

USAID'S EVALUTION PORTFOLIO

HOW EVALUATION RESULTS CAN SUPPORT GOVERNMENT POLICIES AND DONOR PROJECT DECISIONS

(22) ((1) (-0.43) 20 ((-0.5) (22) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-0.5) (-

32 MARTER, DECKI, S. M. S.

LL BE TO MALE OFFICE COMMENTS TO LLATCH TALES OFFICE COMMENTS TO TO POTT - MET MARKETS COMMENTS OF DERIVER MALE IN

ALTERNATION AND ALL SALES

10/24/2016

USAID EVALUATIONS

- IMPACT EVALUATIONS
 - Ethiopia: Pastoral and farmland rights certification programs (2)
 - Liberia: Community land rights protection program
 - Tanzania: Farmland rights certification program
 - Zambia: Agroforestry and land certification pilot, REDD+ pilot w/GCC (2)
 - Indonesia: Improved fisheries and marine governance project

PERFORMANCE AND OTHER EVALUATIONS

- Tanzania: MAST performance evaluation of mobile mapping pilot
- Tanzania: MAST "time and cost special study" on cost/time per parcel of mobile mapping
- Multiple Locations: Performance evaluation of responsible land-based investment pilots

EVALUATIONS: WHY DO WE INVEST?

- To justify our programs
 - \$ for \$, how much does securing tenure increase productivity vs. seeds? How are our land programs affecting women? Is securing tenure really an effective way to reduce deforestation? What are the results of our land programs in the real world??
- To help Missions decide whether to scale up our pilots
- To help Country Governments make policy decisions
- To comply with USAID's Evaluation Policy



Example I: Ethiopia ELAP/ELTAP

- **Findings:** second-level certification produced negligible benefits in terms of, e.g., access to credit, and perceptions of tenure security.
- Impact:
 - Potential to inform GoE decisions on value of second level certification efforts.
 - Potential to inform GoE National Land Use Policy, which is currently being developed.
 - Potential to inform other donor land certification efforts (e.g. DFID) which are ongoing.



Example 2: Liberia CLPP

- Examines: Impact of strengthening community land governance (through Namati's Community Land Protection Program) on conflict, livelihoods, investor relationships, tenure security perception, and women's empowerment
- Impact:
 - Potential to inform implementation of USAID's new land activity, which includes piloting of National Land Rights Policy.



Example 3: Tanzania MAST Time/Cost Special Study

- **Examines:** The time and cost per parcel of delivering CCROs using the MAST mobile app vs. traditional methods.
- Potential Impact:
 - GoT decision to scale MAST nation-wide
 - Decisions of other donors (e.g. DFID, SIDA, DANIDA) engaged in land certification efforts in Tanzania.
 - Decisions by USAID, which is currently scaling MAST in 41 villages.
- Complements the MAST Village I Performance Evaluation
- Develops new methodology for cost per parcel calculations



Example 4: Tanzania LTA Impact Evaluation

- **Examines:** How delivery of CCROs impacts perception of tenure security, women's and youth empowerment, agricultural investment, and conflict
- Potential Impact:
 - GoT buy-in to the LTA project (building champions and greater understanding)
 - GoT buy-in and learning re: IEs



