

**OFFICE OF PRIVATE AND VOLUNTARY  
COOPERATION**

**BUREAU FOR HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE**

**RESULTS REVIEW  
FY 1998**

**April 1, 1999**

The attached result information is from the FY 1998 results review and resource request (R4) for BHR/PVC and was assembled and analyzed by USAID/PVC. The R4 is a “pre-decisional” USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID Reviews.

Additional information on the attached can be obtained from Adele Liskov USAID/BHR/PVC. Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse  
1611 N. Kent St., Suite 200  
Arlington, Va. 22209-2111  
Telephone: 703-351-4006 Ext. 106  
Fax: 703-351-4039  
EMAIL: [DOCORDER@DEC.CDIE.ORG](mailto:DOCORDER@DEC.CDIE.ORG)  
INTERNET: [HTTP://WWW.DEC.ORG](http://WWW.DEC.ORG)

## **Part I - OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE**

PVC's performance in relation to its management of the strategy has continued to be strong. As the following sections will indicate, PVC's programs have increasingly been shaped by use of performance data in several areas. PVC's performance has met and exceeded expectations in some areas at SO and IR levels (see Part II and performance tables). PVC has devoted increased attention to those few areas where performance was short of expectations as well as to areas where program evolution suggests that IR and/or indicator revision is needed.

The overriding factor this past year has been the tremendous amount of learning that has been gained from the performance data. Following last year's R4, an action agenda was established to address areas of weak performance or gaps in documentation. Thirty operational changes were identified. In this way, PVC has institutionalized management for results. For the past two years, following the R4 review meeting, PVC has conducted an internal office-wide "stocktaking" to review the performance data and identify priority actions that will improve our ability to document and utilize data so that weak performance can be better addressed and understood. While items on this agenda will take several program cycles to complete, nearly half of the actions identified in the review are either underway or completed. Specific actions and results include:

- **Strengthened the RFA Process.** Revisions were made in the RFAs in all programs to align them more closely with PVC's Strategy, i.e., the RFA application review process was revised for the Ocean Freight program placing greater weight on performance issues. Various elements in the program cycle (applicant debriefing and detailed implementation plan (DIP) review process) were revamped to provide more direct feedback and assistance to the PVOs on program design issues that the performance data identified as weak. As a result, a new planning matrix was added to all RFAs to address difficulties PVOs have in developing measurable program objectives and valid indicators.
- **Revamped the Monitoring and Evaluation Process.** PVC completed a monitoring and evaluation needs assessment, drafted a two-year Evaluation Plan, and initiated program-specific actions to maximize the collection of evaluation data that will be more useful for program management purposes and allow us to aggregate data within and across programs. To systematize the office approach to program monitoring, development was started on a site visit checklist. This will make better use of the limited program monitoring that is possible with the current travel budget constraints. When fully implemented, the site visit data will be entered into the database as well. And, greater emphasis has been placed on operational analysis at the project level and on portfolio analysis at the program level. For example, the office commissioned a microenterprise study to identify key issues, best practices and impact and sustainability of the broad spectrum of microenterprise approaches used by cooperatives, credit unions and PVOs.
- **Made Sustainability Planning a Priority.** The office has insufficient data on program sustainability and has taken a series of steps to strengthen and accelerate PVO planning and action on this issue. The Child Survival program highlighted sustainability in the Detailed Implementation (DIP) reviews, concentrating on the development and use of sustainability

indicators. Matching Grants assisted PVOs to conduct sustainability audits, developed and piloted a business planning workshop, and provided training and assistance in developing linkages with commercial businesses. The impact of these interventions will not be realized for several years.

The office continued to use performance to improve its programs. In addition to using the R4 performance data for program decision-making, the office took a number of actions to streamline operations and to decrease the transaction costs and management burden. For example, the Child Survival program brought on-line a new technical support contractor to provide a broader range of technical and capacity building assistance to child survival and health PVOs.

