



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

EVIDENCE ACT DELIVERABLE

ANNUAL EVALUATION PLAN FY2022

February 2021



Table of Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Identifying Significant Evaluations.....	2
3.	USAID Significant Evaluations FY 2022	2
3.1	Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda	3
3.2	Performance Evaluations of Activities with a Budget of \$40 million or more	17
3.3	Impact Evaluation	25
3.4	Ex-Post Evaluations.....	27
4.	Methodological Approach.....	29
5	Challenges.....	31
6	Dissemination.....	32
7	Technical Support from the Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research (LER).....	32
8	Next Steps	32

Acronyms

AEO	Agency Evaluation Officer
AEP	Accelerated Education Program
CDCS	Country Development Cooperation Strategy
COMMIT	Community Mobilization Initiative to End Tuberculosis
CPS	Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Stability
CVP	Conflict and Violence Prevention
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
DQA	Data Quality Assessment
EA	Evaluability Assessment
FTF	Feed the Future
IGCE	Independent Government Cost Estimate
IR	Intermediate Result
J2SR	Journey to Self-Reliance
LER	Office of Learning Evaluation and Research
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIYCN	Maternal, Infant, and Young Child nutrition
OEA	Operational Excellence Agenda
OU	Operating Unit
PAD	Project Appraisal Document
POC	Point of Contact
PPL	Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning
RISE	Resilience in the Sahel Enhanced
SOW	Statements of Work
SRLA	Self-Reliance Learning Agenda

SVC	Strengthening Value Chains
TB	Tuberculosis
TEC	Technical Evaluation Committees
USAID	United States Agency for International Development

I. Introduction

The Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act of 2018 (Evidence Act) requires agencies to develop an Annual Evaluation Plan, which describes the significant evaluation activities the Agency plans to conduct in the fiscal year following the year in which it is submitted. OMB Circular A-11 (2020) 290-11 states that *“Annual Evaluation Plans offer agencies the opportunity to methodically plan and document their approach to evaluation and, in particular, how their intended evaluations will support those questions on the agency’s learning agenda that are best answered by evaluation.”*

Evaluation functions at USAID are highly decentralized, but with a central office for policy, guidance, and technical assistance. Evaluation is operationalized at three levels within the Agency. These are (1) Bureau for Policy, Planning, and Learning - Office of Learning Evaluation and Research (PPL/LER), (2) Washington Regional and Technical Bureaus, and (3) Bilateral and Regional Missions. The Bureau for Management (M Bureau) leads on management assessments across the operational platform. Given this decentralized characteristic of the Agency evaluation functions, plans for Agency evaluations are also decentralized.

USAID has established the Evaluation Registry to track and report on the various efforts taken to evaluate program activities across the Agency. The registry is updated annually with information on planned, ongoing and completed evaluations. The sources of information for the Annual Evaluation Plan include key staff involved in monitoring and evaluation (M&E) at the various operating units of the Agency, and technical working groups engaged on the Agency-wide Learning Agenda.

In addition to the Evaluation Registry, the M Bureau executes an Operational Excellence Agenda (OEA) that informs continuous improvements of USAID operations which is aligned with the Agency-wide Learning Agenda. The M Bureau implements a range of research studies to improve management operations at USAID, which include but are not limited to, benchmarking studies, business process reviews, data-driven after-action reviews, and cost savings studies. They examine major management challenges at the Agency and seek to produce practical, actionable recommendations for responsible offices and staff. The tasks involve framing key operational questions, answering them either through existing data, or collecting new information and developing appropriate processes for analysis and dissemination. The M Bureau tracks implementation progress and impact over time and provides regular reports to Agency senior management.

2. Identifying Significant Evaluations

OMB Circular A-111 (2020) states that *“The significance of an evaluation study should be defined by each agency and take into consideration factors such as the importance of a program or funding stream to the agency mission; the size of the program in terms of funding or people served; and the extent to which the study will fill an important knowledge gap regarding the program, population(s) served, or the issue(s) that the program was designed to address. Agencies should clearly state their criteria for designating evaluations as “significant” in their plans.”*

There are four criteria¹ used by USAID to identify “significant” evaluations². They are:

- Any evaluation that addresses a question from the [Agency-wide Learning Agenda](#);
- All performance evaluations of activities with budgets of \$40 million or more;
- All impact evaluations; and
- All ex-post evaluations.

PPL/LER applied these criteria to a data collection tool designed to identify planned evaluations for FY 2022. Below is a description of each significant criteria, and a list of planned evaluations that meet each significant criterion, reported by USAID OUs. For some evaluations, the methods, challenges, data needed, and dissemination strategy are still to be determined (TBD) by the operating units.

3. USAID Significant Evaluations FY 2022

OMB Circular A-111 (2020) states that, *“The Evidence Act requires agencies to develop an Annual Evaluation Plan, which describes the significant evaluation activities the agency plans to conduct in the fiscal year following the year in which it is submitted. It should include “significant” evaluations that would help answer priority questions on the Learning Agenda and any other “significant” evaluation, such as those required by statute.”*

¹ These four criteria are mutually exclusive. However, performance evaluations of activities with a budget over \$40 million, impact evaluations, and ex-post evaluations may contribute to answering agency-wide evaluation questions, in addition to answering their Mission learning questions.

² The M Bureau includes management assessments on the Operational Excellence Agenda if they meet one or more of the following four criteria: 1) Is a United States government-wide, Agency, or management platform priority; 2) Addresses a risk on the Agency risk profile; 3) Provides potential for cost savings, cost recovery or cost avoidance; and 4) Addresses a systemic customer service issue as indicated in the Agency’s Customer Service Survey. Management assessments on the Agency’s Operational Excellence Agenda meets the first of the four criteria in that it helps address Question 13 on the USAID Self-Reliance Learning Agenda.

The data on planned significant evaluations for FY 2022 was generated with input from the USAID Operating Units who submitted information on planned evaluations that meet the criteria identified. A total of 22 OUs submitted 35 significant evaluations planned to be conducted in FY 2022. Below is a breakdown of the number of planned evaluations by significant evaluation criteria:

Significant Evaluation Criteria	Number of FY 2022 Planned Evaluations
Evaluations that Address an Agency Learning Agenda Question	20
Performance Evaluation of Activity of \$40 million or more	10
Impact Evaluation	3
Ex-post Evaluation	2
TOTAL	35

3.1 Evaluations Addressing a Question from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

USAID Agency-wide Learning Agenda addresses 13 questions. Specifically, it is designed to support effective integration of data and evidence as the Agency operationalizes the [Journey to Self-Reliance \(J2SR\)](#) Policy Framework. The Agency-wide Learning Agenda will help USAID understand whether its current self-reliance approaches are working, and if not, what changes might improve implementation of the Policy Framework. Through evaluations and other studies and analysis, the Agency-wide Learning Agenda will also enable USAID to generate, collect, synthesize, and disseminate evidence and learning, and facilitate their use to inform the Agency’s efforts to support countries on their journeys to self-reliance. Therefore, evaluations conducted to address any of the thirteen questions are considered significant.

