**Evaluation Questions Presented in GEM-3 Evaluation Scope of Work**

**IMPACT:**

1. Overall, what are the key results and outcomes of the program? Have the specific targets established for the various activities and projects implemented under the GEM-3 Program been attained?

2. What has been the impact of the activities? Have the various projects and activities carried out under the GEM-3 Program played an appreciable role in bringing about improved situations with respect to peace and development?

3. Impact of specific GEM-3 Components:
   
   **A. Infrastructure Development**
   
   4. How did the infrastructure development component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II?

   5. Did the differing scopes and scales of the infrastructure projects have a significantly different level of impact on meeting the program’s targets and objectives? (E.g. Barangay Infrastructure Projects (BIPs) vs. the Regional Infrastructure Projects (RIPs)).

   6. Out of the different types of infrastructure projects supported (solar dyers, box culverts, irrigation canals, boat landings, etc.), were there specific types that were more effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in meeting targets and programmatic objectives?

   7. Have the quality and functionality of infrastructure projects been maintained by local partners?

   **B. Workforce Preparation**

   8. How did the Workforce Preparation component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II?

   9. Which of the different Workforce Preparation activities (Computer Literacy and Internet Connection (CLIC), Education Matching Grant Project (EMGP), Job Enabling English Proficiency (JEEP), Productive Internships In Dynamic Enterprises (PRIDE), Investments in Vocational, Elementary, Secondary and Tertiary Studies (INVESTS), etc.), were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in meeting targets and programmatic objectives and why?

   10. Did the combination of Workforce Preparation activities result in synergies that magnified the effect of any one specific activity?

   **C. Governance Improvement**

   11. How did the Governance Improvement component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II?

   12. Did the technical assistance activities conducted under this component effectively improve the capacity of the Government of the ARMM and its constituent Local Government Units (LGUs) to address their key administrative and management problems?

   13. Which of the different Governance Improvement activities (Revenue Enhancement And Progress (REAP), Congressional Internship Program for Young Mindanao Leaders (CIPYML), etc.), were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in meeting targets and programmatic objectives? Did these programs address the most pressing needs of the ARMM LGUs?
14. Did packaging— incentives (e.g. additional infrastructure projects) with governance improvements lead toward successful attainment of LGU targets? Which incentives seemed to be the most effective?

D. Business Growth

15. How did the Business Growth component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II?

16. Did the activities lead to a significant increase in private investment in the targeted sectors? Which of the different Business Growth activities (Business Support Organization (BSO) Development, Targeted Commodity Expansion Project - (TCEP), etc.), were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in meeting targets and programmatic objectives and why?

17. How effective were the different activities at facilitating the services required by local businesses to grow and generate employment? How effective has the Business Growth component of GEM-3 been in improving Mindanao producers’ access to markets? How effective was GEM-3’s business policy agenda in improving competitiveness of Mindanao businesses?

E. Former Combatant Reintegration

18. How did the FCR component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II?

19. What effect did FCR programming have on recidivism rates of former combatants towards violence?

20. Did the activities effectively support former MNLF combatants develop the production of agricultural products to generate sustainable economic opportunities?

21. Which of the specific elements of the Livelihood Enhancement and Peace (LEAP) program were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) meeting targets and programmatic objectives?

F. Communications and Public Relations

22. How did the CPR component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II?

23. Have public relations efforts been effective in changing the impression that all of Mindanao is a —battleground? If yes, has this led to an increase in business activities and investment in the region?

24. Has the CPR component generated public awareness, understanding and support of the Government of the Philippines and USAID activities in Mindanao? If so, to what extent?

25. What have been the impacts of GEM-3 branding efforts? What is the GEM brand worth? Do different Mindanao stakeholders properly associate the GEM-3 Program with USG/USAID development assistance? Does the GEM brand have a synergistic effect on other USG/USAID activities in Mindanao? Should the GEM brand be used for future programs in the region? What are the implications of continuing to use the GEM brand?

26. Which of the CPR activities (Pamphlets, radio, videos, CD-ROMs, etc.), were most effective and efficient (from a cost and time perspective) in supporting GEM-3/USG branding/outreach efforts?

G. Cross Cutting GEM-3 Support Services
27. How did the Support Services component of the GEM-3 Program contribute to the overarching development objectives outlined in Section II?

28. How has the range of support services provided by the GEM-3 program impacted other USG/USAID programming in the region? Which of the Support Services activities (security services, transportation, arranging Very Important Person (VIP) visits, etc.), were most effective?

29. Are the Support Services a necessary component to achieve success in conflict-affected areas of Mindanao?

RELEVANCE AND SELECTIVITY:

30. Did the program address relevant and priority areas in Mindanao that are consistent with the Philippine government peace and development strategies?

31. Which of the GEM-3 Program activities were the most relevant to meeting its peace and economic development objectives?

32. For which activities did USAID have the best comparative advantage? Is it possible to link GEM-3’s socio-economic activities with the objectives of bringing about peace and stability in Mindanao?

33. What evidence was found to support or dismiss these linkages?

EFFECTIVENESS:

34. Did the GEM-3 Program accomplish its objectives and achieve its targets? What are the strengths and weaknesses of the program? Did the umbrella-type assistance approach work?

35. Have technical assistance, training, and partnerships been targeted at the appropriate beneficiaries to ensure the greatest impact in advancing peace, stability, and economic growth?

36. How effective are the public and private partnerships that GEM-3 developed?

37. How effective was the financial resource leveraging or — buy-in — of GEM-3 activities?

38. Where have synergies been achieved with other USAID/USG-funded activities in Mindanao, such as the U.S. Department of Agriculture’s Food for Progress program and the activities of the Joint Special Operations Task Force – Philippines (JSOTF-P)?

39. What additional opportunities exist for greater collaboration, with JOSTF-P and other USG organizations?

EFFICIENCY:

40. Were the program management structure and implementing tools efficient in achieving results?

41. Have the various activities and projects carried out through the GEM-3 Program been appropriately managed?

42. Have staffing levels been appropriate?

43. Were management and oversight costs suitable given the number and scope of activities carried out?

44. How efficient was the USAID oversight and management of GEM-3? How could it be improved?

45. Has the umbrella-type project design for GEM-3 been an efficient method of using program resources and finding synergies amongst the different program components?

46. How cost effective were the results of each program area compared with alternative approaches of accomplishing the same objectives?
GENDER:

47. To what extent has the GEM-3 Gender Action Plan been implemented?

48. Have gender concerns been mainstreamed into GEM-3 activities?

49. To what degree have gender issues been addressed?

50. What was lacking in the project design and/or implementation that would have improved gender considerations?

SUSTAINABILITY:

51. Are the results and impacts of GEM-3 activities sustainable?

52. What evidence exists of the host country and local government units (LGUs) taking ownership of the GEM-3 program, including promoting the networks and best practices developed and disseminated under GEM-3?

LESSONS LEARNED:

53. What lessons have been learned from the design and implementation of GEM-3? How can socio-economic development programs be designed to have the greatest impact on fostering peace and stability?

54. Are there activities that are more effective in promoting peace, relative to other activities? If so, which activities are these?