As the broader Agency and external context for PVC's strategic plan continues to be favorable to the implementation of our programs and to nurturing the strong USAID-PVO partnership, there are strong prospects for making progress through the next budget year. We have set plans in motion to improve program integration through data documentation and to apply the lessons learned from program performance reported in the R4 and from program reviews. We also expect program management to be more streamlined over the next year. The Farmer-to-Farmer Program's five-year cycle is ongoing, with no RFA anticipated until FY 2002 to coincide with the expiration of the current farm bill. The Development Education Program moved from a one-year to a two-year grant cycle, lessening the program management burden and increasing the likelihood that project activities will have sufficient time to generate results. The Ocean Freight Reimbursement Program will no longer administer a special NIS program, in addition to the worldwide program, as it has done for the past three years with funds from the Department of State.

The Administrator is actively promoting the initiation of a new program to assist Missions with NGO institutional strengthening and capacity building. An important determinant of progress this year in extending our expertise to Missions and local NGOs in this area will be whether the funds approved in last year's budget review will be forthcoming. This is critical in light of the \$2 million reduction in PVC's program budget for FY 1999.

## **Part II - RESULTS REVIEW BY STRATEGIC OBJECTIVE**

### **PVC's Strategic Objective**

PVC's primary mandate is to strengthen the capacity of the U.S. PVO community to enable it to provide more sustainable development assistance. The Office's Strategic Objective (SO), "*increased capability of PVC's PVO partners to achieve sustainable service delivery,*" reflects this mandate. PVC's aim is continuous improvement in the institutional capacity, as represented by PVC's grantees, to respond effectively to the full range of challenges facing developing countries. The key elements in the SO are institutional strengthening, service delivery and sustainability. The five Intermediate Results (IRs) are:

- Operational and technical capacity of PVC grantees improved

- Strengthened partnership between USAID and U.S. PVOs
- Strengthened partnership between U.S. PVOs and local NGOs
- Improved Mobilization of Resources by PVC's PVO partners
- U.S. Public Awareness Raised.

Each IR contributes to the achievement of the SO. PVC has taken steps to ensure that the IRs and the associated indicators cut across all office programs. The work of the IR teams have complemented the work of various office divisions and have increasingly emphasized a sense of shared responsibility for managing progress towards achievement of the SO. Each IR team, for example, has been responsible for collecting and analyzing its performance data for the R4.

### Summary Table

#### SO: Increased Capability of PVC's PVO Partners to Achieve Sustainable Service Delivery

Strategic Objectives and Intermediate Results	Indicators	Rating (Exceeded, Met, Failed to Meet)	Comments
SO Indicators	1. Change in the mean capacity score of PVC-supported PVOs on PVC-developed capacity self-assessment instrument	Mixed	Preliminary data (1/3 of PVOs reporting)
	2. Change in the number of members of formal networks or associations of voluntary organizations	Exceeded	
	3. Change in key measures of child survival program performance	NA	Measured every 3 years (FY98 is yr.2)
	4. Change in key microenterprise (ME) measures of performance	Exceeded	
	5. Percent change in key measures of sustainability: a)% of ME programs that are operationally sustainable; b) % of programs with evidence of financial input at local level	NA	(a) data not available till 5/99 ; (b) will not be measured until evaluations are restructured
<b>IR1:</b> Operational and Technical Capacity of US PVOs Improved	Percent PVOs that develop quality program plans	Mixed	Targets met in 2 of 5 sub-indices
	Percent of PVOs that adopt a systematic approach to program monitoring and impact evaluation	NA	Not measured, indicator & data source will be redeveloped

Strategic Objectives and Intermediate Results	Indicators	Rating (Exceeded, Met, Failed to Meet)	Comments
IR2: Strengthened Partnership between USAID and US PVOs	Percentage of recommendations presented by ACVFA that are adopted by USAID	NA	No target set
	Percentage of USAID program funds channeled through US PVOs	NA	
IR3: Strengthened US PVO and NGO Partnership	Percent of PVC grants where there has been a clear transfer of resources by the PVOs to local level partners	Exceeded	A new set of indicators will be considered for IR3
	Percent of PVC grants where the PVO has clearly established formal partnerships with local partners	Exceeded	
	Percent of PVC grants in which local partners have access to the internet	Met	
IR4: Improved Mobilization of Resources by PVC's PVO Partners	The percent of PVC grantees with a non-diversified funding base	Failed to met	Trends on sub-target is on track
IR5: US Public Awareness Raised	Percent PVC grantees that measure changes in the awareness and understanding of US audiences of the importance of global sustainable development	NA	Not measured in FY98 Survey in FY2000

## Key Results

At the SO level PVC measures three dimensions - change in PVO institutional capacity, service delivery, and sustainability.

