GUIDELINES FOR DEVELOPING A DETAILED IMPLEMENTATION PLAN

MATCHING GRANTS PROGRAM
OFFICE OF PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY COOPERATION
BUREAU FOR HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE
U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Matching Grant Division has begun the process of moving from yearly implementation plans to multi-year Detailed Implementation Plans (DIP). Starting in 1998, all PVOs awarded Cooperative Agreements (CA) through the Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation's (PVC) Matching Grant Program are required to submit a DIP.

I. **PURPOSE**

The DIP serves as the primary document guiding program implementation and evaluation. It should provide PVC and the PVO with a detailed *blueprint* for how the program will be implemented.

Following the award, PVOs will have six months to engage in in-depth discussions with local partners, conduct baseline studies, and prepare the DIP. Based on information from these baseline studies, the PVO may propose modifications to the technical approach, beneficiary base or country selection from what was proposed in the Matching Grant (MG) application, consistent with the negotiated award.

The DIP, as contrasted to the proposal or grant application, is the PVO's life-of-program workplan for implementing the program. The DIP should build on and refine the program design described in the CA.

- It should contain specific plans as to how the program will be implemented in <u>each country</u> approved in the CA.
- It should specify the organizational strengthening the PVO will undertake at headquarters; what capacities it will build or strengthen in the local partners; and **how this will be accomplished.**

The development of the DIP will satisfy the s*ubstantial involvement* element in the CA, which requires that the workplan be approved by USAID/BHR/PVC. The PVO's CA will be amended, when necessary, to reflect changes made and approved during the DIP process. After approval of the DIP, the Matching Grants Program Officer must approve changes that are proposed in the program description, interventions, sites, or beneficiary base.

<u>The approved DIP is the basis for the midterm and final evaluations of the program (see attachment A: SOW for Matching Grant evaluations)</u>.

II. **DIP SUBMISSION**

<u>Timing:</u>

The DIP should be submitted six months after the start data of the grant. The PVO shall submit to BHR/PVC 2 bound double-sided copies, one unbound single-sided copy and an electronic copy in WORD97.

<u>USAID Contact:</u>

Any questions regarding these guidelines should be referred to Sallie Jones, Chief of the Matching Grant Program at USAID/BHR/PVC.

III. **DIP REVIEW PROCESS**

The purpose of the review is to provide PVC and the PVOs that have been awarded a CA an opportunity to collaborate, discuss the baseline findings and to finalize program implementation decisions.

This is the first year that the Matching Grant (MG) program is implementing a formal DIP Review Process. As the PVO applications or proposals vary widely the MG Division is considering having two levels of review.

- <u>Simplified Review Process.</u> DIPs that have: adequate baseline data; contain fairly detailed information on how the program will be implemented; fully developed monitoring and evaluation plans; and, a well developed *Planning Matrix*, will be reviewed and approved by the Project Officer.

- Consultative Review Process. In an effort to make the review process more participatory, and to involve a larger number of stakeholders from both the PVO and PVC offices, the MG Division will hold a limited number of DIP Consultative Review Meetings to discuss the implementation plan submitted by the PVO (when there are gaps in the information presented). These meetings will allow the PVO to present and discuss the baseline studies and implementation plan with PVC colleagues and other program and technical specialists. At the end of the Consultative Meeting, the MG Division Chief will summarize the discussion; approve the DIP, or outline revisions. The Meeting will take approximately 2 hours.

At the end of either process outlined above the DIP will be:

- approved with no revision;

- approved with additional information to be provided by the PVO, at an agreed upon date, or provided in the first Annual Report; or

- revised significantly and required within an agreed upon time frame. Written recommendations will be provided to guide the revision process.

PVOs that prefer to have their DIP reviewed in a Consultative Meeting should alert the Matching Grant Division as soon as possible and indicate how many people from the PVO will participate in the discussions.

IV. DIP FORMAT

To facilitate review of the DIP, use the same numbering system, headings and subheadings provided in these guidelines to identify sections in the DIP. Include a cover page that contains PVO name; CA number; CA beginning and end dates; country sites; beneficiary base (see chart in Annex A), and name and position of all those involved in writing the DIP. The DIP should contain detailed plans for the program to be implemented in each country location.

