The President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief

FY 2014

Supplemental ANNUAL PROGRAM RESULTS GUIDANCE for Reporting on PEPFAR-funded Evaluations

SUPPLEMENTAL FY 2014 APR GUIDANCE FOR PEPFAR FUNDED EVALUATIONS

Table of Contents

Introduction

The PEPFAR Stewardship and Oversight Act Of 2013[1], requires reporting on all completed evaluations on an annual basis. The legislation specifically states that PEPFAR must provide:

- *"A **description of program evaluations completed during the reporting period**,*
- *including whether all **completed evaluations have been published on a publicly available Internet** website;*
- *and **whether any completed evaluations did not adhere** to the common evaluation standards of practice published under paragraph (4)."*

In order to meet these requirements, PEPFAR implementing agencies developed Evaluation Standards of Practice (ESoP)[2] . The ESoP outlines a common set of evaluation practices across PEPFAR. The ESoP is available on pepfar.gov.

This November, when FY14 results are reported, all country teams as well as headquarters will have to report on **ALL PEPFAR funded evaluations COMPLETED in FY14 only**. [3] Going forward, additional guidance and reporting requirements may be required.

Section I: Annual Program Results Reporting Instructions for PEPFAR Evaluations

Starting with FY 2014 Annual Program Results (APR), Implementing Agencies and Operating Units (OUs) will report on all PEPFAR funded evaluations completed in FY14. The goals of this initial reporting, in addition to adhering the legislative requirements are to:

- Enable PEPFAR to track and report on evaluations being conducted
- Monitor the implementation of PEPFAR evaluation standards

[1] PUBLIC LAW 113–56—DEC. 2, 2013, PEPFAR STEWARDSHIP AND OVERSIGHT ACT OF 2013

[2] President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), Evaluation Standards of Practice (ESoP) Guidance, January 2014. http://www.pepfar.gov/reports/guidance/221111.htm

[3] "Completion" may have a different meaning depending on the agency. In the case of USAID: "An evaluation is complete when the AOR or activity manager signs off. This may be different than signing off on an entire contract, if the contract includes other activities such as dissemination." Furthermore, "Finalization and DEC submission are two separate processes, but ADS 203 underscores the need for transparency and what to do in the event that finalization does not happen with the mission and contractor in a timely fashion. ADS 203.3.1.10 suggests that DEC submission creates a 'final' version of the evaluation when it was stalled for one reason or another." For CDC "completion" is: An evaluation for which the study protocol has closed and/or for which the final summary report has been issued within the reporting period. The application of each of the two criteria will depend on the type of protocol (research/non-research), how the protocol was closed (e.g., following publication of final report and with data destroyed, or preceding publication of final report and data retained for analysis, etc.) and type of report issued (e.g., publication in a peer-reviewed journal, final report submitted by the contractor to the Agency and accepted as final, non-CDC co-authored report published by COAG partner, etc.). If you are unsure whether an evaluation is deemed "completed", please contact your agency.

- Reduce duplication of evaluation resources and efforts
- Share best practices
- Improve dissemination and use of evaluation findings and recommendations

OUs are required to report on all PEPFAR funded evaluations that were completed in FY 2014 and submit the following to headquarters via the DATIM software:

- a description of program evaluations completed during FY 2014
- whether findings from completed evaluations have been published on a publically available Internet website
- whether any completed evaluations did not adhere to PEPFAR evaluation standards of practice published on pepfar.gov in January, 2014 (http://www.pepfar.gov/reports/guidance/221111.htm)

Additional reference documents and other materials are available on the PEPFAR.net MER project page within the Evaluation Standards of Practice folder here: https://www.pepfarii.net/Project-Pages/collab-22/Shared%20Documents/Forms/AllItems.aspx For any additional questions, please contact SGAC_SI@state.gov.

What is DATIM?
DATIM stands for Data for Accountability, Transparency, and Impact. It is a new PEPFAR system for use in the collection, approval, storage, analysis, and reporting of partner data. DATIM uses DHIS2 software, an open-source software developed by the University of Oslo. DHIS2 has been customized to meet PEPFAR's needs, including reporting on evaluations for this APR.

