



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

January 11, 2018

THE DIRECTOR

M-18-04

MEMORANDUM FOR HEADS OF FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

FROM: Mick Mulvaney
Director

Handwritten signature of Mick Mulvaney, dated 01/11/18.

SUBJECT: Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines for Federal Departments and Agencies that Administer United States Foreign Assistance

As required by sections 3(b) and 3(d) of the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016 (the "Act") this memorandum provides the first cross-agency monitoring and evaluation guidelines for Federal departments and agencies that administer foreign assistance.

The goal of these guidelines is to set forth key monitoring and evaluation principles to guide each agency and to provide specific direction on content for agencies to include in their own policies on monitoring and evaluation of foreign assistance. OMB has ensured that the guidelines are robust, comprehensive, and coordinated with Federal departments and agencies. The guidelines reflect current thinking on monitoring and evaluation of U.S. foreign assistance and may be updated at a future time.

In addition to the assistance covered by the Act, OMB has determined that for the purposes of implementation and to improve foreign assistance effectiveness, all foreign assistance programs already covered by the Guidance on Collection of U.S. Foreign Assistance Data (OMB Bulletin 12-01) are included in these guidelines as well. OMB will require agencies to report annually through the Budget submission process on implementation of monitoring and evaluation policies and practices related to these guidelines.

Attachment: Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines for Federal Departments and Agencies that Administer United States Foreign Assistance.

Monitoring and Evaluation Guidelines for Federal Departments and Agencies that Administer United States Foreign Assistance

These guidelines are required to be set forth under Sec. 3(b) of the Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act of 2016 (FATAA) and cover the objectives related to monitoring and evaluation as defined in Sec.3(c)(2)(A–M)

Scope and Purpose

Section 3 of the FATAA requires the establishment of guidelines on monitoring, evaluation, and reporting on the performance of United States foreign assistance and its contribution to the policies, strategies, projects, program goals, and priorities undertaken by the Federal Government. The Act also supports and promotes innovative programs to improve effectiveness and seeks to coordinate the monitoring and evaluation processes of Federal agencies that administer covered U.S. foreign assistance. Finally, the Act calls for the President to set forth guidelines according to best practices of monitoring and evaluation.

These guidelines provide direction to Federal departments and agencies that administer United States foreign assistance on monitoring the use of resources, evaluating the outcomes and impacts of United States foreign assistance projects and programs, and applying the findings and conclusions of such evaluations to proposed project and program design. In addition to the assistance covered by the Act, the Administration has determined that for purposes of implementation of the Act and to improve foreign assistance effectiveness across the government, all foreign assistance programs already covered by the Guidance on Collection of U.S. Foreign Assistance Data in the form of [OMB Bulletin 12-01](#) are included in these guidelines as well. Agencies are encouraged to expand these guidelines to all current or future accounts and programs that cover foreign assistance.

The goal of these guidelines is to set forth key principles to guide each agency and to specify requirements, where appropriate, that agencies must cover in their own policies on monitoring and evaluation of foreign assistance.

Note on program or project planning: The foundation for useful monitoring and evaluation is a well-documented program or project plan against which progress and results can be assessed. While these guidelines do not address planning requirements, it is recommended that agencies have guidance on sound planning that addresses the following:

- a) Align programs or projects with higher-level strategies or objectives;
- b) Consider contextual or programmatic factors that could affect program or project design, implementation, or intended results;
- c) Ensure programs or projects have clear goals and objectives; and
- d) Use logic models to document expected program or project logic and theory of change. Such models should clearly define the expected inputs, activities, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and end outcomes.

Monitoring and evaluation activities can then assess the extent to which programs are progressing as designed, and if changes to the program logic or program itself are necessary.

Definitions

Agencies should be guided by these definitions. Except for “evaluation,” which is defined by FATAA, the

other definitions can be adjusted in agency policies as needed to be relevant to an individual agency's operating environment.

Evaluation is the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of the program, including projects conducted under such program, as a basis for making judgments and evaluations regarding the program; improving program effectiveness; and informing decisions about current and future programming.

Impact Evaluations measure the change in an outcome that is attributable to a defined intervention, are based on models of cause and effect, and require a credible counterfactual to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for the observed change.

