

PD-ABS-696
106959

Subproject Final Report:
Planning for Sustainability
Cooperating Agency/Non-Governmental Organization
December 1995 - May 1997

September 30, 1997

Paul Fishstein
Stephen Sacca

Family Planning Management Development
Cooperative Agreement No.: CCP-3055-A-00-5000-00

Management Sciences for Health
400 Centre Street
Newton, MA 02158

A

Table of Contents

I.	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
A.	Introduction	1
B.	Objectives and Activities	1
C.	Results	1
D.	Constraints	2
E.	Major Recommendations	2
II.	BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW	3
III.	ACTIVITIES	5
A.	Design of Overall Methodology and Tools	5
B.	Orientation Meetings for NGOs	5
C.	Follow-Up Technical Assistance to NGOs	6
D.	NGO Plan Preparation and Review	6
E.	Wrap-Up Workshop	7
IV.	RESULTS AND /OUTCOMES	7
A.	Overall perceptions of the planning process and experience	7
B.	Specific Results and Outcomes	8
C.	Additional Discussion	11
V.	SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS	12
Annex A	Members of Technical Assistance Teams	14
Annex B	Agenda: NGO Sustainability Planning Orientation Meeting	15
Annex C	List of Orientation Meeting and Participants	17
Annex D	Protocols for Draft Plan Review	23
Annex E	NGO Sustainability Planning Workshop: Objectives and Focus Questions	24
Annex F	Bibliography of Key Documents	26

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

A. Introduction

Between December 1995 - May 1997, the Family Planning Management Development Project (FPMD) and the University Research Corporation (Bangladesh) provided technical assistance (TA) to 24 USAID-funded NGOs to help the NGOs acquire skills needed to develop more realistic, practical, and comprehensive plans for becoming more sustainable programmatically, institutionally, and financially. Technical assistance was also provided to the three Cooperating Agencies (CAs) who were supporting the NGOs, and who were also responsible for providing TA to their grantee NGOs. The program of assistance built on previous work done in orienting NGOs to the concepts of sustainability. As the first experience with explicitly "operationalizing" sustainability, the tools and approach were exploratory and innovative.

B. Objectives and Activities

The objectives of the TA were: 1) a framework and process is developed for the development of NGO sustainability plans; 2) the CAs and NGOs have improved ability to think strategically, and to develop practical, effective sustainability plans; and, 3) NGOs and CAs have increased access to local TA in planning for sustainability. FPMD worked with 24 "Phase I" NGOs (those which were most developed, and which were presumably in the best position to become more sustainable organizations) in order to pilot the process and to provide models for other NGOs. The remaining 75 NGOs (Phases II and III) were intended to receive TA from the three concerned CAs based on the experiences gained with the Phase I NGOs.

Each NGO attended one of five regional "orientation meetings", during which TA providers launched the planning process by presenting planning tools, ensuring understanding of and commitment to the process, and introducing the TA resources available to the NGOs. The orientation meetings were based on a formal curriculum and set of learning materials, including a financial planning tool, and contained a balance of conceptual and "hands-on" operational material. Local consultants and/or the relevant CA staff then carried out a series of individualized on-site TA visits to help the NGOs develop their draft plans. Draft plans were reviewed according to formal protocols, and feedback and assistance provided to each of the NGOs to help them revise their plans.

C. Results

NGO participants expressed positive reactions to the planning process, especially the orientation meeting model, individual TA, and sharing of ideas and experiences. Participants expressed the need for more individual TA and more time for the orientation meetings, as well as for modification of the financial tools. Almost all reported that they would use the planning framework if they had the need, and would try to implement their plans with modifications

required by the new National Integrated Population and Health Project (NIPHP) environment. Most of the NGOs have acquired greater capability to prepare sustainability plans; the quality of the NGO plans was higher than plans submitted before the start of the TA. Main improvements were in the level of detail in identifying activities and inputs. Many of the weaknesses in the first post-workshop drafts were addressed in the follow-up TA and in the revised plans. Technical assistance provided by the local consultants (and the CAs) clearly contributed to the NGOs' improved planning capability. All three objectives of the TA were achieved.

D. Constraints

That the sustainability planning exercise took place while the USAID-funded family planning program was in a major transition to the NIPHP placed enormous constraints on the process. The NGOs (and CAs) were unclear on their own future funding as well as on the types of activities and approaches that would be sanctioned by the NIPHP. This uncertainty, as well as the preoccupation of some CA staff in NIPHP start-up activities, clearly limited the NGOs' and CAs' ability to concentrate on developing sustainability plans.

E. Major Recommendations

The model of a hands-on task oriented workshop followed by individual TA was considered successful. Major recommendations drawn from this pilot process include: making roles and responsibilities and lines of communication clear to all stakeholders; continuing to encourage each NGO to consider itself comprehensively rather than as a collection of separate projects; providing NGOs with orientation on sustainability planning to incorporate the new elements in the NIPHP Basic Services Package; allocating more time and attention to financial planning and financial planning tools; and clarifying policies, such as on the disposition of revenue from services and other revenue generating activities. Most important, a real and sincere focus should be placed on NGO independence. While it is a challenge for stakeholders to reorient themselves after many years, NIPHP should look at the role that its partners will play as intermediary organizations and ensure that this role is consistent with the development of strong, independent, and "robust" NGOs.

II. BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

Between December 1995 - May 1997, the Family Planning Management Development Project (FPMD) and the University Research Corporation (Bangladesh) (URC[B]), under a contract with FPMD, provided technical assistance to 24 USAID-funded NGOs on improving the NGOs' ability to develop practical sustainability plans. Technical assistance was also provided to the three Cooperating Agencies (CAs) who were supporting the NGOs, and the CAs also worked with FPMD, URC(B), and individually to provide technical assistance to their grantee NGOs. The program of assistance built on previous work done by FPMD, URC(B), the CAs, and others in orienting NGOs to the concepts of sustainability and encouraging them to think about steps they can take to become more sustainable. The current FPMD assistance aimed at helping the NGOs acquire the skills needed to develop more realistic and comprehensive operational plans for moving towards sustainability. The current work also used tools and concepts developed under FPMDI, including those related to the Management Development Assessment.

As the current work was the first experience with trying to explicitly "operationalize" sustainability in a systematic way, the approach was exploratory and innovative, with respect to the tools, the practical approach, and the number of stakeholders involved. Because of concerns about rising costs of the Bangladesh national program combined with anticipated reductions in donor funding, sustainability has increasingly become a concern of the Government as well as many donors. While much of the donor focus has been on financial sustainability, sustainability has been defined here in the broader sense as programmatic and institutional/managerial, as well as financial. Donors and governments have emphasized cost containment and cost recovery, income generation, coordination and leveraging of resources, and the search for new, innovative modes of service delivery. It should be noted, of course, that the prospects for full financial self-sufficiency (i.e., 100% cost recovery) at this time are very limited for most of the Bangladesh family planning NGOs.

As part of their agreements with USAID, the NGOs have been required to develop sustainability plans. Most of the plans developed before the current technical assistance could be improved by greater precision and specification of how the NGOs will achieve their sustainability objectives. Therefore, for many of the NGOs, developing more realistic and comprehensive operational plans for moving towards sustainability was seen as an important next step.

Based on decisions taken after the July 1995 "Future Search" workshop on sustainability organized by Pathfinder/Bangladesh on behalf of USAID, in early 1996 the approximately 99 USAID-funded NGOs were "triaged" into three groups, or phases. During an October 1995 planning meeting between USAID/Bangladesh and the CAs, it was agreed to request FPMD assistance in helping the NGOs to develop sustainability plans. It was agreed that FPMD would work with the approximately 15 "Phase I" NGOs, which were those which were most developed in institutional, managerial, and financial terms, and which were therefore presumably in the best position to become more sustainable organizations and to provide successful models for other NGOs. The remaining NGOs were to be divided into Phases II and III, and would receive

technical assistance from the three concerned CAs (The Asia Foundation, Family Planning Services and Training Centre, and Pathfinder Fund International) based on the experiences gained through the work with the Phase I NGOs. At USAID's request, the number of Phase I NGOs was later increased to 24.

Between December 1995 and March 1996, a Management Development Plan (MDP) was developed describing FPMD's planned work with the Phase I NGOs. (See *Management Development Plan: Planning for Sustainability Cooperating Agency/Non-Governmental Organization Project, Bangladesh, December 1995 - December 1996*; May 1996.) The MDP contained the following objectives:

1. a framework and process is developed for the development of NGO sustainability plans;
2. the CAs and NGOs have improved ability to think strategically, and to develop practical, effective sustainability plans; and,
3. NGOs and CAs have increased access to local technical assistance (TA) in planning for sustainability.

Appropriate indicators were developed to assess the achievement of each of these objectives.

The technical assistance activities contained in the MDP were seen as a task-oriented learning experience, whereby the development of practical, realistic NGO sustainability plans (a task) would be achieved while at the same time CA program staff, NGO staff, and local technical assistance providers improved their skills and modeled an approach to developing sustainability plans. The "lessons learned" through the process would be considered in working with the other (Phase II and II) NGOs.

The basic model of technical assistance was as follows:

1. Representatives of six NGOs attend a regional "orientation meeting" (workshop) during which technical assistance providers help to launch the sustainability planning process by presenting planning tools, ensuring understanding of and commitment to the process, and introducing the technical assistance resources available to the NGOs.
2. Upon completion of the orientation meeting, local consultants and/or the relevant Core Team for Sustainability Planning (CTSP) members make an immediate follow-up visit to the NGO's site to maintain momentum and try to ensure that the entire NGO becomes involved in the planning process.
3. NGOs work on developing their plans.
4. Local consultants and/or relevant CTSP members provide on-going technical assistance to individual NGOs, based on each NGO's needs, in developing their plans.

III. ACTIVITIES

To achieve the objectives of the MDP, especially the NGOs' improved ability to develop sustainability plans, beginning in January 1996 the following major activities were carried out.

A. Design of Overall Methodology and Tools

Between January - April 1996, two MSH/FPMD consultants worked with the six-member CA Core Team on Sustainability Planning (CTSP) and Dr. Abul Barkat to finalize frameworks and tools for sustainability planning. These included an approach to planning based on a modified strategic planning framework; an extensive orientation curriculum and set of learning materials; and a financial planning tool. By virtue of their involvement in developing the tools and materials, the CTSP was intended to become the "experts" within the CAs on sustainability planning; they were to take the lead in organizing NGO orientation meetings, preparing orientation meeting materials, assisting the NGOs in developing their plans, and disseminating information about the sustainability planning process within the CAs themselves. The six members of the CTSP were chosen in part due to their previous involvement in sustainability initiatives. External technical assistance, including participation in the orientation meetings as well as individual on-site assistance, was provided by a seven person Technical Assistance Team (TAT) recruited by URC(B) under a subcontract from FPMD, with input and oversight provided periodically from FPMD/Boston. The TAT held periodic meetings amongst themselves and the CTSP in order to review progress, discuss the effectiveness of the methodology, orientation meetings, and planning tools, and plan site visits and future actions. (Annex A list members of the Technical Assistance Team and the Core Team for Sustainability Planning.)