### Institutional Capacity:

Data collection for the Discussion-Oriented Self-Assessment (DOSA) has been proceeding with the cohort of grantees. Final data collection for the DOSA, which is PVC's main instrument for measuring a change in institutional capacity, will be completed this spring. Preliminary results from one third of the organizations confirms the modest measurable increase recorded last year in improved institutional capacity, while indicating a recurring cohort-wide pattern in two areas. Generally, PVO's rank human resources management lowest of the six capacity areas and external relations only slightly higher. Conversely, Service delivery and financial resource management are ranked highest by most organizations. This consistent shape of the data distribution suggests that investments made by USAID and other donors in service delivery and financial management have

paid off. IR1 data on the technical capacity of PVOs is consistent with this finding. The areas that hold the most potential for change are human resource development and external relations. Members of the DOSA cohort have expressed high interest in obtaining follow-on technical assistance to address institutional weaknesses that have been identified by the DOSA. PVC is exploring ways to supplement assessment with intervention approaches.

In addition to organizational changes measured by DOSA, PVC is tracking membership in formal networks that provide a forum for inter-organizational learning, peer consultation and practitioner knowledge. Membership in the two networks (CORE and SEEP) being tracked increased. In addition, it is notable that a number of new networks have coalesced around special interest issues and initiatives that PVC has set in motion. These networks have resulted in new forms of joint learning and collective action. For example, informal networks have resulted from TA and support PVC provided to the business/PVO partnerships initiative (CorCom), and the International Forum on Capacity Building, and exploration of an environment PVO network is currently in progress. With the proliferation of new networks, PVC will rethink the measurement of this indicator in FY99, reaching a decision whether it would be desirable to capture a broader range of “social capital” building activities (joint ventures, networks and linkages) that are critical to implement effective development innovations.

#### Service Delivery

Data on change in PVO capacity to deliver sustainable child survival services is calculated on a three-year mean and will not be reported in this R4. However, there is good evidence from the IR that the technical capacity of PVC’s partners to design state-of-the-art (SOTA) technical interventions in all program areas are uniformly high. This is an important cross-check on the institutional capacity of the PVOs. The challenge facing PVC is to adjust these SO level indicators to more closely match service delivery trends in the health sector. PVO field programs are increasingly working on quality of care, health communication/behavior change and organizational strengthening issues. While the current set of SO level indicators do not directly address these issues, it should be noted that the CORE network of Child Survival PVO implementers have created a very active committee to analyze and address this issue.

The PVOs implementing microenterprise projects continue to improve operations – the number and dollar amount of loans increased, as did the percent of women borrowers, which increased from 66% in 1996 to 77% in 1997. Collaboration between the Global microenterprise office and BHR/PVC is culminating in a more detailed analysis of the microenterprise data and a deeper look at sustainability issues in these programs. Finally, PVC expects to link the microenterprise and child survival databases into the new PVC performance monitoring database currently underway. PPC is providing guidance to the office on this work.

The office anticipates making a number of revisions to the indicators to increase sensitivity to the nuances of yearly change and to examine the level at which the objectives and indicators are set. This will result in both eliminating and broadening some indicators. For example, last year PVC discussed including a set of Farmer to Farmer service delivery indicators at the SO level. PVC believes that results data emerging from the program’s performance monitoring system has evolved to the point that it can provide valid estimates of program performance. For example,

FTF data indicates that as a result of short-term volunteer technical inputs: 33% of the host organizations adopted new or innovative practices; 22% reported increased production; and 20% increased their financial performance.