Section II: Evaluation Reporting Process for APR FY2014

This section describes the PEPFAR APR evaluation reporting process. It describes the information flow from the bottom up (Table 1). Please note, Implementing Agencies may have additional requirements for evaluations that may alter the specific processes.

1. In order to report on completed evaluations, AM/AOR/COR/Project Manager/Agency Designee must complete the **Adherence Checklist (Appendix A)** to assess PEPFAR-funded evaluations against the standards of practice.

2. Once the adherence checklist is completed, it must be submitted through the Agency POC, to the SI Liaison who is responsible for warehousing the completed checklists. ***During APR reporting, the SI Liaisons will use the new DATIM system. [Webinars will be held with the field on how to use this new system.]***

Table 1. ESoP Reporting in APR 2014

Document to complete/submit	Process and Person Responsible	Where to upload document/appendix
Adherence Checklist (see appendix A)	For every completed evaluation in FY 2014: • OU AM[4]/AOR[5]/COR[6]/PM[7]/Agency Designee for each evaluation will complete ESoP Adherence checklist (see Appendix A) and submit to agency field POC who in turn will compile and submit to SI Liaison. • OU SI Liaison/SI POC transfers findings from the checklist into DATIM (under the Events Capture in the Apps Menu	• Using the Adherence Checklist as a guide, the OU SI/SI POC completes the Evaluation Report in www.datim.org under Event Capture in the Apps menu. • *Note that OUs will be required to keep completed checklists on file – as they may be subject to data quality assessments.* • Note. DATIM webinars will be held with the field on how to use system.
	• HQ staff who have completed evaluations in FY 2014 will submit the Adherence Checklist to Agency evaluation leads, e.g. to ADS[8] (for CDC), if required by the agency.	HQ agency designee will populate Appendix B in www.datim.org under Event Capture in the Apps menu

[4] Activity Manager
[5] Agreement Officer's Representative
[6] Contract Officer's Representative
[7] Project Manager
[8] Associate Director for Science

Document to complete/submit	Process and Person Responsible	Where to upload document/appendix
DATIM Evaluation Reporting Template (datim.org, under Events Capture in App Menu)	• OUs and HQ agency designee **will only report on completed evaluations and corresponding ESoP adherence**	SI Liaison/SI lead and HQ agencies designees will populate the Evaluation Reporting form in www.datim.org
	• In sub-sequent years, OUs and HQ agencies designees will report on both ongoing and completed PEPFAR-funded evaluations	Guidance will be provided in COP 2015
Evaluation Report Components (see Appendix B)	• Evaluation reports need to include the components in Appendix C	N/A

Section III: Roles and Responsibilities

PEPFAR implementing agencies may have some variation in how some responsibilities are allocated. These variations should be articulated in agency-specific translational documents providing guidance on the integration of ESoP requirements with agency-specific policies and procedures. Table I illustrates ESoP roles and responsibilities as they relate to the APR. The roles and responsibilities are broken down by stakeholder. PEPFAR evaluations may be implemented using field and/or central funding and planned and implemented by headquarters and field Implementing Agencies and Implementing Partners. For questions about the roles and responsibilities as it relates to the APR, please contact SGAC_SI@state.gov.

Table 1: Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities Related to the APR

Stakeholders	Roles & Responsibilities
Implementing Partners	• Apply ESoP when developing and implementing PEPFAR-funded evaluations. • Cooperate with relevant donor agency and external or internal agency evaluators to provide access to data, information, human resources, and sites for evaluation efforts.
Operating Units	• Understand and utilize the ESoP and the APR Guidance for reporting. • Ensure that all PEPFAR evaluations are assessed for adherence to the standards using the Adherence Checklist and checklists are submitted to the in-country SI Liaison/PEPFAR Coordinator within expected timeframes (90 days after agency approval of final evaluation report)