B. Orientation Meetings for NGOs

Between April and October 1996, five "orientation meetings" (four meetings with six NGOs per meeting, plus one meeting solely for one large national NGO, attended by a total of 87 NGO participants, of which 44 were female and 44 male) were held in different locations in Bangladesh to launch the planning process by introducing to the NGOs the planning framework; providing program and financial planning tools that the NGOs can use; and improving the NGOs' understanding of practical steps in developing their sustainability plans. The overall objective of the orientation meetings was "to strengthen participants' capacity in preparing NGOs' plans;" the specific objectives were that the participants:

- understand the sustainability planning process and framework;
- be able to refine their existing sustainability plan;
- be more confident and motivated to prepare a sustainability plan; and,
- be able to implement an appropriate process in their NGO using the framework and process.

The orientation meetings were designed to have a balance of conceptual and operational material, as well as to employ a mix of formal presentation and “hands-on” activities. During Day One, materials, tools, and approaches were presented. Day Two concentrated mainly on a case study and group work modeling the preparation of a sustainability plan. The agenda for the orientation meetings is presented in Annex B. The FPMD Boston-based consultants participated in the design and delivery of the first orientation meeting, while the remaining orientation meetings were delivered by URC(B) and the CTSP. Towards the end of each meeting, the NGOs identified next steps in planning to be taken after their return to their work sites, along with a schedule. Annex C contains a list of the orientation meetings held and the persons representing each of the NGOs. During the later meetings, a bound copy of the meeting materials was distributed to the participants at the start of the meeting. The meeting materials and sessions were continually revised based on experience and participant feedback.

C. Follow-Up Technical Assistance to NGOs

Whenever possible, individual site visits were made by the TAT and the CTSP immediately following the orientation meeting in order to maintain momentum gained during the meeting and to acquaint NGO staff and Executive Committee members with the content of the meeting and on the participant action plans. Subsequently, follow-up on-site technical assistance in program and financial planning was provided to individual NGOs by a combination of the URC(B) consultants and CTSP members. The intensity of the technical assistance varied according to the expressed interest of the NGOs selected by the relevant CTSP members. Intensive on-site technical assistance was provided by URC(B) to seven NGOs, and the CTSP visited their respective NGO grantees to provide follow-up. A number of joint TAT/CTSP visits were made. Formal protocols were developed for the NGO site visits to try to ensure that all relevant issues were addressed. Technical assistance was provided through a combination of on-site visits, telephone conversations, and meetings in Dhaka.

D. NGO Plan Preparation and Review

By the end of February 1997, 25 draft sustainability plans had been received (one plan for each of 23 NGOs, plus one plan each for two separate sites of one national NGO). Plans were prepared in either Bangla or English, depending on the NGO. Upon receipt of the draft plans, the URC(B) consultants (and the CTSP) reviewed the plans according to protocols that were developed jointly by FPMD, URC(B), and the CTSP. Annex D contains the plan review protocols. Feedback was provided to the NGOs and to the CAs, and the plans were then revised by the NGOs to incorporate the feedback. A second round of feedback was provided to the NGOs, and “final” versions of the plans were prepared. While December 1996 was originally anticipated as the end date of the technical assistance, cost savings allowed the program to be extended through May 1997, which allowed the NGOs additional time for plan preparation and accommodated CA staff who were preoccupied with the new National Integrated Population and Health Project (NIPHP).

E. Wrap-Up Workshop

A one day wrap-up workshop was held on May 5, 1997 in order to: 1) identify the lessons learned from the sustainability planning process; 2) review whether the process was effective in improving the NGOs' capacity to develop practical and effective sustainability plans; and, 3) identify the potential utility of the planning process (and techniques) for the future. The workshop was attended by 68 persons, including representatives from 24 NGOs, URC(B), the CTSP, the CAs/NIPHP partners, USAID/Bangladesh, and FPMD. Participants were asked to consider which parts of the process had been most and least useful, how they would use the materials and knowledge in the future, and how the process might be improved. (See Annex E for workshop objectives and focus questions.) Most of the workshop was given to discussion, in order to allow the NGO participants to fully and freely express their perceptions of the planning process.

IV. RESULTS AND /OUTCOMES

The FPMD program of assistance in sustainability planning aimed to support the development of plans (a product), through the development of skills (human capital) among NGO staff. The following discussion on the main results of the assistance are based on: 1) discussions held during and immediately after the May 1997 workshop; 2) the workshop participants' written comments; 3) reports from the TAT and the CTSP; 4) observations made by the FPMD consultants during the course of the technical assistance; and, 5) review of successive sustainability plan drafts. The results are organized according to the original objectives of the MDP. (See Section II above.) All three objectives were achieved.

A. Overall perceptions of the planning process and experience

The perceptions of the planning process and experience expressed by the NGOs during the wrap-up workshop were generally positive. During the group discussion exercises, the NGOs reported that the orientation meetings and materials were the most valuable, followed by the individual technical assistance, sharing of ideas and experiences, and CA/TAT cooperation. The NGOs reported that inadequate amount of technical assistance and insufficient time for the orientation meetings were the least valuable, followed by general review comments, lack of effective coordination between TAT/NGO, and lack of cooperation of NGO members. Almost all of the NGO participants reported that they would use the framework if they had the need, and would try to implement their plans with modifications required by the new NIPHP environment.

The workshop participants suggested a number of measures for improvement in the sustainability planning process, including: simplification and modification of the financial tools, organization of more workshops and meetings, and making the orientation meetings three rather than two days.

In a confidential questionnaire at the close of the workshop, 98% of the participants reported finding the orientation meetings “very useful” or “useful.”

The wrap-up workshop, which was intended to provide a forum to pool and synthesize observations on the planning process and the related technical assistance, unavoidably took place very close to the time when NGO funding proposals to the two main NIPHP components (urban and rural) were due. While the attendance at the workshop of stakeholders in NIPHP (i.e., partners, USAID) was considered important in encouraging the transfer of lessons to the new USAID bilateral, it is not clear whether the presence of the stakeholder representatives -- especially current and potential funders -- discouraged the NGOs from expressing themselves candidly.

