



# USAID Evaluation Statement of Work Requirements

A Mandatory Reference for ADS Chapter 201

Full Revision Date: 06/07/2023  
Responsible Office: PPL  
File Name: 201mab\_060723

An [evaluation Statement of Work \(SOW\)](#) provides the framework for an evaluation and communicates evaluation questions. An evaluation SOW is needed to implement evaluations through external parties. While not required for internal evaluations, it can also guide internal evaluations with modifications, as appropriate.

If the evaluation is conducted by an external party, the drafter of the SOW must ensure that all requirements that will be placed on the contractor are addressed within the SOW. Such requirements must be explicitly stated; the SOW itself must not reference the Automated Directives System (ADS). ADS references are only included in this Mandatory Reference to assist the drafter in formulating requirements.

Unless stated otherwise, all evaluation SOWs must:

#### *Purpose*

1. Identify the evaluation as an impact or performance evaluation (see [ADS 201.3.6.4](#) for definitions).
2. State the commissioning Operating Unit (OU) as well as the purpose of, audience for, and anticipated use(s) of the evaluation.
3. Describe what is being evaluated (e.g., a strategy, intermediate result, project, activity, or intervention(s) within an activity), including award numbers, award dates, funding levels, and implementing partners, as relevant.
4. Describe who will use the results of the evaluation and how they will use it.

#### *Background*

5. Provide brief background information on the strategy, intermediate result, project, activity, or intervention(s) that will be evaluated. This should include country and/or sector context; the specific problem or opportunity the intervention(s) addresses; and, where available, the development hypothesis, theory of change, or simply how the intervention(s) address the problem.

#### *Evaluation Questions*

6. Identify a small number of proposed evaluation questions (one to five questions are recommended) that can be answered with empirical evidence, are appropriate to the type of evaluation, and are relevant to future programmatic decisions or learning. Note that the SOW may allow evaluation questions to be finalized post-award and prior to completing the evaluation design. For more information, see [Tips for Developing Good Evaluation Questions](#).

7. **(For impact evaluations)** Identify questions about measuring the magnitude of change in specific outcomes attributable to a specific USAID intervention or interventions.

### *Evaluation Design and Methodology*

8. Identify all evaluation questions requiring sex-disaggregated data, the use of gender-sensitive data collection methods, and analysis of sex-specific differential impacts (for more information, see [ADS 205](#)).
9. Identify any evaluation questions requiring the use of data for which usage rights or consent must be obtained. Ensure that usage rights or consent permits the secondary use and sharing of these data.
10. Identify existing and relevant strategy, project, or activity documents or performance information sources that the OU will make available to the selected evaluation team, including monitoring data.
11. If known in advance of procuring the evaluation, describe any preferred evaluation method(s) for data collection and analysis including sampling strategy, or provide parameters within which prospective evaluators may propose evaluation methods. The proposed method(s) should be appropriate to the evaluation questions being posed. They should also generate the most credible evidence on each evaluation question—taking time, budget, and other practical considerations into account. Note that as with evaluation questions, the SOW may allow methods to be finalized post-award and prior to completing the evaluation design.
12. **(For impact evaluations)** Require examination of the implementation of the intervention(s) evaluated, including whether it followed the scope and/or work plan and any major challenges in implementation.
13. **(For impact evaluations)** Require specific [experimental or quasi-experimental methods](#) or request the prospective evaluators to propose experimental or quasi-experimental methods.
14. **(For impact evaluations)** Require prospective evaluators to provide a detailed description of the proposed method of deriving the comparison (i.e., control) group. If a quasi-experimental method is used, require prospective evaluators to provide an explanation of how the comparison group will be formed and the data sources that will be used to identify comparison group respondents (e.g., government administrative data list or evaluator conducted household survey).
15. **(For impact evaluations)** Require a cost analysis of the intervention or interventions being studied (see [Discussion Note: Cost Data Collection and Analysis](#) for additional information).

16. Require prospective evaluators to discuss strengths and limitations of the proposed evaluation methods and potential risks to the evaluation. Discuss mitigation measures, as appropriate.

#### *Deliverables and Reporting Requirements*

17. Specify the evaluation deliverable(s), the timeline of these deliverables and logistics including:
  - A written design that includes key questions, methods, main features of data collection instruments, and data analysis plan.
  - A draft report for review by USAID;
  - A final report that includes all the relevant required elements described in [ADS 201mah, USAID Evaluation Report Requirements](#). The SOW must not reference ADS 201mah, but must list in the SOW itself, all the required elements from ADS 201mah that apply (depending on whether the evaluation is a performance evaluation or impact evaluation); and
  - Datasets and supporting documentation such as code books, data dictionaries, scope, and methodology used to collect and analyze the data. Submission of datasets and supporting documentation, such as code books, data dictionaries, scope, and methodology, to the Development Data Library is also required. Please note that non-english datasets eligible for submission to DDL must be translated in a way that is at least minimally sufficient for required reviews.
  - Please note that OUs must submit data assets created or derived in the process of carrying out an evaluation to the DDL (see ADS 579 for more information) OUs must ensure that implementing partners submit data assets and supporting documentation – such as code books, data dictionaries, informed consents, and the scope and methodology used to collect and analyze the data – compiled under USAID funded evaluations to the DDL. OUs should collaborate with implementing partners to maintain links among evaluation reports and supporting data assets.
18. Clarify requirements for reporting and dissemination. Note that per [ADS 201.3.6.10](#), OUs may request dissemination products in addition to a report, such as slide decks, videos, infographics, visualizations, podcasts, or other means of sharing the evaluation findings. Unless stated otherwise, USAID Operating Units (OUs) must ensure that evaluation reports be posted to the Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC) (see ADS 579, USAID Development Data for additional guidance)." Increased compliance with posting evaluations and other documents to the DEC would help improve the Agency's transparency.

19. Clarify actions to facilitate evaluation utilization. This may include a recommendations workshop to co-create recommendations based on evaluation findings or a utilization workshop, a facilitated conversation aimed to help OUs develop the post-evaluation action plan required by [ADS 201.3.6.10](#).
20. Include the criteria listed in [ADS 201maa, Criteria to Ensure the Quality of the Evaluation Report](#). This communicates USAID's quality criteria to prospective evaluators and serves as the basis for reviewing reports.

#### *Evaluation Team Composition*

21. Clarify expectations about the methodological and subject matter expertise and composition of the evaluation team, including (1) expectations concerning the involvement of local evaluation team members and evaluation specialists, and (2) expectations concerning expertise in gender analysis, if relevant.
22. Require evaluation team members to provide a written disclosure of conflicts of interest to be included as an annex to the report and, where applicable, require key personnel to submit their conflict of interest disclosure with the proposal.

#### *Additional Elements*

23. Describe expected participation of USAID staff, implementing partners, national counterparts, and/or program participants in the design or conduct of the evaluation.
24. Specify the expected period of performance for the evaluation.
25. Address scheduling, logistics, security requirements, etc..
26. Include illustrative information about the level of effort expected, if determined applicable, in consultation with the Contracting Officer or Contracting Officer's Representative as appropriate.
27. All evaluations must adhere to mandatory reference to ADS 200 ["Protection of Human Subjects in Research Supported by USAID."](#)

201mab\_060723