Monitoring is the ongoing and systematic tracking of data and information relevant to policies, strategies, programs, projects and/or activities and used to determine whether desired results are occurring as expected during program, project, or activity implementation. Monitoring often relies on indicators, quantifiable measures of a characteristic or condition of people, institutions, systems or processes, that may change over time.

A Pilot Program or Pilot Intervention is any new, untested approach that is implemented to learn about its potential feasibility and efficacy/effectiveness because it is anticipated to be replicated or expanded in scale or scope through U.S. Government foreign assistance or other funding sources.

Program refers to a set of projects or activities that support a higher level objective or goal. At some agencies, an activity carries out an intervention or set of interventions through a contract, grant, or agreement, and a project is a set of complementary activities, over an established timeline and budget, intended to achieve a discrete result.

Principles

Monitoring and evaluation of U.S. foreign assistance and agency policies or guidance covering monitoring and evaluation should align with the principles below and include expectations for meeting them. One or more of these principles may at times compete with others, and any resulting trade-off decisions must be judiciously balanced.

- Designed and Timed for Use: Monitoring and evaluation information is used to generate evidence that informs decisions, including those related to project and program design and prioritization.
- Use the Best Methods Available: Use monitoring and evaluation methods that are the most rigorous, feasible, and appropriate to address the questions, and that generate the highest quality and most credible evidence, subject to the Practical and Efficient principle.
- Practical and Efficient: Determine what and how to monitor and evaluate based on information needs, balanced with costs (taking into consideration time, budget, and other constraints), and ensure only the most relevant indicators or questions are tracked or evaluated.
- Planned Early: Plan for monitoring and evaluation early, while developing policies, strategies, projects, program goals, and priorities, recognizing that flexibility and adaptation may be necessary.
- Sufficiently Resourced: Provide adequate resources for monitoring and evaluation, including

financial and human resources.

- Conducted Ethically: Monitoring and evaluation should be conducted in an ethical manner to appropriately balance the desired creation of evidence with the protection of human subjects, including safeguarding the dignity, rights, safety, and privacy of participants.
- Shared Transparently: Be transparent and share information widely and in a timely manner, and report candidly about the use of resources and the outcomes and impacts of projects and programs.

Evaluation and monitoring also have principles specific to each discipline.

Monitoring involves collecting data and information that indicate what is happening and help determine if implementation is on track or if any timely corrections or adjustments may be needed to improve efficiency or effectiveness. Monitoring data can also inform decisions on when an evaluation is needed to understand how or why certain results are being observed, as well as provide useful input into planning or conducting an evaluation.

Monitoring should be:

- *Objective* with unambiguous and unidimensional indicators;
- Based on data and information that meet specific *data quality standards*. These can include:
 - Validity: the data clearly and adequately represent the intended result
 - Integrity: safeguards are in place to minimize risk of data manipulation or error
 - Precision: data have a sufficient level of detail for decision making
 - Reliability: data collection processes and analyses are consistent over time
 - Timeliness: data are current and available at a useful frequency for decision making;
- *Logically linked* to program efforts and measure changes plausibly caused by the program; and
- *Useful* to inform course corrections during implementation.

Evaluation often takes monitoring data as a starting point, and supports deeper understanding into why and how results are or are not being achieved.

Evaluation should be:

- *Impartial* and independent from policy making;
- *Unbiased* in measurement and reporting;
- *Useful and relevant* to important questions and decisions;
- *Participatory*, to the extent possible, involving relevant stakeholders, including beneficiaries;
- *Shared* widely, publicly, and transparently, with results communicated in a useful and actionable manner;
- *Credible*, based on the inclusion of the aforementioned principles; and
- *Collaborative* among donors and recipients.

An external evaluation is one conducted by third-party experts external to the agency who have no undisclosed conflict of interest or stake in the agency or bureau commissioning the evaluation. A self-evaluation, or internal evaluation, is one conducted within an institution, government, agency, or among collaborating institutions implementing programs or projects, and can be a useful, complementary approach to assess progress toward goals and reasons for success or failure to meet goals. In all evaluations – whether external, internal, or a blended approach – all other principles apply, evaluator

qualifications should be appropriate to the evaluation, and any conflicts of interest should be disclosed. The evaluators should be selected to avoid, and be protected from, any undue pressure or influence that would affect the independence of the evaluation or objectivity of the evaluator.