B. Specific Results and Outcomes

Objective 1:	A framework and process is developed for the development of NGO sustainability plans.
Indicator:	CAs use the framework and process in their sustainability planning work with their Phase I and Phase II NGOs.

It appears that the orientation meeting model was a useful one, both for the NGOs and for the CTSP and TAT. The meetings provided a forum for dissemination of knowledge and sharing of ideas and experience between NGOs, and provided an opportunity for the CTSP and TAT to improve their skills as facilitators and technical assistance providers. Also, it was generally felt that the orientation meetings for the Phase I NGOs were progressively improved due to the CTSP and consultants gaining experience with the materials and with facilitation techniques; the refinement of the training and technical assistance materials, including the program and financial planning tools; and the material's compilation in one document.

Based on observations and the feedback received, the following would improve the orientation meetings and related planning materials:

1. More clarification of difficult concepts and tasks by the TAT/CTSP for the NGOs during group work, while being careful not to unduly influence the thoughts of the participants. Given the funding relationship between the CAs and NGOs (and the possibly perceived influence on funding of the TAT), a degree of trust must be established. While this did occur to some extent due to extensive working together, this should be carefully thought through.

2. Either a reduction in material or an increase in the overall time for the orientation meeting. Although time management improved in the later meetings, the sessions were very tight. The financial sessions, which were the most challenging for many NGOs, were especially tight. More time for focused group discussion would also be useful.
3. Translation of all materials into Bangla. Comprehension and use of the materials would be improved if the materials were available in Bangla. (This was achieved to some extent during the later meetings.)
4. Modification of financial tools. The NGOs experienced difficulty with the financial plan/tool. This was perceived during the course of the technical assistance and was expressed in the wrap-up workshop discussion. The difficulty may have resulted from a combination of the tool's complexity and the gap between the NGOs' present skill levels and that required to do basic financial planning. This difficulty is also exacerbated by the NGOs' historical experience with the separate project proposal approach, rather than planning for the organization as a whole. The financial tool should be simplified, and more intensive TA provided in financial planning. In order to reduce reliance on computers, the financial tool was developed to be used without a computer; however, a manual version of a planning tool does not provide the power and flexibility that a spreadsheet version would. Therefore, future versions of the financial planning tool should be computer-based. This is reasonable given the rapidly rising levels of information technology and computer skills in Bangladesh.

Objective 2: The CAs and NGOs have improved ability to think strategically, and to develop practical, effective sustainability plans.

Indicators: 1) Realistic and practical sustainability plans are produced by the NGOs.
2) CA program staff demonstrate increased skills at critical analysis.

In general, the NGOs have acquired greater capability to prepare (sustainability) plans. The quality of the NGO sustainability plans was higher than plans submitted before the start of the technical assistance. Main improvements were in the level of detail in identifying activities and inputs. The first post-workshop drafts of many plans still contained several weaknesses, including objectives that were not "SMART," confusion between objectives and activities, overly optimistic implementation schedules, a lack of realism in financial plans, and, perhaps most important, the lack of a link between the NGO's environmental analysis (SWOT) and its chosen activities. Many of these weaknesses were addressed in the later versions of the plans. Their existence, however, may indicate that some of the NGOs are having difficulty redirecting their activities, or that plans are being developed with an eye to likely donor funding. Some NGOs also had difficulty in articulating indicators, and often confused indicators with outputs. While to some extent these weaknesses were also resolved in the later drafts, NGOs will still

need guidance and assistance in these areas. It was noted that the content and internal consistency of the Bangla versions of the plans were better than the English versions (even within one NGO).

Some of the NGOs began to consider themselves comprehensively, rather than as viewing the family planning project as a separate entity from the NGO. This resulted in part from the sustainability planning process bringing the Executive Committee members into closer relationship with the family planning staff, which to some extent broke down the division between the family planning project and the NGO. This approach was reinforced throughout the technical assistance, and has the potential to yield benefits to the NGO.

The SWOT exercise was quite valuable to the NGOs in describing their environment at the onset of planning.

Objective 3: NGOs and CAs have increased access to local technical assistance (TA) in planning for sustainability.

Indicator: NGOs receive periodic TA visits from the CA program staff and local consultants in the development of sustainability plans, and establish contact with other NGOs.

Clearly technical assistance provided by the TAT (and the CTSP) contributed to the NGOs' improved capability, as reflected in the improvement in their draft plans. Clearly also the technical assistance was the most challenging aspect of the overall model, as in addition to the newness of the technical challenge and approach, the number of different stakeholders (MSH/FPMD, URC(B), the three CAs, and the 24 NGOs) made the activities organizationally quite complex.

1. The main issue was the definition of the respective roles of the TAT and the CTSP. In some cases, CTSP members perceived that the involvement of outside technical assistance marginalized the contribution of the CAs. On the other hand, some TAT members may have underestimated the importance of having a full practical understanding of the individual NGOs.
2. The fundamental question of the CA/NGO historical relationship (donor/recipient) also influenced the responses of each to the process. As was noted in previous progress reports and notes, it is critical that the donor or intermediary have a real commitment to the independence of the NGO. Part of the NGOs' current need for planning skills may reflect their past funding relationships, under which USAID and the CAs closely dictated the terms of their activities. Therefore, technical assistance should proactively aim to reduce dependence, and the providers should feel confident enough in their own roles to support this. NIPHP should look at the precise role that its partners will play intermediary organizations so as to encourage stronger, more independent NGOs. It is

difficult for the NGOs to reorient themselves after acquiring habits over the years. In addition, it is not clear that "trickle-down" technical assistance is very effective in an environment with relatively low levels of human capital.