### Sustainability

PVC has placed additional emphasis on sustainability in all of its programs. While the office does not expect to see immediate evidence of this in the key SO level indicator, some results are beginning to be seen at the IR level. This year 54% of the applications in response to the Child Survival RFA had acceptable sustainability plans, as compared to 39% last year.

PVC has put into place a cluster of actions that are intended to increase financial planning for sustainability among the PVO partners. The Matching Grant Program required business plans as part of the DIP process; designed a training program to assist recipients to build skills in developing business plans to ensure sustainability of program benefits; Sustainability Development Services provided TA to grantees to enhance strategic and business planning; and, CorCom conducted planning meetings to engage the PVO community in developing corporate partnerships.

### Improved Operational and Technical Capacity (IR1)

This indicator looks at PVO planning capacity through rating the quality of project designs. PVC's continued emphasis on managing for results at the annual RFA meeting and during review of the DIPs has resulted in a general improvement in PVO project planning. Although all targets in all sub-areas were not met, PVC is comfortable with the steady increase in all areas of planning capacity since the 1996 baseline. The data shows that PVOs have clearly moved towards project designs with results-oriented (as opposed to input oriented) objectives. Continued emphasis will be placed on the challenge of performance monitoring and data for decision making. Specific attention needs to be directed towards helping PVOs define what level in the chain of results they need to set their objectives and indicators. While the PVOs are adept at using the common intervention and technical indicators, they are less experienced in using capacity building indicators. The IR Team is moving towards broadening this IR to capture change in the full program cycle --- design through implementation and use of performance data to restructure programs beyond the PVC-funded project

### Strengthened Partnership between USAID and US PVOs (IR2)

The office gauges progress in the partnership between USAID and U.S. PVOs, an important element of increasing PVO capability to achieve sustainable service delivery, by reporting on the degree to which the Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid (ACVFA) receives Agency endorsement and action on implementing its policy agenda. The listing of Agency actions taken on ACVFA recommendations has been maintained in a "report card." As evidenced by the cumulative percent of recommendations adopted, the effectiveness of the ACVFA has increased and the partnership between USAID and U.S. PVOs strengthened. The new ACVFA membership has less of an Agency reform agenda than the last membership and has expanded into interesting new directions on results reporting, civil society, and non-presence issues. This indicator will be reassessed in the coming months to ensure their future appropriateness.

In addition to ACVFA's policy agenda, PVC tracks the Agency's progress to reach the 40% of development assistance to PVOs, called for by Vice President Gore and endorsed by Agency leadership. PVC uses this as a barometer of the Agency's partnership with U.S. PVOs by virtue of the amount of development assistance that is channeled through the PVO community. At the current rate of change, it appears unlikely that the Agency will meet the 40% by FY 2000. As stated above, discussion as to the relevancy of IR 2 indicators will take place in the near future.

#### Strengthening US PVO and NGO Partnership (IR3)

Linking US PVO development activities to the strengthening of local level partner organizations has been a priority for PVC for the past three years. PVC has very effectively used the RFA process to encourage US PVOs to shift from a direct service delivery role to an intermediary role to support the capacity development of local partners. These efforts have been successful. The targets of all three indicators have either been met or are near completion. The IR team is of the opinion that the current IR and indicators do not adequately capture the dynamism of the USAID-PVO-NGO partnership and has been exploring with its external PVO team members how to redesign the IR and indicators. There is consensus within the IR3 team that one of the indicators should focus on the quality of the partnership rather than the existence of a partnership, which has been the primary focus for the past three years. More importantly, as the new \$2.5 million dollar NGO Capacity Building Initiative will be absorbed under IR3, some adjustments to the IR and its indicators will be needed to properly reflect the results expected from this new intervention. The team plans to have a proposal in place for discussion at the yearly stocktaking meeting in PVC.