	• Ensure that all completed evaluations are reported on during APR process. • Request ESoP-related technical assistance through Agency POC who will coordinate with the ESoP Work Group to provide support, as needed.
SI Liaison/SI POC/HQ agency designee	• Collect completed Adherence Checklist(s) from OUs and populate results into DATIM
Implementing Agencies at HQ	• Support dissemination and orientation of ESoP and the APR Guidance to OUs. • Review and synthesize all planned evaluation reporting from OUs in the APR. • Provide Technical assistance to corresponding OU Agency POCs and other staff involved in developing and implementing evaluations.
OGAC	• Support dissemination and orientation of ESoP and the APR Guidance to OUs. • Consolidate and review agency and OU reporting of planned and completed evaluations and ESoP adherence. • Coordinate efforts to provide technical assistance to strengthen agency, OU, and implementing partner evaluation capacity. • Coordinate the development of an annual report to Congress on the descriptions of all PEPFAR funded evaluations, public dissemination of evaluation reports, and adherence to ESoP.
ESOP Working Group & M&E TWG (as needed)	• Develop ESoP and the APR Guidance on PEPFAR evaluations and orient the field and HQ staff on these guidance documents. • Serve as a resource group to answer questions and provide technical assistance to OUs and HQ regarding implementation and use of the ESoP and the APR Guidance. • Review and synthesize all planned and completed evaluation reporting from OUs in the APR. • Conduct annual quality assurance efforts to develop a baseline of the quality of PEPFAR evaluations and monitor the trend over time. • Review on an annual basis the ESoP, the APR Guidance, and relevant tools and templates and revise accordingly.

Appendix A: Adherence Checklist

Instructions

- The Adherence Checklist must be completed by the AM/AOR/COR/Project Manager or Implementing Agency Designee for all PEPFAR funded evaluations completed in FY14.
- The evaluation's final report should be used as the primary reference document to complete the tool. (Other project documents that include relevant information may also be used as reference documents).
- The primary purpose of this checklist is to help AM/AOR/COR assess whether the evaluation has adhered to the Evaluation Standards of Practice launched earlier this year.
- It is understood that evaluations completed in FY14 were developed (and potentially implemented) prior to the release of the ESoP, however, this year is essential for PEPFAR to establish a baseline and to be able to track improvement over time. This will be appropriately noted in the annual report.

Completion of the Adherence Checklist is required at the end of each evaluation, but evaluators/AM/AOR/CORs can also use it as guidance at the start of an evaluation.

1) Prior to reporting at APR, AM/AOR/COR/Project Managers responsible for an evaluation should print the checklist below and fill it out.
2) Each completed checklist should be provided to the SI Liaison/OU SI lead for data entry into DATIM and the paper record should be kept (as it may be requested for audit/data quality purposes at a later date).
3) Please refer to the ESoP to determine definitions for evaluation type.
4) Check all that apply with respect to technical areas. If any information is not found in the report, such as evaluation cost, please follow up with the relevant contacts.
5) Please read the checklist's evaluation review factors and rate whether the sub-questions were met by answering (YES), (NO), or (PARTIALLY).
    a. If all of the sub-elements under each standard are rated (YES), rate the overall standard as (YES).
    b. If all of the sub-elements of the standard are rated (NO), rate the overall standard as (NO).
    c. If there is any combination of Yes and No for the sub-elements, rate the standard as (PARTIAL).
6) The right hand column of the checklist can be used to make any comments to, explain, clarify, or provide any justification for each rating.

a. If the overall standard is rated as No or Partially (met), you must provide evidence of this in the comments section.

b. This column can also be used to indicate any additional reference materials, other than the final evaluation report, that might have been used to assess the standard.