3. For much of the period, TAT did not communicate directly with the NGOs, but rather communicated through the CA. While it was necessary that the CAs be aware of activities in which their grantees were involved, this approach was time-consuming and confusing for all concerned, and probably diluted the assistance. In any future activities, respective roles and responsibilities and lines of communication should be made clear to avoid any confusion among the NGOs and the TA/support providers themselves, as well as to provide quicker feedback to the NGOs.
4. Because both the planning process as well as the use of outside technical assistance was new to the NGOs, they had difficulty in identifying areas in which they required assistance. More formal assessment of technical assistance needs immediately after the orientation meeting (e.g., a sort of "needs assessment" for the NGO) might have enabled the earlier engagement of TAT and CTSP in technical areas in which the NGOs needed help, rather than waiting for the first draft of the plans to identify problems.
5. The most valuable technical assistance was practical. Greater success was achieved by consultants who were able to think on the same level of complexity as the NGOs, and who were able to engage with NGO staff as partners. The most useful feedback to the NGOs addressed substantive matters rather than smaller details. Familiarity with how NGOs work as well as with the national family planning program was critical for providing effective technical assistance.

C. Additional Discussion

Constraints

As was noted in the periodic progress reports, the NGO sustainability planning process was undertaken at a time when the USAID-funded family planning program was in major transition and the NGOs (and CAs) were unclear on their own future funding as well as in the types of activities and approaches that would be sanctioned by the new NIPHP. Clearly it was difficult for NGOs to develop a strategy before knowing for certain what would be an acceptable approach. Funding uncertainty preoccupied many of the NGOs and may have limited their ability to concentrate on developing sustainability plans. This was especially the case for NGOs working in high-performing areas. Relatedly, as NIPHP began implementation, it became known that some of the participating NGOs would be funded by NIPHP and some would not. While hopefully the NGOs are convinced of the intrinsic utility of sustainability plans, realistically they will want to know the donor's interest and anticipated future support for such an activity. During the plan preparation period, it was not clear what approach or emphasis the NIPHP partners would place on sustainability planning. Therefore, many of the NGOs expressed a "wait and

see" attitude. In addition, during the same period the CA staff, some of whom were also facing uncertainty about the future, were also preoccupied with work under the NIPHP (e.g., the customer validation survey). These other responsibilities reduced the time available to work on sustainability planning, including the critical and time-consuming task of providing feedback on draft plans to the NGOs.

Other issues

Many NGOs will need further orientation on sustainability planning under NIPHP, as there are new elements in the Basic Services Package. As was noted in a February 1997 progress report (see *Progress Report: NGO Planning for Sustainability*; February 1997), the changes related to NIPHP require that NGOs adapt quickly and creatively to a completely new environment and new program priorities. The envisioned changes in service delivery structure and in the overall approach to NGOs will require planning of some sort. For example, if smaller NGOs are encouraged to create regional or national consortia, this will require planning, including development of management protocols, identification of roles/responsibilities, and, perhaps most sensitively, rationalization of staff. Therefore, the current NGO plans can provide both a baseline as well as a basis for discussion on future directions.

The NGOs are not clear on what to do with revenue from services and other revenue generating activities. Many of the NGOs showed projected revenue -- including service charges -- but without indication of how they planned to use it. In such cases revenue was essentially not incorporated into the NGO's expenditure or investment plans, but rather stood as a separate item. This suggests that the NGOs, while aware of the need to generate revenue, are unclear as to what to do with it.

Management objectives, being the most abstract, are the hardest for NGOs to specify. Financial objectives (i.e., level of cost recovery, percent cost reductions) and program objectives (i.e., CPR) are easier for NGOs to specify.

V. SUMMARY OF MAJOR RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a summary of the major recommendations already discussed. More detail is presented in the preceding text. As was noted above, the sustainability planning program was innovative in nature, and should be seen as providing the basis for future activities. For the sake of discussion, it is assumed that technical assistance in sustainability planning will continue in some form or another.

1. Roles and responsibilities and lines of communication should be made clear to all stakeholders.

2. NGOs should be further encouraged to consider themselves comprehensively. The family planning project should not be considered a separate entity. The Executive Committee members should continue to establish a closer relationship with the family planning staff.
3. NGOs should be provided further orientation on sustainability planning under NIPHP to incorporate the new elements in the Basic Services Package.
4. More time and attention should be allocated to financial planning and financial planning tools.
5. Policies, such as on the disposition of revenue from services and other revenue generating activities, should be made clear.
6. A real and sincere focus should be place on NGO independence. While it is a challenge for stakeholders to reorient themselves after many years, NIPHP should look at the role that its partners will play as intermediary organizations and ensure that this role is consistent with the development of strong, independent, and "robust" NGOs.

Annex A
Members of Technical Assistance Teams

Local Technical Assistance Team:

Dr. Abul Barkat, University Research Corporation (Bangladesh)
Dr. Sushil Ranjan Howlader, University Research Corporation (Bangladesh)
Dr. M.A. Mannan, University Research Corporation (Bangladesh)
Dr. Azizur Rahman, University Research Corporation (Bangladesh)
Dr. Pradanendu Bikash Chakma, University Research Corporation (Bangladesh)
Dr. Sayeedul Haque Khan, University Research Corporation (Bangladesh)
Mr. Anwarul Azim Syed, Micro Industries Development Assistance and Services

CA Core Team for Sustainability Planning:

