

## END Fund Program Analysis Tool

The Program Analysis Tool is the primary document of record for the END Fund due diligence process. Other documents – such as the logic model or logical framework, application, budget, etc, are necessary to complete effective due diligence and support this document. However, this document provides the primary due diligence summary for the END Fund database. This should be kept in mind as the Program Analysis Tool is completed, so that it provides an accurate and clear understanding of the END Fund’s effort to evaluate both an organization and its proposed project and highlights both the potential impact of a grant and the potential risks.

This worksheet is broken down into sections that correspond with each of the 7 categories. For each, read the Critical Question, which represents the information that the analyst (the person completing due diligence on the organization), must understand in order to complete the section. The critical question is not meant to be answered directly. Rather, it is intended to guide the analyst in determining if s/he has effectively completed due diligence for that section. Even if the analyst checked against all END Fund standards, if in his or her mind the analyst can’t answer the Critical Question, then there is more due diligence work to be done for that section.

No template can anticipate all the categories and standards that could be required to answer the Critical Questions for every potential project. It is the analyst’s job to think critically and analytically to ensure that the analyst have proactively uncovered any critical issues required to effectively answer the Critical Questions.

Once due diligence for a C is complete, if the answer to the Critical Question is “no” for any of the first four sections (Context; Clarity; Coherence; and Capability and Capacity), then the project should not be considered for funding by END Fund donors (with rare exceptions). A “no” answer to the Critical Questions for the remaining Cs (Credibility and Continuous Improvement) should result in the analyst giving serious consideration as to whether the project should move forward.

For each category, note the ‘END Fund Standards’ column. As the analyst reads each standard, consider the organization and proposed project’s strengths and weaknesses. It is not necessary to address each standard in the analyst’s notes but all standards with a (\*) must be addressed in the summary. Under Strengths, only comment on significant strengths that will help the project succeed, point to the unique selling point for the project, or helping to identify its contribution to the overall SI or cluster goals. Under Weaknesses, any weaknesses that may cause the project to fail to achieve its goals should be noted.

After the analyst has considered the category, s/he should complete the Program Analysis Score Sheet for that section. A risk for the section should be noted in the summary section and a brief explanation of the risk provided. The analyst should ensure that he or she has sufficiently addressed issues in the **Critical Question** from each ‘C’ in the Summary box for each C.

**Project ID:**  
**Program/SI:**  
**Organization:**  
**Grant Amount:**  
**Duration:**  
**Total Lives:**  
**Sector:**  
**Sub sector:**  
**Interventions:**  
**Location:**  
**Analyst:**

**Project Summary**



## Context

**Critical Question:** Is this project necessary, appropriate, and strategic given the *environment* in which it will be implemented?

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Environment:</b> The recent political, social, economic, and cultural factors that comprise the area of implementation.	1. The current and local events and trends in the region are favorable for the project's implementation. If unfavorable conditions exist, the organization has taken adequate steps to ensure project's success.*	-	-

### Context Summary

## Clarity

**Critical Question:** Is the *project design* appropriate and reasonable, verifying the estimated *impact* numbers?

(Assessment for this section will rely heavily on the project proposal, project log frame, and the Solution's granting strategy.)

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
<b>Project Design:</b> The methodology of each intervention in the project.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project addresses at least one cause related to the need.*</li> <li>2. Timing of implementation makes sense given the type of project and its location.*</li> <li>3. Project design reflects adherence to best practices.*</li> <li>4. Outputs and activities from the log frame support the likelihood of success.*</li> <li>5. Beneficiary selection is fair.</li> <li>6. Possible delays in beneficiary selection are mitigated by a well designed selection plan.</li> <li>7. Beneficiaries contribute through commitment of time, labor, or financial resources.</li> </ol>	-	-
<b>Impact:</b> The breadth (number) and depth (extent) of change realized among beneficiaries as a result of the proposed project.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Project implementation plan confirms that goals are realistic and achievable within the funding period.*</li> <li>2. The depth and breadth of this project's impact is comparable with other projects using the same intervention in the same region.</li> <li>3. The organization has a well-developed network. Where necessary, it will be able to partner with other organizations to achieve maximum results.</li> </ol>	-	-

### Clarity Summary

## Coherence

**Critical Question:** Does the organization's experience in the *location* and its *track record* in the region and sector adequately prepare it to accomplish the project goals? If applicable, is the project an integral part of the *Strategic Initiative (SI)*?

