Compact Survey Summary, FY17

MILLENNIUM
CHALLENGE CORPORATION
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Table of Contents

Basic Information: 3

Topic I: Partnership During Implementation 3

Topic II: Progress Towards Results 4

Topic III: Performance to Standards 5

Topic IV: DCO Portfolio Management and Oversight 5

In preparation for the annual decision to select compact partners, MCC gathers a great deal of internal reporting and information on implementation for countries which will finish implementing their first compacts within 18 months of MCC's Board of Directors' selection decision. This includes surveying MCC implementation staff on a number of topics. The following document is intended to provide a sense of the topics and questions addressed through this process.

Basic Information:

- EIF Date/ Compact End Date:
- Compact Size:
- Amount disbursed through Q3 of current fiscal year: in $ and % of compact total
- Amount committed through Q3 of current fiscal year: in $ and % of compact total

Topic I: Partnership During Implementation

The purpose of these types of questions, asked of MCC compact implementation staff, is to capture the nature of a given country's partnership with MCC. This includes two categories: *political wil*l and *management capacity*. Questions are designed to evoke team responses that:

- Assess the degree to which the partner government cooperates with MCC at the operational level, and their commitment to take action when necessary for successful implementation.
- Include details that describe the demonstrated depth of capacity and competence across the MCA and Implementation Entities in managing programs according to budget and timeline, and with accountability.

Part A—Political Will: Satisfaction of Major Conditions Precedent

MCC staff description and assessment of the government's completion of significant conditions precedent or policy reforms as required by the compact, especially those associated with the sustainability of program investments, and an assessment of the government's appetite for further policy reform.

Part B—Program Implementation

1. MCC staff assessment of the extent to which the government upheld responsibilities clearly articulated in the compact and supplemental agreements.
2. If there were rescopings or reallocations, MCC staff description of:
    - The cause for rescoping;
    - The degree to which the government exercised leadership in pursuing solutions to budget shortfalls, including committing own resources or soliciting aid from other donors; and/or
    - Assessment of the degree to which the MCA (vs. MCC) took initiative in identifying and addressing causes of project restructures in a timely and effective manner.

3. If the country (or key government ministries) went through any political transitions during the compact period, MCC staff descriptions of how the transitions affected the operation of the MCA.

Part C—Sustainability of MCC Investments

MCC staff description of how the country partner has demonstrated a commitment to ensuring the sustainability of MCC investments/project outcomes for each compact project.

Part D—Management Capacity Rating

1. MCC staff ratings of each MCA on the following measures of project management capacity.
    - Program and project planning and reporting documents, including quality of work, procurement/financial plans, and alignment between them;
    - Capacity to hold MCA staff, implementing entities, contractors, procurement/fiscal agent accountable to responsibilities, timelines, performance, etc; and
    - Proactivity in identifying and addressing implementation challenges.
2. MCC staff descriptions of the level of MCC engagement and oversight required during the life of the compact, including details on why and when more or less MCC resources were required.

Part E—Project Performance

1. MCC staff notes on projects that faced or are currently facing performance issues, including whether there were substantial changes in MCA performance over the course of implementation. Project performance summaries typically include:
    - Period of performance concern;
    - Whether or not the project is currently on track to meet or exceed objectives and targets;
    - If off-track, the nature of poor performance such as delays in time or procurement; MCA, Independent Engineer, Fiscal Agent, and/or Procurement Agent performance concerns; or inability to meet process milestones or performance targets.
2. If corrective actions were implemented for any identified performance issues mentioned above, This also includes MCC staff description of the degree to which the MCA (vs. MCC) took initiative in identifying and addressing poor performance in a timely and effective manner.

Topic II: Progress Towards Results

The purpose of these types of questions, asked of MCC compact implementation staff, is to gather information on the degree to which MCAs and partner countries have demonstrated a commitment and capacity to achieve program results, have demonstrated that they take accountability for these results, and have in fact achieved program results.

Part A—Financial Results

1. Expected dollar amount and the percentage of compact disbursement and commitment targets

that will be met by December of this year.
2. Percentage of project-level funds that are expected to be expended by the end of the compact term. This includes MCC staff notes on delayed or revised financial targets, and the drivers of missed targets.

Part B—Program Results

1. MCC monitoring and evaluation (M&E) staff assessment of whether the compact currently on track to meet end of compact targets as defined in the M&E Plan. This typically includes a summary statement about compact results for projects at the output, outcome, and objective levels.
2. MCC staff ratings of each MCA on:
    - The level of commitment of the MCA to focusing on results;
    - The level of the MCA's use of monitoring plans and reports to track program progress and make course-corrections as necessary. This may include notes on whether or not the system became operational and, if so, are they using it to feed data into management decisions; and
    - The level of the MCA's cooperation with incorporating requirements of rigorous impact evaluations. This may include whether impact evaluation requirements were included in implementation plans and contractor terms of reference, and if potential problems were identified quickly, and/or acted on.
3. MCC staff assessment of which metrics in the Indicator Tracking Tables or Key Performance Indicators best serve as proxies for measuring progress across the compact.

Topic III: Performance to Standards

MCC's risk management team produces a summary report on fraud or corruption related incidents reported across all partners. The purpose of this type of question, asked of MCC compact implementation staff, is to gather input on how the government and/or MCA responded to any violations of MCC policies and standards.

This includes MCC staff rating of the government/MCA's commitment to upholding the following MCC operational policies and guidelines:

- Fraud and Corruption Policy
- Procurement Policy
- Monitoring and Evaluation Policy
- Social and Gender Guidelines
- Environmental Guidelines
- Program Closure Guidelines
- Legal provisions as defined by the compact or other supplemental documents

Topic IV: DCO Portfolio Management and Oversight

The purpose of these types of questions, asked of MCC regional management, is to receive input from those who are able to look comparatively across MCC's entire portfolio.

Part A—MCC Resource Requirements

MCC regional management assessment of the extent to which a particular compact required more/less/equal amounts of the following MCC resources relative to other MCAs with similar compact projects. This includes:

- MCC implementation support team (IST) work time at HQ
- IST direct support through extended in-country missions
- Rescopings/reallocations related to MCA/implementation entity performance
- MCC senior management intervention to manage problems

Part B—Upcoming Audits and Reviews

Reporting on whether ongoing audit investigations or reviews by the OIG, GAO, or others may present recommendations or findings that the MCC Board of Directors should bear in mind when considering a country for a second compact.

Part C—Nature of MCC Oversight/Intervention

MCC regional management notes or context on resources required to ensure successful completion of a compact.