

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT



Center for Development Information and Evaluation

May 2001



Designing and Managing Partnerships Between U.S. And Host-Country Entities

This guide and other reports in the evaluation publication series of the Center for Development Information and Evaluation (CDIE) can be ordered from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse (DEC)
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: (703) 351-4006
Fax: (703) 351-4029
E-mail: docorder@dec.cdie.org

To access CDIE documents from the Internet, key in www.usaid.gov. Click on *Partner Resources*, then on *USAID Evaluation Publications*.

The CDIE Evaluation Publications Catalog and notices of recent publications are also available from the DEC.

U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the U.S. Agency for International Development.

Designing and Managing Partnerships Between U.S. and Host-Country Entities

May 2001

Project Director: Michael Kott,
Academy for Educational Development

Principal Writers: Chanya Charles and C. Stark Biddle,
Academy for Educational Development

Researchers: Tamer Ibrahim and Dana Wichterman,
Academy for Educational Development

Editors: Tom Kelly and Jean Bernard,
Academy for Educational Development;
Michael Hopps,
Conwal Incorporated

Graphic Designer: Ben Dyson,
Conwal Incorporated

Contents

List of Case Studies	iv
List of Tables	vii
Acknowledgments	ix
Foreword	xi
1. Introduction: Toward Effective Partnerships	1
2. Deciding Whether to Use Partnerships	5
Contributing to Results Through Partnerships	5
Will the Partnership Provide a Benefit?	5
3. Designing a Partnership Program	11
Partnership Management Models	11
Funding Instruments	14
Financial Arrangements to Strengthen Partnerships	17
Selecting the Partners	18
Roles and Responsibilities	19
4. Managing Partnerships	23
Facilitating the Partnering Process	23
Principles for Establishing Partnerships	24
Factors to Consider When Forming Partnerships	28
Creating Common Ground	32
Encouraging Communication and Collaboration	37
5. Monitoring and Assessing Results	41
Measuring the Effectiveness of Partnerships	42
Participatory Evaluation	43
Specific Tools for Evaluating Partnerships	46
6. Sustaining the Partnership	51
Indications of Organizational Sustainability	54
Indications of Financial Sustainability	54
Appendix A. Case Studies and Web Sites	A1
Appendix B. Workshop and Focus Group Participants And Interview Subjects	B1

Appendix C. Sample Memorandums of Understanding	C1
American International Health Alliance	C1
Katalysis North/South Development Partnership	C6
Catholic Relief Services	C10
Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum	C20
Appendix D. Katalysis Sample Potential Partner Criteria	D1
Appendix E. AIHA Sample Work Plan Guide	E1
Appendix F. The Alliance for Collaboration on Enterprise Development Sample Sustainability Plan	F1
Appendix G. Partnership Behavior Identification Tools	G1
Catholic Relief Services Partnership Reflection Tool	G1
American International Health Alliance High-Performance Teams Evaluation	G8
American International Health Alliance Leadership Inventory	G10
Leadership Self-Assessment Test	G12
Appendix H. Facilitation Tools	H1
Bibliography	

Case Studies

Case Study 2.1. Benefits to U.S. Partners	6
Case Study 3.1. Intermediary as Partnership Broker	12
Case Study 3.2. Funding the Host-Country Partner	17
Case Study 3.3. Capturing the 'True' Value of Cost Sharing	18
Case Study 3.4. Importance of Leadership	19
Case Study 4.1. Exploring Partnership Possibilities	25
Case Study 4.2. The Use of Program Development And Learning Funds	25
Case Study 4.3. Shared Experiences and Future Partnerships	26
Case Study 4.4. U.S. Private Voluntary Organization Relations With Namibian Nongovernmental Organizations	27
Case Study 4.5. Collaboration in the New Independent States	28
Case Study 4.6. Finding Common Ground	29
Case Study 4.7. Partnerships Between Nongovernmental And Commercial Organizations	30
Case Study 4.8. Overcoming Differences In Organizational Culture	31
Case Study 4.9. Choosing the Most Cost-Effective Partner	32
Case Study 4.10. Appreciative Inquiry Model For Building Partnerships	33
Case Study 4.11. Mutual Accountability Reflected In Formal Agreements	34
Case Study 4.12. U.S.-Russian Partnerships	34
Case Study 4.13. Katalysis Partnership Model	35

Case Study 4.14. Changing Relationships: From Project Office to Partner	36
Case Study 4.15. Communicating With Partners	37
Case Study 4.16. Catholic Relief Services/Ethiopia and the Nazareth Children’s Center and Integrated Development.....	38
Case Study 4.17. Insights From a 28-Year-Old Partnership	39
Case Study 5.1. Monitoring Results of the Partnership Between Sinclair Community College And the Center for Vocational Education	42
Case Study 5.2. Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy For the Institutional Partnerships Project	45
Case Study 6.1. New Partnerships Develop From Old Ones	52
Case Study 6.2. From Partnership to Autonomous Organization: The PRIP Trust	53
Case Study 6.3. Sustainability Grants	56

Tables

Table 1.1. Types of American and Host-Country Organization Partnerships	2
Table 2.1. Deciding Whether to Use Partnerships	8
Table 3.1. Advantages and Disadvantages of Alternative Partnership Management Models	13
Table 3.2. Characteristics of Alternative Funding Instruments for Partnerships	16
Table 3.3. Roles of Partnership Players	20
Table 4.1. Stages of Partnership	24
Table 6.1. Sustainability of Partnerships	51
Table 6.2. Organizational Sustainability	54

Acknowledgments

THE PARTNERSHIPS STUDY TEAM thanks Sharon Benoliel, senior social scientist in USAID’s Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination, for her invaluable direction and stimulating discussions.

The study team also thanks Sharon Pauling of USAID’s Africa Bureau and Janet Kerley of the Europe and Eurasia Bureau for their assistance in making trips to Kenya and Ukraine (to verify the team’s initial findings) highly productive. We also greatly appreciate the support from Stella Roudenko in the USAID/Kiev mission and members of the Academy for Educational Development office in Kiev, particularly Monique Goyette and Alexander Artamonov.

The team thanks all the people who were involved at various stages in the production of this document. Many people from USAID and various partner organizations contributed their time and ideas during review sessions and

provided comments on the report. A full list of people who were interviewed or participated in workshops or focus groups in Kenya, Ukraine, and Washington is found in appendix B.

The team also thanks the numerous organizations that shared their stories to create the 27 case studies listed throughout the guide. A complete list of these partnerships, along with Web site addresses, is found in appendix A.

Finally, the study team thanks the American International Health Alliance, the Alliance for Collaboration on Enterprise Development, Catholic Relief Services, the Katalysis Partnership, Pact Publications, and the Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum for generously providing the tools—such as memorandums of understanding, work plan guidelines, and partnership behavior assessments—that make up most of the appendixes.

Foreword

SINCE USAID'S INCEPTION, many of its activities have involved support for organizational linkages – or partnerships – between U.S.-based and overseas entities. But until the early 1990s the Agency devoted relatively little attention to the characteristics of the partnership process. While linkages were considered important, the partnership was viewed as secondary to the goal of supporting a project, program, or sectoral enhancement. Recently, there has been growing realization that a better understanding of the content and dynamics of partnership relations affects the results that can be achieved.

This guide originates from a story about a USAID-funded partnership that went wrong. What made the partnership fail? What could have been done to prevent the partnership's demise? Two particular questions emerged from the discussion:

- Why are some partnerships more effective and sustainable than others?
- What can the Agency do to help USAID-funded partnerships become effective and sustainable?

To address these questions, the Center for Development Information and Evaluation in USAID's Bureau for Policy and Program Coordination launched a study in June 1999 to advance the Agency's understanding of how best to work with partnerships so they become effective and sustainable. Although USAID funds all types of partnerships, senior management decided to limit the study to partnerships be-

tween organizations in the United States and those in host countries. Nevertheless, much of the guidance contained in this report may be useful for establishing and managing other types of partnerships.

From an extensive document analysis and interviews with key informants, phases 1 and 2 of the study identified a set of factors associated with establishing and managing effective and sustainable partnerships. The study also underscored the central importance of USAID systems and procedures as influencing factors that need to be taken into account by Agency personnel when working on partnerships.

While many of the factors identified in the *Durable Partnerships: Phase II Desk Study* may represent common knowledge, they are not always reflected in the Agency's work with partnerships. It was decided that more in-depth information on the nature of these factors, and on how to effectively manage potential impediments they posed, could provide USAID staff with a better understanding of how to work with partnerships more successfully. Thus, the third phase of the study was intended to translate these factors into operationally relevant guidance for USAID staff responsible for designing and managing partnership activities.

Preparation of this guide began with a workshop in Washington attended by about 40 USAID staff and U.S. private voluntary organization representatives with partnering experience. The workshop participants reviewed and discussed the factors identified in

**Partnerships,
though dynamic
and organic by nature,
can benefit from goal setting,
mutual responsibility for
achievements, and a rigorous
evaluation process.**

the phase 2 document. On the basis of their comments, more interviews, and document analysis, phase 3 culminated in this guide. It provides a practical application of the principles identified in the earlier phases and is intended to move beyond theory to offer guidance and concrete illustrations of which procedures and mechanisms work and which do not. Many USAID staff and partners in Kenya, Ukraine, and Washington reviewed drafts of the guide. Feedback from interviews and focus groups helped shape the final document.

The interviews and focus groups demonstrated to those of us working on the project that the concept of “partnership” evokes surprisingly strong emotions. In part, this is because the term is used to characterize virtually all of USAID’s organizational relationships. Seemingly everyone has a strong opinion on the topic of partnerships. These views range from beliefs that collaborative relationships fostered by USAID are a whole new way of doing business for the Agency to beliefs that partner-

ships have always been USAID’s way of operating. The truth lies somewhere in between. One theory about why talking about partnerships brings so much anxiety is that there is tension between the Managing for Results philosophy and the use of partnerships to achieve objectives. The dynamic nature of partnerships does not fit neatly into the perceived static nature of the results framework.