Guideline Requirements

1. All federal departments and agencies that administer covered United States foreign assistance must put in place or establish specific policies and procedures for monitoring and evaluation of covered foreign assistance no later than one year after these guidelines are published.
2. Other than the term “evaluation,” which is specifically defined in FATAA, agency policies should define key terms within the agency context as necessary, such as “program,” “project,” and “activity,” and be clear about how monitoring and evaluation requirements apply to each level.
3. Policies must include mechanisms and requirements for applying the findings and conclusions of monitoring and evaluation information to proposed projects and programs and, where appropriate, to ongoing projects and programs.
4. Policies must address funding transfers between or among U.S. government agencies and ensure accountability for monitoring and evaluation, including in cases where one agency leads or coordinates an overall program, but multiple agencies implement activities under that program. Monitoring and evaluation roles and responsibilities should be considered and documented when funds are transferred, and policies may also address funding transfers to third party institutions or funds. Policies should define roles and responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation when other agencies will be implementing activities that support a multi-agency project for a lead agency; ensure monitoring and evaluation responsibilities are clearly defined in interagency agreements on covered foreign assistance; and ensure that lead agencies share necessary assessments, past evaluations, and other information with supporting agencies to assist with the supporting agency’s monitoring and evaluation.
5. These policies must include requirements to ensure agencies’ monitoring and evaluation of U.S. foreign assistance support the objectives listed in FATAA Sec. 3(c)(2) and, associated with these, also address the additional guidelines provided below:

Establish annual monitoring and evaluation objectives and timetables [Sec.3(c)(2)(A)]: Agencies may do this centrally, or when decentralized, agency policies should require that operating units annually document their monitoring and evaluation objectives and timetables, as well as other key aspects of managing monitoring and evaluation and using the resulting information for learning.

Agencies should plan to use monitoring data and evaluation findings for making decisions about policies, strategies, program priorities, and delivery of services, as well as for planning and budget formulation processes. Evaluation findings may be used by agency staff to course-correct a project or program. When evaluators themselves provide course-correction recommendations, the responsible agency should explicitly consider how to efficiently balance the potentially competing values of the course corrections and the evaluator’s independence.

Develop specific project monitoring and evaluation plans [Sec.3(c)(2)(B)]: Monitoring and evaluation

plans should be developed as part of program, project, and activity design, and should include measurable goals. Policies should require establishing and documenting a baseline data collection methodology and a plan for regular monitoring of all programs and projects. Monitoring plans should document all of the indicators, including baselines and milestones or targets for each indicator. They should also include data collection methodology and frequency for each indicator, which should be a time interval that is feasible and necessary to effectively manage and monitor progress and results, conduct internal learning, and meet external reporting or communication requirements.

Policies should require that monitoring plans be updated or adjusted as necessary to reflect new or better information that becomes available as learning occurs (e.g., additional indicators if new data sources become available).

Policies should require that the responsible organizational units establish evaluation plans and provide guidance about what the plans should include and when and how to submit them. Evaluation costs should be planned and accounted for as part of the overall program budget.

Apply rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodologies to such programs [Sec.3(c)(2)(C)]: Guidance should require that evaluations be “evidence based,” meaning they should be based on verifiable data and information that have been gathered using the monitoring and evaluation principles established in these guidelines. Evaluation design and data collection methodologies should be appropriate to answer the key questions posed by the evaluation, including both qualitative and quantitative data. The timing of evaluation data collection should be driven by the relevant program logic. Considerations for selecting a methodological approach include the information needs of management, timeline, availability of data, and resources. Evaluations should include an assessment and disclosure of assumptions and limitations.

Guidance on monitoring methodologies should include the use of logic models and definition of the program inputs, activities, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and end or long-term outcomes. Logic models set the foundation against which progress can be monitored and evaluated. Logic model documentation should include the assumptions upon which the model is based, i.e., the conditions that need to exist in order for one step in the logic model to succeed, and lead to the next step. Documentation may also include a theory of change, if applicable, which explains why it is believed that the stated program activities will lead to the desired outcomes. Logic models should be appropriate for the type of program, context, existing evidence for the theory of change, and implementation modalities.

