challenging as their implementation. IEs require negotiation and consensus-building to finalize a design that meets the needs of all parties and produces rigorous evidence.

In the past four years, the Project has developed a set of tools and guiding principles for designing IEs to address these key challenges. These promising practices were informed by a series of semi-structured interviews the Project conducted with evaluation specialists in the E3 technical offices, informal discussions between Project team members and other E3 Bureau staff and evaluation practitioners, and a review the Project conducted of USAID IEs completed between 2011 and 2016. The Project is producing a discussion paper of lessons learned as well as resources and approaches that USAID staff are using to enhance their investments in IEs going forward.

**Early Coordination to Build Stakeholder Buy-in**

When an IE is commissioned, the Project works with all relevant USAID parties (including Washington and mission staff), the activity implementing partner, and local stakeholders to connect the evaluation and implementation teams, discuss expected timelines and key milestones, and ensure understanding of how intervention decisions affect evaluation design options and vice versa.

**Collaborative IE Design Workshops**

The Project has held several early-stage, in-country IE design workshops to foster understanding among USAID, implementing partner staff, and local stakeholders about the key concepts, benefits, and utility of IEs. These workshops create a collaborative, interactive space for attendees to decide on evaluation questions, clarify roles and expectations for the design and parallel implementation of the activity and evaluation, and build broader interest and enthusiasm for the evidence the IE expects to produce.

**Evaluation Assessments at Multiple Points of the IE Design Stage**

For each IE, the Project produces multiple documents at the design stage (e.g., concept paper, scoping report, design proposal) — to explore options, gauge the suitability of an IE, and facilitate consultations.
External Peer Reviews to Strengthen and Validate the Design

The Project submits its draft IE design proposals to external peer reviewers to ensure evaluation designs are feasible, methodologically sound, and informed by existing evidence. The Project developed an assessment tool for peer reviewers to analyze the main components and rationale for the selected evaluation design and recommend alternative options for consideration, if appropriate.

Rating Evidence and Ensuring Quality

As with any evaluation, the quality of IE results may vary even though the intended design is rigorous. The Project developed tools to ensure IE reports provide enough information for an informed reader to assess the quality of the evidence presented in the final evaluation report and the reliability of IE results. Fidelity to design, model specification, and the level of detail in reporting estimates are critical factors in determining whether an IE presents convincing evidence on an activity’s causal impact. Checklists and peer-review guidance can help ensure standard and straightforward assessment criteria for IE evidence.

Facilitating the Transfer of Ongoing IEs

Since IEs can last several years and extend past the period of performance of an evaluation contract, USAID should plan for a seamless transfer of evaluation implementation between mechanisms. The Project has developed standard protocols and good practices for handling this transfer process. First, it adheres to a data management plan and ensures that data, codebooks, and associated files are clearly structured and understood by the follow-on evaluation team. Second, the Project has formalized implementation fidelity monitoring plans to inform the team of changes to the delivery of activities, address unexpected challenges, and measure outputs and intermediate outcomes along the causal chain. Third, the Project ensures in the evaluation design stage that the timing of the transfer will not disrupt the evaluation or activity implementation.

Reflecting on IE Practice

Since USAID’s 2011 Evaluation Policy, the Agency has funded and published dozens of IEs and developed a variety of tools and guidance documents for implementing rigorous evaluations. The Project has worked with Agency staff to compile lessons learned and practical tools for facilitating the development, implementation, management, analysis, and dissemination of IEs. In the coming year, the Project will work with USAID to make this compilation of tools and lessons learned accessible to Agency staff and evaluation partners to help ensure that IEs meet quality standards and deliver reliable evidence to improve future development assistance.
ANTICIPATED ACTIVITIES IN 2018

The fourth year of the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project saw the start of new activities, and the implementation or near completion of several large studies. While it is difficult to predict how many new activities the E3 offices may request in the last year of the Project, it is possible that the pace of new activity requests may level off after four years of consistent increases. Nevertheless, the Project expects 2018 to be a busy year, with 26 ongoing activities that will involve significant data collection and analysis. Of these 26 activities, 16 will involve sending teams into the field for data collection.

The following key milestones are expected in 2018:

- Completion of the performance evaluations of the West Africa Trade and Investment Hub, the Responsible Land-Based Investment Pilot in Mozambique, and the Women’s Leadership Portfolio.
- Delivery of the final reports for the IEs of the Women’s Leadership in Small and Medium Enterprises activities in Kyrgyzstan and India.
- Midline data collection and analysis for the IE of the Feed the Future Land Tenure Assistance in Tanzania.
- Analysis and reporting of the Education Evaluation Synthesis.
- Continuing submission to the Education Office of Oral Reading Fluency Progress Briefs toward the Goal 1 count of improved readers.
- Ongoing monitoring, learning, and adaptation support for USAID/Mexico’s energy portfolio.
- Data collection and delivery of the final reports for the performance evaluation of the USAID-Department of Energy interagency agreement.
- Design and data collection for the performance evaluation of the Partnership for Growth in the Philippines.
A focus group of women cashew growers. Credit: Irene Velez, MSI.
E3 ANALYTICS AND EVALUATION PROJECT PARTNER OVERVIEW

The implementation team for the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project consists of three core partners: Management Systems International (MSI), a Tetra Tech Company; Development and Training Services, a Palladium company; and NORC at the University of Chicago.