Fourteen OUs in Africa, Middle East, Europe and Eurasia, Latin America and the Caribbean, and Washington DC, reported a total of 20 activities that will be evaluated through evaluations that primarily address at least one of the 13 Agency-wide Learning Agenda questions. Specific questions that

each evaluation will address are not yet available and are not included in the tables. These questions are expected to be identified by the country Missions at the beginning of FY 2022, as they finalize planning and design of the evaluations. Descriptions³ of these significant evaluations are outlined below:

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda	
Evaluation # 1	
Operating Unit	Cambodia
Name of Evaluation	Community Mobilization Initiative to End Tuberculosis (COMMIT)
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will be conducted at mid-term to reflect on and evaluate past performance and inform any necessary changes for the rest of the performance period.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q8. How can different approaches to design, procurement, and management of programs foster self-reliance? What promising partner engagement practices emerge from these approaches?
Data/Information Needed	Data on the significant achievements of the activity to date, will inform the way forward to achieve the desired outcomes for the remaining period of performance for the activity. Data on the effectiveness of the new approaches to finding missing TB cases will also be needed.
Methods	Mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative data collection).
Challenges	The scale of community outbreak of COVID-19 and the subsequent timeline for national-level vaccinations could affect the data collection for this evaluation.
Dissemination Strategy	The findings will be disseminated among the implementing partners and will be used by the TB team to decide on the activity's strategic direction; the implementing partner will use the findings to improve their performance and approaches.

³We have provided detailed information for each evaluation when possible, but for some evaluations the methods and other details are still to be determined. We have marked those evaluations with ***

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

USAID and the IP will share the findings with the national TB program to advocate for their buy-in into the promising approaches to find missing TB cases.

Evaluation # 2

Operating Unit	Cambodia
Name of Evaluation	The Women Entrepreneurs Act (WE Act) Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will assess the project's performance to date with respect to its objectives, and recommend any changes to improve project performance in the three remaining years.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q10. How can local, sub-national, national, and regional voices, priorities, and contributions be integrated into how USAID fosters self-reliance?
Data/Information Needed	Data on the significant achievements of the activity to date will inform the way forward to achieve the desired outcomes for the remaining period of performance for the activity.
Methods	Mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative data collection)
Challenges	The scale of community outbreak of COVID-19 and the subsequent timeline for national-level vaccinations could affect the data collection for this evaluation. In addition, the various restrictions of the government in relation to containment of COVID-19 and the civil society space could also limit the scope and extent of this assessment. Lastly, the elections in 2022 could affect mobilization of teams for data collection.
Dissemination Strategy	Based on the sensitivity of the report findings, USAID and the implementing partner will decide if the evaluation report should be released in whole or in part. USAID will use this report to identify the challenges of this program and assess its successes.

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

The implementing partner will use this report to modify its approach and programming and mitigate any identified risks for the remainder of the activity.

Evaluation # 3**

Operating Unit	Cambodia
Name of Evaluation	Feed the Future (FTF) HARVEST II Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will be conducted to determine the achievements of the activity against the stated objectives and to document lessons learned of the activity implementation for future FTF activities.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q4. How can private sector engagement (PSE) support countries to advance in their Journey to Self-Reliance?

Evaluation # 4**

Operating Unit	Central Asia
Name of Evaluation	Eliminating Tuberculosis in Central Asia
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will provide findings, statistics, and judgments that assist USAID and its partners to learn what has been accomplished, and determine what components of the project worked well, which did not and why.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q7. How can USAID and its partners foster self-reliance in fragile contexts?

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Evaluation # 5

Operating Unit	Development, Democracy, and Innovation Bureau (DDI)/Private Sector Engagement (PSE) Hub
Name of Evaluation	CATALYZE Blended Capital Investment Platform Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of the evaluation is to collect data to determine if any mid-course corrections are needed; document lessons learned; and adaptation of blended finance approach.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q8. How can different approaches to design, procurement, and management of programs foster self-reliance? What promising partner engagement practices emerge from these approaches?
Data/Information Needed	Need data to determine whether there is sufficient comparable baseline data to conduct an impact evaluation. This is currently being assessed. This information plus additional counterfactual analysis will determine whether an impact evaluation is appropriate.
Methods	Mixed methods being considered, including quasi experimental, formative, and implementation evaluation approaches.
Challenges	Baseline data will be difficult to collect. There is a wide variety of programmatic approaches, objectives and contexts being employed depending on the Mission's buy-in scope.
Dissemination Strategy	Dissemination will be in accordance with the requirements outlined in ADS 578, including posting the evaluation results on the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) and on internal USAID sites. Information will also be shared with the PSE Community of Practice, PSE POCs and PSE Knowledge Management groups.

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Evaluation # 6

Operating Unit	Egypt
Name of Evaluation	Feed the Future Egypt Rural Agribusiness
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will determine the extent to which the project contributes to increased incomes of smallholder farmers due to agriculture related activities.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q4. How can private sector engagement (PSE) support countries to advance in their Journey to Self-Reliance?
Data/Information Needed	The evaluation will need data that will allow for the assessment of the performance of the activity and recommend any needed programmatic corrections/adjustments, if any.
Methods	A mixed method approach to the evaluation that complies to the greatest extent possible with the USAID evaluation policy will be followed. The evaluation will adopt specific qualitative and quantitative data collection, if possible, and analytical methods that align with current circumstances to appropriately answer the evaluation questions. The evaluation will aim to collect data using a sample size that is valid and representative.
Challenges	The COVID-19 situation is imposing restrictions with regards to conducting fieldwork and meeting with stakeholders and beneficiaries. Also, evaluation teams are facing difficulties in obtaining approvals from the Government of Egypt to conduct surveys, particularly household surveys.
Dissemination Strategy	The primary audience of the evaluation report will be USAID/Egypt, specifically USAID Senior Mission management, the Office of Economic Growth (OEG), and the Program Office. The draft of the report will also be shared with the Implementing Partner for their review and feedback. USAID/Egypt will share the final report on the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) within 90 days of report completion

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

	Evaluation # 7
Operating Unit	Egypt
Name of Evaluation	Macro-economic Stabilization & Reform (MESR)
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will provide data to determine the extent to which the activity is contributing to improved public investment planning, implementation, and monitoring to enhance the productivity of public capital assets and the efficiency and effectiveness of public services.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q11. How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?
Data/Information Needed	Data will be needed to evaluate the performance of the activity and inform similar activity designs in the future.
Methods	A mixed method approach to the evaluation that complies to the greatest extent possible with the USAID evaluation policy will be followed. The evaluation will adopt specific qualitative and quantitative data collection, if possible and analytical methods that align with current circumstances to appropriately answer the evaluation questions. The evaluation will aim to collect data using a sample size that is valid and representative.
Challenges	1) The COVID-19 situation is imposing restrictions with regards to conducting fieldwork and meeting the stakeholders and beneficiaries. 2) The evaluation teams face difficulties in obtaining approvals from the Government of Egypt to conduct surveys, particularly household surveys.
Dissemination Strategy	The primary audience of the evaluation report will be USAID/Egypt, specifically USAID Senior Mission management, the Office of Economic Growth (OEG), and the Program Office. The draft of the report will also be shared with the Implementing Partner for their review and feedback. USAID/Egypt will share the final report on the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) within 90 days of report completion.