Disseminate guidelines for the development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs to all personnel [Sec.3(c)(2)(D)]: Guidelines should be disseminated to all personnel, including those in the field, and should include:

- a) Roles and responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation, and for ensuring monitoring and evaluation are informed by and/or inform program design;
- b) Requirements for when and how to monitor and evaluate programs, including timing and frequency;
- c) Statement of the expected use of monitoring and evaluation, including processes for the use of findings for policy and program improvement;
- d) Public and internal dissemination of evaluation reports and results; and
- e) How the agency will ensure the collection, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge and lessons learned.

Establish methodologies for the collection of data, including baseline data [Sec.3(c)(2)(E)]: Policies

should cover the standards for data collection, including:

- a) Establish expectations for developing performance indicators to monitor progress and results for all programs;
- b) Establish expectations for fully defining appropriate use of the indicator, such as its scope, acceptable data sources, or other terms of use;
- c) Establish expectations for identifying or collecting baseline data, as appropriate and feasible, at the start of a program to provide a basis for planning or assessing subsequent progress;
- d) Establish expectations for collecting subsequent results and at what frequency;
- e) Ensure targets are set for each performance indicator to indicate the expected change over the course of each period of performance; and
- f) Outline expected procedures for reporting on and using monitoring data, which could include reviewing and analyzing progress and results, adaptive management, internal learning, meeting external reporting or communication requirements, and any relevant reporting or sharing of data to agency stakeholders.

Evaluate, at least once in their lifetime, all programs whose dollar value equals or exceeds the median program size for the relevant office or bureau or an equivalent calculation [Sec.3(c)(2)(F)]: A key consideration in selecting a program for evaluation should be the information needs of the agency or office managing the program to inform future decisions. At a minimum, agencies that directly manage foreign assistance program funds should direct their responsible organizational units to evaluate, at least once in their lifetimes, all programs whose dollar value equals or exceeds the median program size for the relevant bureau or office, or an equivalent calculation, such that the majority of program resources are evaluated. This determination should reflect the Practical and Efficient principle, taking into account the scope of their portfolio, size of their budget, anticipated needs of management, and appropriate programmatic level at which to evaluate. Evaluating a subset or component of a program may be acceptable provided the evaluation is sufficient to address key uncertainties and critical questions related to the program's intended outcomes.

Conduct impact evaluations on all pilot programs before replicating, or conduct performance evaluations and provide a justification for not conducting an impact evaluation [Sec.3(c)(2)(G)]: Agency policies should include the expectation that pilot programs or interventions (defined above) should be evaluated for impact before being replicated or expanded. Pilot interventions should be identified during project or activity design, and the impact evaluation should be integrated into the design of the project or activity. An impact evaluation (defined above) requires a specialized design, and must be carried out by evaluators with the expertise and knowledge to properly implement such a design and analyze the resulting data. Its timing must also be coordinated with the implementation of the intervention and so must be planned accordingly. If an impact evaluation is deemed to be impracticable or inappropriate for a particular pilot program or intervention, a performance evaluation must be conducted with a justification of the methodological choice.

Develop a clearinghouse capacity for the collection, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge and lessons learned [Sec.3(c)(2)(H)]: Agencies should make information on program plans, monitoring data, and evaluation findings available to the public, other foreign assistance agencies, implementing partners, the donor community and aid recipient governments. Agencies may develop a new website or house this information on an existing one in a way that is easily accessible to the public. Evaluation reports must be included on each agency's clearinghouse website, except those exempted under clearly

specified criteria in agency policies under the guidelines to “Publicly report each evaluation.” Other documents published may include:

- a) Strategies that guide foreign assistance;
- b) Planning information on how programs are developed;
- c) Monitoring information and reports;
- d) Tools and resources used to manage programs;
- e) Summaries of lessons learned;
- f) Budget information; and
- g) Links to related data required by OMB Bulletin 12-01, Guidance on Collection of U.S. Foreign Assistance Data, to be reported to FA.gov or other relevant websites.

