Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
Bureau of Humanitarian Response
U.S. Agency for International Development

REPORT OF DIP ORIENTATION WORKSHOP
Matching Grant Program
OCTOBER 22-23, 2001

Submitted to

Martin Hewitt, Team Leader
Matching Grant Program

Submitted by

DATEX, Inc.
1331 H Street, N.W., Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20005-4706
Contacts:
Nilou DeSilva, Ph.D.
Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist
and
Mary Ann Zimmerman, Workshop Facilitator
(consultant)

November 16, 2001

Contract No. FAO-C-00-01-00002-00
Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation
Bureau of Humanitarian Response
U.S. Agency for International Development

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

Overview 1

Workshop Design 1

Participation 2

Program Assessment 2

DIP Format and Guidelines 5

Conclusion 6

Attachments:

1: Agenda 7

2. Summary Listing of Participants 11

3. Participant Evaluation–Summary of Responses 12

INTRODUCTION

The DIP (Detailed Implementation Plan) Orientation was a 2-day workshop that took place for Matching Grant Private and Voluntary Organizations (MGPVOs) that were recent recipients of grants. It was held at in the library conference room at the U.S. Agency for International Development on October 22-23, 2001. The program ran each day from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. A workshop packet was provided to participants that included the agenda, participant list, evaluation form, and the revised DIP guidelines, in addition to a complete set of USAID/CDIE Performance Monitoring and Evaluation TIPS.

This report gives an overview of the workshop design, the participants, a program assessment, and a conclusion. Attachments to this report are the agenda, the list of participants, and the evaluation responses from the participants.

OVERVIEW

This workshop was a result of an expressed interest by the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC) to hold a training session for grantees in the Matching Grant Program that addressed four needs:

- The quality of DIPs in the past has been uneven with new and smaller organizations, particularly, falling below expected standards sometimes;
- There is a need overall to strengthen technical skills for doing baseline studies and for using baseline results meaningfully for monitoring and evaluation over the life of the program;
- Planning matrices, which are a part of the DIP and serve as a project "snap shot" overview, need to be sharpened;
- Grantees need more orientation on how to involve partners and other stakeholders in the planning process toward developing a more broad-based indigenous ownership and institutionalization of the program.

A telephone survey of recent MG recipients that are currently implementing programs reemphasized the need for a workshop to address these areas.

WORKSHOP DESIGN

The resulting workshop design was a collaborative effort between Niloufer DeSilva, Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) Specialist for PVC, and Mary Ann Zimmerman, the workshop facilitator. The topics addressed included the following:

1. DIP Requirements – presentation of new DIP Guidelines (completed and issued just prior to the workshop)
2. Preparing the Planning Matrix – review and small group exercise involving key

elements of planning matrix (goal, activities, objectives, indicators (with measurement methods) and assumptions)

3. Baseline Assessments – review of purposes of baseline studies as part of DIP, elements of a study, and methods for gathering data; small group exercise (by MGPVO) on service delivery baseline data requirements for developing that portion of the DIP; report back by three PVOs and discussion with large group
4. Organization Development – brief review of role of capacity building in MG program; small group work (by MGPVO) on developing higher level objective and corresponding results and outcome indicators for PVO capacity building; report back by three PVOs and discussion with large group
5. Program Sustainability – discussion on definition of sustainability for service delivery and for partner or PVO organizations; small group work (by MGPVO) on developing higher level objective and corresponding results and outcome indicators for service delivery/partner level sustainability efforts in one country; report back by three PVOs and discussion with large group
6. Partnerships – panel addressing key issues in working with partners: (a) review outcomes of survey of partnerships from both Northern PVO and Southern NGO perspectives, (b) overview of key points in "Designing and Managing Partnerships Between US and Host-Country Entities," and (c) startup approach used by one organization in partner capacity building; small group work (by MGPVO) on defining partnership strategy for MG and how partners will be involved in DIP; report back by three groups – chosen by "lottery;" large group feedback.

PARTICIPATION

There were a total of 19 participants from nine PVOs (all current Matching Grant recipients) that attended the workshop. This included three country staff from two of the PVOs and one PVO partner. In addition, there was six PVC Matching Grant staff who attended and actively participated in the sessions.