Checklist

Evaluation Report Title: ____

Brief description (250 characters max): (Including key findings, purpose, etc in bullet points)

____

US Agency Funding Project[9]: USAID ☐ CDC ☐ Peace Corps ☐ HRSA ☐ NIH ☐ DoD

US Agency Funding the Evaluation[10]: ☐ USAID ☐ CDC ☐ Peace Corps ☐ HRSA ☐ NIH ☐ DoD

Name of Project Implementing Partner(s): ______________________________________

Name of Evaluator(s) or Evaluation Partner(s)[11]: ___________________________________

Evaluation Type (select one): ☐ Process ☐ Outcome ☐ Economic ☐ Impact

Primary Technical Area(s) addressed in the evaluation: (select all that apply)

☐ PMTCT ☐ Abstinence/Fidelity ☐ Other Prevention ☐ Male Circumcision ☐ Injection Safely ☐ Blood Safety ☐ Infecting and non-Injecting drug use ☐ Counseling and Testing ☐ Adult Treatment ☐ Adult Care and Support ☐ Pediatric Care and Support ☐ Pediatric Treatment ☐ TB/HIV ☐ Orphans and Vulnerable Children ☐ ARV Drugs
☐ Laboratory strengthening ☐ Strategic Information ☐ HSS
[Note that in DATIM, only 1 technical area can be identified, however for the purposes of the checklist please select as many as needed]

Total evaluation cost: ____

Evaluation Start and End Dates: Start Date__________
End Date _____________

Date Evaluation Report Approved by Agency: ____________________________________

Reviewer Name: ____

Reviewer Title and Agency: Title _________________ Agency _________________________

Date of Review: ____

---

[9] Agency funding the project
[10] Agency funding the evaluation of the project. (In most cases, these will be the same.)
[11] If this is an internal evaluation, it may be possible that the Funding Agency may be conducting the evaluation

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	Was the standard met?			Reviewer Comments [Please include comments to explain if No or Partially met, and reference documents/supporting materials used in making the assessment]
	No	Partially	Yes	
ESoP 1: ENGAGE STAKEHOLDERS	☐ NO	☐ Partially	☐ YES	
1a. The evaluation team identified the stakeholders, their information needs, and involved these stakeholders in informing the design, implementing the evaluation, disseminating, and using the results.				
ESoP2: CLEARLY STATE EVALUATION QUESTIONS, PURPOSE, AND OBJECTIVES	☐ NO	☐ Partially	☐ YES	
2a. There is a clear description of the project being evaluated, the purpose of the evaluation, the evaluation questions, and how the evaluation results will be used and by whom.				
ESoP3: USE APPROPRIATE EVALUATION DESIGNS, METHODS, AND ANALYSIS	☐ NO	☐ Partially	☐ YES	
3a. The selected design, methods, and analytical plan are appropriate for the evaluation questions being asked. (Please reference your agency's protocol processes – as well as the data collection tools referred to in 3b)				
3b. The data collection tools (questionnaires, checklists, interview guides, and other instruments) used in the evaluation are provided in the annex of the report or protocol.				
ESoP4: ADDRESS ETHICAL CONSIDERATIONS AND ASSURANCES	☐ NO	☐ Partially	☐ YES	
4a. The evaluation report describes procedures in place to ensure human rights were protected with respect to privacy, confidentiality, and maintenance of the dignity of participants and received IRB approval where applicable or other human-subject review (for non-research evaluation).				

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	Was the standard met?			Reviewer Comments [Please include comments to explain if No or Partially met, and reference documents/supporting materials used in making the assessment]
	No	Partially	Yes	
4b. If interviews were conducted, informed consent procedures were described and documented in the evaluation report to ensure that participants were informed of the risks and benefits of their participation, as well as the lack of consequences in their eligibility to receive services regardless of their participation.				
ESoP5: IDENTIFY RESOURCES AND ARTICULATE BUDGET	**☐ NO ☐ Partially ☐ YES**			
5a. The evaluation report included total cost of implementing the evaluation.				
ESoP6: CONSTRUCT DATA COLLECTION AND MANAGEMENT PLANS	**☐ NO ☐ Partially ☐ YES**			
6a. Data collection and management procedures were described in the evaluation report. Changes made to the evaluation plan/protocol were documented.				
ESoP7: ENSURE APPROPRIATE EVALUATOR QUALIFICATIONS AND EVALUATION INDEPENDENCE	**☐ NO ☐ Partially ☐ YES**			
7a. The evaluation report includes a description of the evaluation team including: evaluator names, each member's role in the evaluation, and their background and experiences, providing evidence of the teams' qualifications in the technical areas of the project and in research/evaluation methods.				
7b. The evaluation report provides evidence of the management of conflict of interest for both internal and external evaluations, including statements of conflict of interest procedures and declarations to ensure credibility and mitigate bias.				
ESoP8: MONITOR THE PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AN EVALUATION	**☐ NO ☐ Partially ☐ YES**			
8a. There is evidence of adequate planning and monitoring of the evaluation implementation such as work plans, timelines/schedules,				