Internally distribute evaluation reports [Sec.3(c)(2)(I)]: Evaluation reports, program summaries, and other relevant documents should be made available internally for learning and analysis. At minimum, the clearinghouse described above should be easily accessible by internal staff, and agencies are encouraged to use additional strategies for distributing evaluation reports and related information. These strategies may include a range of options, such as using newsletters or listservs, distributing abstracts or summaries of recently completed evaluations, videos, blogs, podcasts, and other events, according to the resources and context of the agency.

Publicly report each evaluation [Sec.3(c)(2)(J)]: Evaluation reports should be clear, concise, and empirically grounded. They should include an executive summary, a succinct description of the program, evaluation purpose and questions, evaluation design and data collection methods and their limitations, key findings, and conclusions or recommendations.

For transparency and accountability, final evaluation reports should be made available to the public within 90 days of completion of the evaluation as defined by the agency. Agencies may have additional requirements for completion such, as required internal and stakeholder reviews, and must establish guidelines that clearly delineate these requirements and processes. To the extent possible, findings should be made available to communities involved in the program implementation or related evaluation efforts in an appropriate format. If the evaluations are classified, sensitive, law enforcement sensitive, or commercially sensitive, agencies should have policies in place spelling out an exemption for public disclosure. Summaries of results from classified or sensitive evaluations, including a description of the methodology, key findings and recommendations, may be made available instead.

Undertake collaborative partnerships, as appropriate [Sec.3(c)(2)(K)]: Agencies should undertake collaborative partnerships or otherwise coordinate with other agencies, operating units, academic institutions, implementing partners, or international or national institutions and organizations to conduct monitoring and evaluation of programs, projects, or interventions when such partnerships can be expected to provide needed expertise or significantly improve the evaluation and analysis. These partnerships or collaborative arrangements may provide needed expertise to significantly improve monitoring, evaluation, and analysis, and may or may not involve the transfer of funds. In such cases where the transfer of funds is involved, agencies should:

- a) Determine roles and responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation as part of the agreement accompanying the provision of funds, and
- b) Ensure the responsible organization carries out evaluations of programs consistent with the agency’s policy and disseminates a final evaluation report.

Ensure verifiable, reliable, and timely data are available to monitoring and evaluation personnel [Sec.3(c)(2)(L)]: Monitoring and evaluation should employ methods appropriate to context and population to ensure that verifiable, reliable, and timely quantitative and qualitative information is collected, included, and considered, with appropriate provisions for the protection of human subjects in the collection and use of this information.

Agency policies should encourage engagement of beneficiaries, partner country governmental or non-governmental stakeholders, and implementing partners in monitoring and evaluation processes where feasible. Agency policies should encourage alignment of monitoring and evaluation efforts with those of partner countries and other donors wherever feasible in order to promote aid effectiveness.

Agency policies should ensure that agreements with third party partners (including, for example, evaluators, implementing partners, host country partners, and other stakeholders) include a requirement for activity, project, and/or program data be made available to agency personnel as well as relevant country stakeholders, while adhering to the principle of ethical conduct of monitoring and evaluation.

Evaluations should include an assessment and disclosure of assumptions and limitations.

Ensure that standards of professional evaluation organizations for monitoring and evaluation efforts are employed [Sec.3(c)(2)(M)]: Agency policies should incorporate relevant standards developed by professional organizations for monitoring and evaluation to ensure appropriate independence of evaluations, guide the selection of monitoring and evaluation methodologies, permit the exercise of professional judgment, and provide for quality control in the monitoring and evaluation process.

Professional standards are intended to improve the quality of evaluation processes and products and to facilitate collaboration. For example, the American Evaluation Association publishes standards and guidelines on evaluation (see American Evaluation Association's An Evaluation Roadmap for More Effective Government). The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) also has published standards that outline the key quality dimensions for each phase of a typical evaluation process (see OECD's Quality Standards for Development Evaluation). Other national and international organizations also publish evaluation standards. Critical among these standards are the need for informed peer reviews, transparency, and ensuring that findings are supported by all the relevant data.

Reporting to OMB

Agencies should report annually through the OMB budget submission process in a manner to be defined in annual guidance on implementation of monitoring and evaluation related to these guidelines.