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Evaluation # 8

Operating Unit	Global Health (GH)
Name of Evaluation	Pillar 2 COVID-19 Response
Evaluation Purpose	This is an evaluation to assess GH performance in Pillar 2 Response to the COVID-19 Pandemic.
Evaluation Purpose	This is an evaluation to assess GH performance in response to the Pillar 2 Response ⁴ to the COVID-19 Pandemic.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	01. What are the change pathways around how capacity and commitment come together to build self-reliance, and what are the implications for USAID programs? How can we foster the capacity and commitment of all actors at different levels of the system (local, sub-national, national, and regional)?
Data/Information Needed	Information on how Global Health supported partner country responses to the COVID-19 global pandemic, across the various COVID-19 relevant technical areas identified by WHO, in the context of our existing investments in global health security and building resilient health systems.
Methods	TBD – will be identified by the Mission in FY 2022, during the planning and design of the evaluation.
Potential Challenges	Due to the complex nature of the pandemic, the wider international response, and challenges establishing a valid counterfactual, it will be difficult to robustly quantify the impact of USAID's support in these areas, as well as to attribute change in these areas to USAID.
Dissemination Strategy	TBD – will be identified by the Mission in FY 2022, during the planning and design of the evaluation.

⁴ Prevent, prepare for, respond to, and bolster health systems to address COVID-19 and re-emergence.

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Evaluation # 9

Operating Unit	India
Name of Evaluation	Technical Assistance to Government of India (GOI) for Swachh Bharat Mission – WASH
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of this mid-term evaluation is to assess the impact of the technical assistance provided to the Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs (MoHUA), Government of India (GOI). Specifically, the evaluation will determine the extent to which the interventions have strengthened the capacity of the GOI to become more self-reliant.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q11. How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?
Data/Information Needed	Data from monitoring reports will be needed, Specifically, data from the Government of India, implementing partner reports, state government reports, multi-donor reports.
Methods	Mostly qualitative to include, document review, reports analysis, key stakeholder interviews in government, implementing partners, and other donor organizations.
Challenges	Meeting relevant officials in the government with knowledge of the activity because they change their post frequently. Attribution to results could be challenging as the activity supports the Government Ministry which also is involved with multiple donors. Data may not be available for some key results.
Dissemination Strategy	Findings will be disseminated through workshops for the stakeholders. Other strategies will be determined later.

Evaluation # 10

Operating Unit	India
----------------	-------

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Name of Evaluation	Asia EDGE (Enhancing Development and Growth through Energy)
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of the mid-term evaluation is to assess the progress and the effectiveness of the activities and implementation in achieving the objective of the project. The findings will help refine the interventions and mid-course correction, if any, for the remaining period of the activity's implementation.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q12. How can we best measure USAID's specific contribution to countries' progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance at the local, sub-national, national, and regional levels?
Data/Information Needed	The evaluation will need data from the Implementing partner progress reports, PPR and IPS results reporting data, Country level economic and energy related data for context information.
Methods	Qualitative including key stakeholder interviews, and document review.
Challenges	This is a regional intervention managed by the USAID/India Mission. Collecting data from multiple countries in South Asia, including interviews and meetings with key officials in the region could be challenging. It may be challenging attributing outcomes in each country to the regional level intervention.
Dissemination Strategy	Findings will be disseminated through regional workshops for the stakeholders. Other strategies will be determined later.

Evaluation # 11**

Operating Unit	Kyrgyz Republic
Name of Evaluation	Cure TB Activity

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will assess the progress of the activity, with the intent to validate the Theory of Change (TOC) and determine the status of risks and assumptions.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q11. How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?

Evaluation # 12

Operating Unit	Management Bureau
Name of Evaluation	Human Capital Operational Policy Effectiveness Evaluations
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of the evaluation is to conduct a management assessment on the effectiveness of the Agency's Operational Excellence Agenda
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q13. How can USAID's organizational structures and staffing, policies, guidance, technical assistance, and capacity building enable us to foster self-reliance? In what ways can USAID/Washington provide effective field services to operationalize the Journey to Self-Reliance?
Data/Information Needed	Quantitative: Applicant flow data and promotion data (five years), retention data for pathways program participants (e.g., PMF, intern), Agency demographic data found in MD-715. Qualitative: Key informant interviews and focus group input from HCTM managers with responsibilities in civil service recruitment/strategic outreach and hiring, Office of Civil Rights and Diversity affirmative employment representatives, B/IO Administrative Management Service Officers and hiring managers.
Methods	Key informant interviews, focus groups, root cause analysis (using problem trees), trend analysis.
Challenges	Challenges include the availability and accuracy of applicant flow data and promotion data for the past five years.

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Dissemination Strategy	Briefings to USAID Chief Human Capital Officer and the Management Operations Council (MOC), a body of senior leaders across Agency B/IOs. It will also be available on the MOC and the Bureau for Management's Office of Management, Policy, Budget and Operational Performance intranet pages.
Evaluation # 13	
Operating Unit	Nepal
Name of Evaluation	Sajhedari - Support to Federalism Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the progress of the activity in achieving its objectives, and to determine any adjustments that should be made to the approach of the intervention and address emerging gaps for strengthening federalism.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q11. How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?
Data/Information Needed	Information about how the subnational level local government capacity building interventions are strengthening their abilities to provide services and be responsive to citizen's demands in the context of newly created federal structures.
Methods	Mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative data collection)
Challenges	Several organizations are working in the same area where the activity is implemented, using a variety of interventions. As a result, it might be challenging to design a robust evaluation using a methodology that will allow for attribution of the results to USAID interventions.
Dissemination Strategy	Dissemination of the findings at the provincial and municipal levels through workshops, sharing sessions. Sharing evaluation reports and key recommendations, findings with the federal level stakeholders, other development organizations, and civil society organizations working to support federalism in Nepal. Additional strategies will be decided when planning for the evaluation and during the evaluation design phase.

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Evaluation # 14

Operating Unit	Peru
Name of Evaluation	Global Development Alliances in Alternative Development (AD) Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of the evaluation is to generate data on the experience and effectiveness of working with the private sector and assess the contribution to women's economic empowerment.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q4. How can private sector engagement (PSE) support countries to advance in their Journey to Self-Reliance?
Data/Information Needed	TBD – will be identified by the Mission in FY 2022, during the planning and design of the evaluation.
Methods	TBD – will be identified by the Mission in FY 2022, during the planning and design of the evaluation.
Challenges	Challenges in accessing multiple stakeholders, including government, private sector, and implementing partners.
Dissemination Strategy	The report will be published on the DEC. Presentations will be made to USAID Mission staff and stakeholders. Other strategies TBD.