A hypothesis of this guide is that this tension can be resolved once it is recognized that the results framework is meant to be a flexible planning, management, and communication mechanism that must be inspected regularly and modified as needed.* At the same time, partnerships, though dynamic and organic by nature, can benefit from goal setting, mutual responsibility for achievements, and a rigorous evaluation process. This guide recommends several tools that will, without hampering the partnership dynamism, enable partners to monitor and evaluate their results and make needed adjustments to ensure that their partnership properly contributes to USAID’s development objectives. We believe that using these tools will facilitate partnership accountability to the requirements of a results framework.

We hope this guide will be a useful starting point for those contemplating the use of partnerships to achieve development results and a practical reference for those who are already carrying out partnership programs.

—MICHAEL KOTT
Project Director
Durable Partnerships Project
Academy for
Educational Development

*For more information on results frameworks, see the Center for Development Information and Evaluation’s Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Tips #13 (http://www.dec.org/pdf_docs/pnaca947.pdf). All uniform resource locaters (Web addresses) were current as this document went to press.

Introduction: Toward Effective Partnerships

THIS GUIDE is written for USAID staff, for intermediary organizations the Agency has chosen to develop partnerships between U.S. and host-country entities, and for the partners themselves. The terms “partner” and “partnership” are used widely to mean many different things and to describe a broad set of relationships between USAID and the organizations with which it works. Because of its use over the past decade at the Agency, and its association with reengineering, the term “partner” may generate varied expectations for USAID staff. While the term “partnerships” refers to many types of relationships, a decision was made during the conception of this study to concentrate the guide on partnerships between U.S. and host-country organizations.*

The type of *partnership* described herein is a voluntary collaboration between two or more entities (U.S. and host country) where the parties have agreed to cooperate to achieve mutually desirable objectives. Partners share decision-making, investment, risks, and rewards. Normally, the following elements are present in such a partnership:

- A belief that both entities will benefit from the relationship

- A transfer of human resources, financial resources, or both
- A written agreement that establishes a set of objectives and responsibilities and outlines operating procedures, such as how the entities will communicate with each other (see appendix C)
- Some evidence that the two organizations intend to collaborate in a manner that reflects the principles of partnership: balance, equity, sharing, and transparency (see appendix E)

Partners share decision-making, investment, risks, and rewards.

Each partnership is unique. There are different kinds of partnerships even within the category of U.S. and host-country organization partnerships – and each has its own dynamics. Partnerships involving volunteers[†] within established entities differ from partnerships between private voluntary organizations (PVOs) and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs).

In cases of partnerships between established entities, between coalitions, or between cities, volunteerism is a defining element. The people in these partnerships are involved because of their desire and commitment, not because it is in their job descriptions. Another type of partnership discussed

*For more discussion of the terms “partner” and “partnership,” see the *Durable Partnerships: Phase II Desk Study*.

[†]In this case, volunteers are employees of the organizations participating in the partnership. For example, a doctor at a hospital or a professor at a university is paid a regular salary while volunteering time to participate in the partnership activities.

Table 1.1. Types of American and Host-Country Organization Partnerships

Type	Example
Entity/coalition to entity/coalition	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ American International Health Alliance and Health Partnerships Program ■ U.S. Energy Association and Energy Industry Partnership Program
City/county to city/county	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Resource Cities Program
University to university	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ University Development Linkages Program ■ Association Liaison Office Program
American private voluntary organization to nongovernmental organization	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Fountain House (United States) and Human Soul (Russia) ■ Pact (United States) and Ethos (Brazil)
Business to business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ United States–Asia Environmental Partnership Program ■ EcoLinks Program

herein is between American PVOs* and host-country NGOs. Since the work of an American PVO involves interacting with international NGOs whether there is a partnership or not, the dynamics of this type of collaboration differ from the ones involving volunteer professionals.

Table 1.1 shows some types of American and host-country organization partnerships that are the concern of this guide.

For our purposes, a *sustainable partnership* is one that has demonstrated the organizational and financial capacity to continue the activities supported by the partnership without criti-

*“Private voluntary organization” is a term USAID’s Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation uses to refer to American NGOs, primarily those registered and working in partnership with the Agency.

cal reliance on USAID funds. Evidence of the financial sustainability of a partnership might include diverse donors and supporters, decreasing dependence on USAID funding, or willingness of the U.S. partner to maintain the partnership with its own budget.

An effective partnership in the USAID context should be able to demonstrate the achievement of significant program results that are also consistent with the goals and objectives of the participating organizations.

While there is no single recipe for developing partnerships, in every partnership some basic ingredients are critical. Many of the principles and skills needed to ensure an effective partnership are applicable to both the relationship between USAID and implementing organizations and between the U.S. and host-country partners. The collabora-

tive nature of a partnership mechanism differs from the traditional consulting mindset. For a partnership, process *is* important. This guide argues that to foster partnerships effectively between host-country and U.S. entities, USAID needs to practice what it preaches. Thus, the Agency's own relationship with implementing organizations that are to develop partnership programs also must be collaborative. Undeniably, there is some tension between the partnership philosophy (which stresses process, parity, and mutuality) and the results framework (which emphasizes results). This guide shows how such tension can be creative and productive.

Chapters 2 through 6 of the guide follow the steps an operating unit (a USAID field mission, regional entity, or Washington office that expends program funds to achieve a strategic or special objective) might take when considering use of a partnership to achieve a particular result.

Chapter 2, "Deciding Whether to Use Partnerships," outlines a series of points for USAID staff to consider while determining whether the overall effort to achieve a strategic objective could be strengthened by a partnership program.

Once USAID has decided to fund a partnership activity, readers can use chapter 3, "Designing a Partnership Program," to help them think through decisions regarding the use of a man-

agement model and funding mechanism. The chapter examines which management models and funding instruments are available. It also discusses different ways to select the partners and outlines the roles and responsibilities of the various actors.

Chapter 4, "Managing Partnerships," suggests ways of facilitating the partnering process by providing some insight into factors that affect the partnerships. It considers how to negotiate particular obstacles that might arise during the partnership process.

Chapter 5, "Monitoring and Assessing Results," discusses how monitoring a partnering activity differs from the monitoring of any other activity.

Chapter 6, "Sustaining the Partnership," considers what USAID can do to help ensure sustainability of the partnership.

The main text provides principles, factors, and suggestions for how to design and manage a partnership program, but the appendixes offer the guide's most practical benefits. The 27 case studies mentioned throughout the text are referenced with Web site addresses in appendix A. In addition, examples of memorandums of understanding, work plan guides, sustainability plans, and partnership behavior assessment tools are included in subsequent appendixes.

Deciding Whether To Use Partnerships

ONCE THE OPERATING UNIT has defined its strategic objectives, it must articulate various approaches for achieving results. One such approach may be partnerships between U.S. and host-country organizations.

Contributing to Results Through Partnerships

In deciding whether to include a partnership program to achieve a strategic objective, we should address three main questions:

1. Will the overall effort to achieve a strategic objective be strengthened by a partnership program?
2. In addition to the *outcomes* of partnerships, are there desired results associated with the *process* of partnering?
3. Is the strategic objective team willing to cope with the challenges of a partnership mechanism?

Partnerships offer flexibility and creativity in addressing development problems and can often help USAID deal more effectively with systemic issues that cut across sectoral domains. They can improve the technical and managerial ability of host-country organizations and add to the experience base of the American groups. Partnerships are associated with faster organizational learning, increased technical and managerial resources, improved capacity to adapt to change, and better prospects for financial and organizational

sustainability. Well-constructed partnerships can provide strong relationships that endure when USAID presence ends.

Partnerships should be considered as a possible mechanism to contribute to the achievement of any of USAID's objectives. Table 2.1 summarizes the issues to bear in mind when making the decision whether to use a partnership.

Will the Partnership Provide a Benefit?

In the strategic planning process, identify which results can benefit through partnership activities. Begin with questions that will eliminate the use of partnerships:

- Does the result require a tight, inflexible schedule?
- Is deviation from course likely to be costly or unwise?
- Is it important to obtain precise deliverables?
- Does USAID need to be directly involved in oversight to achieve this result?

If the answer to any of these questions is yes, a partnership program is probably not appropriate.

In most cases, the results USAID hopes to achieve will be the outcomes of the partnership relationship — activities and programs that are implemented jointly under the partnership agreement. Partnerships can be used to help

Case Study 2.1. Benefits to U.S. Partners

A glimpse at a few of the partnerships* under the Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development program reveals multiple benefits to American institutions. Rapid globalization has made it essential for American higher education institutions to internationalize their programs. Internationalization may take the form of adding courses, creating study-abroad programs, or developing partnerships with overseas institutions. Specific benefits to American higher education institutions include the following:

- Howard University School of Medicine in Washington and the University of the Transkei in South Africa have partnered to produce an Internet educational program in emergency medicine for health care providers in South Africa. Owing in part to this experience of developing training modules in emergency medicine and providing real-time consultations through the Internet, Howard University has now established a department of telemedicine.
- Metropolitan Community College in Omaha, Nebraska, is working with the Universidad Centroamericana José Simeón Cañas in El Salvador to develop and strengthen the preschool curriculum for at-risk children in rural areas. U.S. partners benefit from the development of training modules that will also be applicable immediately in the Omaha area, which has one of the fastest growing Latino populations in the United States. Metropolitan Community College is using the materials developed through the collaboration for its associate's degree program in early childhood education and to provide workshop training for local Hispanic groups.
- Highline Community College in Washington State is collaborating with the Polytechnic of Namibia to establish a center for entrepreneurial development and create linkages between the polytechnic and the business community. The partners have also organized trade missions for business executives. Thanks to connections made through the partnership, the Namibian prime minister recently negotiated the purchase of airplanes from Boeing Company. Developing such a high profile within its own community has benefited Highline tremendously.