Reporting will outline agency policies and guidance developed, as well as best practices and lessons learned through implementation of such monitoring and evaluation policies and guidance. Agencies should also report annually on implementation of Sections 4(a)-(c) of the Act (all United States government departments' and agencies' accounts and programs defined by the OMB Bulletin 12-01 to fund or execute foreign assistance), Section 4(d) of the Act (USAID and Department of State only), and compliance with reporting to FA.gov as required by guidance contained in OMB Bulletin 12-01.

Annex: Legislative Reference Chart

Foreign Aid Transparency and Accountability Act Sec.3(c)(2):	Guidelines
<p>(A) establish annual monitoring and evaluation objectives and timetables to plan and manage the process of monitoring, evaluating, analyzing progress, and applying learning toward achieving results;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Agencies may do this centrally, or when decentralized, agency policies should require that operating units annually document their monitoring and evaluation objectives and timetables, as well as other key aspects of managing monitoring and evaluation and using the resulting information for learning. b. Agencies should plan to use monitoring data and evaluation findings for making decisions about policies, strategies, program priorities, and delivery of services, as well as for planning and budget formulation processes. Evaluation findings may be used by agency staff to course-correct a project or program. When evaluators themselves provide course-correction recommendations, the responsible agency should explicitly consider how to efficiently balance the potentially competing values of the course corrections and the evaluator’s independence.
<p>(B) develop specific project monitoring and evaluation plans, including measurable goals and performance metrics, and to identify the resources necessary to conduct such evaluations, which should be covered by program costs;</p>	<p>Monitoring and evaluation plans should be developed as part of program, project, and activity design, and should include measurable goals. Policies should require establishing and documenting a baseline data collection methodology and a plan for regular monitoring of all programs and projects. Monitoring plans should document all of the indicators, including baselines and milestones or targets for each indicator. They should also include data collection methodology and frequency for each indicator, which should be a time interval that is feasible and necessary to effectively manage and monitor progress and results, conduct internal learning, and meet external reporting or communication requirements.</p> <p>Policies should require that monitoring plans be updated or adjusted as necessary to reflect new or better information that becomes available as learning occurs (e.g., additional indicators if new data sources become available).</p>

	<p>Policies should require that the responsible organizational units establish evaluation plans and provide guidance about what the plans should include and when and how to submit them. Evaluation costs should be planned and accounted for as part of the overall program budget.</p>
<p>(C) apply rigorous monitoring and evaluation methodologies to such programs, including through the use of impact evaluations, ex-post evaluations, or other methods, as appropriate, that clearly define program logic, inputs, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and end outcomes;</p>	<p>Guidance should require that evaluations be “evidence based,” meaning they should be based on verifiable data and information that have been gathered using the monitoring and evaluation principles established in these guidelines. Evaluation design and data collection methodologies should be appropriate to answer the key questions posed by the evaluation, including both qualitative and quantitative data. The timing of evaluation data collection should be driven by the relevant program logic. Considerations for selecting a methodological approach include the information needs of management, timeline, availability of data, and resources. Evaluations should include an assessment and disclosure of assumptions and limitations.</p> <p>Guidance on monitoring methodologies should include the use of logic models and definition of the program inputs, activities, outputs, intermediate outcomes, and end or long-term outcomes. Logic models set the foundation against which progress can be monitored and evaluated. Logic model documentation should include the assumptions upon which the model is based, i.e., the conditions that need to exist in order for one step in the logic model to succeed, and lead to the next step. Documentation may also include a theory of change, if applicable, which explains why it is believed that the stated program activities will lead to the desired outcomes. Logic models should be appropriate for the type of program, context, existing evidence for the theory of change, and implementation modalities.</p>
<p>(D) disseminate guidelines for the development and implementation of monitoring and evaluation programs to all personnel, especially in the field, who are responsible for the design,</p>	<p>Guidelines should be disseminated to all personnel, including those in the field, and should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Roles and responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation, and for ensuring monitoring and evaluation are informed by and/or inform program design;