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	Was the standard met?			Reviewer Comments [Please include comments to explain if No or Partially met, and reference documents/supporting materials used in making the assessment]
	No	Partially	Yes	
and deliverables by the team lead and USG staff providing oversight.				
ESoP(; PRODUCE QUALITY EVALUATION REPORTS	**☐ NO ☐ Partially ☐ YES**			
9a. The evaluation report has all relevant components of a high quality evaluation report including: • cover and title pages; • executive summary; • project background • evaluation purpose and questions; • evaluation design, methods, and limitations; • findings and conclusions • recommendations; • dissemination • references • appendices (evaluation protocol/SOW, data collection tools, informed consent forms, abridged bios of evaluation team members, Conflict of Interest Statements, evaluation costs, data sources, results frameworks/logical frameworks, funding documents				
9b. The evaluation report conveys that the evaluation was undertaken in a manner to ensure credibility, objectivity, transparency, and the generation of high quality information and knowledge?				
9c. Findings are specific, concise, and supported by strong quantitative and/or qualitative evidence from multiple sources, data collection methods, and analytic techniques. If not, an explanation is provided.				
9d. Each conclusion in the report is supported by a specific or clearly defined finding.				
9e. Each recommendation is supported by a specific or clearly defined set of findings and conclusions, and are feasible, specific, responsive to the purpose, and action-oriented.				
ESoP10: DISSEMINATE RESULTS	**☐ NO ☐ Partially ☐ YES**			
10a. The evaluation report includes a dissemination plan for how the findings of the evaluation will be disseminated to relevant stakeholders				

EVALUATION REVIEW FACTOR	Was the standard met?			Reviewer Comments [Please include comments to explain if No or Partially met, and reference documents/supporting materials used in making the assessment]
	No	Partially	Yes	
(e.g. reports, presentations, publications, agency websites, annual reports, policy briefs).				
10b. The final evaluation report was uploaded to the respective agency website within 90 days after clearance/approvals by all relevant authorities.				
ESoP 11: USE FINDINGS FOR PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT	**☐ NO ☐ Partially ☐ YES**			
11a. The evaluation report includes a stated plan for how the evaluation findings will be used for decision-making and program improvement (e.g. mid-course corrections, new procurements, resource allocation, and intervention uptake) and timeframe, if appropriate.				

Appendix C: Components of an Evaluation Report

An evaluation report is the primary vehicle to document the methods, findings, conclusions, and recommendations of evaluations in order to disseminate results. Reports should clearly, succinctly, and impartially describe findings, conclusions, and recommendations.

Each component listed below is required for every PEPFAR evaluation report, but the order can vary and the components may be addressed in separate project documents. Agencies may have their own respective report templates/formats that should be followed, but all of the below components must be included in the final report or related documentation, which may be included as appendices to the final report. Evaluation projects that result in multiple reports on different aspects of the evaluation may be submitted as a single report, by aggregating the reports and supporting documentation.

Final PEPFAR evaluation reports and related project documentation that includes information on the required components will be posted on agency websites, on pepfar.gov, as well as on a website of the Department of State, in accordance with agency open access policies.