#### Improved Mobilization of Resources by PVC's PVO Partners (IR4)

There was a slight increase in the percent of PVOs with a non-diversified funding base in 1997. PVC believes that this ratio of public to private support is essentially at a plateau. The major changes over the past three years are within the "total private support" category. Among the PVC's partners there was a change in private revenue as a portion of total private support. This indicates that more of our partners are diversifying their source of income and engaging in revenue generating activities to stabilize and diversify their funding base. This trend is particularly pronounced among the larger PVOs (revenues > \$50 million), where there has been a steady increase from 1995 to 1997 in (a) private support, (b) private contributions, and (c) private revenue. From 1995 to 1997, mid-size PVOs (revenue from \$25 to \$50 million) have seen an increase in the dollar-value of in-kind contributions and a decrease in private revenue. The dollar amount of total private support in this mid-size group also appears to be declining. To get a better estimate of PVC's effect on PVO financial diversity, the office will continue to track changes in the total private support category and the private revenue stream. The team will consider adding an indicator that is more sensitive to the specific actions PVC is taking to build fiscal diversity in PVC-funded grantees. For example, the Sustainable Development Services project that is charged with assisting PVOs build financial diversity and sustainability reported a substantial increase in the number of PVOs in their working group using revenue generating approaches (39% in 1997 to 81% in 1998).

#### US Public Awareness Raised (IR5)

Based on the results of the phone survey for the FY97 R4 report and the survey conducted at the 1998 RFA meeting, the IR team determined that there was insufficient reason to collect data on



the indicator on a yearly basis. PVC management agreed with the proposed plans to conduct the survey in FY2000. The actions taken by PVC that place a priority on informing and educating the public about development needs and successes have largely been successful. The grant applications across all programs submitted to PVC for assistance contain thoughtful sections on what the PVO applicant is doing to raise public awareness of their activities. For example, the Farmer to Farmer (FTF) program collects data on grantee and volunteer efforts to raise public awareness. The data indicates that over the past two years 50% of the 1,345 FTF volunteers performed public outreach activities on return from their short-term assignments. The IR team will continue to focus on an action agenda to keep this issue a priority, e.g., develop a toolbox for the PVC website that contains information on effective public awareness campaigns, highlighting specific PVO accomplishments. For the annual PVC stocktaking, the team will explore what directions this IR could take in the next reiteration of PVC's strategic plan.

## **2. Performance and prospects**

PVC has actively pursued the key actions outlined in last year's R4: increasing emphasis on PVO/NGO partnering in all RFAs; providing TA and training support for PVO/NGO partnering; expanding collaboration with other Bureaus to improve information sharing and to document and disseminate innovative Agency approaches to capacity building of local NGOs; and increasing direct support to USAID missions for local NGO capacity building.

The internal yearly review of data has also enabled the office to discuss general trends and specific measurement issues that affect our ability to achieve and document performance:

- The plateau in immunization coverage rates seen in a number of countries worldwide will affect PVC's ability to demonstrate progress using the current set of child survival indicators. It is unlikely that we will continue to see an increase in the immunization coverage and indeed we could see a decrease in immunization coverage rates in countries that have reduced investments in core child survival interventions. The Child Survival Division in conjunction with its technical support contractor and the Global Bureau are exploring how the Agency is going to address this issue.
- Demonstrating changes in the sustainability of PVC-funded programs continues to be a measurement and management challenge. We anticipate that it will take several years for the actions taken this fiscal year to result in improved capacity to document program sustainability.
- On the IR level, while the PVOs have moved to more results-oriented objectives in their project design, approximately half of the designs submitted had acceptable indicators. The office is taking steps to assist the PVOs with performance monitoring issues and anticipates continued progress in this area.
- As more mature, high performing PVOs graduate from the Matching Grant Program, the introduction of new, nascent microenterprise PVOs will slow the rate of change in the current indicator.

- The decrease in PVC's budget for FY 1999 is accelerating changes in the Matching Grant Program. With minimal resources available outside the microenterprise earmark, a majority of the Matching Grant portfolio will be in this sector. The program is at risk of no longer mirroring the Agency's strategic objectives, as it has traditionally done.
- To improve our ability to document improvements in PVO capacity, PVC is discussing refinements to the DOSA that will increase its sensitivity and enhance its usefulness as a management tool. PVC anticipates seeing small, steady improvements in DOSA scores.