Evaluation # 15

Operating Unit	Senegal
----------------	---------

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Name of Evaluation	Government-to-Government Activity: Sustainable Access to Water and Sanitation
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of this evaluation is to support both USAID/Senegal and the Government of Senegal (GoS) in identifying strengths and weaknesses in the current Government to Government (G2G) approach to improving water and sanitation services.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q8. How can different approaches to design, procurement, and management of programs foster self-reliance? What promising partner engagement practices emerge from these approaches?
Data/Information Needed	Identify strengths and weaknesses in the current Government to Government (G2G) approach in improving water and sanitation services.
Methods	TBD – will be identified by the Mission in FY 2022, during the planning and design of the evaluation.
Challenges	COVID-19 pandemic restrictions preventing evaluation team to conduct field work.
Dissemination Strategy	Presentations to mission and stakeholders, infographics, other strategies TBD.

Evaluation # 16

Operating Unit	Senegal
Name of Evaluation	Fisheries, Biodiversity and Livelihood (FBL) Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of the evaluation is to examine both performance and the broader contextual issues that impact FBL’s theory of change and expected results, scalability and sustainability of interventions.

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q11. How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?
Data/Information Needed	Data will be needed on the performance and broader contextual issues that impact FBL's theory of change and expected results, the scalability and sustainability of interventions.
Methods	TBD – will be identified by the Mission in FY 2022, during the planning and design of the evaluation.
Challenges	COVID-19 pandemic restrictions may prevent evaluation teams from conducting field work.
Dissemination Strategy	Presentations to mission and stakeholders. Develop infographics. Other strategies TBD.

Evaluation # 17**

Operating Unit	Turkmenistan
Name of Evaluation	Governance Support Program Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will provide pertinent information, analysis, and judgments that assist USAID to assess accomplishments towards the intended results of the agreement.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	01. What are the change pathways around how capacity and commitment come together to build self-reliance, and what are the implications for USAID programs? How can we foster the capacity and commitment of all actors at different levels of the system (local, sub-national, national, and regional)?

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Evaluation # 18

Operating Unit	USAID/PPL
Name of Evaluation	Evaluation of USAID's response to address second-order impacts of COVID19
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will be conducted to determine the effectiveness of various strategies used to mitigate second order effects of COVID19
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	01. What are the change pathways around how capacity and commitment come together to build self-reliance, and what are the implications for USAID programs? How can we foster the capacity and commitment of all actors at different levels of the system (local, sub-national, national, and regional)?
Data/Information Needed	Resource allocations (supplemental funded programming); performance reports; interview / FGD data; partner reports.
Methods	Document reviews, FGD, KII, and Surveys.
Challenges	No designated funding stream for this evaluation; travel and contact restrictions due to COVID-19; coordinating priority questions across multiple technical areas and stakeholders.
Dissemination Strategy	Report in the DEC, Internal presentation of methods and results.

Evaluation # 19**

Operating Unit	Uzbekistan
Name of Evaluation	Uzbekistan Education Reform Activity

Evaluations Addressing Questions from the Agency-wide Learning Agenda

Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will provide findings, statistics, and judgments that will assist the activity team, the contractor, its subcontractors, and USAID to learn what has been accomplished. It will also determine what components of the activity worked well, which did not, and why.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q11. How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?
Evaluation # 20**	
Operating Unit	Uzbekistan
Name of Evaluation	Uzbekistan Rule of Law Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will provide findings, statistics, and judgments that will assist the activity team, the contractor and its subcontractors, and USAID to learn what has been accomplished. It will also determine what components of the activity worked well, which did not, and why.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Q11. How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?

** Data/Information Needed, Methods, Challenges, and Dissemination Strategy, to be determined. These will be available in FY 2022, as Missions finalize planning of the evaluations.

3.2 Performance Evaluations of Activities with a Budget of \$40 million or more

Performance evaluations include a broad range of evaluation methods and are the most common type of evaluation conducted by USAID. Performance evaluations also include evaluation types defined by OMB Circular No. A-11 and referenced in OMB Memorandum M-20-12 providing Program Evaluation

Standards and Practices. These include, developmental evaluations, formative evaluation, outcome evaluation, and process or implementation evaluation.

This criterion focuses on performance evaluations of activities with a budget of \$40 million or more. These evaluations are significant because activities with this level of funding are large procurements that require approval by the USAID Administrator. As such, evaluations of these activities are significant, given the size of the activity, in terms of funding.

Four OUs from Africa, Asia, and the Middle East reported performance evaluations that are planned to be conducted on activities worth \$40 million or more. A total of 10 significant evaluations are planned by these OUs in FY 2022. The evaluations will primarily address learning questions at the OU level. However, the Mission learning questions align with the specific Agency-wide learning questions, and these are also included in the table. Below is a description of the planned evaluations under the criterion, including the learning questions they will address:

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above	
Evaluation #1	
Operating Unit	Burma
Name of Evaluation	Health Project Appraisal Document (PAD) IRI - Empowered people, communities, and health system actors to increase demand for high-quality, essential, affordable health services (multiple activities)
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will be conducted to generate data that will inform mid-course corrections, and direction of the activity implementation
Mission Learning Question	How can disparate Global Health (GH) funding streams contribute to the common goal of more empowered health system stakeholders with greater agency?

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	Q 11. How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?
Data/Information Needed	The data and information on how USAID could empower the health system of stakeholders in Myanmar.
Methods	Qualitative and quantitative methods.
Challenges	If COVID-19 pandemic continues over the course of the year, it may affect the evaluation data collection.
Dissemination Strategy	Mission-wide exit briefing of evaluation findings and recommendations, sharing the final evaluation report to the relevant stakeholders, and publishing the report on the DEC.

Evaluation # 2

Operating Unit	Burma
Name of Evaluation	Health Project Appraisal Document (PAD) IR2 - Expanded availability and use of information and knowledge (multiple activities)
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will be conducted to generate data that will inform mid-course corrections, and direction of the activity implementation
Mission Learning Question	How can disparate Global Health (GH) funding streams contribute to the common goal of better availability and use of information for decisions in the health sector?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda	Q 12. How can we best measure USAID’s specific contribution to countries’ progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance at the local, sub-national, national, and regional levels?

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Question Alignment	
Data/Information Needed	The data and information on the availability and use of information for decisions in the health sector and how USAID could contribute to those results.
Methods	Qualitative and Quantitative methods.
Challenges	If COVID-19 pandemic continues over the course of the year, it may affect the evaluation data collection.
Dissemination Strategy	Mission-wide exit briefing of evaluation findings and recommendations, sharing the final evaluation report to the relevant stakeholders, and publishing the report on the DEC.