Mr. Noor Mohammed, Family Planning Services and Training Centre
Mr. K.M. Syeduzzaman, Family Planning Services and Training Centre
Mr. Rafique Ahmed, Family Planning Services and Training Centre (until June 1996)
Mr. Toslim Uddin Khan, Pathfinder International
Mr. Farhad Chowdhury, Pathfinder International (until February 1997)
Mr. Suresh C. Datta, The Asia Foundation
Mr. Wahiduzzaman Chowdhury, The Asia Foundation

International Technical Assistance Team:

Mr. Paul Fishstein, Management Sciences for Health/Family Planning Management Development
Mr. Stephen Sacca, Management Sciences for Health/Health Financing Program

ANNEX B

AGENDA
NGO SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING MEETING

DAY ONE :

09-00-09:30

Registration

SESSION-A
09:00-10:00

Plenary

- * Welcome and Introduction
- * Workshop Ground Rules
- * Objective of Workshop and Agenda
- * Administrative Issues

SESSION-B

Plenary

- * Review of Sustainability Indicators by Types of Sustainability (Institutional, Managerial, programmatic, financial)

10:45-11:00

TEA BREAK

SESSION-C
11:45-11:45

Plenary/
Group

- * NGO Sustainability Plan: Process Followed and Problems Faced (NGO-specific Groups)

SESSION-D
11:45-13:00

Plenary

- * Introduction of Sustainability Framework and Process

13:00-14:00

LUNCH BREAK

14:00-15:00

Plenary

- * Introduction of Sustainability Framework and Process Continues and Exercise Based on Sustainability Process and Framework

15:00-15:15

TEA BREAK

SESSION-E

Plenary

- * Introduction to Financial Analysis
- * Importance of Financial Analysis for Sustainability Planning
- * Financial Tools
- * Examples (TAF Cost Study - its Implications on Sustainability)
- * Question/answer

SESSION-F
16:17:00
financial part

- * Sum up of days work
- * Distribution of the Case "Basmati" including for review

17:00

Adjourn

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

15

DAY TWO:

SESSION-G 09:09:30	Plenary	* Participatory Review of Day One Activities
SESSION-H 09:03-09:45	Plenary	* Introduction and Analysis of Basmati Environment
SESSION-I 09:45-11:00	Plenary	Case Study: * Exercise on SWOT Analysis of Basmati * Group Presentation
11:00-11:15		TEA BREAK
SESSION-J 11:15-12:00	Group	Case Study: * Exercise-Developing Sustainability Plan for Basmati Group Presentation
SESSION-K 12:00-13:00	Plenary	Case Study: * Exercise-Developing Sustainability Plan for Basmati
13:00-14:00		LUNCH BREAK
14:00-14:45		Exercise- * Developing Sustainability Plan for Basmati Continue
	Group	Case Study: * Group Presentation of Basmati Plan and Discussion
14:45-15:00		TEA BREAK
SESSION-L	<u>Plenary/Group</u>	* Development of Schedule for Preparing Sustainability Plan by Individual NGOs * Group Presentation and Discussion
16:00-16:25	Plenary	* Sum up and Discussion on "Next Steps"
16:25-16:30	Plenary	* Vote of Thanks and Closing

Y. D. ...

ANNEX C

List of Participants

**Planning for NGO Sustainability
15 April 1996
Hotel Abakash, Dhaka**

NGO's

Jatio Tarun Sangha (JTS)

Mohammad Fazlul Haque	Chairman
Sultan Ailim Ahmed	Executive Director
Md. Khalil Ullah	Accounts Officer

Palli Shishu Foundation (PSF)

Razaul Karim	Secretary General
Ghazi Shafique Rahman	Executive Director
Md. Anwar Hassain	Project Coordinator

Shahid Smete Shangshad (SSS)

Babar Ali	Authorized Official
Md. Deluar Hossain	Field Supervisor
Md. Jahanul Haque	Field Supervisor

Sobhanbag Mohila Club (SMC)

Nighat Aslam	Vice President
Rumani Haque	Treasurer
Nazma Sultania Lodi	Secretary

Swanirvar Bangladesh (SB)

Salah Uddin Ahmed	Honorary Secretary General
Syed Manunur Rashid	Project Coordinator
Md. Rafiqul Islam	MIS Officer

Voluntary Family Welfare Association (VFWA)

Shamsuddin Ahmed	Secretary General
Mamataz Begum	Project Manager
Farida Begum	Deputy Project Manager

CA Core Team:

Family Planning Services Training Centre

Mr. Rafique Ahmed
Mr. K.M. Syeduzzaman

Senior Program Officer (MIS)
Program Officer

The Asia Foundation

Mr. Suresh Chandra Datta
Mr. Wahiduzzaman Chowdhury

Senior Program Officer
Program Officer

Pathfinder International

Mr. Farhad Chowdhury
Mr. Toslim Uddin Khan

Program Officer
Program Officer (MIS)

Technical Assistance:

Dr. Abul Barkat
Mr. Paul Fishstein
Mr. Stephen Sacca

Advisor, URC(Bangladesh)
Senior Program Associate, MSH/FPMD
Senior Program Associate, Health Financing
Program MSH