*Refer to appendix A for more information on the cases described throughout the document.

achieve just about any result, particularly if the strategic objectives involve institutional capacity-strengthening or technical assistance. Of course, other mechanisms might be equally effective in achieving the results. What, then, is the advantage of using a partnership mechanism?

The reason to use partnerships is the value they add. Thus, as a means to an end, a partnership may be no better or worse than any other possible mechanism. As an end in itself, though, a partnership can add great value to a development program. This added value may not be captured specifically in the results framework. Thus, the de-

cision to use a partnership should be based not only on the utility of the partnership to achieve a tangible result but also on the added benefits that come from the process of partnering.

The benefits of partnerships between U.S. and host-country entities can be mutual. While on the surface it may appear that the host-country entity gains more from the relationship, closer examination reveals that the U.S. side receives significant, if not equivalent, benefits. The host-country organization may receive technical assistance or transfer of knowledge. But the U.S. organization, through partnership with an international organization, may see

old issues through a new lens. There have been cases of U.S. organizations revisiting their organizational structure and procedures after working in partnership with overseas groups. In addition, since some of the U.S. organizations are trying to enter new markets, working in partnership with a local organization enables them to get a foot in the door. Finally, internationalization is now an essential part of any U.S. university (see case study 2.1).

Special and significant benefits—financial and programmatic—typically accrue for partnerships that involve extensive use of volunteers by both the U.S. and host-country partners. The benefit from these participants' commitment is something that money simply cannot buy. But beyond the enthusiasm of volunteers, such partnerships can boast of bringing more tangible benefits, such as cost-effectiveness and sustainability. In addition to supporting specific results, volunteer-based partnerships promote an understanding of USAID's work to constituencies that are normally unfamiliar with foreign development work.

Thus, to what extent could the overall effort to achieve a strategic objective be strengthened by using a partnership? Specific questions to ask include

- Are ongoing, intellectual relationships between organizations desirable?
- Is it desirable to strengthen relationships between U.S. and host-country entities?
- Is the establishment of potential long-term (post-USAID) relationships, especially as part of an Agency exit strategy, desirable?

Partnerships can take long to get started, and their success frequently hinges on factors that are hard to attain and manage: trust, good communication, cross-cultural sensitivity.

- Is it desirable to link local organizations to a wider fabric of international connections?
- Is mobilization of volunteers desirable?

If the answer to any of these questions is yes, then a partnership program might be useful. It is important to be aware that even under the best circumstances the decision to use partnerships entails a commitment and readiness to deal with challenges specific to this mechanism.

Partnerships can be an effective way to accomplish a variety of results, though their dynamics involve specific tensions and their outcomes may seem less predictable than those resulting from traditional contracting arrangements. Partnerships can be unstable. They can be expensive to support and maintain. They often take long to get started, and their success frequently hinges on factors that are hard to attain and manage: trust, good communication, cross-cultural sensitivity.

Partnerships that rely on volunteers have their own set of complications. Volunteers from U.S. partner organizations may find it difficult to commit time. Further, they may have little overseas experience and may need extensive orientation. Though they

Table 2.1. Deciding Whether to Use Partnerships

Do not use a partnership if	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Result requires a tight, inflexible schedule ■ Deviation from course is likely to be costly or unwise ■ Precise deliverables are important ■ USAID needs to be directly involved in oversight to achieve the result
Partnerships may be appropriate if the intended results include	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Institutional capacity strengthening ■ Transfer of technical skills, methods, or new approaches ■ Transfer of important principles and values—for example, civil society ■ Two-way transfer of information
Partnerships are likely to be effective if additional intended results involve	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Ongoing intellectual relationships between organizations ■ Strengthening relationships between U.S. and host-country entities ■ Establishing potential long-term (post-USAID) relations ■ Linking local organizations to a wider fabric of international connections ■ Mobilizing volunteers
If using partnerships, be prepared for some of the following potential challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Relatively high level of interorganizational instability ■ Long and cumbersome formative period before progress is made in achieving programmatic results ■ Shifting goals and objectives as the partnership matures ■ Less control by USAID to manage and direct the relationship toward achieving Agency goals ■ Difficulties associated with working through volunteers

might be experts in their fields, volunteers often have little training or technical assistance delivery experience. Finally, in many cases, local government volunteers may not be able to schedule more than one trip overseas.

Thus, to achieve the strategic objectives and reap the value-added benefits of partnerships, the operating unit must be willing to work through the following potential challenges when working with partnerships:

- Goals and objectives shift as the partnership matures.
- There are potential difficulties associated with working through volunteers.

- Some partnerships endure a relatively high level of interorganizational instability.
- USAID has less control over managing and directing the relationship to achieve results contributing to Agency goals.
- Frequently a long and cumbersome formative period is needed before progress is made in achieving programmatic results.

Donor commitment is particularly important to the success of the relationship between a U.S. group and a host-country group. A donor can facilitate exploration of potential partnerships, fund joint activities, and support capac-

ity-building efforts so both entities work together better. A donor can also provide advice, guidance, and a broad, long-term perspective that the participants may lack. Conversely, insensitive donor involvement can derail a budding

relationship—for example, by pushing the partners to work together on larger and more complex programs before trust and effective communications have been established.*

*Chapter 4 provides suggestions on how to facilitate the partnering process and overcome some of the potential obstacles that could arise.

Designing a Partnership Program

3

THIS CHAPTER outlines the management models and funding mechanisms available to USAID for partnerships. It looks at ways to select partners and defines the roles of the various actors.

Partnership Management Models

USAID has two basic approaches toward supporting partnership activities:

1. The Agency provides funds (a grant, a cooperative agreement, or, sometimes, a contract) directly to one member of the partnership—usually, but certainly not always, the U.S. entity.
2. The Agency provides funds to an intermediary organization that manages multiple partnerships between U.S. and host-country entities. The intermediary may be a broker or catalyst for the partnerships or may act in a purely administrative role.* The intermediary may provide funds, generally through subgrants, to either U.S. or local groups.

If a USAID operating unit has determined that partnership activities can help it achieve a certain objective but that only one or two partnerships will be used (and Agency staff is sufficient

to provide the oversight required), a partnership funded directly by USAID—option 1—might be more appropriate. If multiple partnerships are to be established, the operating unit should consider an intermediary organization.

In part because of USAID staffing limitations and in part because of the professional competence of organizations that can act as intermediaries, operating units have increasingly opted to work through an intermediary. With input from USAID, an intermediary can

While an intermediary structure can provide more flexibility for diverse activities, it runs the risk of increased confusion about roles and responsibilities between the Agency and the intermediary and recipient groups.

draft solicitations, conduct screening sessions, establish selection panels, and make selections or recommendations. The organization can also be responsible for contracting/granting actions and monitoring of and fiscal accounting for the individual partnerships.

The use of an intermediary provides economies and opportunities of scale. This has advantages and disadvantages. The intermediary can act as a bridge, or even a catalyst, for partnerships to occur by creating an opportunity for them to develop. It can also cause tensions because of the potential

*As a broker, the intermediary is responsible for matching partners, facilitating the partnering process, and overseeing the partnership activities. As an administrator, the intermediary oversees partnerships that already exist and assists in the partnering process as needed.

Case Study 3.1. Intermediary as Partnership Broker

Organized especially to carry out a partnership program in central and eastern Europe and Eurasia, the American International Health Alliance (AIHA) moved quickly in bringing partners together and helping them get their programs under way. In the early stage, the AIHA field offices were lean organizations that emphasized linguistic and logistic competence rather than subject-specific expertise. Once the logistical network and systems were established, the support structure needed to change to reflect the needs of the individual partnerships. As the program evolved, AIHA provided more medical expertise and methods for the partnerships to share their experiences with one another.

for different interpretations of the operating unit's strategic objectives and results framework. For this reason, when using an intermediary, USAID should be clear with the implementing organization about core objectives and results. Similarly, while an intermediary structure can provide more flexibility for diverse activities and can assist the recipient organizations with some of USAID's procedural requirements, it runs the risk of increased confusion about roles and responsibilities between the Agency and the intermediary and recipient groups. For example, in one case the intermediary spent a great deal of time working with the partners to build consensus on specific tasks for the partnership to carry out. Later, USAID staff went directly to the partners to tell them what tasks they should perform. This confused the partners and angered the intermediary.

The following questions may help when considering the advantages and disadvantages of partnership management models:

- Is there a specific partnership that needs funding?
- Are specific results desired for a particular case?

- Is there a need for close monitoring and oversight by USAID?
- Is there sufficient Agency management time available to oversee a partnership activity?

If the answer to any of these questions is yes, then directly funding the partnership may be more appropriate than using an intermediary. While direct funding of one of the partners may result in a heavier management workload for USAID staff, it does provide more opportunity for the Agency to shape and guide the partnership and permit close monitoring and oversight. In addition, with fewer layers of organizations to convey objectives the direct funding model is more likely to reflect an emphasis consistent with the results framework.

Further questions to ask when considering which partnership management model to use include

- Is there a need for a partnership program that involves matching numerous organizations? (This may be sector specific or part of USAID's exit strategy.)

Table 3.1. Advantages and Disadvantages of Alternative Partnership Management Models

Model	Advantages	Disadvantages	When to Use
<p>USAID directly funds the partner (either U.S. or local).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provides opportunity for USAID to shape and guide the emerging relationship ■ Allows substantive USAID involvement ■ Permits close monitoring and oversight ■ More likely to reflect emphasis consistent with results framework 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Heavy management workload ■ USAID staff may lack special skills or time to nurture partnerships ■ Host-country partner is more dependent on U.S. partner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ A specific partnership needs funding ■ Specific results are desired for a particular case ■ Sufficient USAID management time is available to oversee the activity ■ There is a need for close monitoring and oversight by USAID
<p>USAID funds an intermediary organization that provides subgrants. There are two variants:</p> <p>1) The intermediary handles all aspects of the subgrant process, including application process, selection, and administration</p> <p>2) The intermediary handles only administrative aspects</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Taps special expertise and experience of intermediary ■ Permits distillation of some procedural requirements ■ Allows for more clarification of USAID procedures ■ Reduces Agency management workload ■ USAID retains substantive oversight and, at same time, minimizes management burden ■ Can assist in tax reductions for host-country partner 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Policy priorities may differ or diverge (intermediary may push for own agenda) ■ Overall costs are higher because of overhead charges ■ Local or U.S. groups may be reluctant to work through an intermediary ■ Creates confusion about roles and functions ■ May generate conflict with intermediary 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ There is a need for a partnership program that matches numerous partnerships ■ Less than sufficient USAID management time is available to oversee partnership activities

- Is there less than sufficient USAID management time available to oversee partnership activities?