PROGRAM ASSESSMENT

All MGPVO participants and one PVC staff participant completed a written evaluation of the workshop. In addition, there was a brief open group discussion of the workshop and suggestions for the future.

The written evaluation covered seven questions. A listing of responses was prepared and shared with PVC staff (see the complete tabulation of responses in Attachment 2). In this report, a summary of the key responses for each question is provided.

1. **Expectations met**. Participants listed many specifics around how their expectations were met. The major point made was that they received clarification on what is expected with the DIP process.

2. **More information desired**. While many detailed comments were made, the most

common comment addressed *indicators* – better understanding of differences among outputs, outcomes and results; how to deal with qualitative indicators as well as proxy indicators; how to measure results. Other more pertinent comments included:

- walk through all elements of the DIP; if possible provide example of successful DIP; address divergence in opinion on what really required for DIP
- provide handouts of all presentations
- provide USAID reporting requirements to help design PVO MIS/reporting systems

3. **Balance between lecture and discussion**. While, in general, participants were satisfied with the workshop approach, several suggested that it would have been better to have had one less session on developing objectives and indicators. One participant suggested that one session might mix participants by type of project and specifically discuss the objectives and indicators each is using, why, and how improve them. Another suggested that, in presentations, examples be given of points made to help understand what is being looked for in developing effective objectives, indicators, and baseline data.

4. **Future sessions – what include, who involve, when hold**. There were lots of responses to this question, which tracked the comments in Question 2 on what additional information is desired.
   - Indicators – successful indicators, use of national standards vs. creating own, how design data collection instruments that are reasonable
   - More details on total DIP Guidelines – "must do's"; one successful project; past DIPS
   - Monitoring & evaluation guidelines

Individual participants also suggested several new topics.

- How to disseminate information and lessons learned continually, not just at the end of the project
- Matching funds
- How to introduce change into another culture
- Mid term evaluations; when decide to change course

Several participants saw value from the two PVOs who had included field staff (and for one also a partner) as part of the team who came to the workshop. The suggestions made about who should participate addressed headquarters (HQ) and field/country staff. One participant suggested including the local partner. An inference that could be made from these and other comments is that broader participation in the workshop could help get everyone on the same page more easily regarding DIP development and implementation and to understand why everyone is being asked to participate, leading to a better implementation result.

Participants were basically satisfied with the timing of the workshop. Several specific comments were (a) keep it linked with SEEP annual general meeting; (b) do it as soon as possible after approval, although group noted they did not yet have approval, but were happy to participate; and (c) as soon as possible after October 1.

One participant also expressed interest in an annual follow-on program, which also came up in the general discussion, to make sure everyone is on track, and to also exchange lessons learned. Such a program could also address an issue mentioned under this question, which was when/how decide to change course.

5. **Key points gained from the workshop**. There were several, consistent themes presented as key learnings from the workshop. These were:
   - What should go into the planning matrix?
   - What is the process to think through a DIP?
   - There is a need to include all stakeholders in a DIP.
   - There is a need to better understand baseline data.
   - The difference between goals, objectives, indicators–that is the terms, outputs, outcomes, results—need to be better defined. Several participants noted the lack of consistent definition of terms in PVC documents and in the workshop discussions.
   - It is important to understand that results are cumulative.

One participant specifically listed as a learning the gaps found in their organization's proposal that had not been seen by them previously.

6. **Key concern for the DIP and implementation**. The issue of definitions was repeated as a key concern for developing the DIP. Another frequently mentioned issue were partners, such as partners respecting commitments, developing relationships/ cooperation, being on the same page, and helping partners have patience to go through a long waiting process. Several participants are concerned about making the DIP a useful tool beyond just a paper document.

7. **Support from the PVC Matching Grant Program**. MGPVO participants look forward to regular, interactive and timely feedback from PVC during the development of the DIP. They also request clarification on definitions (e.g., objectives, indicators, sub-objectives) and timelines. Finally, several participants requested input from PVC on best practices.