List of Participants

Sustainability Planning Workshop

June 23-24, 1996

Royal Hotel, Khulna, Bangladesh

NGO	Participant Name	Position
Bonoful	Begum Majeda Ali	President
Bonoful	Zakia Akhter Hossain	Project Coordinator
Bonoful	Aparna Talukder	Office Manager
FPSTC, Dhaka	Khondokar Abdul Hai	Official
FPSTC, Dhaka	Momtaz Begum	Field Senior Supervisor
FPSTC, Dhaka	Shamsunnahar	Project Coordinator
Chalna Bandar		
Mahila Samity (CBMS)	H.A. Khalida Begum	Project Manager
CBMS	Reva Rani Roy	Supervisor
RFWP	Mr. A. Sattar Bhuiyan	Executive Director
RFWP	Mofizur Rahman Khan	Unit Coordinator
RFWP	Md. Mizanur Rahman	Unit Coordinator
PSKS	Mosharrof Hossain	Project Director
PSKS	Md. Romzan Ali	Member E/C.
PSKS	Md. Saiful Islam	Coordinator
Surjamukhi	Rahima Khatun	Treasurer
Surjamukhi	Devi Roy	Project Coordinator
Surjamukhi	Mrs. Zinnatunnessa	Office Manager
USAID		
Robert Cunnane		
M.A. Quasem Bhuiyan		
MSH		
Mr. Paul Fishstein		
Mr. Stephen Sacca		
URC(B)		
Abul Barkat		
P.B. Chakma		
S.H. Khan		
Pathfinder International		
Farhad Chowdhury		
Toslim Uddin Khan		
FPSTC		
Mr. K.M. Sayeduzzaman		
Mr. Rafique Ahmed		
TAF		
Suresh C. Datta		
Wahiduzzaman Chowdhury		

NGO Sustainability Planning Orientation Meeting
Rajshahi Region
BRAC Training and Resource Centre
August 28-29, 1996

NGO	Participant Name	Position
1. Tilottoma Rajshahi	1. Dr. Jubieda Khatun	NGO Representative
	2. Mrs. Syeda Khatun	NGO Representative
	3. Mrs. Murshida Morshed	Project Manager
	4. Mrs. Mahfuza Khanam	Dy. Project Manager
2. Pabna Poura: Pabna	1. Mr. M. Shujauddowla	NGO Representative
	2. Mrs. Anowara B. Chowdhury	Project Manager
	3. Mehtar M. Khatun	Supervisor
3. Ayon Thakurgaon	1. Mrs. Alpana Chakrabarty	NGO Representative
	2. Mrs. Salina Akhtar	Project Manager
	3. Dilara Rumi	Supervisor
4. Bogra P.K. Samity Bogra	1. Mrs. Monowara Begum	Project Manager
	2. Mrs. Nasim Nahar	Supervisor
5. Kallyani Chapai Nawabganj	1. Mrs. Fawzia Alam	Project Coordinator
	2. Mr. Moyez Uddin	Office Assistant
6. Unnata Paribar Gaibandha	1. Mrs. Mahmuda Begum	NGO Representative
	2. Mrs. Mahfuza Begum	Project Coordinator
	3. Mrs. Rowshan Ara	Supervisor

Technical Assistance Team:

1. Prof. Abul Barkat, Dhaka University
2. Prof. S. R. Howladar, Dhaka University
3. Dr. P.B. Chakma, Dhaka University
4. M.A. Mannan, Dhaka University
5. Dr. S.H. Khan, Dhaka University

CA CTSP Members:

1. Mr. Shuresh C. Datta, TAF
2. Mr. Wahiduzzaman Chowdhury, TAF
3. Mr. Noor Mohammad, FPSTC
4. Mr. K.M. Sayeduzzaman, FPSTC
5. Mr. Toslim Uddin Khan, Pathfinder
6. Mr. Farhad Ahmed Chowdhury, Pathfinder

**NGO Sustainability Planning Orientation Meeting
Chittagong Region
Chittagong Eye Hospital and Foundation Auditorium
September 17-18, 1996**

NGO	Participant Name	Position
1. NISHKRITI	1. Sk. Shahidul Anwar	Project Director
	2. Mohd. Jan-e-Alam	Accountant
2. AMS	1. Mohammad Ali	President
	2. Joynata Kumar Banik	Project Director
	3. Md. Nizam Uddin	Accountant
3. MAMATA	1. Swapna Talukder	Project Coordinator
	2. Md. Shahjahan	Office Manager
	3. Rakiba Yasmin	Organizer
4. UTPS	1. Rokeya Zaman	Director
	2. Munshi Ahmed Zaman	Vice-President
	3. Rehana Sultana	Supervisor
5. PKSP	1. Sheikh Khorshed Anwar	President
	2. Oheeduzzaman Mazumder	Vice-President
	3. Dr. Md. Golam M. Miah	Medical Officer
	4. Shahida Begum	Unit Manager
6. MMKS	1. Shahana Nasreen	Project Manager
	2. Salma Begum	Deputy Project Manager

Technical Assistance Team:

1. Paul Fishstein, MSH
2. Prof. Abul Barkat, Dhaka University
3. Prof. P.B. Chakma, Dhaka University
4. Dr. S. H. Khan, Dhaka University

CA CTSP Members:

1. Mr. Shuresh C. Datta, TAF
2. Mr. Wahiduzzaman Chowdhury, TAF
3. Mr. Noor Mohammad, FPSTC
4. Mr. K.M. Sayeduzzaman, FPSTC
5. Mr. Toslim Uddin Khan, Pathfinder
6. Mr. Farhad Ahmed Chowdhury, Pathfinder

NGO Sustainability Planning Orientation Meeting
SWANIRVAR
Comilla BARD
September 29-30, 1996