If the answer to either question is yes, then using an intermediary to manage the partnership program may be more appropriate. Although the overall costs may be higher because of overhead charges, the use of an intermediary greatly reduces USAID management's workload. Also, in some

cases, the use of an intermediary may eliminate the need to transfer money to either partner, thus reducing taxes for the host-country partner. At the same time, again, the use of an intermediary can cause some confusion over roles and responsibilities. Having an additional layer of organization also may distort the policy priorities of USAID. For example the intermediary may work with the partners to help them assess their needs and objectives, but in this process

While USAID has much control with a contract, and a limited role when managing a grant, a cooperative agreement permits Agency staff to have what is known as substantial involvement.

USAID priorities may get lost and the activities may only reflect local needs and not feed into Agency objectives. Early evaluations of numerous partnership programs using intermediaries reflected concern that the variety of partner activities under one program were too diverse and did not feed into USAID results. The situation was remedied by designing partnership programs that allowed for more flexibility but also ensured a level of consistency in types of activities.

There are two types of intermediaries: The “broker” intermediary matches partners and facilitates the partnering process. The other type, which is more administrative, manages partnerships that have already been created.

The advantages and disadvantages to USAID of these different models are summarized in table 3.1.

Funding Instruments

It is possible to support a partnership without providing funds by helping facilitate the interaction between

two organizations. In general, though, a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement is used to fund the partnership program. If there is an intermediary, the partners are supported through separate agreements.

A central consideration when choosing the funding instrument is the role USAID desires to play in implementation. The type of relationship the Agency and the recipient anticipate determines the implementing instrument. While USAID has much control with a contract, and a limited role when managing a grant, a cooperative agreement permits Agency staff to have what is known as “substantial involvement” (described later in this section).

A *contract* is a mutually binding legal instrument when the principal purpose is the acquisition, by purchase, lease, or barter, of property or services for the direct benefit or use of the federal government. USAID states in a contract which goods, services, and results it wants to buy. It then monitors and evaluates the contractor’s performance in providing these goods and services and results. USAID and the contractor agree on the requirements and standards to be used, and the Agency frequently provides technical direction for the activity during contract implementation. Contracts usually have a fixed design for implementation, with clearly defined deliverables along the way. They may be used where both the U.S. and host-country partners are known to have specific technical capacities that will produce the desired technical deliverables.

A *grant*, according to USAID’s Automated Directives System,⁸ is “a legal instrument used where the principal purpose is the transfer of money, property, services, or anything of value to the

⁸The Automated Directives System—the document that guides USAID’s policy, practices, and operations—can be found at <http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads>.

recipient . . . to accomplish a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by federal statute and where substantial involvement by USAID is not anticipated.” In a grant, USAID receives progress reports and summary financial reporting. The Agency does not manage the grantee; it supports the grantee’s program. A grant is usually used with the direct funding model for partnerships. For example, most partnerships between an American PVO and a host-country NGO are funded through the Matching Grants Program of the Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation.

A *cooperative agreement* is a legal instrument used when the principal purpose is the transfer of money, property, services, or anything of value to the recipient to accomplish a public purpose of support or stimulation authorized by federal statute—and where substantial involvement by USAID is anticipated. Though there is no formal legal reason barring contracts from being used for partnership activities, the consensus among program staff and implementing partners is that a cooperative agreement is better suited for partnerships. In a cooperative agreement, the recipient has substantial freedom to pursue its program. No deliverables or products must be produced, as there are in a contract. USAID receives progress reports and summary financial reporting but does not manage the recipient. Yet the Agency can have substantial involvement in key programmatic areas.

The “substantial involvement” in a cooperative agreement is not the kind of involvement USAID has when managing a contract. Cooperative agreements must describe in detail anticipated Agency involvement during performance of the award. Substantial involvement is limited to

- Approval of the recipient’s implementation plan
- Approval of specified key personnel
- Agency and recipient collaboration or joint participation
- Agency authority to halt a construction activity immediately

When the partnership is called upon to accomplish broader objectives, and the operating unit at USAID is relying on the technical abilities of the partnership to accomplish those objectives, a cooperative agreement enables all stakeholders to participate in the deter-

There is general agreement within the development community that partners should make financial contributions, because doing so reinforces their commitment to the partnership and services offered.

mination of what will, in effect, constitute mutually agreed-upon results. Since Agency staff may be quite involved in the program at the initial stage, it is easy to forget that USAID’s role under a cooperative agreement is *not* the same as its role under a contract. It is important to sense when to step back and let the partners take control.

With a cooperative agreement, the program is largely the recipient’s—with USAID ensuring (before the award) that the proposed program supports a stra-

Table 3.2. Characteristics of Alternative Funding Instruments for Partnerships

Funding Instrument	Characteristics	When to Use
Contract	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Allows maximum USAID involvement ■ Forces clarity regarding deliverables ■ Can be perceived as infringement on partner prerogatives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Both U.S. and host-country partners are known to have specific technical capabilities that will produce the technical deliverables desired ■ There is need for USAID direct oversight of the partnership
Grant	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Most consistent with organic nature of partnering ■ Minimal USAID management burden ■ Appropriate when the Agency wishes to maintain low profile ■ May limit USAID influence and leverage ■ May make interprogram coordination difficult 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ To fund a single partnership directly ■ To promote an existing partnership ■ There is no need for USAID to closely oversee the partnership
Cooperative Agreement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Most commonly used instrument for partnering ■ Moderate USAID management burden ■ Allows USAID “substantial involvement” ■ May create ambiguity regarding roles and responsibilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ An intermediary is needed to establish numerous partnerships ■ Flexibility in partner activities is desired

tegic objective. Cooperative agreements are often preferred over contracts for partnerships because of the perceived flexibility needed, since partnerships are dynamic and do not always have a set course. If the long-term endurance of the partnership is considered an essential component of the activity, this flexibility is virtually demanded. Also, as with a grant, a cooperative agreement may leave room for a contribution on

the part of the partners. There is general agreement within the development community that partners should make financial contributions, because doing so reinforces their commitment to the partnership and services offered.

Whichever instrument is used to support a partnership, an initial step involving all stakeholders is important to clarify expectations to reduce the potential for subsequent misunderstanding.*

Table 3.2 describes the characteristics of the alternative funding instruments for partnerships and when it might be appropriate to use them.

*For more information on choosing funding instruments, refer to USAID’s Managing for Results training materials (<http://www.dec.org/partners/mfr/training>) and Automated Directives System 201.3.6.5.

Case Study 3.2. Funding the Host-Country Partner

EcoLinks Challenge Grants, each for up to \$50,000, support one-year, cost-shared partnership projects that address specific urban and industrial environmental problems with a market-based approach. Eligible organizations in central and eastern Europe submit brief concept papers to EcoLinks and, if approved, assemble a project team to prepare a full application that meets the guidelines in the request for application. If they don't already have one, EcoLinks is able to help local organizations find U.S. partners.

Quick Response Awards, for up to \$5,000 each, can be used to help organizations find and develop partnerships to prepare a Challenge Grant application.

Financial Arrangements To Strengthen Partnerships

Several arrangements can be built into a grant or cooperative agreement and act as an incentive to steer the developing relationship in a positive direction. Here are four of the most straightforward:

Control of budget. Traditionally, when USAID supports a partnership directly, the funds go to the U.S. organization, which then works with a local group. An alternative is to give the funds to the local organization, as long as the group has the financial and administrative procedures to be certified as eligible for USAID funding. The primary advantage of this approach is that it puts the local group in a much stronger bargaining position than would otherwise be the case. Added benefits include organizational learning, an incentive to “shop around” to find the ideal relationship, and a stronger feeling of equality in the relationship.

If it is difficult to certify that the local organization has the administrative capacity to manage USAID funds, it may be preferable to work through an intermediary organization. In cases where the partnership constitutes a le-

gal entity (such as a joint venture) the partnership, and not just one of the partners, can be funded.

Cost-sharing. It is well understood in the development community that effective partnerships include a sharing of risks. Providing resources (financial or in-kind) shows commitment to the partnership. When designing and negotiating a development activity, the strategic objective team may use 25 percent as a suggested reference point for a partner's cost-share, keeping in mind the need for flexibility and the diverse circumstances and conditions that may define a relationship between USAID and a funding recipient. Financial participation rates of less, or more, may be justified as reasonable and appropriate in view of the recipient's financial resources and fund-raising capacity, USAID's objectives, or where justified by Agency program objectives. Thus, cost-sharing can be a valuable tool used strategically to encourage progress toward financial sustainability.

Phased approach. Partnerships tend to move through a series of stages (see table 4.1, next chapter). Funding for the partnership can be linked to these stages, and the grant or cooperative agreement renegotiated. For example, phase 1 might start at a lower dollar

Case Study 3.3. Capturing the ‘True’ Value of Cost-Sharing

The American Council on Education’s ALO (Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development) awards small grants to U.S. colleges and universities to partner with developing-country colleges and universities to work on a host of social and economic issues. Under these awards, ALO requires a minimum 25 percent cost-share (a financial or in-kind match of support). Partner cost-share contributions, which are on average 100 percent, are not necessarily in the form of money, but “in kind” contributions such as donated staff time, resources, local transportation, and supplies.

