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**SOAR Advisor Review Form**

**Activity Name:**

**Bureau/Office/Mission:**

**Total Estimated Cost/Amount:**

**Award Type:**

**Reviewer’s Name/Office Symbol:**

**Mandatory Responses:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Approach** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| How did the Operating Unit (OU) develop its approach to addressing the problem?  | How did the OU define its development problem or approach to addressing the development problem? What is the basis for believing the proposed approach will deliver expected results for development outcomes? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| How does the proposed approach support Administration priorities and the Administrator’s vision of helping countries become self-reliant? | Does the package contain approaches that support helping countries to become owners of their own development and make USAID funding unnecessary?  | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| How does the approach align with priorities in the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Acquisition and Assistance (A&A) Strategy? | Statement of Objectives; Concept Paper stage; oral presentations; oral discussions; Broad Agency Announcement (BAA); Annual Program Statement (APS); modular design; option years; Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting methods; incentive tools; diversified approaches in the design, solicitation, and award of programs; *etc*. | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| Other than routine performance monitoring, how does the proposed activity measure, incentivize, and improve results (*e.g.*, milestones; fixed amounts/prices; performance-based incentives; pay for results; cash benchmarking; impact or performance evaluation; Collaborating, Learning and Adapting plan, *etc*.)?  | *Development Impact:* Does the proposed activity include metrics for measuring results or development impact?*Implementing Partner Accountability for Results:*  Will the proposed implementing mechanism include a deliverable schedule or payment type that incentivizes exceptional performance, such as reduced deliverables payments for sub-par work in a fixed price contract; performance-based incentives; *etc*.? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| How is flexibility and adaptive management being incorporated (*e.g.*, modular design, option years)?  | Does the design include flexibility to adapt to unexpected crises in country? Does the contracting or agreement instrument or clauses/provisions allow for adaptability during implementation?  | PPL: |  |
| LAB:  |  |
| M:  |  |
| How is innovation being used or considered? | Possibilities include: the development, adaptation, or scaling of new interventions, processes, or approaches; integration of digital technologies to drive greater efficacy and project outcomes; collaboration with new partners to advance the evidence-base, apply learning and adaptation, introduce design-thinking, and/or embody more iterative and agile approaches; scientific research that leads to a new intervention or body of knowledge related to the development problem; or new methods of partnering with the private sector, local entrepreneurs, and in-country actors. | PPL: |  |
| LAB:  |  |
| M:  |  |
| **[If a PIO Agreement]** Why is support to a PIO a better approach than direct-Agency awards that are more collaborative in nature and provide greater oversight USAID funding? | Explain why and how support to a PIO is more likely to achieve Agency goals than an A&A award.  | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Other Public- and Private-Sector Resources** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| Could the private sector solve the target problem by itself? Could a market-based approach address the problem? | Self-explanatory | PPL:  |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| Are there factors that constrain the private sector from involvement and investment? Could USAID help alleviate or eliminate these constraints?  | Self-explanatory | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| Does the proposed approach mobilize other public- and private-sector resources to increase development impact with the potential to carry forward beyond USAID’s funding? | Self-explanatory | PPL:  |  |
| LAB:  |  |
| M:  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Use of Evidence** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| What has been the use of evidence (*e.g.*, from the impact or performance evaluations, scientific research) and assessments and/or analysis (*e.g.*, political-economy analysis, cash-benchmarking, cost-effectiveness analysis, cost-benefit analysis, gender analysis, inclusive development analysis, *etc*.) in designing the activity? | What type of evidence has been used in the design phase, and if no formal evidence-based approach, what research or analysis has informed the design of this activity? | PPL:  |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| What evaluations or research projects are planned to facilitate learning from this activity?  | Self-explanatory | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| Is this activity a new, untested approach that is anticipated to be expanded in scale or scope through U.S. or funding sources? | Self-explanatory | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| If so, is an impact evaluation planned, as required, if feasible, in ADS 201.3.5.13? Why or why not? | Self-explanatory | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Past Activities**  |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| How does the activity build off past activities?(**Note to reviewer:** This may be answered in the next question of the three-part question below) | How have you used past activities to inform the project design for this activity? If a follow-on, how has the experience with the past activity informed the design for this activity to fill in gaps or realize efficiencies?  | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| If this is a follow-on award, and it has not been based on a thorough review of the initial award, please explain why not. | Is the reason sound? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| If this is a follow-on award, how will the new award demonstrate a) inclusion of lessons learned from the previous award to inform better program design? | More people reached; implementation of policies/strategies developed under the previous award, *etc*. | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| If this is a follow-on award, how will the new award demonstrate b) an expanded level of results that builds on previous work? | More people reached; implementation of policies/strategies developed under the prior; more informed indicators or results, *etc*. | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| If this is a follow-on award, how will the new award demonstrate c) increased sustainability of development assistance impact? | Is there a cost-share, leveraging, increased ownership by host-country counterparts, *etc*.? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |

**Additional Comments:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Sustainable Results** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| How is the activity designed to deliver results that can be achieved beyond U.S. engagement or sustained beyond the life of this activity?  | How are local actors (government, civil society, private sector) involved in implementation? Are social entrepreneurs or other local providers being leveraged? Has the host government or private sector expressed interest? Does your suggested approach prescribe all the elements of how the program will unfold in advance, or does it incorporate opportunities to co-create, convene others, allow for exploration phases and open innovation? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| How will the activity work to increase the capabilities of local partners, if at all? | Local partners include, but are not limited to, local non-governmental organizations (NGOs), local private firms, local institutions of higher education, *etc*. Will local players be key in delivery of activities?  | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| How, if at all, will this activity work to increase the capabilities of host governments, local partners (NGOs, private industry, institutions of higher education) and/or the availability of local resources to one day enable the country and/or local actors to either undertake similar work or maintain the results achieved through this activity over time?  | Does this approach incorporate an intentional approach to collection and care of data? Use of digital connectivity or digital finance? Use of mapping, advanced informatics? Is it designed to be responsive to end-customer feedback and to collect such feedback in real-time? Does the investment in data collection or community access via technology allow for other programs to build on that data and those communities in the future? Are local actors taking on responsibilities that have previously been contracted by USAID? Is there a shift from supplementing local capacity to building and transferring local capacity? Is there a component in the award to increase the capacity of local actors, such as a local NGO incubator program, a pledged amount of sub-awards issued to local organizations? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| **[If a PIO Agreement]** How will support to a PIO advance sustainable results as discussed above? | Self-explanatory | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Size of Activity - For Indefinite Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQs) and Leader with Associate (LWAs) Only** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| How was the dollar value of the activity determined? | What level of market research went into informing the Independent Government Cost Estimate (IGCE)? How did you determine the estimated need for Task Orders or Associate Awards? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| What consideration was given to country-specific awards or multiple, smaller global activities in which a set of smaller awards might provide more opportunity for small, local, or non-traditional organizations to respond to an opportunity? | Does the package include an analysis of why this could not be broken out into several smaller awards to increase opportunity? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| Are there any provisions or incentives to enable small or local organizations, entrepreneurs, *etc.*, to participate in the award? | Self-explanatory | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| Is there any maximum dollar value for an individual task order or associate award? | Self-explanatory | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |

**As Applicable Responses:**

|  |
| --- |
| **Scale** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| What is the scale of the activity?  | Does the activity include a component to scale the activity, and if it does, to what magnitude? | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| If the scale is not country-wide, why is that inadvisable, or how would it be possible to scale the outcomes eventually to affect the entire country or all affected areas of it?  | What is the likelihood of success of the development objective at its proposed level of scale?  | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| How can lessons and impact reach beyond the target country or countries? | Universal challenges being addressed; issues that have an effect/relationship to neighboring countries or global markets. | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Cross-Sectoral Synergies** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| Does the activity offer any unique synergies with work done in other sectors in the same country? | Examples: Integration of nutrition and food security or maternal/child health; democracy/good governance and economic growth, *etc*.  | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M:ES: |  |
| How does the activity contribute to cross-cutting goals in a mission Country Development and Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) or OU’s strategy or Project Appraisal Document (PAD)? | Examples: Contributions to democracy and governance; engaging local, private-sector, higher-education and faith-based actors; climate change risk; gender equality and inclusive development; peace and state building; engaging youth; human rights; resilience; *etc*.  | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Risks and Unknowns** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| Are there any risks or unknowns? | Examples: Security risks, risk to sustainability of development outcomes; risk to scalability; political or economic risks; risks to excluding/worsening exclusion of marginalized populations. | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
| What actions are planned to mitigate risks? | Submission should only identify and discuss real risks that should be considered by senior management as opposed to presenting a risk simply to respond to this topic.  | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Clear Choice** |
| ***SOAR Question*** | ***Examples or Criteria*** | ***Reviewer Notes or Confirmation*** | ***Responses to Feedback as Applicable*** |
| How is this activity designed to further the objectives of the Clear Choice Framework and counter malign (*i.e.*, Chinese, Russian, Iranian) influences? | Self-explanatory | PPL: |  |
| LAB: |  |
| M: |  |
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