The comments made during the conference wrap-up parallel those made in the written evaluations. MGPVO participants think this type of workshop has value and should be offered in the future. They are also interested in some type of follow-on workshop of this group in order to share what was learned and the "struggles" encountered; to discuss how to address changes in programs; and to provide opportunity for "show and tell." This would also help foster relationships among the organizations in this group. In addition, it was agreed that a list of countries each group is working in for their grant program would be emailed to all participants.

DIP FORMAT AND GUIDELINES

Participants were somewhat confused about the differences in the DIP format and the format they had followed in submitting their proposals. They also noted what they felt were inconsistencies in what PVC staff stated they wanted for the DIP–again, differences in definitions of terms, degree of detail, and format. None of this seemed to be stopping anyone from going the next step except for one participant who received several significantly different recommendations on how to develop objectives and indicators for his program. However, there were ongoing comments in the evaluations about wanting to have some clarifications in definitions and requirements.

In preparation for this workshop, the facilitator did review the DIP guidelines and noted similarities to concerns raised by the MGPVO participants. The review affirms that the DIP guidelines are not clear about what is wanted, especially within the planning matrix (Table 1 in the guidelines). As was noted at the workshop, the Table 1 matrix should be reissued with activities and objectives included in the correct columns and clearly defined. Additional questions to consider are:

1. Does a program have one program goal or several (e.g. by HQ and by country)?
2. Should the HQ and individual country planning matrix summaries include all four categories of the objectives (technical interventions, organizational development, partnership formation, sustainability achievement)?
3. Should only the higher-level objectives be listed on the planning matrix, or should intermediary objectives also be included? (It should be noted that the lower level objectives should be part of a program monitoring system.)
4. Should all indicators be listed for the higher level objective or can there be additional indicators used that are not shown? How many indicators are needed for each objective?
5. Should there be baseline values, intermediate targets, and end-of-project result targets be given for each indicator shown?

In various parts of the document there is terminology that is sometimes unclear, but none seems significant enough to require changes for this year's DIPs. In addition, there are areas, such as development of timelines and training plans, where different points of view exist on the level of detail that is appropriate to provide at the beginning of a 3-5 year process. PVC may want to decide whether is would be better to ask for a shorter period of detail initially, with annual or mid-term updates perhaps as part of a planned review with each MGPVO. This could be especially useful if a review were planned after the mid-term evaluation is conducted, because it would help assure that the results were used to determine whether changes in a program are necessary.

CONCLUSION

In summary, the DIP Orientation Workshop met expectations. Comments by participants about improving future workshops, especially in understanding indicators, should be helpful for strengthening the next workshop. The somewhat unspoken expectation of developing stronger working relationships between the staffs of PVC and MGPVOs was also met with a strong desire expressed by the MG recipients to keep this initial contact ongoing.

Attachment 1
USAID/BHR/PVC
Matching Grant DIP Orientation Workshop
October 22-23, 2001
Agenda

Time	Session	Facilitator(s)
	Monday, October 22, 2001	
8:30-9:00 a.m.	**Continental Breakfast **	
9:00-9:30 a.m.	**Introductions and Workshop Objectives** • Present workshop objectives and review the agenda • Participants introduce themselves and highlight what they want from this workshop • MG Staff introduce themselves and their roles	Martin Hewitt *MG Division Chief*
9:30-11:00 a.m.	**DIP Requirements** • Explain the DIP functions over the PVC grant cycle • Discuss DIP utility in program management • Walk-through the DIP sections, clarify requirements, procedures and next steps • Discussion - Participants that have prepared DIPs previously share experiences - Q&A	Peggy Meites, *PVC Technical Advisor, Monitoring and Evaluation* Niloufer De Silva *Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist* and Matching Grants Division Team Members
11:00-11:15 a.m.	* * Break * *	

Tuesday, October 23, 2001		
8:30-9:00 a.m.	**** Continental Breakfast****	
8:45-10:30 a.m.	**Key Planning Matrix Element– Organization Development** • Reflections on Day One • Define and discuss organization development • Participants prepare their planning matrices focusing on one capacity building objective for HQ and one for service delivery • At least three groups present matrices for feedback	Mary Ann Zimmerman *Lead Facilitator*
10:30-10:45 p.m.	*** * Break * ***	
10:45-12:15 p.m.	**Key Planning Matrix Elements– Achieving Program Sustainability** • Define and discuss program sustainability • Participants prepare their planning matrices focusing on a sustainability objective for HQ and another for service delivery • At least three groups present matrices for feedback	Mary Ann Zimmerman *Lead Facilitator*
12:15-1:30 p.m.	* Lunch Break * * (*Participants on their own*)	