ALO’s partnership between Maricopa Community Colleges in Arizona and the Universidad Veracruzana in Mexico struggled with how to present a fair representation of the in-kind contributions of the Mexican partner, since wages differ so vastly between the two countries. They developed a method for capturing the “true” value of their cost-sharing contributions. Using a model that captures the relative value of the services performed by the Mexican partners, they identified an average U.S. salary equivalent for a particular kind of work and then used this amount when calculating in-kind donations of hourly work by a Mexican partner.

level for 18 months to develop and plan a partnership. Success of this phase may lead to phase 2 – implementation of the partnership activities – which lasts four years and has a higher dollar level. Phase 3, which might be for two to three years, follows successful implementation of the activities and concentrates on mentoring by the U.S. organization to develop an autonomous local organization.

Performance conditions. A wide variety of goals and accomplishments can be incorporated as performance conditions in a contract, grant, or cooperative agreement. These include jointly drafting a partnership agreement, establishing a joint capability of some sort, or achieving a specified level of funding diversification.

Selecting the Partners

USAID or an intermediary can match U.S. and host-country partners in any of three ways:

1. Host-country entities find U.S. partners or receive assistance from the intermediary to locate a U.S. partner if needed. EcoLinks uses this approach.
2. USAID advises the intermediary organization on which regions or specific organizations in the host country should participate in the partnership program. The intermediary then assesses the situation and puts out a request for application (or RFA) for a U.S. partner. The American International Health Alliance (for the Health Partnerships Program) and the International City/County Management Association (for the Resource Cities Program) use this approach.
3. The RFA for a grant assumes that the partnership already exists. This implies that the partners themselves are responsible for finding each other.* Current programs using this approach include the Global Bureau’s higher education partnerships (ALO and the University Development Linkages Pro-

*See appendix D for an example of potential partner preselection criteria.

Case Study 3.4. Importance of Leadership

In the past decade, thousands of exchanges have occurred between the two small cities of Dubna, Russia, and La Crosse, Wisconsin. The partnership has transformed Dubna's medical care system. The town has a new maternity hospital, a kidney dialysis center, women's wellness clinics, and a rehabilitation center for disabled children and adults. In addition, streamlined medical procedures have eliminated nearly one third of the city's hospital beds, a contraception program has reduced the city's abortion rate to two thirds of the national level, and there has been a dramatic rise in residents' satisfaction with medical care.

The success of the partnership is in part due to the chemistry between the cities and their early agreement that the relationship was not that of an American mentor and Russian protégé, but of equals. The success is also attributable to the determination of the leaders of Dubna to make the partnership work. For example, under Russian government formulas that base hospital aid on the number of patients, promoting home care meant a huge drop in subsidies for Dubna. Battling Russian bureaucracy, managers of Dubna and La Crosse argued that the city should not be punished for gaining greater efficiencies and managed to get a new formula to calculate assistance. The mayor of Dubna is described as a visionary who was intolerant of obstacles to change. He surrounded himself with people who would remain committed to a project—not only until the money ran out but until it made life better for the townspeople.

gram) and the Matching Grants Program of the Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation. ALO provides a Web site, "Cupid," to help universities connect with one another.

When USAID or the intermediary organization acts as a broker, case after case points to the need for dynamic, committed leadership to ensure a successful and sustainable partnership. Because strong partnerships are difficult to form and sustain, the interest and commitment of the leadership of both organizations is critical if the partnership is to address and resolve the issues that inevitably develop. If the leadership is uninterested or ambivalent, it is extremely difficult to energize the staff and sustain interest in the benefits of the partnership during its formative period. If leadership commitment is in doubt, consider not moving forward with the partnership. Even so, while it is most important to ensure commitment from the top, long-term pros-

If the leadership is uninterested or ambivalent, it is extremely difficult to energize the staff and sustain interest in the benefits of the partnership during its formative period. If leadership commitment is in doubt, consider not moving forward with the partnership.

pects are better when midlevel management, which may include future leaders, is also involved.

Roles and Responsibilities

Although the main concern of this guide is relationships between American and host-country organizations, the relationship between USAID and an organization receiving funds for a part-

Table 3.3. Roles of Partnership Players

USAID	Intermediary	Partner
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Establish broad strategic vision and objectives ■ Provide strategic direction ■ Coordinate and collaborate with intermediary in annual strategic planning and work plan sessions ■ Provide guidance for developing indicators to monitor progress ■ Review progress ■ Review sustainability plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Provide program administration and management consistent with USAID requirements ■ Provide facilitative leadership ■ Provide logistical support and orientation ■ Provide cost-effective solutions ■ Develop indicators to monitor progress ■ Help monitor and assess progress ■ Help create sustainability plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Develop collaborative work plan and memorandum of understanding through a consensus-building process ■ Identify appropriate people to work in the partnership ■ Identify indicators to monitor progress ■ Implement activities ■ Monitor and assess progress ■ Make adjustments to activities on the basis of information collected through monitoring and evaluation ■ Submit progress reports ■ Participate in debriefing meetings with donors ■ Create sustainability plan

nership (whether it is one of the partners or an intermediary) is also crucial to the success of that partnership.

The interactions inherent to a relationship with contractors or consultants – one that assumes a one-way transfer of information and services – differ greatly from the collaborative style needed when working in partnership. This collaborative style requires a different mindset and a specific set of skills. Styles of communication and collaboration with partners affect the partnership.* In other words, USAID’s relationship with the intermediary (or with the partner receiving funds, if using the direct funding model) has an impact on the partnership between the U.S. and host-country entities. In addition,

it is crucial that the roles and responsibilities of all groups involved with the partnership – USAID, an intermediary, the U.S. partner, and the host-country partner – be laid out unambiguously. Table 3.3 describes some of the roles and responsibilities of the players when there is an intermediary. If USAID funds the partners directly, Agency staff takes on the responsibilities listed for the intermediary.

USAID sets the stage, of course, by establishing broad guidelines for the partnership. Working with the intermediary, the Agency finds established partnerships or matches partners with each other to implement activities that reflect USAID’s development objectives. Clearly conveying the connection between the partnership and the Agency’s objectives is essential. If the partners do not understand their relationship with USAID from the outset, they may not be forth-

*See appendix G for various tools to identify effective partnership behavior.

coming later in providing the Agency with monitoring and evaluation data.

The intermediary works closely with the partners to assist them in developing a collaborative work plan and memorandum of understanding. Under guidance from the intermediary, the partners identify indicators to monitor progress and develop a sustainability plan. In implementing their activities, the partners sometimes disagree; this is to be expected. This is the time for the intermediary to show its mettle and provide leadership to help the partners work through their problems.

The partners and the intermediary monitor and evaluate the partnership. Site visits by USAID staff not only are a good way to obtain direct insight into the work and its results, but also (and just as important) bring credibility to the project. A site visit by an Agency official is often an occasion for winning local authorities' and additional community support for a given partnership. USAID's engagement with the partners to learn what they have accomplished will also enrich the monitoring and reporting process.

Managing Partnerships

4

IN MOST CASES, USAID staff are not directly involved in facilitating the progress of a partnership. But understanding the process—especially some of its more difficult areas—can better prepare Agency staff to help move a partnership forward. When the partnership is managed by an intermediary organization, the intermediary plays a leadership role to help solidify the partner relationship. Understanding the role of the intermediary and knowing what to expect in the partnering process can help USAID staff know when and how to offer skillful and timely guidance. In an ideal situation, Agency staff collaborate with the intermediary as a facilitative leader. When there is no intermediary, USAID may play a bigger role or assist in finding facilitators to help in the partnering process.

Facilitating the Partnering Process

Partnerships are organic. They arise and flourish, and then often decay and die, through continual internal assessments of potential gains. Since they involve bringing new groups of people to work together, partnerships can be unstable. Moreover, because partnerships are adaptive and often change direction, the benefits and the future of the relationships are difficult to predict. The dynamic nature of the partnership process suggests that the range and variety of relationships will expand in the future and that new forms will emerge to suit the participants' needs.

Most partnerships go through a period of adjustment and adaptation that reflects a learning process and changing participant capacities. Anecdotal evidence shows that as a partnership matures, the relative importance

Anecdotal evidence shows that as a partnership matures, the relative importance of process factors declines and the importance of perceived benefits increases.

of *process factors* declines and the importance of *perceived benefits* increases. Although the maturation of a partnership appears to evolve fluidly and gradually, most relationships move through a series of successive stages that are built on and based on experience. When a maturing relationship jumps ahead too quickly or skips a stage in the relationship process, it often means that the partners need to go back and deal with deficiencies that have not yet been addressed.

Normally there are four sequential stages in the evolution of a partnership. Each of the stages consists of a set of activities that establishes a capacity allowing the next stage to occur. Each stage also brings a new set of challenges.

Table 4.1. Stages of Partnership

Stage	Illustrative Activities
1. Exploration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Exchanging information ■ Sharing lessons learned ■ Looking at pros and cons of collaboration
2. Establishing trust	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Discussing values and mission ■ Identifying cultural differences ■ Dealing with power imbalances ■ Taking steps to ensure transparency ■ Drafting letter of agreement
3. Coordinating systems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Establishing working group ■ Developing work plan ■ Agreeing on communication protocol ■ Integrating components of budgeting and accounting systems
4. Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Planning and implementing parallel projects ■ Planning and implementing integrated projects ■ Establishing capacity to integrate budget and workforce planning ■ Conducting joint evaluations ■ Coordinating response to evaluations/assessments
Strategic alliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ☛ Joint strategic planning ☛ Integration of planning office and functions ☛ Establishment of uniform systems ☛ Integration of governance systems

First, organizations explore the possibility of partnering with each other. Second, trust is established between the partners. Third, systems are coordinated so the partners can work together. Fourth, the partners cooperate to implement activities.