### **3. Possible adjustments to plans**

This year, PVC will hold a more intensive retreat to do a three-year review of the strategic plan. The office will undergo a DOSA self assessment similar to that taken by our grantees to measure the capacity of PVC as an organization, conduct the annual R4 stocktaking, and put into place the process for updating the strategic plan and performance monitoring plan. After completing three years of data collection and analysis, the office will review the performance monitoring systems, the current make-up of IR teams, identify staff constraints and vulnerabilities in proceeding to make revisions, and assign responsibilities for performance measurement.

### **4. Specific actions the office is taking to manage for results**

The yearly action agenda developed at the post-R4 retreat is an example of how PVC is using performance data that identifies weakness to make operational changes within the programs. For example, the challenges of collecting sustainability data from the project evaluations led to an internal review of the evaluations, resulting in revised evaluation guidance and increased cross-program discussion and learning. This has improved program integration. Secondly, when performance targets were met or the trend indicated that prospects for final achievement was quite strong, PVC either introduced a second set of indicators or collected additional information on which to develop the next generation of indicators. For example, the targets for IR3 are being met, and the IR3 team is now in the process of refocusing the indicator on quality issues. Finally, the IR teams have been particularly effective in transferring best practices and approaches across sectors and programs. For example, a planning matrix that was typical in many of the best designed PVO applications in the Child Survival program was adapted by PVC for use in all the RFAs.

In addition to working towards a more consistent office-wide approach in key operations, PVC is placing emphasis on detailed program-specific data and analysis. The Child Survival Division is re-examining the wealth of data available from PVO projects to develop a child survival annex for next year's R4 report that will be specifically targeted for use in the APR. The current study initiated by the Cooperative Development and Matching Grants programs examines the comparative advantage and lessons learned from cooperative lending and microenterprise development approaches to micofinance. The development and implementation of the office wide database and management information system will support overarching analysis and lead to more effective use of the data and cross-office learning.

**Table 1: SO1 Performance Indicator 2**

<b>Performance Indicator 2:</b> Change in the number of members of formal networks or associations of voluntary organizations			
<b>Unit of Measurement:</b> Combined PVO membership of two networks <b>Data Source:</b> Networks records 1997: CORE 31 and SEEP 44 members. 1998: Core 32 and SEEP 50 members <b>Indicator Definition:</b> Measures change in collaboration and self strengthening <b>Comments 1998:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While membership in these two PVC-supported networks has increased, it is important to note that a number of new networks have coalesced around special interest issues and initiatives that PVC has set in motion. These informal networks have resulted in new forms of joint learning and collective action. For example PVC has provided support to a number of new NGO alliances and to business/PVO partnerships</li> <li>PVC was a key actor in conceptualizing and supporting the emergency of the International Forum on Capacity Building. The May 98 start-up meeting in Brussels provided an arena for Northern and Southern NGOs to set capacity-building priorities. The preparation for the meeting catalyzed intensive regional interest and discussions on implementing capacity building initiatives.</li> <li>With the proliferation of new networks PVC will rethink the measurement of this indicator in FY99. The objective will be to capture a broader range of “social capital” (joint ventures, networks and linkages) building activities that are critical to implement effective development innovations.</li> </ul>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	<b>1996 (B)</b>	-	62
	<b>1997</b>	65	75
	<b>1998</b>	79	82
	<b>1999</b>	83	
	<b>2000</b>	87	