Time	Session	Facilitator(s)
11:15-12:45 p.m.	**Preparing the Planning Matrix** • Defining and explaining the relationship among elements of the matrix: goal, objectives, activities, indicators, measurement methods and assumptions • Group exercise for evaluating the quality of matrix samples	Mary Ann Zimmerman *Lead Facilitator*
12:45-1:45 p.m.	* Lunch Break * * (*Participants on their own*)	
1:45-3:15 p.m.	**Key Planning Matrix Element–Baseline Assessments** *Session One:* • Purpose of baseline assessments – beyond initial situational analysis • Elements of a baseline study • Methods for gathering data • Discussion and Q&A - Getting client communities involved - Past experience of participants on what works & what doesn't	Mary Ann Zimmerman *Lead Facilitator*
3:15-3:30 p.m.	* * **Break** * *	
3:30-5:00 p.m.	**Baseline Assessments** *Session Two:* • Participants prepare their baseline study plan for two elements of program – service delivery and headquarters strengthening • At least three groups present plan for feedback	Mary Ann Zimmerman *Lead Facilitator*

1:30-3:00 p.m.	**Planning with Partners** *Session One – PVO Panel* • Overview of Partnership Approach to International Development Planning • Defining Partnerships and Selecting Partners • Learning from Partners: Organizing a DIP Start-Up Workshop • Discussion - Sharing experiences - Q&A	Niloufer De Silva *Monitoring and Evaluation Specialist* (Moderator) <u>Panelists:</u> Evariste Karangwa *Program Manager, Africa Liaison Program Initiative, InterAction* Chanya Charles *Program Manager Civil Society Initiative Academy for Educational Development* Rebecca de Graaff *Assistant Director for Health Adventist Development and Relief Agency*
3:00-3:15 p.m.	* * Break * *	
3:15-4:45 p.m.	**Planning with Partners** *Session Two – Participants present* • Partner profiles • How they will prepare the DIP with them • How they plan to produce results with their partners	Moderator and Panelists (*continued*)
4:45-5:15 pm	**<u>Wrap-Up</u>** • Share workshop results • Evaluation of workshop outcomes • Next steps	Mary Ann Zimmerman *Lead Facilitator* Martin Hewitt *Chief, Matching Grant Division*

Attachment 2
USAID/BHR/PVC
Matching Grant DIP Orientation Workshop
October 22-23, 2001
Summary Listing of Participants

Aid to Artisans
- Sonu Rangnekar
- Mary Cockram

Concern Worldwide
- Isabelle Kidney
- Jean Frenel Tham (Haiti office)
- Eleanor Sayno So (Cambodia office)
- Sonia Lee (Fonkoze – Haiti partner)

Helen Keller Worldwide
- Jeff Waller
- Alka Dev

International Development Enterprises
- John Magistro

MEDA
- Cherie Tan
- Sonia Dominguez (Peru office)

PLAN International
- John Schiller
- Delores Mclaughlin

Salesian Missions
- Peter Reitz
- Mary Ellen Duke
- Christine Moan

TechnoServe
- Laura Kletter

World Vision
- Lisa Jackinsky
- Dan Norell

PVC/MG
- Martin Hewitt
- Tom Kennedy
- Mary Herbert
- Regine Douthard
- Lori Pommerenke
- Peggy Meites

Attachment 3
USAID/BHR/PVC
Matching Grant DIP Orientation Workshop
October 22-23, 2001
Participant Evaluation – Summary of Responses