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
------------	--------------------	-----------	------------

<p><b>Location:</b> The specific location where the project will be implemented.</p>	<p>1. Implementer has experience with similar types of projects in the same geographic area.</p>	-	-
<p><b>Track Record:</b> The organization's history and background as it relates to the proposed project.</p> <p>*If there is not a track record, please complete the 'Expertise' piece in the Capability and Capacity for Authorization.</p>	<p>1. Project aligns with organization's goals and values.*  2. Organization has experience in region, sector, and intervention related to this project.*  3. Organization has experience with the project's design and scale such that there are no significant changes which could hinder project's success.  4. The proposed breadth and depth of impact is similar and does not significantly exceed those from previous, similar projects.</p>	-	-
<p><b>For projects within an SI:</b> The proposed project's contribution to overall SI goals.</p>	<p>1. The project is strategic and worthy of funding as it aligns with and contributes to the overall SI goals.*  2. The project complements other projects in the SI but still adds unique value.*</p>		

**Coherence Summary**

**Capability and Capacity**  
**Critical Question:** If the grant is placed, does the organization have the *leadership* and *staff, expertise, implementation resources*, plan for *sustainability*, and *capacity for expansion* necessary to accomplish its goals and objective, and maintain the project's scope beyond the project-funding period (where necessary)?

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
<p><b>Leadership:</b> Individuals directly involved with the proposed project and the related system of developing and expanding leadership abilities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is appropriate depth of leadership within the organization with a well-developed leadership contingency plan. The project could continue if something should happen to current leadership.*</li> <li>2. The current leadership has been in charge of the organization for more than two years and the organization seems to be stable in terms of the leadership's commitment and abilities.*</li> </ol>	-	-
<p><b>Expertise:</b> Members of the organization or committed affiliates whose backgrounds (training and experience) provide the abilities necessary for project implementation.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Either project staff or project consultants have experience with similar design and scale and will be actively involved throughout the project.*</li> </ol>	-	
<p><b>Resources:</b> Number, commitment, level of training and experience for staff and other necessary supplies.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The number and quality of staff is adequate for the project's success.*</li> <li>2. If the project relies on a third party in the surrounding area for implementation, the organization has mitigated the risk of the party being unable to fulfill its commitment.*</li> <li>3. If the project requires an increase in staffing levels, the project plan includes sufficient time and resources to find, place, and train new staff members.</li> </ol>	-	-
<p><b>Sustainability:</b> Organization's ability to maintain proposed scale including leadership, staff, and funding resources.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The organization has plans in place to maintain and grow leadership, staff, and financial resources in ways that sustain the proposed project's scale of service. This includes building donor support and/or financial sustainability through fees, self-sustainability initiatives, etc.</li> </ol>	-	-

<p><b>Capacity for Expansion:</b> Organization's ability to manage this project's level of funding and programs.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This project represents a manageable and sustainable level of expansion given the budget size relative to last year's operating expenses. (Provide the ratio of this project's budget to last year's operating budget.)*</li> <li>2. Does the organization have commitments to other projects (new or continuing) in the coming year that, when considered together with this project, could exceed the organization's capacity and prevent it from achieving the goals of this project? (If so, determine the total amount of the organizational budget for this year and compare with the previous three years' budgets. Include all four figures in the summary.)</li> </ol>	-	-

**Credibility**

**Critical Question:** Do references' opinions, current community presence, and financial and *governance* systems indicate that the organization's *results* and *integrity* are respected and accepted by their community and peers, such that project success is likely and, if necessary, partnership with other organizations is possible?

<b>Definition</b>	<b>END Fund Standards</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
-------------------	---------------------------	------------------	-------------------

<p><b>Reputation &amp; Results:</b> Verification from:  local reference who has seen the organization and its related projects  other implementers  previous organization funders</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Based on the Site Visit Reference, an independent source’s assessment compares well with the organization’s self-assessment.*</li> <li>2. The organization is seen as effective by others working locally in the same sector.</li> <li>3. The organization is viewed positively by previous funders. There is evidence of ongoing support by these funders.</li> <li>4. Evidence strongly supports a clear endorsement for the organization from the community.</li> </ol>	-	-
<p><b>Integrity:</b> Character and financial transparency and honesty verified by:  at least one objective reference (one who is not related to the organization and will not benefit from the grant) who comments on the project leader’s integrity  a suitable financial reporting system</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. At least one objective reference supports the fact that the organization and the project have a reputation for integrity (no history of graft/ corruption/misuse of funds)*</li> <li>2. The financial reporting and auditing system promote transparency and integrity throughout the organization (will be assessed by the Financial Analyst).*</li> <li>3. Connection to terrorists or terrorist networks. The U.S. government requires that we check all organizations and their leadership against certain lists. The required lists are all checked by the Complinet system. All organization and project leaders, including board members, should be checked through the Complinet system and results included in the summary for this section. Results of this search must be included in the summary for this section.</li> </ol>	-	-



<b>Governance:</b> System that provides organizational oversight and maintains standards and principles	1. The governing board maintains enough independence to properly manage leadership and organizational success.	-	-
---	--	---	---

**Credibility Summary**

**Continuous Improvement**  
**Critical Question:** Does the organization have as part of its program and project design, a plan to *monitor* project progress, *evaluate* results, and *revise and refine* their programs in a way that ensures continuous learning and improvement (especially for multi year initiatives)?