NGO	Participant Name	Position
1. Family Planning Services Project	1. Nibedita Sanyal	Trainer
	2. Jannatara Begum	FWV
	3. Momotaz Begum	Supervisor
	4. Beauty Bhatta	FWV
	5. Archana Rani Debi	FWV
	6. Razia Akhter	FWV
	7. Md. Harun-Or-Rashid	Organizer
	8. Md. Mahbub-ul-Alam	Trainer
	9. Nil Kamal Paul	Organizer
	10. Shariat Ullah	Organizer
	11. Md. Hossain	Organizer
	12. Kulsum Samad	FWV
	13. Md. Kabirul Islam	Trainer
	14. Md. Maksudur R. Ansary	Organizer
	15. Md. Sanwar H. Khan	Organizer
2. Total Village Development	1. Md. Nazrul Islam	Trainer
	2. Md. Abul Kalam Azad	Trainer
	3. Md. Amir Hossain	Trainer
3. Swanirvar Head Quarter	1. Mr. Mamunur Rashid	
	2. Md. Rafiqul Islam	
	3. Mr. Faruk Ahmed	
Technical Assistance Team:	1. Prof. Abul Barkat, Dhaka University	
	2. Dr. P.B. Chakma, Dhaka University	
	3. Prof. Azizur Rahman, Dhaka University	
	4. Dr. S.H. Khan, Dhaka University	
CA CTSP Members:	1. Mr. Shuresh C. Datta, TAF	
	2. Mr. Wahiduzzaman Chowdhury, TAF	
	3. Md. Azizur Rahman Mollah, Pathfinder International	
	4. Mr. Farhad Ahmed Chowdhury, Pathfinder International	
	5. Mr. Monsur Ahmed, Pathfinder International	

Annex D Protocols for Draft Plan Review

Feasibility:

1. Are the plan's objectives and activities realistic?
2. Are the plan's dates for achievement of objectives realistic?
3. Are the cost and revenue projections realistic? Are the projections on number of services (units) and the prices realistic? Are the revenue projections realistic?
4. Does the NGO already have the trained staff necessary to carry out the planned activities? If not, can the NGO realistically hire the needed staff?
5. Has the NGO identified sufficient detail on inputs and costs? Are inputs reflected in the financial plan (tool)?
6. Can the NGO successfully compete with other providers (i.e., commercial laboratories, baby taxis) in the NGO's planned activities?
7. In which areas of plan implementation will the NGO probably require technical assistance?

Consistency with Organizational Internal/External Environment:

1. Does the NGO's plan build on the NGO's strengths/opportunities?
2. Does the NGO identify realistic steps to reduce its relevant weaknesses/threats?
3. Are there known S-W-O-Ts that the NGO has omitted from its analysis?

Logic/Consistency:

1. Are objectives SMART? (to the extent that they should be for a given objective? "SMARTness" per se is not the concern)
2. Has the NGO identified all of the major activities needed to achieve the objectives? Has the NGO omitted critical steps or assumptions that will affect its ability to achieve the objectives?
3. Is the NGO's financial plan consistent with its program plan?

Comprehensive view of the organization:

1. Does the plan indicate that the NGO has taken a comprehensive view of the organization?

ANNEX E
OBJECTIVES AND FOCUS QUESTIONS
FOR SUSTAINABILITY PLANNING WRAP-UP WORKSHOP

Overall objectives: The workshop participants will have:

1. identified the “lessons learned” from the sustainability planning process through conducting a critical review;
2. reviewed whether the process was effective in improving the NGOs’ capacity to develop practical, effective sustainability plans; and
3. identified the potential future utility of the planning process.

Focus questions for review of planning experience (morning):

1. What specific parts of the sustainability planning process have been most valuable to you and your NGO in assisting you to develop a sustainability plan.? Why were they most valuable?
2. What specific parts of the sustainability planning process have been least valuable to you and your NGO in assisting you to develop a sustainability plan.? Why were they least valuable?
3. Will you make use of the planning materials, methodology, and knowledge gained? If so, how?
4. Will you make use of your NGO’s sustainability plan itself? If so, how?

During the introduction to the session, the facilitator should provide informal examples to remind the participants of possible areas for discussion; e.g., the orientation meeting, the planning framework, on-site TA, written materials, review of draft plans, feedback from CTSP/TA, etc.

Focus questions for future suggestions for planning (afternoon):

During the introduction to the group work, the facilitator should refer to the outputs from the review (morning) session and ask the participants to reflect and answer questions such as:

1. How will you build on or strengthen the most valuable experiences or outputs?
2. How will you work around or minimize the less valuable experiences?
3. What suggestions would you make to improve the overall sustainability planning process?

4. How would you help another NGO which was preparing a sustainability plan?

The facilitator should also mention such areas as types of assistance needed, which TA areas are critical to the NGOs, etc.

Annex F
Bibliography of Key Documents

- *Management Development Plan: Planning for Sustainability, Cooperating Agency/Non-Governmental Organization Project, Bangladesh: December 1995 - December 1996; May 1996*
- *NGO Sustainability Planning: Orientation Meeting Materials; revised April 1997*
- Barkat, Dr. Abul, et al, *Sustainability Planning of NGOs in Bangladesh (Technical Assistance Report: Contract CRTA-23; University Research Corporation (Bangladesh); July 1997*
- Barkat, Dr. Abul, et al, *A Study on Family Planning NGO Sustainability Efforts in Bangladesh; University Research Corporation (Bangladesh); August 1995*
- Fishstein, Paul, and Stephen Sacca, *Planning for Sustainability, Progress Notes; May 7, 1997*
- Fishstein, Paul, *Progress Report: NGO Planning for Sustainability; February 1997*
- Fishstein, Paul, *Planning for Sustainability, Progress Notes; November 3 - 14, 1996*
- Fishstein, Paul, and Stephen Sacca, *Planning for Sustainability, Progress Notes; June 14 - July 4, 1996*
- Fishstein, Paul, and Stephen Sacca, *Progress Report: Bangladesh CA/NGO Subproject; April 1996*
- Huber, Sallie Craig, *Evaluation Report: FPMD Assistance in Bangladesh; August 1995*
- *Sustainability of the FP-MCH Program of NGOs in Bangladesh; proceedings of a Future Search Workshop in Rajendrapur, July 15 - 18, 1995*
- Fieldler, John L. and Laurence M. Day, *Costs and Cost Efficiencies of NGO Family Planning Services in Bangladesh: The Asia Foundation Portfolio; March 1996*