1. In what ways were your expectations for the training met during the past two days?

- Understand process/a lot of clarification on what is expected
- Useful to hear others present – interesting to contrast their understandings, strategies and to glimpse at their level of operations
- Help with working on the Planning Matrix
- Help with partnering
- I think that this session was very beneficial for us because: 1) it gave us a chance to change certain point in our proposal; 2) it gave us a chance to hear about the other projects as well as their recommendations
- Training gave out better understanding and appreciation of the DIP for me
- Sharing of experiences was very useful for first-time DIP/USAID recipient like us
- I have a better understanding of output, outcome and result objectives and indicators
- Was able to learn what AID's expectations are in order to convey to partners
- Got an understanding of why DIP should be done, how it can help manage the program – this will be very helpful
- Also the training has helped start the thinking process and thrown light on the important components of DIP preparation, especially the matrix
- Better understanding of new planning matrix – for that matter, the existence of the new matrix.
- Clearer understanding of AID expectations on objectives and indicators
- I learned a great deal about commonalties and differences in organizations and the way they prepare DIPs
- Clarification of PMF and DIP concepts, appropriate language, terminology in drafting the DIP. Clarification on organization of the DIP into subcomponents
- Some overview sessions to general and long; partnership session very general, minimally useful
- Focus more on individual/some group work sessions
- I have a much better understanding of how the DIP will come together, and of what AID is looking for in the DIP
- I had not been to any DIP meetings before. I learned a lot about AID's expectations for DIPs
- Excellent concentration on essential definitions and logic processes – i.e., if the objective is "x," the following must follow, etc.
- It was very useful, specially going over the matrix which is the main issue
- DIP format was demystified, particularly the baseline data requirement
- Have a better understanding of the terms used in the DIP process
- Clarifications were provided on what is needed in the DIP
- Some exercises helped stimulate more thinking about ways to strengthen our implementation plan
- I came out of the training session with a better understanding of the different levels in the planning matrix and what is required in each section
- Better than expected because of the interactive aspect of the program. To be able to listen and learn from AID staff and from our fellow PVOs was great. In addition, the opportunity to actually work on our DIP in this environment was very productive for Ms. Dev and me.
- My expectations were surpassed. I expected to walk away with a timeline and idea of how to

prepare a DIP but really appreciated the hands-on approach with the planning matrices. That was a bonus!
- I also expected to learn more about the priority areas of DIP development which were clear

2. What would you like more information on?

- It would have been useful to have gone through more explicitly the "walking through the DIP"
- Haven't had a chance to go through all the information so can't really say
- Go through DIP Guidelines in greater depth
- How do we get into the process of involving all stakeholders in the preparation of DIP
- Appreciate handouts of presentation materials and tools
- Samples of successful DIPS
- Matching funds process
- Qualitative indicators
- Indicators that border on output/results – how to differentiate them
- A questions still unanswered – how to measure/quantify ATA's business training of the artisans - ?increase in income, or?
- Proxies for those hard to track indicators, like income. What's the latest research?
- Examples of highly effective, well designed DIPs with appropriate goals, objectives, indicators, etc.
- Nothing right now
- Output vs. outcomes
- Difference between output and outcomes; this is still confusing to me
- I will like to have a complete success project, if it's in the same area will be better
- It will be useful to have more information on indicators and how to measure
- I like more information on how to measure quantifiable indicators
- A more united response from speakers on some topics discussed. It seemed at times that there was a wide divergence of opinion on issue of how the DIP should be done to the point that if appeared that the PVO could do about anything if it was logical.
- What role will or can AID play in disseminating the information, lessons learned and processes that we generate?
- AID annual reporting requirements would be nice to have in hand as we plan our MIS tools and design tools to collect results and outcomes information. This is always a really time consuming process for the field to prepare USAID annual reports.

3. Were you satisfied with the balance between lecture and discussion/small group work? If not, what suggestions do you have?

- Yes, fine
- OK, a bit more small group in Day 1 a.m.
- Yes, I was satisfied
- Yes
- I would like to see more time in lecture and more time perhaps showing examples of the points made
- Groups should have been broken out by those who are familiar with process (indicators, results, etc) and those not familiar. A lot of repetition for those who know
- Yes, very
- Yes, although I found the panel really useful and might have been nice to break up the small group work
- One less session on the objectives/indicators. Three rounds of it was just a little too long
- More emphasis on individual (not group) work time to develop DIPS – more one on one feedback from PVC staff on revising DIPs
- I think there might have been one too many planning matrix exercises. Otherwise, it was very good
- Yes. Enough time to work and everyone got a chance to present