Components	Content
1. Cover and Title pages	☐ Title of evaluation
	☐ Date of release of report
	☐ Names of evaluators and affiliation
2. Executive Summary	☐ Contains evaluation purpose, evaluation questions, brief description of project being evaluated, data collection methods, limitations, evaluation findings, conclusions and recommendations
3. Project Background	☐ Brief description of program/project to be evaluated including dates of project implementation, total cost, geographical location, and objectives
4. Evaluation purpose and Questions	☐ Purpose of the evaluation and justification
	☐ Questions the evaluation will answer
5. Evaluation Design, Methods, and Limitations	☐ Overall evaluation design
	☐ Type of evaluation (process, outcome, impact, economic)
	☐ Summary of stakeholder engagement
	☐ Sampling strategy
	☐ Data collection methods and rationale as aligned to evaluation questions
	☐ Ethical considerations and assurances (e.g., non-research determination and/or IRB approval with dates; application of informed consent, if appropriate; procedures to ensure human rights protection)
	☐ Deviations and adjustments (if any) from the approved SOW/protocol
	☐ Procedures used to ensure that the data are of highest achievable quality
	☐ Data analysis plan

Components	Content
	Limitations of the design and methods
6. Findings and Conclusions	Key findings for program improvement in relation to evaluation questions
	Unexpected findings
	Conclusions
	Graphical representation of results and quotes where relevant
7. Recommendations	Actionable, feasible, and specific recommendations aligned to key findings and evaluation questions
8. Dissemination	Dissemination procedures/plan
	Date for submission to Department of State/agency HQs, etc
9. References	Reports or publications cited in the body of the report
10. Appendices	Approved Evaluation SOW/Protocol
	Data collection instruments/tools
	Informed Consent, where relevant
	Abridged bios of the evaluation team members including qualifications, experience, role on the team, and Ethical certifications (if applicable)
	Conflict of interest statement (if applicable)
	Evaluation costs/budget
	Sources of information (key informants, documents reviewed, other sources)
	Project Results Framework or Logical Framework

Appendix D: Definitions

CONFLICT OF INTEREST: "A situation in which a party has interests that could improperly influence that party's performance of official duties or responsibilities, contractual obligations, or compliance with applicable laws and regulations".[12] A real or perceived conflict of interest of an evaluator translates to a lack of "impartiality, objectivity, and integrity"[13] and could jeopardize the credibility and validity of the findings.

ECONOMIC EVALUATION: Use of applied analytical techniques to identify, measure, value and compare the costs and outcomes of alternative interventions. Economic evaluation is a systematic and transparent framework for assessing efficiency focusing on the economic costs and outcomes of alternative programs or interventions. This framework is based on a comparative analysis of both the costs (resources consumed) and outcomes (health, clinical, economic) of programs or interventions. Main types of economic evaluation are cost-minimization analysis (CMA), cost-effectiveness analysis (CEA), cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and cost-utility analysis (CUA).[14]

EVALUATION: "Evaluation is the systematic collection and analysis of information about the characteristics and outcomes of programs and projects as a basis for judgments, to improve effectiveness, and/or inform decisions about current and future programming. Evaluation is distinct from assessment, which may be designed to examine country or sector context to inform project design, or an informal review of projects."[15]

EVALUATOR INDEPENDENCE: Refers to having "no fiduciary relationship with the implementing partner" that is being evaluated". [16] "Independence provides legitimacy to evaluation and reduces the potential for conflict of interest which could arise if policy makers and managers were solely responsible for evaluating their own activities".[17] "Evaluators are independent from the development intervention, including its policy, operations and management functions, as well as intended beneficiaries…The evaluation team is able to work freely and without interference. It is assured of co-operation and access to all relevant information". [18]

EXTERNAL EVALUATION: An evaluation conducted externally by an independent consulting firm, research institute, or independent oversight agency such as GAO or an agency's Inspector

---

[12] Asian Development Bank. 2005. Guidelines to avoid conflict of interest in independent evaluations. p. 46.
[13] Ibid
[14] Drummond 2005.
[15] Department of State, Evaluation Policy, op. cit.
[16] United States Agency for International Development, ADS 203. P 10.
[17] OECD DAC, 1991. Principles for Evaluation of Development Assistance. P. 6.
[18] OECD DAC, Quality Standards for Development Evaluation. P. 11