<p>implementation, and management of covered United States foreign assistance programs;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. Requirements for when and how to monitor and evaluate programs, including timing and frequency; c. Statement of the expected use of monitoring and evaluation, including processes for the use of findings for policy and program improvement; d. Public and internal dissemination of evaluation reports and results; and e. How the agency will ensure the collection, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge and lessons learned.
<p>(E) establish methodologies for the collection of data, including baseline data to serve as a reference point against which progress can be measured;</p>	<p>Policies should cover the standards for data collection, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Establish expectations for developing performance indicators to monitor progress and results for all programs; b. Establish expectations for fully defining appropriate use of the indicator, such as its scope, acceptable data sources, or other terms of use; c. Establish expectations for identifying or collecting baseline data, as appropriate and feasible, at the start of a program to provide a basis for planning or assessing subsequent progress; d. Establish expectations for collecting subsequent results and at what frequency; e. Ensure targets are set for each performance indicator to indicate the expected change over the course of each period of performance; and f. Outline expected procedures for reporting on and using monitoring data, which could include reviewing and analyzing progress and results, adaptive management, internal learning, meeting external reporting or communication requirements, and any relevant reporting or sharing of data to agency stakeholders.
<p>(F) evaluate, at least once in their lifetime, all programs whose dollar value equals or exceeds the median program size for the relevant office or bureau or an equivalent calculation to ensure the majority of program resources are evaluated;</p>	<p>A key consideration in selecting a program for evaluation should be the information needs of the agency or office managing the program to inform future decisions. At a minimum, agencies that directly manage foreign assistance program funds should direct their responsible organizational units to evaluate, at least once in their lifetimes, all programs whose dollar value equals or exceeds the median program size for the relevant bureau or office, or an equivalent calculation,</p>

	<p>such that the majority of program resources are evaluated. This determination should reflect the Practical and Efficient principle, taking into account the scope of their portfolio, size of their budget, anticipated needs of management, and appropriate programmatic level at which to evaluate. Evaluating a subset or component of a program may be acceptable provided the evaluation is sufficient to address key uncertainties and critical questions related to the program’s intended outcomes.</p>
<p>(G) conduct impact evaluations on all pilot programs before replicating, or conduct performance evaluations and provide a justification for not conducting an impact evaluation when such an evaluation is deemed inappropriate or impracticable;</p>	<p>Agency policies should include the expectation that pilot programs or interventions, (defined above) should be evaluated for impact before being replicated or expanded. Pilot interventions should be identified during project or activity design, and the impact evaluation should be integrated into the design of the project or activity. An impact evaluation (defined above) requires a specialized design, and must be carried out by evaluators with the expertise and knowledge to properly implement such a design and analyze the resulting data. Its timing must also be coordinated with the implementation of the intervention and so must be planned accordingly. If an impact evaluation is deemed to be impracticable or inappropriate for a particular pilot program or intervention, a performance evaluation must be conducted with a justification of the methodological choice.</p>
<p>(H) develop a clearinghouse capacity for the collection, dissemination, and preservation of knowledge and lessons learned to guide future programs for United States foreign assistance personnel, implementing partners, the donor community, and aid recipient governments;</p>	<p>Agencies should make information on program plans, monitoring data, and evaluation findings available to the public, other foreign assistance agencies, implementing partners, the donor community and aid recipient governments. Agencies may develop a new website or house this information on an existing one in a way that is easily accessible to the public. Evaluation reports must be included on each agency’s clearinghouse website, except those exempted under clearly specified criteria in agency polices under the guidelines to “Publicly report each evaluation.” Other documents published may include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Strategies that guide foreign assistance; b. Planning information on how programs are developed;