- Yes
- Yes, I like it because we were able to work on our own project
- Good balance
- Yes. It made understanding DIP easier because it was participatory
- The small group exercise on first day mixing reps. from organizations was good. Too much time spent in our own group struggling with details of objectives, indicators, etc. Suggestion: Some organizations are working on similar programs/projects. They could be grouped together to discuss what objectives and indicators they each have identified and why
- Yes
- I think it was about right
- General, yes. I think we covered a lot in two days. It would be nice to have more group work on planning for DIP preparation, especially baseline data collection as this will be a tough area. Also a lecture/discussion on scientific rigor – it would be a shame to lose scientific rigor in favor of speeding toward meeting objectives.
- The panel discussion was extremely boring and a poor way to present information.

4. For future training sessions, list two or three topics that you think should be included. Who do you think is most important to involve in the training? When should it be held?

- Actually, if you broaden out the agenda, you risk diluting the attention you can give to topics which I felt was well balanced.
- DIP Guidelines
- Utilize Matching Grant DIP writers from last year
- Timing is good – linked to SEEP Annual General Meeting
- How the proposal/application relate to the DIP and vice versa
- I think it would have been helpful to walk through in more detail the components of the DIP at the beginning to make sure that everyone has a basic understanding of the major components
- Mid term evaluations
- When to decide when to change course
- Matching funds
- A session on past DIPs (for follow-on grants) to discuss how relevant, functional the document was. Was it referred to? How often? If not, then why not?
- A session on successful indicators, that were useful, indicative and helpful in managing the program. Can other similar programs ?adapt/adopt? them?
- Indicator work, always
- Partnerships
- Where PVC is headed
- I'll let you know as I run into problems when I'm actually preparing the DIP
- Output vs. outcomes
- Training should include whoever will be in charge of the MG project, both at HQ and in the field.
- Should be held early in the process, soon after approval
- Purest anthropology versus change. How to introduce change within the context of a people's culture
- I think we need to have the material in advance, and it will be nice to have the whole information over one successful project
- I think it will help to have a training at least once in a year to be sure we are working in the correct track
- I think it is important to have the PVO as well as their local partners involved in the training
- I did not perceive this as training. It is helpful to me to think of this session as being strategic planning
- Topics were appropriate
- Perhaps a summary of <u>critical</u> aspects of DIP that PVO <u>must</u> provide to meet AID Standard

- Encourage PVO to bring regional or country level staff to workshop
- The timing is good, even though we don't have a CA signed yet
- Topic 1 – use of international standards and recommendations vs. creation of these standards or even a revision based on our findings -> sometimes we're the first..
- Topic 2 – how to design a data collection instrument to capture indicators but not produce excess work for field staff
- Topic 3 – how to disseminate information and lessons learned continuously, not just at EOP, to the international community
- Topic 4 – M&E guidelines
- Important to involve PVO country staff; also means more people for small group work
- Hold workshop ASAP after October 1

5. List two or three key points about preparing the DIP that you have gained from these sessions.

- What is involved in and meant by a good matrix
- Clarification on baseline data
- Planning Matrix
- Objectives
- Indicators
- Using benchmarks
- Differentiating between output and outcome indicators
- Need to include all staff in office working on project in development of DIP
- To involve partners in preparing the DIP
- To have yearly benchmarks/targets to ensure that the DIP is a working (alive) document and not something that just sits somewhere!
- Pushing for higher level results
- Partnership ideas
- It's a highly individualized, subjective process
- A general framework is to be followed, but the details are not specified by PVC
- Baseline, situational analysis – new, valuable info
- Hierarchy and distinctions between goals, objectives, outputs, outcomes, results, etc
- Difference between outputs, outcomes and results
- What should go into the planning matrix
- Learned a logical process for thinking/preparing the DIP
- Also learned that there were gaps in our proposal we didn't think of before
- First, that Salesian Mission's change at HQ must be better articulated
- Second, more thought needs to be given to sustainability beyond project funding (i.e. after it ends)
- Baseline data
- Planning matrix
- Understanding what the planning matrix is, and how to state objectives that are specific, clear and active
- Understanding that objectives are an accumulative process in understanding output and outcomes
- Indicators should be more specific and quantifiable
- Matrix development, but there remained some doubt as to agreed upon definitions of terms between our 2000 RFA and new 2001 terms
- Need for logic and consistency between text objectives and matrix categories
- Partnership lecture was very good at clarifying issues to be considered in building and maintaining mutually productive relationships
- Planning matrices – how to develop good, measurable indicators
- Use of baseline data
- Identification of results value