**Table 2: IR1 Performance Indicator 1**

<b>Performance Indicator 1: Percent PVOs that develop quality program plans</b>					
<p><b>Unit of Measurement:</b> Percent (%)</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> During the applications review score sheets are filled out by MG technical reviewers and CS PVC staff. <b>Indicator Definition:</b> Indicator measures the change in the quality of PVO program planning. <b>Population:</b> All applications in the MG and CS divisions. Applications scored in 1996, 1997 and 1998 were 76, 61 and 73, respectively. <b>Calculation:</b> Numerator: number of program applications that scored acceptable with minor changes, good and excellent. Denominator: total applications</p> <p><b>Criteria developed for five sub areas:</b> 1) Measurable and quantifiable results-oriented objectives (Obj), 2) Appropriate indicators (Ind); 3) Use of state of the art (SOTA) technology, 4) Sustainability (Sust) plans, and 5) Partnerships (Partn). <b>Scoring system:</b> 1) Excellent; 2) Good; 3) Acceptable with minor changes; 4) Acceptable with major changes; and 5) Unacceptable</p> <p><b>Comments 1998:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There continues to be a steady increase in most areas since the 96 baseline (the decrease from 61% to 52% in the “Ind” category may be the result of incomplete sample in the CS applications in 97).</li> <li>• Improvements can be tied to USAID’s focus on managing for results and the stress that PVC placed on this issue in both the 97 and 98 RFAs. Marked improvements were seen in the MG program in the objectives, indicators and SOTA categories. Marked improvements were seen in the CS program in the sustainability and partnerships.</li> <li>• The PVO capacity to identify valid indicators is a major area of concern that will require additional resources if progress is to be made.</li> <li>• The IR team is looking to improve the quality and consistency of data to be collected in 1999.</li> <li>• DevEd and FTF plans were scored in 1998 but scores were not included in the calculations.</li> </ul>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Quality Scored</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
		<b>1996 (B)</b>	Obj	-	53%
			Ind	-	39%
			SOTA	-	83%
			Sust	-	37%
			Partn	-	58%
		<b>1997</b>	Obj	58%	57%
			Ind	44%	61%
			SOTA	≥90%	97%
			Sust	42%	52%
			Partn	63%	72%
		<b>1998</b>	Obj	65%	63%
			Ind	65%	52%
			SOTA	≥90%	95%
			Sust	55%	52%
			Partn	75%	77%
		<b>1999</b>	Obj	≥65%	
			Ind	≥65%	
			SOTA	≥90%	
			Sust	≥60%	
Partn			≥80%		

	<b>2000</b>	Obj	≥70%	
		Ind	≥70%	
		SOTA	≥90%	
		Sust	≥60%	
		Partn	≥80%	

**Table 3: IR2 Performance Indicator 2**

<b>Performance Indicator 2: Percentage of USAID program funds channeled through US PVOs</b>			
<b>Unit of Measurement:</b> Percent <b>Data Source:</b> USAID/M <b>Indicator Definition:</b> Measures the amount of development assistance going to the PVO community <b>Comments 1998:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This indicator is calculated by the Management Bureau.</li> <li>*Data for FY98 and FY99 are not available .</li> </ul>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>
	<b>1995 (B)</b>	-	30.5%
	<b>1996</b>	N/A	34%
	<b>1997</b>	37%	33.6%
	<b>1998 (T)</b>	40%	*
	<b>1999</b>	40%	*
	<b>2000</b>	40%	

**Table 4: IR 3 Performance Indicator 1**

<b>Performance Indicator 1: Percent of PVC grants where there has been a clear transfer of resources by PVOs to local level partners.</b>				
<p><b>Unit of Measurement:</b> Percent (%)</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Phone survey</p> <p><b>Indicator Definition:</b> Measures the change in resource transfer to Southern NGOs.</p> <p><b>Sample:</b> Random sample of cooperative agreements from the MG, CS, CD and FtF programs were drawn; 30 in FY96, 61 in FY97 and 72 in FY98. Project managers were interviewed in all years. In FY97, survey was expanded to include actual funds transferred and external resources mobilized.</p> <p><b>Comments 1998:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>An increase from 64% in 1997 to 81% in 1998 was observed. In the RFA from the last two years grantees were required to have a local partner. The increase may be the result of greater awareness about partnerships and greater transfer of resources due to changes in the RFA. Targets are expected to be met.</li> </ul>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
		<b>1996 (B)</b>	-	55%
		<b>1997</b>	60%	64%
		<b>1998</b>	75%	82%
		<b>1999</b>	90%	
		<b>2000</b>	100%	