<b>Definition</b>	<b>END Fund Standards</b>	<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Weaknesses</b>
<b>Monitor:</b> System by which the organization assesses progress through each stage of the project	1. The organization has developed an achievable plan to determine the status of benchmarks throughout the project.* 2. The organization has a well-developed system to monitor projects.	-	

<p><b>Evaluate:</b> System by which the organization assesses project results (outputs and outcomes).</p>	<p>1. The plan for a baseline and follow up assessment is thorough and well defined and staff are equipped and available to perform this evaluation.*</p>	-	-
<p><b>Revise/Refine:</b> “Learning loop,” by which the organization utilizes information gained through monitoring and evaluation to improve program design and implementation.</p>	<p>1. Strong evidence supports the fact that the organization has a system to incorporate learning from previous experience to improve and refine its program design.*  2. The organization has a developed network of other organizations working in the same sector and is able to learn from this network.</p>	-	

**Continuous Improvement Summary**

## Conclusions

**Critical Questions:** Does the promise of return exceed the associated risks in such a way that END Fund should recommend this project for funding (within the relevant SI, if appropriate)? If so, what special needs and critical areas should be considered to support this organization for project success, sustainability and if applicable, significant contribution to the SI?

Definition	Questions to Consider	Recommendations
<b>Risk/Return:</b> The potential threats to the project success measured against the potential impact and strategic results for this project.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Upon completion of the Cs above and the Risk Score Sheet, what does the analyst see as the significant risks which could prevent the project from achieving its goals?*</li> <li>2. What does this project do the overall portfolio risk of the SI (if applicable)?</li> <li>3. What potential “return on investment” does this project offer that makes it worthy of recommendation? How does the ROI contribute to the success of the SI (if applicable)? *</li> </ol>	-
<b>Capacity Building:</b> Areas in which specified funds, training, or other resources could benefit the organization in a sustainable way.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Can any of the project’s significant risks be prevented through capacity building? If yes, what do the analyst recommend to be included for capacity building within the grant?*</li> </ol>	-
<b>External Monitoring:</b> The degree to which this project will need external monitoring and the areas in which the organization requires a strong level of accountability.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where should END Fund focus our efforts as we monitor this project?*</li> <li>2. Is there any reason that this project should require a more rigorous accountability structure than our standard monitoring policy?</li> </ol>	-

## Conclusions Summary

**Log Frame – completed and content checked, reviewed with potential grant recipient. All benchmarks consistent btw this and other documents such as Benchmarks table, and MOU.**

- Goal
- Impact
- Outputs
- Activities
- Inputs

**7 Cs Score Sheet (2<sup>nd</sup> tab only) – ideally, there should be comments in spreadsheet to right of any score above low, or for any component where it is important to document risk or explain lack of risk.**

- Risk Scores for...
  - Context
  - Clarity
  - Coherence
  - Capability and Capacity
  - Credibility
  - Continuous Improvement

**Supporting Data – Completed application including supporting data materials listed here.**

- All organization and board members checked against Complanet for US patriot act requirements
- Leadership names and organization
- Governance names and organization
- Financial statements for most recent 3 year period
- Operating expenses for last three years

**Results Reporting Plan**

- MOU
- Banking information

**Checklist before finalizing MOU**

- Completed Application and Representation letter (see end of application)
- Agreed upon and finalized Logical Model/ Logical Framework
- Agreed upon and finalized budget
- Agreed upon and finalized benchmarks by year (benchmark language and numbers consistent on all documents: Logic Model, Benchmarks table, and MOU)

- Completed 7 Cs Worksheet, signed off by supervisor
- Completed 7 Cs Scoresheet, signed off by supervisor
- Reference letters received from at least 1 other source (preferably 2 – 3 sources)\*
- 3 most recent year audited financials\*
- All relevant materials above, and any other important documents such as project narrative, any list of staff and their qualifications provided by org, etc, attached in Oasis

\*with previous supervisor approval, MOU can be finalized before these are received where necessary

**Additional information to gather**

- Registered charity number
- Country organization is registered in
- Are there any outstanding and significant legal cases against organization or any other previous activity that might call into question its track record?
- Is there any cause for concern in the organization's most recent audited accounts?
- Does publicly available information inform of organization's strong reputation
- Do references from two independent referees, including one recent donor, inform of organization's strong reputation?
- Has the organization been funded by other respected donors and/or is associated with respected figures in the relevant fields (provide examples)?
- Does the organization have an appropriate child protection policy?
- Is there a procedure in place to deal with conflict and security issues in-country?
- Is there a procedure in place to deal with issues of bribery and corruption in-country?
- Is the intervention/project solving a proven problem using a respected methodology?
- Does the organization have a strong track record for comparative project implementation and capacity to deliver?
- Does the project have the written approval of necessary in-country partners (eg MoH, MoE, etc.)?
- Is there a signed MOU with any delivery partners?
- If the project requires funding from other sources, has this been secured?