Section A: Program Design

A.1. Baseline and Follow-up Assessment

The purpose of the baseline assessment is to collect sufficient information on the condition or problem that the program intends to address in order to establish intervention priorities and tailor the design and implementation strategy. The baseline studies provide the foundation or starting point for judging program achievements and the effectiveness of the program's approach. The baseline assessment should provide sufficient information to verify that the program objectives outlined in the proposal are on target, refine the indicators and establish targets and yearly benchmarks.

PVOs are encouraged to use assessment techniques or existing data sources that: (1) best suit their program objectives; (2) are within the management capacity of their organization to implement; and, (3) use methodologies which are effective enough to document changes that have occurred over time. PVC encourages grantees to consider a broad range of quantitative and qualitative assessment techniques.

In the DIP, briefly discuss:

- The type(s) of baseline assessment(s) conducted and methods used.

- Summarize findings in this section and refer to the findings or specific data under the appropriate intervention sections (A.3 & 4; Section D, E, F) in of the DIP.

- If objectives or indicators are changed from the original application or modified as a result of the baseline assessment, describe the change and the rationale for the new objectives/indicators.

- Discuss plans to collect end of program data to compare with the baseline.

- Discuss any additional plans to conduct operations research or special studies that have been identified as a result of the baseline study that will be needed to support or strengthen the implementation efforts.

A.2. Goals, Objectives, Indicators and Targets

Describe any changes that have occurred in the program design as a result of the baseline studies.

Provide an **updated *Planning Matrix* (see attachment B)** that contains:

- a final statement of the objectives;

- refinements to the indicators;

- criteria (if appropriate) for judging the indicators (i.e., if the indicator is % of schools with improved education, then identify the list of things that will be used to judge that improvements been made.

- targets for the life of the program and yearly benchmarks that will be used to monitor program implementation. (In the program monitoring schedule [see Section D], cite how the program will measure these yearly benchmarks to assure that the program is on schedule.

  For example, if you intend to increase immunization coverage by 50% over the life of the program, then indicate yearly benchmark that will allow the program to chart yearly progress towards the final target.

- Include both intervention specific (sectoral) objectives and indicators as well as capacity building objectives and indicators.

A.3. Program Design

Briefly outline the overall program design, including specific interventions approaches, activities and target groups. If no changes have been made in the program design, summarize the relevant sections from the original application or proposal submitted in response to the RFA.

- If the design or interventions proposed in the original application have changed as a result of the baseline studies or other circumstances, describe the rational for change and how it differs from the original application.

- Discuss how the activities proposed for each objective support and are sufficient to achieve the objectives.

A.4. Training

Training has come under increased scrutiny as a development strategy. For this reason it is important to have a well thought out rationale for training and a well-developed methodology to measure how skills are being **used**. If training is a significant component of the program, briefly discuss:

- The training strategy, broad training objectives and design of the training program.
- Describe what will be done to increase training opportunities for women.
- Detail how you will measure: the effectiveness of the training strategy; the capacity built; and, the impact of training, i.e., the use of new skills or change in individual or organizational behavior.
- How training will be financed or sustained at the end of the program.

Section B. Program Location and Formal Agreements

Outline any changes that have been made in terms of location, beneficiary base or partnership agreements that have been developed as a result of the baseline studies. If no changes have been made, provide a concise re-cap of the appropriate sections in the original application.

B.1. Location description
Describe the precise program location. Include socio-economic characteristics of the population. Identify key geographic, economic, educational and/or cultural constraints to the proposed activities that may be unique to this location and how the program will address these constraints. **Cite relevant baseline data.**

B.2. Formal Agreements
Describe the current status and substance of agreements with governmental departments, NGOs, CBOs, and local businesses that are important to the implementation of the program.

Section C: Program Timeline and Schedule of Activities

C.1. Develop and attach a timeline and work schedule of activities for the total period of the cooperative agreement. Include a calendar of major activities and annual benchmarks for judging or monitoring implementation achievements.