Evaluation # 3

Operating Unit	Burma
Name of Evaluation	Health Project Appraisal Document (PAD) IR3 - More equitable accessibility of essential, high-quality goods and services (multiple activities)
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will be conducted to generate data that will inform mid-course corrections, and direction of the activity implementation
Mission Learning Question	How can disparate Global Health (GH) funding streams contribute to the common goal of increased availability/accessibility of essential health goods and services for target people?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda	Q 12. How can we best measure USAID’s specific contribution to countries’ progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance at the local, sub-national, national, and regional levels?

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Question Alignment	
Data/Information Needed	The data and information on accessibility and availability of essential health goods and services for the target population in Myanmar and how USAID could utilize the resources to contribute to those results.
Methods	Qualitative and quantitative methods.
Challenges	If COVID-19 pandemic continues over the course of the year, it may affect the evaluation data collection.
Dissemination Strategy	Mission-wide exit briefing of evaluation findings and recommendations, sharing the final evaluation report to the relevant stakeholders, and publishing the report on the DEC.

Evaluation # 4

Operating Unit	Burma
Name of Evaluation	Strengthening Democratic Institutions, Supporting Elections and Political Transition in Burma
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will be conducted to generate data that will inform mid-course corrections, and direction of the activity implementation
Mission Learning Question	How effective has our investment in Burma's elections and political processes been in contributing to democratic reforms? Are there new or different areas that should be a focus as we look to a new government?

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	Q 12. How can we best measure USAID’s specific contribution to countries’ progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance at the local, sub-national, national, and regional levels?
Data/Information Needed	The data and information of effectiveness of USAID’s investment in Myanmar’s 2020 elections and political processes and the areas of focus for the new Myanmar government in its democratic reforms.
Methods	Qualitative and quantitative methods.
Challenges	If COVID-19 pandemic continues over the course of the year, it may affect the evaluation data collection.
Dissemination Strategy	Mission-wide exit briefing of evaluation findings and recommendations, sharing the final evaluation report to the relevant stakeholders, and publishing the report on the DEC

Evaluation # 5

Operating Unit	Ethiopia
Name of Evaluation	Evaluation of Growth through Nutrition Activity
Evaluation Purpose	This evaluation will assess what the activity has achieved, how well it is being implemented, and how it is perceived and valued by beneficiaries.
Mission Learning Question	To what extent is the nutrition activity contributing to changes in access to diverse, safe, quality, and the preservation and storage of nutrient dense foods? To what extent is the nutrition activity contributing to multi-sectoral coordination, and strengthening of capacity to implement effective nutrition and WASH activities?

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	Q10. How can local, sub-national, national, and regional voices, priorities, and contributions be integrated into how USAID fosters self-reliance?
Data/Information Needed	Data on the livelihoods/resilience of beneficiaries and comparison groups will be needed.
Methods	Quasi-experimental, using both qualitative and quantitative data collections methods to compare the resiliency of households and communities in USAID and non-USAID intervention areas.
Challenges	Travel and gathering restrictions due to COVID19 may potentially affect the breadth and depth of the evaluation and in effect the quality of the evaluation may not be the same as it would have been without COVID19 restrictions.
Dissemination Strategy	Strategy will include presentation to Mission staff, report sharing with relevant government stakeholders, and then the report will be published on the DEC. Other strategies will be determined during final evaluation design.

Evaluation # 6

Operating Unit	Lebanon
Name of Evaluation	Quality Instruction Towards Access and Basic Education Improvement II (QITABI II) Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The result of this midterm evaluation will assess the performance of the activity and identify any elements that may not be working as planned. This will provide data to guide USAID in making midcourse adjustment of the program (if need be).
Mission Learning Question	Is the activity serving its purpose? Are we reaching our targets? What can we do to improve activity performance?

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	The evaluation may also contribute to Agency-wide Learning Agenda question 11 - How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?
Data/Information Needed	Data will be needed from QITABI II MEL plan, work plans, progress, and project reports. Reading assessments and other completed baselines assessments. Data verification reports and Data Quality Assessment (DQA) reports. Analysis generated from interviews and FGDs.
Methods	The evaluation will apply qualitative methods including, key informant interviews with USAID staff, Education Office Director, Project team, and officials in the Ministry of Education. Focus group discussions with assistant administrators and educators, taking into consideration gender and age representation.
Challenges	Challenges may include access to all needed information from the Ministry of Education. Ability to meet selected key informants. Ability to organize focus group discussion in a timely and coordinated way with selected administrators and educators.
Dissemination Strategy	Strategies will include final debriefing with World Learning. Publish the final report on USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC). Develop a 2-page summary of the evaluation report. Preparation of the evaluation post-action plan. Integration of endorsed recommendations in the Mission portfolio review.

Evaluation # 7

Operating Unit	Lebanon
Name of Evaluation	Community Support Program (CSP)
Evaluation Purpose	The result of this midterm evaluation will assess the performance of the activity and identify any elements that may not be working as planned. This will provide data to guide USAID in making midcourse adjustment of the program (if need be).

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Mission Learning Question	Is the activity serving its purpose? Are we reaching our targets? What can we do to improve activity performance?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	This evaluation will also contribute to Agency Learning Agenda question 10 - How can local, sub-national, national, and regional voices, priorities, and contributions be integrated into how USAID fosters self-reliance? and How can we engage local and other relevant systems such that they become more self-reliant and sustain results?
Data/Information Needed	Data needed include CSP work plans, MEL plan, progress, monitoring and other project reports. Baseline reports and other community-based assessments and surveys. Data verification reports and DQAs. Analysis generated from interviews and FGDs.
Methods	Qualitative methods will be used. This will include key informant interviews with USAID and project staff, representatives from assisted local entities and municipalities, representatives from established partnerships, and with selected local development experts and public officials if the situation allows. Focus group discussions with beneficiaries from selected grants and communities, taking into consideration gender and age representation.
Challenges	There may be challenges in the ability to access all selected sites and communities. As well as the ability to meet and interview selected key informants.
Dissemination Strategy	Strategy will include final debriefing with Chemonics. Publish the final report on USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC). Develop a 2-page summary of the evaluation report. Preparation of the evaluation post-action plan. Integration of endorsed recommendations in the Mission portfolio review.
Evaluation # 8	
Operating Unit	Lebanon

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Name of Evaluation	Agriculture and Rural Empowerment (ARE) Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The result of this midterm evaluation will assess the performance of the activity and identify any elements that may not be working as planned. This will provide data to guide USAID in making midcourse adjustment of the program (if needed).
Mission Learning Question	Is the activity serving its purpose? Are we reaching our targets? What can we do to improve activity performance?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	This evaluation will also contribute to Agency-wide Learning Agenda question 7 - How can USAID and its partners foster self-reliance in fragile contexts?
Data/Information Needed	Data will be needed that include ARE work plans, MEL plan, CLA plan, progress, monitoring, contextual reports, and other project reports. Baseline reports and technical/value chain assessments and surveys. Data verification reports and DQAs. Analysis generated from interviews and focus group discussions.
Methods	Mixed methods (Quantitative and Qualitative data collection and analysis). This will include conducting a survey of beneficiaries. Key Informant Interviews with USAID and project staff, experts in selected sectors, grantees, and selected beneficiaries. Focus group discussion and/or beneficiary-based survey with grants beneficiaries, taking into consideration gender and age representation.
Challenges	Challenges may include ability to access all selected sites and interventions. Ability to meet and interview selected key informants.
Dissemination Strategy	Strategy will include final debriefing with Chemonics. Publish the final report on USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC). Develop a 2-page summary of the evaluation report. Preparation of the evaluation post-action plan. Integration of endorsed recommendations in the Mission portfolio review.