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Monitoring information and reports; d. Tools and resources used to manage programs; e. Summaries of lessons learned; f. Budget information; and g. Links to related data required by OMB Bulletin 12-01, Guidance on Collection of U.S. Foreign Assistance Data, to be reported to FA.gov or other relevant websites.
<p>(I) internally distribute evaluation reports;</p>	<p>Evaluation reports, program summaries, and other relevant documents should be made available internally for learning and analysis. At minimum, the clearinghouse described above should be easily accessible by internal staff, and agencies are encouraged to use additional strategies for distributing evaluation reports and related information. These strategies may include a range of options, such as using newsletters or listservs, distributing abstracts or summaries of recently completed evaluations, videos, blogs, podcasts, and other events, according to the resources and context of the agency.</p>
<p>(J) publicly report each evaluation, including an executive summary, a description of the evaluation methodology, key findings, appropriate context, including quantitative and qualitative data when available, and recommendations made in the evaluation within 90 days after the completion of the evaluation;</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Evaluation reports should be clear, concise, and empirically grounded. They should include an executive summary, a succinct description of the program, evaluation purpose and questions, evaluation design and data collection methods and their limitations, key findings, and conclusions or recommendations. b. For transparency and accountability, final evaluation reports should be made available to the public within 90 days of completion of the evaluation as defined by the agency. Agencies may have additional requirements for completion, such as required internal and stakeholder reviews, and must establish guidelines that clearly delineate these requirements and processes. To the extent possible, findings should be made available to communities involved in the program implementation or related evaluation efforts in an appropriate format. If the evaluations are classified, sensitive, law enforcement sensitive, or commercially sensitive, agencies should have policies in place spelling out an exemption for public disclosure. Summaries of results from

	classified or sensitive evaluations, including a description of the methodology, key findings and recommendations, may be made available instead.
<p>(K) undertake collaborative partnerships and coordinate efforts with the academic community, implementing partners, and national and international institutions, as appropriate, that have expertise in program monitoring, evaluation, and analysis when such partnerships provide needed expertise or significantly improve the evaluation and analysis;</p>	<p>Agencies should undertake collaborative partnerships or otherwise coordinate with other agencies, operating units, academic institutions, implementing partners, or international or national institutions and organizations to conduct monitoring and evaluation of programs, projects, or interventions when such partnerships can be expected to provide needed expertise or significantly improve the evaluation and analysis. These partnerships or collaborative arrangements may provide needed expertise to significantly improve monitoring, evaluation, and analysis, and may or may not involve the transfer of funds. In such cases where the transfer of funds is involved, agencies should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Determine roles and responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation as part of the agreement accompanying the provision of funds, and b. Ensure the responsible organization carries out evaluations of programs consistent with the agency's policy and disseminates a final evaluation report.
<p>(L) ensure verifiable, reliable, and timely data, including from local beneficiaries and stakeholders, are available to monitoring and evaluation personnel to permit the objective evaluation of the effectiveness of covered United States foreign assistance programs, including an assessment of assumptions and limitations in such evaluations; and</p>	<p>Monitoring and evaluation should employ methods appropriate to context and population to ensure that verifiable, reliable, and timely quantitative and qualitative information is collected, included, and considered, with appropriate provisions for the protection of human subjects in the collection and use of this information.</p> <p>Agency policies should encourage engagement of beneficiaries, partner country governmental or non-governmental stakeholders, and implementing partners in monitoring and evaluation processes where feasible. Agency policies should encourage alignment of monitoring and evaluation efforts with those of partner countries and other donors wherever feasible in order to promote aid effectiveness.</p> <p>Agency policies should ensure that agreements with third party partners (including, for example, evaluators, implementing partners, host country partners, and</p>

	<p>other stakeholders) include a requirement for activity, project, and/or program data be made available to agency personnel as well as relevant country stakeholders, while adhering to the principle of ethical conduct of monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p>Evaluations should include an assessment and disclosure of assumptions and limitations.</p>
<p>(M) ensure that standards of professional evaluation organizations for monitoring and evaluation efforts are employed, including ensuring the integrity and independence of evaluations, permitting and encouraging the exercise of professional judgment, and providing for quality control and assurance in the monitoring and evaluation process.</p>	<p>Agency policies should incorporate relevant standards developed by professional organizations for monitoring and evaluation to ensure appropriate independence of evaluations, guide the selection of monitoring and evaluation methodologies, permit the exercise of professional judgment, and provide for quality control in the monitoring and evaluation process.</p> <p>Professional standards are intended to improve the quality of evaluation processes and products and to facilitate collaboration. For example, the American Evaluation Association publishes standards and guidelines on evaluation (see American Evaluation Association’s An Evaluation Roadmap for More Effective Government). The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) also has published standards that outline the key quality dimensions for each phase of a typical evaluation process (see OECD’s Quality Standards for Development Evaluation). Other national and international organizations also publish evaluation standards. Critical among these standards are the need for informed peer reviews, transparency, and ensuring that findings are supported by all the relevant data.</p>