Section D: Monitoring and Evaluation

D.1. Monitoring and Evaluation System

Describe the program's strategy for: (1) monitoring program implementation; (2) determining the effectiveness of the models or approaches used; and (3) measuring effects or impact on the target population. Specify how the data will be collected and reviewed. Include information on how the program plans to:

- measure achievement of the program objectives, i.e., the impact of the program and the effectiveness of the intervention;
- collect routine data about the processes, activities and outputs to monitor program implementation benchmarks;
- conduct action research or operations research or diagnosis of specific problems;

- build monitoring and evaluation capacity of local partners,

- consolidate and use the *lessons learned* for headquarters and other field operations, local government, NGOs or business, and the community.

Provide a program monitoring and evaluation schedule and an updated *Planning Matrix* that includes life of program targets and yearly benchmarks. See Attachment B for *Planning Matrix* template.

D.2. Resources

Identify the human and financial resources that management has set aside for developing a monitoring and evaluation system for the program. Provide the name, title and background experience of the person responsible for implementation and management of these monitoring and evaluation tasks and attach her/his job description and resume.

Section E: Sustainability Strategy

This section should build on the sustainability strategy outlined in the proposal and clearly identify:

- what program elements are intended to be sustained;

- sustainability objectives and indicators to measure progress and achievements;

- methodology program will use to determine achievement of sustainability objectives and how you will judge prospects for post-grant sustainability;

- approaches and activities that will be used to generate resources to support program operations at the end of PVC funding (cost recovery mechanism, local level financing, fundraising, etc.) or other approaches what will be used to generate resources to support program operations at the end of PVC funding.

Section F: Organizational Strengthening

A major objective of the Matching Grants is building capacity of the PVO grant recipient and its local partners. In this section of the DIP, identify what capacities will be built in the your own organization and in your local partner's organizations. Describe: (1) how these needs were assessed, **cite specific baseline data**; (2) objectives, indicators, targets and yearly benchmarks; and (3) the methods that will be used to measure change, or capacities built, over the life of the program. The following are examples of institutional capacity that the program might seek to strengthen based on an assessment of current organization strengths and weakness. See the EDC/Pact organizational self-assessment methodology or DOSA for a more developed discussion of measuring organizational capacity. The web address: http: www.edc.org/INT/CapDev/dosapage.htm.

- External Relations. Ability to communicate with constituency; conduct outreach to policy makers; build relations with the business sector or diversify financial support by mounting an effective fundraising operation.

- Strategic Planning and Management. Ability to develop strategic plans; adapt to changing circumstances; and build strategic partnerships. Capacity for critical thinking necessary to address broad overarching issues like sustainability, program renewal and/or the development of next generation of program design.

- Service Delivery. The capacity to assess needs, design and implement programs and to evaluate the performance and effectiveness of programs as well as provide them with quality technical support.

- Organizational Learning. The capacity to produce timely, useful data to improve organizational performance. Assure that there is sufficient quantitative and qualitative on program performance that can be consolidated, analyzed, interpreted and presented in a form that is understandable to all program partners. The capacity to transfer these skills to local partners.

- Human Resource Management. The organization's capacity to develop, deploy and supervise staff; provide advancement opportunities, or resolve personnel conflicts.

- Financial Resource Management. The capacity to maintain appropriate balance between expense and revenue and provide accurate, transparent, and useful financial reports.

Section G: Human Resources

G.1. Organizational Chart
Attach an organizational chart listing the key positions in the program. Cite the names and titles of key staff. Be sure to include the persons responsible for (a) program administrative management; (2) technical oversight; and (3) monitoring and evaluation. Indicate if staff is expatriates or host country nationals; full or part-time; salaried, volunteer or seconded from another agency. Indicate on the organizational chart the person(s) who are responsible for liaison with local partners.

G.2. Role of the Community and Local Partners
Identify and describe local partners (NGOs, community-based organizations or local level government and business) that the program will be working with.