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Evaluation # 9

Operating Unit	Lebanon
Name of Evaluation	Trade and Investment Facilitation (TIF) Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The result of this midterm evaluation will assess the performance of the activity and identify any elements that may not be working as planned. This will provide data to guide USAID in making midcourse adjustment of the program (if needed).
Mission Learning Question	Is the activity serving its purpose? Are we reaching our targets? What can we do to improve activity performance?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	The evaluation will also contribute to Agency-wide Learning Agenda question 7 - How can USAID and its partners foster self-reliance in fragile contexts?
Data/Information Needed	Data will be needed include TIF work plans, MEL plan, progress, monitoring and other project reports. Assessments and surveys. Data verification reports and DQAs. Analysis generated from interviews.
Methods	Qualitative methods including key informant interviews with USAID and project staff, representatives from assisted entities, taking into consideration gender and age representation; and representatives from established partnerships and stakeholders.
Challenges	There may be challenges in the ability to access all selected sites and interventions; and the ability to meet and interview selected key informants.
Dissemination Strategy	Strategy will include final debriefing with Development Alternatives International (DAI). Publish the final report on USAID's Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC). Develop a 2-page summary of the evaluation report. Preparation of the evaluation post-action plan. Integration of endorsed recommendations in the Mission portfolio review.

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above

Evaluation # 10

Operating Unit	Somalia
Name of Evaluation	The Somalia Accelerated Quality Learning Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of this evaluation is to (1) identify the most effective and cost-efficient models of delivering accelerated education programs in the pilot phase of the contract, focusing on learning outcomes, equitable access, and retention for all students, particularly the most vulnerable; (2) measure the results of the full program, in terms of learning outcomes, equitable access, and retention for all students, particularly the most vulnerable. (3) measure the cost effectiveness of the program (for pilot models and scaled-up models); and (4) capture the lessons learned (for pilot models, and scaled-up models)
Mission Learning Question	How and why results differed across Accelerated Education Program (AEP) pilot models? What types of students benefited most or benefited the least from various Accelerated Education Program (AEP) models? How cost-effective are the Accelerated Education Program (AEP) models?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	The evaluation may also contribute to Agency-wide Learning Agenda question 12 - How can we best measure USAID's specific contribution to countries' progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance at the local, sub-national, national, and regional levels?
Data/Information Needed	TBD – will be available in FY 2022 when the evaluation planning and design are being finalized.
Methods	TBD – will be available in FY 2022 when the evaluation planning and design are being finalized.

Significant performance Evaluations of Activities with Budget of \$40 million and above	
Challenges	COVID-19 pandemic preventing evaluation team to conduct field work
Dissemination Strategy	Not finalized but preliminary thoughts are presentation to Mission, report sharing with relevant government stakeholders, and submission to DEC. Other strategies will be determined during evaluation design

** Alignment with Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Questions Data/Information Needed, Methods, Challenges, and Dissemination Strategy, to be determined. These will be available in FY 2022 when the evaluation planning and design are being finalized.

3.3 Impact Evaluations

Impact evaluations measure changes in development outcomes that are attributable to a defined intervention, program, policy, or organization. Impact evaluations are based on models of cause and effect and require a credible and rigorously defined counterfactual to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for observed changes. Impact evaluations can be either experimental design or quasi-experimental design.

USAID evaluation policy states that each USAID Mission and Washington OU must conduct an impact evaluation, if feasible, of any new, untested approach that is anticipated to be expanded in scale or scope through U.S. Government foreign assistance or other funding sources (i.e., a pilot intervention). However, USAID is currently encouraging Missions to conduct long-term impact evaluations, providing technical support to build the capacity of Missions to conduct these evaluations. The expectation is that in subsequent Evaluation Plans, we will be seeing an increase in the number of impact evaluations.

D

As indicated earlier, though impact evaluation is a mutually exclusive significant evaluation category, these evaluations may also contribute to Agency-wide learning agenda questions, in addition to the mission learning questions they address. The table below also shows the Agency-wide learning questions to which the mission learning questions are aligned. Impact evaluations are significant evaluations, because they fill important knowledge gaps about the effectiveness and change that can be attributed to USAID investments and interventions.

There are three impact evaluations reported to be implemented in FY 2022 by OUs in Africa and the Middle East. These are described below:

Impact Evaluations	
Evaluation # 1	
Operating Unit	Ethiopia
Name of Evaluation	Feed the Future Ethiopia Livelihoods for Resilience Activity
Evaluation Purpose	This evaluation will be conducted to measure the effectiveness of livelihoods for resilience interventions by comparing the resiliency of beneficiary and non-beneficiary households and communities.
Mission Learning Agenda Question	To what extent does the resiliency of households and communities receiving USAID livelihood interventions increased, compared to households and communities in non-USAID intervention areas?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	The evaluation will contribute to Agency-wide learning Agenda question 6 - In what ways can humanitarian assistance approaches and funds contribute to country progress toward self-reliance, while also meeting urgent needs?
Data/Information Needed	Will need data on the performance of the activity and how it was perceived by beneficiaries.
Methods	Quasi-experimental method to measure pre-and-post intervention outcomes using qualitative and quantitative data collection methods.
Challenges	Travel and gathering restrictions due to COVID may potentially affect the breadth and depth of the evaluation and in effect the quality of the evaluation may not be the same as it would have been without COVID evaluation.
Dissemination Strategy	Presentation to Mission; report sharing with relevant government stakeholders; and then the report will be submitted to the DEC.

