Considerations for the M&E of G2G Assistance

**ADS 220 M&E Requirements (in conjunction with ADS 201 and ADS 203)**

- ADS 220 outlines considerations for the monitoring and evaluation of *risk* AND the monitoring and evaluation of *performance*.
  - The “monitoring” of G2G projects involves a range of mission staff to develop a comprehensive monitoring approach (e.g. technical and program office staff for performance monitoring; controllers for monitoring and oversight of risk mitigation measures and projects that build institutional capacity for PFM).

- Per ADS 220.3.b(5), the Project Appraisal Document (PAD) for G2G projects should:
  - Include an M&E plan, per ADS 203, that encompasses [performance] monitoring of all project activities; and
  - Specifically address the coordination, oversight, monitoring, and evaluation of any risk mitigation measures. The monitoring plan should:
    - Include provisions to ensure partner government follow-up on any risk mitigation measures
    - If appropriate, incorporate the results of the PFMRAF (stages 1 and 2) and any technical assistance to address diagnosed weaknesses.

- Per ADS 220.3.4.1, the Approval for Use of Partner Government Systems (AUPGS) must:
  - Outline the management, monitoring, and reporting roles and responsibilities over the project’s G2G activities (including adherence to the risk mitigation plan); and
  - Document that the PFM systems that will be used for project implementation will be subject to evaluation of the outcomes and effectiveness of the project’s G2G activities and of related capacity building support to implementing partner government entities.

- USAID and its partner government counterparts must agree on a reporting plan that includes periodic progress reports from the responsible government counterpart, including:
  - Reporting on the performance indicators identified in the M&E plan that measure progress towards goals and objectives of the USAID-funded project;
  - Periodic implementation progress meetings; and
  - Subsequent, jointly-agree plans of action to address implementation problems.

**Considerations during Project Design that Inform M&E**

- **Theory of Change.** What is the rationale for using G2G assistance? What is the role of the government entity vis-à-vis other local actors in achieving desired development outcomes?
- **Systems Lens.** What resources, (formal and informal) roles, relationships, and rules guide the system or network in which the partner government entity is embedded?
- **Capacity Development Objectives.** What capacities (e.g. individual, institutional, system) are needed to achieve and sustain which results? (Also consider: incentives for capacity development, different actors’ perspectives of “capacity,” time horizons, sequencing, emergent capacity needs).
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- **Multi-actor Monitoring of Performance.** What are the roles and responsibilities of the potential actors, in addition to USAID, which will be engaged in monitoring (e.g. partner government M&E or audit offices; USAID-contracted third party technical assistance providers; USAID M&E platforms; partner government IPs (e.g. sub-national government entities or NGOs); third party stakeholders in oversight, quality assurance, or accountability roles, such as CSOs/CBOs engaged in citizen monitoring, local engineering or construction firms, etc.)

- **Sustainability.** Which institutional capacities, intersecting with the actors, interrelationships, and incentives of the system as a whole, are needed to achieve and sustain development outcome? (see ADS 220.3)

Considerations for Identifying Performance Metrics and Evaluation Questions

- Selection of **performance metrics** requires thinking through the logic chain associated with measuring capacity development and performance outcomes.
  - Identification of Needed Capacities to Improve Performance Outcomes → Strengthened Institutional Capacity (within a System) → Improved Performance and More Effective Delivery of Services → Sustainability of outcomes (within a system)
  - PFMRAF or like assessments (e.g. Public Expenditure and Financial Accountability Framework (PEFA)) may inform metrics or be used as a baseline to track and document progress.
  - As generally we can only measure our contribution, as compared to attribution, to observed outcomes, we made need to think creatively through measurement approaches (e.g. complexity-aware monitoring).

- Consider **evaluation questions** that include the **effectiveness and sustainability** of the use of PGS in meeting assistance objectives and the effectiveness of related capacity building support to partner government entities.

Opportunities to Engage Partner Government Entities on M&E

- Defining mutually agreed upon objectives
- Problem analysis and solution identification
- Identifying performance indicators (particularly those aligned with data already collected through government systems)
- Clarifying/negotiating roles and responsibilities **upfront**, including with regard to performance monitoring, data collection, and reporting (ADS 203 applies)
- Clarifying expectations with regard to site visits, DQAs, reporting, and other oversight and accountability measures
- Reviewing assumptions and risks and how these will be monitored
- Determining how the project will collect needed data from project inception (baseline data) and periodically over the life of the project
- Data collection in ongoing performance monitoring
- Analysis and interpretation of monitoring data
- Identifying priority evaluation questions
- Engagement in the dissemination and utilization of findings from evaluations and assessments
- Identifying opportunities for joint implementation reviews and collaborative reflection and assessments on progress

*For more in-depth discussion, please see the discussion paper “Considerations for the Monitoring and Evaluation of G2G Assistance,” which is available on ProgramNet.*