- Describe the role, responsibilities (decision-making power) of local partners; mechanisms employed (MOU, sub-grant, contract etc.)

- Describe how technical and operational capacity of local partner(s) were assessed and identify capacity building plans -- **cite baseline data**. How will the program measure changes in the capacity of local partners.

Describe what will be done to insure women are equally represented and involved in program operations and as beneficiaries.

G.3. Role of country nationals in program management. Briefly describe roles and responsibilities of country nationals in the management of the program. Discuss plans for enhancing their skills in planning, evaluation, budgeting, computer use, accounting or personnel management. Describe what you have done to insure that women are involved in the management of the program.

G.4. Role of headquarters staff. Name the individual(s) from the regional office and/or U.S. office who are responsible for technical backstopping the field programs. Describe the program's supervisory system. Include the supervisor to staff ratio and the technical and management experience of the supervisory staff at both headquarters and field programs.

Section H: Procurement and Logistics

SECTION II: See Budget Tables A, B, and C which are attached to this document.

Attachment A: STATEMENT OF WORK FOR MATCHING GRANTS EVALUATIONS

(These Guidelines are not final. Percentages in categories may be adjusted according to PVO being evaluated.)

EVALUATION SCOPE OF WORK

I. PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION

PVO
contract number
Time
Country programs

II. PROGRAM BACKGROUND

INSTRUCTIONS:
Include a short statement on:
- History
- Current implementation status
- Partners
- Program goal and purpose (objective & outputs)
indicators
logframe/planning matrix
- Availability of data
annual reports
prior evaluation
PVO M&E system data
Other sources

III. PURPOSE OF THE EVALUATION

INSTRUCTIONS:
Identify the evaluation audience, their information needs and decisions that will be made based on findings PVO, local partners, USAID

This final (or mid-term) evaluation fulfills the requirements of the USAID/BHR/PVC Matching Grant Program. PVC will use this information in its annual Results Report and in the review of any follow-on proposals from your organization.

IV. EVALUATOR STATEMENT OF WORK

The evaluator or evaluation team will assess the following program and institutional elements, providing evidence, criteria for judgment and citing data sources. The evaluator(s) will assess both headquarters and the country-level programs in the following countries: Fill in the name of countries whose activities will be evaluated . An estimate of the emphasis or level of effort for each segment of the SOW is in italicized brackets.

A. Program Implementation: *[EMPHASIS FOR THIS EVALUATION --- 60%]*
(may be adjusted)
These percentages will change with each evaluation.

1. Assess progress towards each major objectives *[subtotal -- 70%]*

   - Based on the logframe/program planning matrix, or statement of program purpose from the proposal, have objectives been met?
   - Identify constraints and unanticipated effects
   - Identify major successes and why these elements were successful
   - Assess effectiveness of models, approaches or assumption that underlie the program.

2. Assess progress towards *sustainability* *[subtotal --- 10%]*

   - What program elements are intended to be sustained? What are the sustainability objectives? What are the indicators used to measure progress? What are the achievements to date? And prospects for post-grant sustainability?
   - Describe the existence and status of cost-recovery mechanisms? local level financing or approaches to generate resources to support project operations?

3. Assess the status of strategic partnership(s) with NGOs, community based organizations or local level government . *[subtotal --- 10%]*

   - Characterize "partnerships" with local level partners
     - role, responsibilities (decision-making power);
     - mechanisms employed (MOU, subgrant, contract etc); and
     - fiscal autonomy & amount of grant funds directly managed in past year.

   - How did the program plan to assess the quality and scope of partner relations?
     - impact of the partnership on the program

   - What change in capacity of local level partner was planned? achieved?
     - effects of training or resource transfer on local partners capacity

   - Assess the local level partners satisfaction with the partnership
     - has the interface and communications among PVO headquarter and partners been effective?
     - do partners have access to email/internet?

4. Cite the major implementation lessons learned and recommendations.

B. Program Management *[TOTAL EMPHASIS FOR THIS EVALUATION ---- 40%]*
These percentages will change with each evaluation.