Impact Evaluations

Evaluation # 2

Operating Unit	Jordan
Name of Evaluation	Evaluation of the Community & Health Nutrition (CHN) Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The impact evaluation aims to generate evidence on the impact of programming to support optimal health and nutritional status of pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and children under two in Jordan.
Mission Learning Agenda Question	What is the impact of the Community Health and Nutrition program on key Maternal, Infant, and Young Child nutrition (MIYCN) indicators? What are lessons learned that can be used in the future to improve nutrition-related research or its use in Jordan?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question Alignment	This evaluation will also contribute to question 12 - How can we best measure USAID's specific contribution to countries' progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance at the local, sub-national, national, and regional levels?
Data/Information Needed	Qualitative and quantitative data from key informant interviews and focus group discussions.
Methods	The stepped wedge randomized control trial will be the impact evaluation design. Key informant interviews and focus group discussions will supplement the main measurement tools of nutrition.
Challenges	COVID 19 health safety protocols could slow down the data gathering of the evaluation team and will likely require the use of more virtual data gathering tools.
Dissemination Strategy	The strategy will include, but not limited to, (a) presentations to the Mission's health team and senior management of CHN results after each of the 3 main data gathering points of the evaluation (baseline, mid-term, end line); (b) presentation of the same to the Ministry of Health of Jordan; (c) social media posts (Facebook,

Impact Evaluations

Twitter) about main findings of nutrition outcomes; and (d) possible article in the Global Health (GH) bureau newsletter and presentation in GH Call to the Field.

Evaluation # 3

Operating Unit	Sahel Regional Office (Niger & Burkina Faso)
Name of Evaluation	Resilience in the Sahel Enhanced (RISE) II Activity
Evaluation Purpose	The purpose of the evaluation is to assess the impact of RISE programming on resilience and well-being.
Mission Learning Agenda Question	(1) To what extent does the RISE approach contribute to well-being outcome indicators? (2) To what extent were RISE households able to recover from shocks? (3) What impact do RISE interventions have on household and community resilience capacities?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Evaluation may contribute to Agency-wide Learning Agenda Question 7 - How can USAID and its partners foster self-reliance in fragile contexts?
Data/Information Needed	Information will be needed to identify if resilience capacities enable households and communities to effectively function in the face of shocks and stresses and still meet a set of assets/income, nutrition, and food security outcomes.
Methods	Quasi-experimental (Mixed methods including qualitative and quantitative data collection), with recurrent monitoring.
Challenges	Challenges may include the COVID-19 pandemic preventing the evaluation team to conduct field work and creating delays. Trying to line up the evaluation and Resilience Recurrent Monitoring Surveys (RMS) studies with the lean season has been an ongoing challenge.

Impact Evaluations

Dissemination Strategy	Will likely host dissemination sessions with the Sahel Regional Office's Collaboration, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) mechanism (The Sahel Collaboration and Communication activity). These dissemination sessions may be staggered over the life of the impact evaluation with updates from the ongoing RMS. Additional dissemination strategies will be developed in partnership with key Washington DC stakeholders and active M&E/CLA participants.
------------------------	--

3.4 Ex-Post Evaluations

All ex-post evaluations are significant evaluations. Ex-post evaluations can be either performance or impact evaluations of a development intervention initiated at least one year after strategy, project, or activity implementation has ended. Though USAID Evaluation Policy does not require ex-post evaluations, USAID's Bureau for Policy, Planning and Learning (PPL), [Food for Peace](#), [Global Health](#), and other bureaus have been experimenting with the use of ex-post evaluation methods to answer questions about whether and how outcomes are sustained over time, and after USAID's investments have ended.

As indicated earlier, although ex-post evaluation is a mutually exclusive significant evaluation category, these evaluations may also contribute to Agency-wide learning agenda questions, in addition to the mission learning questions they address. Based on USAID's current Journey to Self-Reliance (J2SR) approach, which refers to a country's ability to plan, finance, and implement solutions to its own development challenges, ex-post evaluations are significant because they offer a unique opportunity to ask key questions about the sustainability of a particular strategy, project, activity, or intervention.

Described below are two ex-post evaluations planned for FY 2022.

Ex-Post Evaluations

Evaluation # 1**

Operating Unit	Bureau for Conflict Prevention and Stability (CPS)/Conflict and Violence Prevention (CVP)
Name of Evaluation	Evaluation of Reconciliation Fund Activities
Evaluation Purpose	The evaluation will be conducted to identify effective approaches to conflict and violence prevention.
Mission Learning Agenda Question	Learning questions to be identified through ongoing analysis and CVP Learning Agenda.
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	Evaluation will contribute to Agency-wide Learning Agenda question 7 - How can USAID and its partners foster self-reliance in fragile contexts?
Data/Information Needed	Data from Reconciliation Fund activities.

Evaluation # 2

Operating Unit	Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)
Name of Evaluation	Strengthening Value Chains (SVC) Activity
Evaluation Purpose	Evaluate performance of the SVC activity and to define lessons learned and determine what USAID/DRC should consider in the future design of agriculture/economic growth activities.

Ex-Post Evaluations

Mission Learning Agenda Question	(1) In what ways did SVC’s collaboration with other USG activities effectively contribute to the sub-Intermediate Results (IR) in the Shared Results Frameworks and the shared contract target? (2) What considerations should USAID/DRC consider in the future design of agriculture/economic growth activities?
Agency-Wide Learning Agenda Question	This evaluation may contribute to Agency-wide Learning Agenda question I - What are the change pathways around how capacity and commitment come together to build self-reliance, and what are the implications for USAID programs? How can we foster the capacity and commitment of all actors at different levels of the system (local, sub-national, national, and regional)?
Data/Information Needed	(1) Activity’s quarterly and annual performance reports; annual monitoring, evaluation and learning plan (AMELP); assessments (political economy; access to finance; value chain; gender, social inclusion, and conflict management); performance review of Food for Peace activities; (2) Information from key informant interviews and focus group interviews; and (3) computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) survey results.
Methods	Mixed methods approach to answer the evaluation questions consisting of key informant interviews (KIIs), focus group discussions (FGDs), online surveys, computer-assisted telephone interview (CATI) survey, and mini-surveys.
Challenges	Challenges may include logistics (poor roads), security concerns, and finding qualified local staff for field work.
Dissemination Strategy	Final report will be uploaded to the Development Experience Clearinghouse. Other strategies to be determined during the planning and design of the evaluation in FY 2022.

** Data/Information Needed, Methods, Challenges, and Dissemination Strategy to be determined. Will be available in FY 2022 when evaluation plans are finalized.

4. Methodological Approach

This section outlines the methodological approach that will be applied to support the significant evaluations that USAID OUs plan to conduct in FY 2022.

Evaluations addressing Agency SRLA questions, and the performance evaluations of activities with a budget of \$40 million or more, will be conducted primarily using performance evaluation methods. Performance evaluation methods often incorporate before and after comparisons, but generally lack a rigorously defined counterfactual. The focus of these evaluations is answering descriptive and normative questions that determine what the intervention has achieved, how it is being implemented, how it is perceived and valued, whether expected results are occurring, and other questions pertinent to program design, management, and operational decision-making.

Performance evaluations apply both qualitative and quantitative data collection and analytical methods. Based on the specific purpose of each evaluation that will be conducted in these two significant evaluation criteria, the performance evaluations will be designed to identify accomplishments, performance issues, constraints in the implementation of the activities, and identify results and lessons learned during implementation. A key focus of these performance evaluations will be on identifying findings that will inform decisions on what activities to continue, modify, or enhance.