At the fourth stage, partners are still distinct organizations that collaborate on programs. In some cases, the partnership may subsequently evolve into a strategic alliance with some degree of institutional integration. The strategic alliance may even involve the establishment of an autonomous entity (see table 4.1).

Principles for Establishing Partnerships

The exploratory phase of an emerging partnership influences the content and structure of the future relationship and how successful it will be. USAID or an intermediary organization can help shape and direct these early discussions. But this is a difficult and sensitive time in the emerging relationship. Too much outside donor involvement can divert the attention of the participants away from the process of developing an effective and solid partnership.

Case Study 4.1. Exploring Partnership Possibilities

Since 1992, the United States–Asia Environmental Partnership (US-AEP), a joint project of USAID and other U.S. agencies, has promoted technology transfer in Asia by linking U.S. businesses with developing-country businesses. Through its partnership with the Water Environment Federation and the efforts of the National Association of State Development Agencies and the Institute for International Education, US-AEP has been able to bring hundreds of Asian buyers and decision-makers to the Water Environment Federation Technology (WEFTEC) conferences in recent years. In 2000 alone, US-AEP sponsored the attendance of more than a hundred Asian buyers at the 72nd WEFTEC Conference in Anaheim, California. The partnership also arranges for one-on-one meetings between American companies and Asian buyers as well as between American companies and US-AEP technology representatives. Since 1992, US-AEP has generated \$1.12 billion in sales and contracts for American companies.



Case Study 4.2. The Use of Program Development and Learning Funds

Missions cannot commit Agency funds until they have an established strategic objective. But USAID's bureaus may create one or more program development and learning (PD&L) objectives to finance program development costs and program assessments and learning efforts. These PD&L objectives are intended to fund assessments or to support the design of new strategic objectives or new activities under existing strategic objectives. Thus they may be used to finance the full range of funding instruments, including grants, contracts, cooperative agreements, and purchase and task orders. PD&L funds can be helpful during the exploratory phase of a relationship when the mission does not have an established strategic objective.

You might use PD&L funds to

- Sponsor a planning workshop
- Provide training so that the local organization can prepare a strong strategic plan
- Finance a study to identify legal impediments to overseas partnering arrangements
- Provide a skilled facilitator to work with prospective partners to identify areas of consensus
- Provide seed funds to finance an experimental joint project to test the possibility of partnership
- Finance an exploratory trip so that the leader of a local organization can visit the headquarters of an American organization
- Sponsor a partnership conference that brings local organizations together at one location to meet with the representatives of American groups

Case Study 4.3. Shared Experiences and Future Partnerships

More than 85 participants from 12 countries met in Albania for two days during February 2000 for a regional conference designed as a forum to forge future partnerships. NGO participants represented various regions of central and eastern Europe, including Russia and the Balkans. The group represented a broad range of successful organizations working in many areas of democratic development, including social services, civic education, media strengthening, environmental protection, and the rule of law and human rights.

An important objective of the conference was to facilitate prospective relations between nongovernmental organizations from different countries. The formation of working partnerships is an important aspect of the development of the NGOs in southern central Europe and is believed to depend heavily on compatible values, a shared vision, and a strong understanding of mutual goals and objectives. The creation of effective partnerships depends greatly on establishing opportunities for dialog and communication in a free and unpressured environment that encourages openness and candor. Many conference participants commented on the value of the information they had obtained about potential collaborations with other NGOs in neighboring countries and how they thought they could work together. All participants received contact information on one another. Many indicated that they intended to maintain relationships that were established during the conference.

There are no hard and fast rules for this exploratory stage, but five principles should be kept in mind:

1. *Support discussion and joint planning.* The USAID system sometimes makes it difficult for the Agency to provide financial assistance to support meetings and conferences that promote dialog. But in the case of an emerging partnership, it is essential that the two parties work through the exploratory phase of the relationship and develop a clear understanding of each other.
2. *Allow plenty of time for the partnership to develop.* It often takes a long time to negotiate the relationship and nurture it to life. Some partnerships may develop within a few months, but for some the gestation period could last five years. Some benefits are likely to be far off, and

initial expectations may exceed possibilities. For example, the relationship between La Crosse, Wisconsin, and Dubna, Russia, began in the late 1980s with children from the two cities exchanging peace lanterns to float down the Mississippi and Volga Rivers to promote world peace. In the early 1990s the cities began a more or less traditional sister-cities relationship, with people from La Crosse sending food, clothes, and medical supplies to Dubna. In 1992 a more formal partnership was established through a USAID program that centered on health care systems. By 2000, nearly \$1 million had been spent, several hundred Russians had visited La Crosse, and several hundred Americans had gone to Dubna.*

3. *Encourage participants to concentrate on the substantive content of the partnership through effective group processes.*[†] Activities devoted to developing a shared vision, clarifying and ensuring compatible

*For more information on this partnership, see case study 3.4 and appendix A.

†For more information on group facilitation tools, see appendix H.

Case Study 4.4. U.S. Private Voluntary Organization Relations With Namibian Nongovernmental Organizations

Under the 1993–99 READ (Reaching out with Education to Adults in Development) project, the American PVO World Education worked with more than 30 Namibian NGOs across a variety of sectors to strengthen their organizational capacity and introduce and promote a participatory training method. At the start of the project (soon after independence) the country faced a volatile political environment. There was general suspicion toward any U.S. presence and toward any U.S.–funded development assistance. The NGO sector was weak and had to adjust to a role that concentrated on broader development issues after spending years in political struggle against apartheid. Old misunderstandings between USAID and the NGO sector contributed to a highly charged relationship characterized by suspicion of American PVOs.

It took at least the first two years of the project for World Education to overcome NGO mistrust and build solid relationships with its NGO partners. The PVO spent a lot of time fine-tuning its process and ensuring that NGOs felt they were equal stakeholders in the partnership with World Education. The READ project had an active steering committee made up of members from both the NGO and government sectors. The project reported to the steering committee regularly. By the end of the project, World Education had strong partnerships with 16 NGOs.

values, and generating enthusiastic commitment are important during the early stages of a relationship. If an effective partnership is to be sustained, it needs to demonstrate results to both parties. In addition to emphasizing the need for clarity about desired results, USAID staff can play a valuable role by encouraging prospective partners to think and talk about how they will coordinate activities, design programs together, and eventually integrate their program planning.

4. *Place early emphasis on the importance of sustainability.** USAID staff can play a constructive role in setting the stage for sustainability by emphasizing the need to establish a sustainability plan during the first few months of the partnership.

To create such a plan, the partners will need to determine the full costs of building and maintaining a partnership. It is useful for the partners to prepare a budget that accounts for direct and indirect costs associated with the relationship. A sustainability plan should identify how enough income will be generated to cover partnership costs. If the partners project significant income from other donors, they should base these assumptions on direct discussions with the donors.

5. *Concentrate on providing the broad delimitations of the partnership.* USAID staff should concentrate on providing the contours of the partnership between U.S. and host-country entities and leave implementation details to the partners. The partnership will succeed only if the two partners are invested in the outcomes. Supporting the partners' creation of a vision and specific activities that will feed into

*See chapter 6 on sustaining partnerships and appendix F for a sample sustainability plan. The work plan guidelines in appendix E also refer to sustainability strategies.

Case Study 4.5. Collaboration in the New Independent States

Even within the difficult and sometimes hostile legal and tax environment of the post-Soviet states, the Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia (ISAR) has found ways to achieve its goals and to do so through increasingly independent field organizations that act as local NGOs—if not in name, then in deed.

A U.S. private voluntary organization, ISAR has since 1991 established eight field offices in the new independent states to act as grant-making organizations that support grass-roots NGOs, with particular emphasis on the environment sector. Despite operating in an arduous legal and tax environment, these field offices have become increasingly independent of U.S. headquarters. Where the enabling environment was conducive (Georgia), the field office became a fully indigenous organization. In three other sites (Kiev, Moscow, and Vladivostok), the field office has “dual” registration. This allows it to act as an independent, indigenous organization in those areas permissible under local law while maintaining its U.S. registration to carry out activities difficult (given current legal and tax impediments) for a local NGO to implement. The other four offices (Almaty, Atyrau, Baku, and Novosibirsk) operate as branches of ISAR, without dual registration. But on an operational level, they too act largely as independent agents.

USAID’s results framework can be a delicate balance.

Factors to Consider When Forming Partnerships

There is no reliable way to determine beforehand if a partnership will succeed. Even so, certain characteristics are associated with effective partnerships. Five factors—country context, maturity of participating organizations, nature of the organizations’ work, similarity of norms and organizational culture, and complementary income structure—are, when favorable, normally associated with an effective relationship. Taking these factors into consideration when forming partnerships will improve the chances of achieving effective and sustainable relationships.

Country Context

Some situations are more conducive than others to establishing partner-

ships. In general, countries with an active and growing independent sector, an established tradition of citizen advocacy, grass-roots participation, or intersectoral collaboration to deal with social and economic issues provide favorable environments for establishing partnerships. The presence of these conditions provides the financial, managerial, and psychological environment conducive to a healthy process of organizational formation. This does not mean that partnerships will not work in countries that lack a strong civil society, but it does mean that extra effort might be needed to help these relationships mature in countries without one.

Certain laws and regulations may discourage partnerships. These tend to fall into four categories: cumbersome currency regulations, onerous taxation provisions, difficult registration requirements, and restrictions on affiliation between local and foreign organizations. Rarely are these barriers sufficient to prevent a partnership from developing. But they are irritants and

Case Study 4.6. Finding Common Ground

The Ethos Institute of Business and Social Responsibility, a 2-year-old organization in Brazil that works with the private sector to spread business social responsibility, is partnering with Pact, a 29-year-old U.S. organization whose mission is to contribute to the growth of civil society—the body of nonstate organizations in which citizens acting together can express their interests, exchange information, strive for mutual goals, and influence government. Ethos argues that companies are important agents in the promotion of economic development and technological advances. At the same time, Pact recognizes that it takes more than public sector resources to address the world’s pressing social, economic, and environmental problems.