1. Assess change in the organizations management capacity (structure & quality of management) as a result of grant.

- Strategic Approach and Program Planning *[subtotal -- 40%]*
  What changes have occurred in the organization=s capacity for critical and analytic thinking regarding program design and impact. Evidence that the program has:
  - fostered analysis and self evaluation in country programs, or conducted quantitative or qualitative analysis to refine interventions;
  - conducted periodic review of performance data by project personnel and taken actions as a result of review;
  - institutionalized performance monitoring and impact evaluation systems into other non-PVC grant funded programs; and
  - acted on recommendations from mid-term evaluation (for final evaluations only).

  Are there changes in headquarters capacity to: (i) manage the planning process --- program renewal, strategy integration, project design; (ii) address over-arching program issues of replicability, scale-up, sustainability; (iii) forecasting and strategic planning; and (iv) organizational development, financial planning and development.

- Monitoring and Evaluation *[subtotal 40%]*
  Assess the capacity of the organization to monitor program performance and measure impact. Give evidence of:
  - appropriate intervention specific; capacity building and sustainability objectives & indicators;
  - developed baseline assessment and plans for final assessment;
  - knowledge of and use of impact and performance measurement techniques;
  - system (e.g., MIS) to consolidate, analyze and interpret project data;
  - transfer of skills and capacity to local partners

- Financial Management *[subtotal --- 5%]*
  - Are adequate financial monitoring systems in place to verify program revenue, operating and financial expense, other inputs and outputs?
  - Has the program leveraged additional resources (beyond the match)?
  - What is the cost effectiveness of the program

- Information *[subtotal ---5%]*
  - Comment on the utility and timeliness of PVOs required reports.
- Logistics --- *[subtotal --- 5%]*
  - Comment on the adequacy and timeliness of PVOs material inputs.

- Supervision *[subtotal --- 5%]*
  Assess if there were sufficient staff with the appropriate technical and management skills to oversee program activity at both headquarters and in the field programs

- HRD --- *[subtotal --- 5%]*
  Did the PVO assess staff training needs and strengthen the organization and local partner professional or technical capacity?

2. Cite the major lessons learned and management recommendations

V. EVALUATION METHODS

INSTRUCTIONS:

- *determine evaluation approach*
- *identify appropriate methodology and instruments*
  - *determine what level of information will be accepted as evidence; identify data source; identify criteria used for judgement, outline how the data was analyzed.*

A. Approach

The PVOs program was developed and funded prior to the Agency's emphasis on results-oriented program designs and the development of PVCs Strategic Plan. The data from all PVC funded programs is critical to PVC's ability to report on achievements against the Office's Strategic Plan. Until all current PVC-funded programs have made the transition to a more results-oriented project plans, it will be necessary for the evaluator to conduct a *team planning meeting* with the PVO and local partners to:

- refine and consolidate the purpose-level objectives and outputs into a set of results-oriented objectives; and
- agree upon a set of appropriate indicators against which the evaluation will assess the achievement of project results outlined in the SOW and will be judged. And where necessary, identify criteria for judgement..

B. Methodology

The Evaluator will:

- assess the appropriateness of using the data collection approaches;
- use the Agency's microenterprise (ME) indicators to assess the status of the ME intervention;
- document data sources; and
- provide, a copy (electronic or paper) of all primary data collected and analysis performed.

VI. TEAM COMPOSITION AND PARTICIPATION

INSTRUCTIONS:

Based on tasks outlined and the emphasis of each evaluation section determine skills needed and who will participate in the evaluation team ---- PVO, NGO and AID staff. Outline:

- *roles and responsibility of team leader and members*
- *language requirements*
- *technical expertise, or country experience*
- *evaluation methods and data collection expertise*

VII. SCHEDULE

INSTRUCTIONS:

Determine:

- *time needed at headquarters*
- *time needed in the field*
- *time necessary for report writing*

VIII. REPORTING AND DISSEMINATION REQUIREMENTS

INSTRUCTIONS:

- *The SOW will serve as the outline of the report*
- *delivery schedule*
- *review/revision policy*