Evaluations will be designed to generate the highest quality and most credible evidence that correspond to each evaluation question. The evaluations will use a mixed method data collection approach, combining qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, using primary and secondary data sources. Data collection methods will be selected to provide the highest quality and rigor in answering the evaluation questions. In addition, the choice of method will also be determined by the cost of collecting the data for each evaluation. In general, depending on the questions asked, data collection may include the use of performance monitoring data, structured surveys, in-depth key informant interviews, focus group discussions, and cost-benefit analyses. In some cases, innovative methods such as outcome harvesting, contribution analysis, and developmental evaluation approaches, may also be applied.

For impact evaluations, they will be conducted using experimental or quasi-experimental designs. So far, from the list of three impact evaluations, the evaluation in Jordan has been identified as an experimental design. The Ethiopia and Sahel Regional Office evaluations are quasi-experimental designs. These evaluations will also be designed to use not just quantitative methods, but also qualitative methods. Based on current efforts by the Agency, it is expected that the number of impact evaluations conducted by Missions will increase over time with subsequent evaluation plans. For example, the recently published [ADS 201](#) highlights the need to apply rigor to support evidence-based decision-making. It established the principle that, “when USAID needs information on whether an intervention is achieving a specific outcome, the Agency prefers the use of impact evaluations” (page 12).

Impact evaluations will be designed to address the causal or attribution question of effectiveness, and as such the design will include a counterfactual analysis of an alternative scenario in which the intervention

did not occur, where that alternative may be no intervention, or an alternative intervention. Creating a rigorous counterfactual by using random assignment or statistical methods to define a group of participants that receive the intervention of interest and another statistically similar comparison group that receives a different or no intervention, allows for an estimate of the amount of change in an outcome that can be attributed to the intervention.

Two ex-post evaluations are identified. One is in the democracy and governance program area, and the other is in economic growth. Considering that the goal of USAID's Journey to Self-Reliance approach is for countries to have the ability to plan, finance, and implement solutions to address their development challenges, ex-post evaluations provide an opportunity for USAID to examine what remains after a project, activity, or intervention receiving USAID support has ended.

USAID does not have a standard approach for designing and conducting ex-post evaluations. Depending on when the ex-post evaluation is planned, and the availability of data, ex-post evaluations can use a variety or combination of methods, including qualitative, mixed qualitative and quantitative, and experimental or quasi-experimental approaches. Designing an ex-post evaluation needs to take into consideration that data availability and collection may be challenging. The time between activity or project implementation and evaluation implementation can complicate data availability. Because of the limitations that are sometimes associated with ex-post evaluations, planning should be done early and not after the project ends to avoid limitations such as respondents having difficulty recalling project/activity events, or difficulty finding beneficiaries to interview.

Given this challenge of data accessibility and quality, PPL/LER recommends conducting an Evaluability Assessment before an ex-post evaluation is designed. An evaluability assessment can be used to strategically document implementation and data quality using a participatory approach. This can help identify available data as well as missing data, and the quality of existing data. However, these evaluations are at the initial phase of conceptualization, and an evaluability assessment has not yet been conducted.

The Management Bureau has a standard set of tools and techniques that it uses in conducting assessments of Agency management operations included on the Operational Excellence Agenda which can be found in [ADS 597 sah, Types of Business Analysis](#). The Management Bureau has also developed a standardized methodology for conducting a Business Process Review (BPR)⁵, which is one of the most frequently used tools used by the Agency for continuous operational improvement.

⁵ BPR is a systematic approach to improving processes using action research methods to achieve results more effectively and efficiently. Information on this method can be found at https://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00X2N6.pdf.

5 Challenges

Several of the evaluations identified challenges which the OUs may have to deal with as they plan, design, and implement these evaluations. Across several of the planned evaluations, restrictions imposed by the COVID19 pandemic were highlighted as a significant challenge that may impact the evaluations. This includes restrictions in movement which may affect data collection efforts, and possibly quality of the evaluations.

There were other data collection challenges, such as accessing multiple stakeholders, or difficulty reaching potential respondents from partner organizations.

6 Dissemination

OUs identified dissemination strategies which include sharing of findings with USAID staff, implementing partners, and stakeholders with interests in the activities evaluated. All significant evaluations will result in a final report that follows the guidance provided in the USAID Evaluation Policy and the Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 201, USAID Evaluation Report Requirements. Also following [ADS 201.3.6.10](#) the evaluation reports will be submitted to the [Development Experience Clearinghouse](#) (DEC) within three months of final approval by USAID.

All quantitative data collected for each evaluation will be provided in machine-readable, non-proprietary formats as required by USAID's Open Data policy ([see ADS 579](#)). The data will be organized and fully documented for use by those not fully familiar with the project or the evaluation. USAID will retain ownership of all datasets developed through these evaluations.

7 Technical Support from the Office of Learning, Evaluation, and Research (LER)

In support of the significant evaluations identified in this Annual Evaluation Plan, LER, in collaboration with M&E POCs and subject matter experts from other Bureaus, will provide virtual and in-person technical and advisory support, when appropriate, to Missions and OUs in the planning, design, procurement, execution, and dissemination of the results of these evaluations. In addition, for evaluations addressing the Agency-wide learning questions, the Question Team will provide technical support to OUs and coordinate the identification of emergent learning from the field related to selected questions in order to add to the body of evidence and encourage peer-to-peer learning between Missions. This is in addition to the ongoing guidance and support PPL/LER provides to all USAID OUs, including an online Evaluation Toolkit with templates and guidance, online and in-person training in monitoring and evaluation practices, and hosting webinars and presentations on evaluation topics.

Depending on need and demand, LER will also provide technical support in conducting evaluability assessments prior to the design of some of the evaluations (e.g. ex-post evaluations). An evaluability assessment contributes to decisions about the feasibility of and best approaches for the evaluation.

All significant evaluations will be USAID external evaluations. An external evaluation is one that is commissioned by USAID, rather than by the implementing partner, and in which the team leader is an expert external to USAID, who has no fiduciary relationship with the implementing partner. In this regard, LER will provide support in identifying appropriate contract mechanisms that may be available for Missions to procure services to conduct the evaluations.

8 Next Steps

These significant evaluations were reported through a separate data call by the Agency Evaluation Officer, outside of the Evaluation Registry data reporting period. As indicated in the tables above, some evaluations are in the early stages of conceptualization and the methods, data/information needed, challenges, agency-wide learning agenda question alignment, and dissemination strategy still have to be determined by the Missions. This will be followed up on, and the evaluation descriptions updated as Missions finalize their evaluation plans.

Another next step is to make sure that Missions update the registry and include the significant evaluations, as well as additional data on these planned evaluations, captured through the registry. These may include, start, and end date of the evaluations, evaluation budget, budget of activity evaluated, and narrative of expected evaluation use.