Management Systems International, A Tetra Tech Company

MSI, the lead implementer of the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project, is an international development firm that has delivered development results across the world for 35 years. Its core expertise is in evaluation, institutional development, public sector management, governance, and anti-corruption. MSI has implemented projects in 90 countries around the world, including Jordan, Kenya, Indonesia, Syria, Pakistan, Afghanistan, Ukraine, Colombia, and Mexico. A leader in international development, MSI has partnered with many international development organizations—from large bilateral and multilateral donors such as USAID, the World Bank, and the UNDP to national and local governments, NGOs, think tanks, foundations, and universities—to support clients. Evaluation has been a core MSI service since the firm’s founding. MSI’s Strategy, Evaluation, and Analysis Practice Area conducts rigorous, high-quality evaluations, assessments, and special studies under ongoing USAID mission and bureau-level Evaluation, Monitoring, and Learning Support projects. Annually, MSI leads over 50 evaluations and assessments. With a focus on utilization, MSI regularly conducts performance evaluations, ex-post evaluations, IEs, and meta-evaluations, providing MSI’s clients with learning on what works or does not work.

For the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project, MSI is responsible for overall contract and project management and reporting to USAID. MSI staff members and consultants play significant technical roles in nearly all activities under the Project, and core MSI staff in Arlington, Virginia provide technical and contractual oversight of the Project.

Development and Training Services, a Palladium company

Palladium partners with institutions, governments, and businesses to deliver positive impact solutions, resulting in a better quality of life for individuals and communities around the world. Palladium is a global leader in applying rigorous, evidence-led methodologies to international development challenges. The organization determines iteratively what works, what does not, and designs solutions that drive innovation and collaboration to produce real change. Palladium teams have devised smart development responses in every region of the world, across a range of sectors including health, education, economic growth, governance, environment, informatics, workforce development, and monitoring and evaluation. Palladium’s Data, Informatics, and Analytical Solutions Practice contributes to program learning through high-quality research and monitoring and evaluation services. Palladium combines qualitative approaches, such as the reality-check approach methodology, with quantitative approaches, such as econometric modelling, within robust theories of change frameworks to better understand if and how programs are achieving impact.

Palladium works closely with MSI to provide analytic services under the Project. Palladium staff and consultants work on most Project activities, including the performance evaluations of Enhancing Capacity for Low Emission Development Strategies and SERVIR, the IE of Municipal Climate Change Strategies pilot activity in Macedonia, and the evaluation of the Women’s Leadership Portfolio. Palladium also leads the monitoring, learning, and adaptation activity for USAID/Mexico’s clean energy portfolio under the Project.
**NORC at the University of Chicago**

NORC is one of the largest and most highly respected social research organizations in the U.S., pursuing high quality social science research that serves the public interest. NORC’s International Programs Department helps governments, international aid agencies, and other organization around the world improve their development programs through designing and implementing evaluations and assessments and providing evidence-based analysis of program results and effectiveness. NORC’s core technical capabilities include designing and conducting rigorous performance and IEs of development projects; program monitoring; survey instruments design; conducting analytic research; statistical design and analysis; study design and survey methodology; survey data collection; policy analysis and recommendations; and related technical assistance. NORC has conducted 186 such projects in 71 countries over the past 10 years, most of which were mixed-methods impact or performance evaluations.

NORC is a subcontractor to MSI under the E3 Analytics and Evaluation Project. NORC team members have provided significant support to the Project since its inception, including on impact and performance evaluation design, qualitative and quantitative survey instrument design, and serving as technical lead for the implementation of multiple evaluations. NORC senior researchers have served as team leaders for the completed MAST pilot performance evaluation and cost- and time-effectiveness study in Tanzania, the ongoing LTA IE in Tanzania, and the performance evaluation of the Responsible Land-Based Investment Pilot in Mozambique. In addition, NORC is leading the development of an IE for the West Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change activity and provides technical guidance across the Project’s IEs.
## OVERVIEW OF ACTIVITIES