General. The importance of an evaluator's independence from program management provides greater credibility of the evaluation findings and report.[19]

IMPACT EVALUATION: Measures the change in an outcome that is attributable to a defined intervention by comparing actual impact to what would have happened in the absence of the intervention (the counterfactual scenario). IEs are based on models of cause and effect and require a rigorously defined counterfactual to control for factors other than the intervention that might account for the observed change. There are a range of accepted approaches to applying a counterfactual analysis, though IEs in which comparisons are made between beneficiaries that are randomly assigned to either an intervention or a control group provide the strongest evidence of a relationship between the intervention under study and the outcome measured to demonstrate impact.[20]

INTERNAL EVALUATION: Evaluations aimed at identifying program improvement and are conducted by a program office or an agency unit that specializes in program analysis and evaluation.[21] Internal evaluations include those led by or made up entirely of implementing agency staff (HQ or field), those implemented by partners of their own efforts, or those commissioned by implementing partners using external consultants. The primary purpose of internal evaluations is for learning and program improvement.

OUTCOME EVALUATION: "A type of evaluation that determines if and by how much, intervention activities or services achieved their intended outcomes." It focuses on "outputs and outcomes (including unintended effects) to judge program effectiveness, but may also assess program process to understand how outcomes are produced."9 It is possible to use statistical techniques in some instances when control or comparison groups are not available (e.g., for the evaluation of a national program)."[22]

PROCESS EVALUATION: "A type of evaluation that focuses on program or intervention implementation, including, but not limited to access to services, whether services reach the intended population, how services are delivered, client satisfaction and perceptions about needs and services, management practices. In addition, a process evaluation might provide an understanding of cultural, socio-political, legal, and economic context that affect implementation of the program or intervention."[23]

PROGRAM: "An overarching national or sub-national response to a disease. A program generally includes a set of interventions marshaled to attain specific global, regional, country,

---

[19] GAO, 2012. Designing Evaluations, 2012 Revisions. P. 5

[20] PEPFAR 2014 Country Operational Guidance and 2012 supplemental guidance on Implementation Science/Impact Evaluation.

[21] GAO, 2012. Designing Evaluations, 2012 Revisions. P. 5

[22] Ibid. p. 65

[23] UNAIDS, 2010, Basic Terminology and Frameworks for Monitoring and Evaluation, p. 66.

or subnational objectives; involves multiple activities that may cut across sectors, themes and/or geographic areas."[24]

PROJECT: "An intervention designed to achieve specific objectives within specified resources and implementation schedules, often within the framework of a broader program."[25]

PROTOCOL: "A study protocol is a document that describes, in detail, the plan for conducting the clinical study. The study protocol explains the purpose and function of the study as well as how to carry it out. Some specific things included in the protocol are the reason for the study, the number of participants, eligibility and exclusion criteria, details of the intervention or therapy the participants will receive (such as frequency and dosages), what data will be gathered, what demographic information about the participants will be gathered, steps for clinical caregivers to carry out, and the study endpoints. A single standard protocol must be used without deviation to ensure that the resulting data will be significant and reliable".[26] We refer to a protocol for an evaluation as opposed to a clinical study.

STATEMENT OF WORK/SCOPE OF WORK: "A formal document that captures and defines the work activities, deliverables, and timeline a vendor must execute in performance of specified work for a client. The SOW usually includes detailed requirements and pricing, with standard regulatory and governance terms and conditions. It thus overlaps in concept with a contract, and indeed SOWs are often legally equivalent to contracts."[27] "A Statement of Work is typically used when the task is well-known and can be described in specific terms. SOW's provide explicit statements of work direction for the contractor to follow."[28]

[24] Ibid p. 66.
[25] UNAIDS, 2010, Basic Terminology, op. cit., p. 67
[26] NIH. https://www.nichd.nih.gov/health/clinicalresearch/clinical-researchers/steps/Pages/prepareprotocol.aspx
[27] wikipedia
[28] General Services Administration. http://gsa.gov/graphics/fas/SOW_Application.Services.and.Component.Framework.pdf