6. What is your key concern about being effective in developing DIP and implementing your program?

- How will partners use DIP as management tool
- We are concerned about pace of expansion vs. consolidation of activities
- Confusion on definitions of objectives, indicators, sub-objectives given in class vs. RFA and DIP Guidelines
- My main concern is respecting commitments because sometimes the partners are difficult to handle
- Maintaining consistency between the two
- The two should match and not so different from one another
- Getting partners to understand importance of DIP
- Getting AID to respond and review in a timely fashion to drafts
- Personally – since I was not part of the proposal writing (it was written prior to my joining ATA) I am banking on inputs from field staff and all departments in HQ in developing and thinking through DIP.
- The quality and effectiveness of one key partner
- (in helping prepare or give guidelines) – there were many conflicting messages given – how can they be honed to consistent, focused advice?
- Setting realistic target outputs and measurable, verifiable indicators
- Building consensus, buy in of partner orgs
- Getting timely feedback from country programs
- Relationship and cooperation among partner organizations
- Making DIP a useful tool
- Making sure that partners are on the same page with us at the end of the process
- That USAID responds to our draft DIP in a thorough, helpful, and timely basis
- The difficult contexts in which we operate sometimes make a DIP almost useless
- The process being too long or not understandable. After the training, it makes the DIP seem more manageable
- Having enough time to develop a strong, useful tool.
- Ongoing communication has to happen between the field partners and HQ to determine realistic results and impact
- Proper alignment of expectations of MG between AID, PVO, partners and beneficiaries
- Agreed upon deliverables are feasible relative to time and budget available
- Getting partner buy in for DIP preparation and getting them to wait six months! to implement. We have been cultivating relationships and commitments for over a year – to those not well versed in PVC procedures, waiting for so long is hard to understand. Our partners are ready to implement! How do we plan without suppressing enthusiasm for implementation?

7. Is there additional support that you would like from the PVC/Matching Grants Office as you develop your DIP and implement your program?

- I'd like to be able to phone up if we have a query about e.g. baseline data or budgetary changes – am hoping that PVC officer can visit program
- Hear more from PVC officers on the definitions of different terms and timelines
- Yes, especially in training
- Monitoring and evaluation of program
- Review of our DIP and suggestions for improvement, if necessary/if any
- Yes, in the last three years (the 1st matching grant) ATA has learnt a lot about indicators, but still needs clarity on which ones would be most appropriate, definite and accurate for this MG. It would be helpful to help in think through that to arrive at good useful indicators
- Regular feedback and review of DIP drafts by on key staff person prior to final submission if possible
- Not specifically – just to be able to call as questions arise
- A one day visit and participation by Mary Herbert during the process, with our partners present

- Comment: Ms Zimmerman was (is) an excellent presenter and discussion leader
- We'll feel free to consult with our Program Officer
- Have contact with the Office during writing of the DIP. More assistance
- More interactive feedback from the program officers on the DIP
- Opportunity for face to face review if DIP in draft form is excellent
- Comment: thanks for a great program! Well done
- Yes! I think it would be useful to know about best practices seen by PVC in MG programs – what worked for other PVOs?

Conference Benefits/Expectations – from intro session – posted on flip chart

- How to create a useful DIP
- Better project implementation
- Keep creative freedom in DIP process and improve DIP quality
- Game plan
- Learn implementing structure (MFIs)
- Implementation tools
- DIP as useful, long-term document
- First-time DIP preparation

Conference Wrap Up – posted on flip chart

- Do this again next year
- Reconvene all or part (e.g. MFIs, etc.) of group either "mid term" or next year
  - What you've learned, struggles
  - Show and tell
  - How addressing changes
- Foster relationships among this group
- E-mail list of countries each working in with MG
- Take one session with mixed group on your program, "peer" review – same country