By concentrating on overlapping visions and objectives, the two organizations have created a flexible partnership with mutual benefits. Pact brings Ethos expertise in organizational strengthening. Ethos provides Pact with an opportunity to explore engagement of the business community. The difference in the level of maturity between the partners—Pact is a well-established institution, and Ethos is a young organization leading the way in a relatively new field—provides opportunities that would not be possible for either organization working alone.

can affect the relationship. For example, there may be a restriction on the ability of a local organization to receive funds from an overseas organization, or there may be laws prohibiting establishment of an overseas entity. Where these impediments exist, encourage the prospective partners to research the laws, fully understand the impact they will have on the relationship, and identify options for handling them. If there is a possibility of negative legal or regulatory restrictions, identify the restriction and encourage prospective partners to cost out the impact. Legal obstacles can provide an excellent backdrop for programs that seek to improve the legal environment. Such programs complement the development of partnerships.

If the country’s environment is not conducive to partnering, USAID can take advantage of the hunger that professionals feel for up-to-date knowledge in areas such as health, education, or city infrastructure. In such environments, partnering is frequently the only opportunity people have to familiarize themselves with the way other societies are organized. Impediments created by a

difficult environment are compensated for by the high motivation of many leaders.

If the country has a weak NGO sector or legal restrictions that could inhibit the functioning of a partnership, USAID may wish to engage in policy dialog at the national level to create a more enabling environment. Specific to the partnership being implemented, USAID can

- Put in place a thorough orientation program for the American partners to ensure an adequate level of cultural competence.
- Provide institutional strengthening that takes into account the current level of institutional development and is sensitive to the real obstacles faced by NGO leaders.
- Take advantage of regional expertise: 1) programs aimed at sustainability or financial funding diversification can be conducted most effectively by regional trainers from slightly more advanced neighboring countries that are

Case Study 4.7. Partnerships Between Nongovernmental and Commercial Organizations

Even though for-profit corporations and social service groups have different organizational goals, they often share community interests. These may include a healthy and well-educated labor force, the absence of civil strife, and an interest in stable democratic processes. A particular challenge in building relations across sectors is overcoming distrust and the attitude that commonality of mission and purpose is impossible.

The motives of each partner must be clear to the other. Business motives may be marketing, production, public relations, or human resource development. The NGO needs to be clear about its social objectives. It is normal for the two parties to have different objectives, but those objectives must be known and mutually respected.

CARE's partnership with Enron Corp. in India is a case in which the community had great animosity toward the oil company's operations. After Enron began working with CARE on economic and community development, cases of vandalism and property destruction decreased, and community support for the company among local leaders and community members increased. Gas and oil companies entering new areas are learning from public-private partnership experiences and are seeking NGO partners to prevent problems before negative sentiments develop.

more aware of the obstacles; 2) NGO representatives from countries with a weak NGO sector often benefit from regional exchanges where they meet NGO leaders who have overcome problems similar to their own.

Maturity of Participating Organizations

Consolidated and well-established organizations have greater capability for sustaining a partnership than those in an early stage of development. An emergent organization tends to be financially insecure, prone to rapid change, and committed to a particular technique and set of values. Moreover, an emergent group is often managed by a founder or leader who has a highly specific and sometimes rigid conception of the organizational mission and how it is to be accomplished.

If there is a significant dissimilarity in the maturity of the two organizations,

- Include a tailored training program in your grant or subgrant.
- Consider funding strategic planning or establish strategic planning as a condition of support.
- Insist on such basics as a written partnership agreement, headquarters visits, and leadership meetings.
- Encourage both organizations to visit with other groups in their country that have established strong overseas partnerships.

Nature of the Organizations' Work

The more similar the work of two organizations, the easier it is to establish and maintain a partnership. Simi-

Case Study 4.8. Overcoming Differences in Organizational Culture

PLAN International and the microenterprise NGO Business Initiatives and Management Assistance Services (BIMAS) in Embu, Kenya, have successfully worked through differences in their organizational cultures. A particular source of tension stemmed from PLAN's orientation toward charitable humanitarian programs and BIMAS's business-oriented emphasis on clients rather than beneficiaries. A second problematic factor was PLAN's elaborate set of systems and procedures and its slow and cumbersome fund-approval process. While the partnership is codified in a formal agreement that lays out roles and responsibilities, it is also embodied in a set of informal understandings that have allowed the relationship to evolve over time. That BIMAS is a sophisticated and knowledgeable organization with a strong understanding of microenterprise methodology has given it leverage in the relationship and has counterbalanced PLAN's size and financial power.

larities in activities are likely to be echoed in similarities in management systems, decision-making processes, and the norms and cultures of the two entities. The establishment of peer relations between professionals working in similar fields can be a powerful link that adds value and legitimacy to the partnership.

Yet, in some cases, dissimilarities between organizations may actually increase the potential for a rich and rewarding association, since each organization has more to offer the other. For example, there is increasing evidence that nonprofits and commercial organizations can enter into beneficial partnerships without corrupting the social service mission of the former.

Where the work of the organizations is different,

- Place special emphasis on headquarters visits and extensive interpersonal contact.
- Encourage the partners to pay particular attention early to organizational culture and systems compatibility.



In some cases, dissimilarities between organizations may actually increase the potential for a rich and rewarding association.



Similarity of Norms And Organizational Culture

If the norms and cultures of partnering organizations are in alignment, the two entities will be better able to communicate effectively and work together. Every organization develops a unique set of beliefs and a supporting culture that influences how it interprets situations. Sharp dissimilarities between organizations can make communication, joint planning, and priority setting extremely difficult.

But while dissimilarity in values presents an impediment, it can also provide a catalyst for positive change. A well-established organization, for example, might deliberately choose to partner with a vigorously entrepreneurial group to benefit from new energy. Additionally, partnerships tend

Case Study 4.9. Choosing the Most Cost-Effective Partner

Freedom From Hunger found a startling difference in efficiency and cost-effectiveness when it switched from one kind of partner to another—in this case, from specialized microfinance institutions (MFIs) to local credit union federations. Working through MFIs, Freedom From Hunger spent \$6.4 million in direct grants and technical assistance to reach 30,000 poor women in need of small loans, a cost of \$211 per borrower. Yet it cost only \$700,000 to create the capacity to reach 36,000 women when partnering with two local credit union federations, reducing the cost to only \$20 per borrower. Additionally, the credit unions reached their outreach capacity in half the time and with a greater level of financial self-sufficiency than the specialized MFIs.

over time to develop their own cultures and norms of behavior. While similar values may be critical at the beginning of a relationship, they may become less so as the partnership matures.

Where norms and culture appear to be dissimilar,

- Fund experimental joint projects to test compatibility.
- Support a joint staff conference to explore practical issues of working together.
- Use a trained facilitator to explore areas of agreement and potential disagreement.

Complementary Income Structure

Organizations that depend heavily on similar funding sources or on the same donor may find it difficult to work together because of their propensity to compete with each other for scarce resources and also because of an underlying awareness that their association may not yield a net increase in income. Alternatively, when the pattern of financial support is markedly dissimilar, incentives to collaborate may be strong. Of course, there are cases when a similar donor profile is a distinct advantage. For example, a foundation that gives to

both groups might increase its total level of support when the groups are collaborating to encourage synergies they believe will emerge.

Where the income structure appears competitive,

- Encourage participants to discuss it openly.
- Encourage participants to address this impediment in their letter of agreement.
- Provide fund-raising support and training to the local group.

Creating Common Ground

The manner in which the partners are first brought together and the process they go through to solidify their relationship are crucial to achieving favorable results. A good first step would be to provide an orientation that explains partnering concepts and what the partners might expect from the process. The partners need to collaborate on developing a common vision and a working framework that includes a work plan and a memorandum of understanding. The initial discussions between partners also should include issues of power and influence in the relationship.

Case Study 4.10. Appreciative Inquiry Model for Building Partnerships

The Global Excellence in Management (GEM) Initiative has developed a model for forging partnerships built on mutual respect and shared goals between Northern and Southern organizations, called the Partnership 4–D Model. The goals of the model are to discover common ground for partnership, experience processes for building authentic partnerships, share best practices relating to partnership, and co-create collaborative strategies for the future.

In a workshop setting, members from both sides of the partnership gather to work through the 4–D cycle. The discovery phase works to appreciate the best of “what is” by emphasizing peak moments in the life of a partnership. The dream phase challenges partners to use stories about partnerships as a launching pad for envisioning what the partnership might become. In the design phase the partners begin to design a “social architecture” that will support their shared dreams. The task is to design a partnership that is aligned with the jointly held vision and values and come to agreement on what needs to happen to make the dream a reality. Finally, the delivery phase asks how the partnership can empower, learn, adjust, and improvise. In becoming a learning organization, the partners continually expand their capacity to envision and create the results they truly desire.

*More information about the GEM Initiative is available at <http://www.geminitiative.org>.

Existence of a Common Vision

Effective partnerships tend to be centered on a common vision that keeps the relationship together and helps the partners transcend the difficulties that may arise from different operating styles. This integrating vision is often represented in a mission statement.

A central vision can evolve. To solidify it may require an extended period of interaction between the two organizations. Often the vision is at first limited to consensus around a narrow objective. From this, a larger shared vision arises. In the early stages of a relationship the partners may not be aware that they share a common vision. Conversely, they may believe they have much more in common than they actually do.

USAID, having set the broad guidelines for what the partnership must accomplish to meet the Agency’s strategic objective, can work with the interme-

diary (or facilitator, if there is no intermediary) to build consensus around the vision. The relationship should not be hurried. There are tools (such as process mapping, storyboarding, SWOT—strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats—analysis, a decision-making framework, and force field analysis) and trained facilitators who can assist with the partnership process.*

Capacity to Establish and Sustain a Working Framework

A working framework refers to those systems, procedures, practices, and habits that allow two or more organizations to communicate and coordinate in a relatively efficient and cost-effective manner. A working framework takes time and patience to develop. Its durability depends on many factors, ranging from the motivation of participants to the similarity of existing

*See appendix H for more information on group facilitation tools.