### TABLE 1: SUMMARY OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES AND STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Activity Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Bureau</th>
<th>Office</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SERVIR Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Global Climate Change</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Africa Trade Hubs Project Design</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Trade and Regulatory Reform</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Initiative for Conservation in the Andean Amazon, Phase II Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Peru Regional Mission</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>West Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change Project Design</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Forestry and Biodiversity</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Africa Trade Hubs Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Trade and Regulatory Reform</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>West Africa Biodiversity and Climate Change Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Forestry and Biodiversity</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Assessment of Indonesia Vulnerability Assessments Project Design</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Indonesia Mission</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Scaling Up Support for the E3 Bureau Project Design</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Water</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>E3 Capacity Development Assessment Project Design</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Economic Policy</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Information and Communications Technology for Education Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Education</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Extreme Poverty Study Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>PPL/Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Sustainable Outcomes in Basic Education Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>PPL/Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Scaling Up Support for the Global Development Lab Scaling Up</td>
<td>GDL</td>
<td>GDL/Office of Evaluation and Impact Assessment</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Education Data Project Design</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Education</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Scaling Up Support for the Global Development Lab - Business Cases for Scale Scaling Up</td>
<td>GDL</td>
<td>GDL/Center for Global Solutions</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Scaling Up Mentoring Support for the Bureau for Food Security Scaling Up</td>
<td>BFS</td>
<td>BFS/Office of Markets, Partnerships, and Innovation</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Scaling Up for Sustainability Training Dissemination</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Education</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Title</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Responsible Agency</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Climate Resiliency of Kazakhstan Wheat and Central Asian Food Security</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3/Office of Global Climate Change</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Human and Institutional Capacity Development-Board for Food and Agricultural Development Program Area Review</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>BFS/Bureau for Food Security</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Regional Clean Energy Initiative</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3/Office of Global Climate Change</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Ethiopia Peace Centers for Climate and Social Resilience</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3/Office of Global Climate Change</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Vietnam Governance for Inclusive Growth</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3/Office of Trade and Regulatory Reform</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Review of Successful Cases of Scaling Agricultural Technologies</td>
<td>Scaling Up</td>
<td>BFS/BFS/Office of Markets, Partnerships, and Innovation</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Indonesia Urban Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>E3/Office of Global Climate Change</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Tanzania Impact Evaluation Clinic</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>E3/Office of Planning, Learning, and Coordination</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Utilization of E3 Evaluations</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>E3/Office of Planning, Learning, and Coordination</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Gender Integration in E3 Evaluations</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>E3/Office of Planning, Learning, and Coordination</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Statements of Work in E3 Evaluations</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>E3/Office of Planning, Learning, and Coordination</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Grameen Shakti-Bangladesh Study Adaptation</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>E3/Office of Energy and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Limited Excess Property Program</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>E3/Office of Local Sustainability</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Southern Africa Trade Hub and Trade Facilitation Measures Assessment</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3/Office of Trade and Regulatory Reform</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Cooperative Development Program</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3/Office of Local Sustainability</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Sanitation Service Delivery</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>Mission West Africa Regional Mission</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>E3 Sectoral Synthesis 2015</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>E3/Office of Planning, Learning, and Coordination</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Title</td>
<td>Task Type</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Office of Management</td>
<td>Status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa Evaluation Summit</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>AFR</td>
<td>AFR/Office of Development Planning</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Course Support</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Energy and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Evaluation Abstracts</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Planning, Learning, and Coordination</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal 2 Meta-Evaluation</td>
<td>Meta-Analysis</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Education</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Data Quality Assessment-Indicator Support</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Planning, Learning, and Coordination</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measuring Impact</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Forestry and Biodiversity</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competitiveness, Trade, and Jobs</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>Central Asia Regional Mission</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteers for Economic Growth Alliance</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Local Sustainability</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Credit Authority</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>PPL/Office of Policy</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Investment Pilot</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Land and Urban</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Africa Trade Hub</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>Mission</td>
<td>West Africa Regional Mission</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Leadership Portfolio</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Gender Equality and Women's Empowerment</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ie Conference Support</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>PPL/Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda Impact Evaluation Committee</td>
<td>Impact Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Forestry and Biodiversity</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity Development Assessment Presentation</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Education</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico Monitoring, Learning, and Adaptation</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Energy and Infrastructure</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation Synthesis Guidance</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>PPL/Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay for Performance</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Private Capital and Microenterprise</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3 Support Survey</td>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Planning, Learning, and Coordination</td>
<td>Inactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Energy Inter-Agency Agreement</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>E3</td>
<td>E3/Office of Global Climate Change</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin American and the Caribbean M&amp;E Meeting</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>PPL/Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3ie Conference Support - India</td>
<td>Dissemination</td>
<td>PPL</td>
<td>PPL/Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GeoCenter Services</td>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>GDL</td>
<td>GDL/GeoCenter</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A farmer and her daughter lead the Project team toward the village center in Magunga, Tanzania for the impact evaluation of the Land Tenure Assistance activity. Credit: Jacob Patterson-Stein, MSI.