**Table 5: IR3 Performance Indicator 2**

<b>Performance Indicator 2: Percent of PVC grants where the PVO has clearly established formal partnerships with local partners.</b>				
<p><b>Unit of Measurement:</b> Percent (%)</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Phone survey</p> <p><b>Indicator Definition:</b> Measures the change in the percent of PVC grants in which the grantee has established formal partnerships with at least one local partner.</p> <p><b>Sample:</b> Random sample of cooperative agreements from the MG, CS, CD and FtF programs were drawn; 30 in FY96, 61 in FY97 and 72 in FY98. Project managers were interviewed in all years.</p> <p><b>Comments 1998:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local partners are now required in the MG and CS RFAs and are part of all CD and FtF activities. The IR3 team is planning to redevelop this indicator.</li> </ul>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
	<b>1996 (B)</b>	-	50%	
	<b>1997</b>	65%	75%	
	<b>1998</b>	≥75%	100%	
	<b>1999</b>	≥75%		
	<b>2000</b>	>95%		

**Table 6: IR3 Performance Indicator 3**

<b>Performance Indicator 3: Percent of PVC grants in which local partners have access to the internet.</b>				
<p><b>Unit of Measurement:</b> Percent (%)</p> <p><b>Data Source:</b> Phone survey</p> <p><b>Indicator Definition:</b> Measures the change in access to communication technologies</p> <p><b>Sample:</b> Random sample of cooperative agreements from the MG, CS, CD and FtF programs were drawn; 30 in FY96, 61 in FY97 and 72 in FY98. Project managers were interviewed in all years.</p> <p><b>Comments 1998:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The target for 1998 was met and a slow increase is expected for the next two years. Indicator depends on availability of internet and cost of the service. The survey found that only 16% of grantees are helping their partners with Y2K problems.</li> </ul>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
		<b>1996 (B)</b>	-	46%
		<b>1997</b>	54%	70%
		<b>1998</b>	75%	74%
		<b>1999</b>	80%	
		<b>2000</b>	80%	



**Table 7: IR4 Performance Indicator 1**

<b>Performance Indicator 1:</b> The percent of PVC grantees with a non-diversified funding base				
<p><b>Unit of Measurement:</b> Percent (%) PVC grantees with a "less-diverse funding base". <b>Data Source:</b> VOLAG. Data reported is for 1997. <b>Sample: Population:</b> All active PVC grantees in CS, MG, FtF, CD division; 46 in 1996, 48 in 1995. <b>Criteria:</b> The degree of "privateness" was calculated for each PVO. PVOs were categorized into "diverse funding base" and "less-diverse funding base". PVOs with 70% of total revenue coming from US government sources were classified as "less-diverse". Corrections were made in 1995 data (B). <b>Indicator Definition:</b> Indicator measures the PVO dependence on USAID funds.</p> <p><b>Comments 1998:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There was a slight increase in the percent of PVOs with a non-diversified funding base in 1997. The current privatenes data is relatively high. It may be unrealistic to expect that this ratio will change substantially over time.</li> <li>• In addition to looking at the larger public/private ratio, PVC has been tracking changes in the various streams that make up total private support. Total private support includes three revenue streams: in-kind contributions, private contributions and private revenue. Over a three-year period the dollar amount of total private support to PVOs increased. There was a noticeable increase from 1995 to 1996 and 1997. However, when examined by PVO size, total private support remained relatively static for most organizations. The exception was among the largest PVOs (revenues &gt; \$50 million), where there was a steady increase from 1995 to 1997 in (a) private support, (b) private contributions; and (c) private revenue. From 1995 to 1997, mid-size PVOs (revenue from \$25 to \$50 million) saw an increase in the dollar amount of in-kind contributions and a decrease in the private revenue stream. The dollar amount of total private support in this mid-size group also appears to be declining.</li> <li>• To track PVC effect on PVO financial diversity PVC will continue to track changes in the private revenue stream and consider bring on-line an additional indicator that is sensitive to the specific actions PVC is taking to build fiscal diversity in PVC-funded grantees.</li> </ul>	<b>Year</b>	<b>Planned</b>	<b>Actual</b>	
		<b>1994</b>	-	16%
		<b>1995 (B)</b>	-	17%
		<b>1996</b>	17%	13%
		<b>1997</b>	11%	18%
		<b>1998</b>		
		<b>1999</b>		
		<b>2000</b>		