Case Study 4.11. Mutual Accountability Reflected in Formal Agreements

The Institute for Development Research examined partnerships between African NGOs and American PVOs as part of a study on strengthening North–South partnerships. With regard to managing partnerships, they found that African partners had concerns about the PVOs’ rigid adherence to procedures and internal resistance to complying with partnership agreements. While all organizations need some policies and procedures to ensure accountability and foster consistent behavior organization-wide, the problem was the lack of willingness by PVOs at times to respond collaboratively to issues and concerns with existing arrangements experienced by the African partners.

A partnership in Ethiopia involving a child-sponsorship PVO explicitly designed a formal agreement to encourage mutual accountability. With the donor’s guidance, the PVO shaped the agreement to be particularly flexible. The PVO staff wanted the formal agreement to support the informal relations of mutual trust they understood to be at the heart of the partnership, so they developed memorandums of understanding rather than formal contracts. The memorandums were written only after several discussions of mutual interests had taken place at both PVO and NGO offices. Contrary to standard practice, the PVO encouraged the NGO to keep the bank accounts close to the communities where they were working, and they expected that some mistakes would be made with the finances during the learning process. The PVO staff had originally put a liability clause in the agreement, in compliance with its standard procedures. It removed the clause at the direction of the donor, which thought it would hinder the development of trust with the partners.

On the basis of its findings, the Institute for Development Research proposes that extending the principle of mutual influence to accountability mechanisms in formal agreements will increase the satisfaction of NGO partners and their accountability to their local stakeholders. Revised procedures should emphasize more flexible forms of agreement, shared liability for inherent risks, and increased Southern-partner influence in determining conditions of funding.



Case Study 4.12. U.S.–Russian Partnerships

Local NGOs are unlikely not to know that their American partners benefit significantly from the overhead earned for managing USAID grant funds and that these charges reduce the level of program funds available for in-country distribution. Tensions arising from this knowledge were documented in a 1996 study of U.S.–Russian partnerships funded by the Agency.

While American and Russian partners tended to agree that both partners benefited from the partnership, they disagreed on the benefit accruing to the other partner. American organizations, on the one hand, generally saw the Russian partner as acquiring the resources for new activities. Most Russian partners, on the other hand, saw financial gain as the chief benefit accruing to their American partner—even to the nonprofit organizations and universities. This perception is a potentially corrosive element in sustainable partnership relationships, both because it reflects a certain cynicism about the American partners’ motivations and because it can contribute to an expectation that the American partner can easily afford to sustain the relationship even if USAID funding ends.

management systems. A working framework often begins with joint development of a work plan that identifies practical tasks that need to be done if the two organizations are to work well together toward the desired results. The work plan should include information on the broad goals and specific objectives of the partnership, planned inputs and activities, outcome indica-

Case Study 4.13. Katalysis Partnership Model

The Katalysis Partnership is a network of one American PVO and eight independent microcredit NGOs in four Central American countries. Katalysis has pioneered a partnership model that is consciously designed to overcome traditional North–South inequalities, distribute power fairly, and avoid perceptions of inferiority. The partnership is structured so each member has a substantial influence over the governance, policies, and practices of the partnership and of Katalysis/USA and the Katalysis regional field office.

The partners are committed to

- Cross-representation on one another's board of directors
- All decisions related to the partnership subject to a council operating on a "one member, one vote" principle
- Participating together in strategic planning, producing a shared mission and values statement
- Joint training that facilitates learning and mentoring as a two-way process
- Joint fund-raising and market studies
- Consultation on key personnel decisions (e.g., Central American members participate in selection of Katalysis/USA's chief executive officer)
- Consultation before entering into other partnerships
- Evaluating one another's organizational and programmatic performance (e.g., members exchange audits)
- Full transparency in all interactions and decisions (e.g., Central American members approve Katalysis/USA's annual budget)
- Partner cost-sharing to meet partnership expenses (e.g., Central American partners cover their own costs of attending board meetings, originally covered by USAID, as an expression of the value of the partnership)
- Documentation of membership decisions and direction (e.g., written memorandum of understanding, vision statement, partner institutional standards, partnership governance)

tors, plans for collaboration, sustainability strategies, and strategies for communicating and collaborating.* The two partners should also sign a memorandum of understanding. The memorandum formalizes the commitment of the

*See appendix E for sample work plan guidelines.

†See appendix C for sample memorandums of understanding.

partners to the vision, to the work plan, or to both.†

Perception of Equal Power and Influence in the Relationship

An important factor in determining the long-term success of a partnership is a belief on both sides that there is approximate parity of power and in-

Case Study 4.14. Changing Relationships: From Project Officer to Partner

During 1996–2000, World Learning, under the Shared Project, transformed its field-based project office into an indigenous Malawian NGO. The intent was to create a means of sustaining the capacity-building benefits beyond the life of the project. One of the biggest challenges was for the existing organizational entity (the field-based project office) to break free from its project mentality and gain a new, separate identity. Since all personnel relationships had been defined by the project, staff found the transformation jolting.

When World Learning and the Development Center (DevCenter) became separate but equal partners, the new need for formal and codified legal relationships initially caused misunderstanding between the two. Whereas the memorandum of understanding had been less formal, a sub-award established the first purely “legal” relationship between the two as partners and was more formal. DevCenter’s initial reaction to the sub-award was concern that World Learning was moving away from the partnership tone of the memorandum of understanding. This point of contention was resolved through individual meetings and group sessions with an outside facilitator. Such a commitment to communication was essential to working through misunderstandings that arose during roller coaster times and to aligning expectations among all parties. World Learning realized that it needed to better interpret its boilerplate legal language for DevCenter, to better fit the particular context and be less alienating. DevCenter came to better understand World Learning’s intent and the need for more formal relationships.

World Learning found that in going through this transformation process, face-to-face communication was essential. Many times a gap in expectations or understanding could be bridged only in person. World Learning leadership made a clear effort to keep in regular contact, particularly at pivotal decision points, to ensure mutual understanding and agreement.

fluence in the relationship. Where one of the partners (especially the local organization) believes it has less influence over important decisions, frustration and dissatisfaction are likely to result.

This is a complicated issue because partnerships between the U.S. and host-country organizations often take place within a context of perceived inequality. Organizations in developing and transitional countries tend to be deeply sensitive about what they see as infringements on their autonomy and criticisms of their competence. At the same time, U.S. organizations may have a significant stake in the particular country and want not to be displaced by a local group with less experience and managerial depth. These sensitivities complicate the partnering process and add an element of instability.

To some extent, the negative effect of a power imbalance can be neutralized if the local group believes it has leverage on decisions that affect the partnership and if there is understanding about the comparative advantage each side brings to the table.

There are many things USAID or an intermediary organization can do to help put partner relations on an equal footing. Several American PVOs have developed policies and sets of objectives to accomplish this. USAID can

- Provide funds to the local organization rather than to the U.S. group
- Provide funds through an intermediary to negate the need to transfer funds to either partner

Case Study 4.15. Communicating With Partners

Freedom From Hunger (FFH) and the World Council of Credit Unions (WOCCU), both U.S. based, originally partnered because a USAID grant required the two to work together in a three-way partnership with local credit unions in the Philippines to improve local credit union operations and develop loan products targeting poor women. According to FFH, work with WOCCU is one of its best programs.

The biggest challenge to building a successful partnership was working through the communication and coordination issues that arose in the initial stages of the partnership. Facilitating optimal communication among FFH headquarters, WOCCU headquarters, and the local office in the Philippines has been complicated. Face-to-face meetings, patience, and prioritizing the issues so they center on partners have all played a central role in resolving communication issues. Knowing when an issue is “technical” and when it is “personality based” is key, as well. In some cases, personality-based issues may require reassignment of staff responsibilities to resolve issues. Being sensitive to a partner's workload (both within the partnership and beyond that related to the partnership) is also critical to building trust and working relationships.

- Encourage absolute transparency, particularly on budgetary matters
- Explore the possibility of local representation on the board of directors of the American organization
- Allocate funds for retreats and group facilitation to create a shared vision and clarify benefits received by both partners

Encouraging Communication And Collaboration

The most common difficulty in a partnership is communication. Clear and regular communication between partners is essential for success. While face-to-face exchanges are important, so too are phone calls, e-mails, and letters. Establishing systems of communication—such as a Web site for the partnership, e-mail discussion list groups, or regularly scheduled phone calls—improves relations. The more communication between partners, the more likely that partners are honest and

open with each other. This assists in creating greater transparency and sharing of sensitive information.

Make Decision-Making Transparent

Transparency is particularly important in partnerships because of the danger that one group may think the other is taking advantage of it or benefiting disproportionately from the relationship. It is especially important that the decision-making process be viewed as open and equitable. There should be shared understanding of the objectives and how they will be carried out, and of the budget and financial systems.

Special problems can arise when a foreign donor such as USAID is funding the partnership. In these situations, there can be serious misunderstanding about such things as the salary differential between American and host-country nationals and the allocation of overhead funds to support the headquarters cost of the U.S. group. While discussing these issues is often awk-

Case Study 4.16. Catholic Relief Services/Ethiopia and the Nazareth Children’s Center and Integrated Development

The partnership between Catholic Relief Services/Ethiopia (CRS/Ethiopia) and the Nazareth Children’s Center and Integrated Development is a good example of a mature relationship that has evolved organically over a decade or more. The partnership began in 1988 when CRS/Ethiopia agreed to drill a well for the orphanage. Cooperation increased as the two organizations gradually became comfortable with each other’s systems and values and became conscious of a shared vision. Because the relationship is longstanding, each organization seems to have an intuitive understanding of the larger hindrances on the other while remaining free to articulate particular problems and issues.

CRS/Ethiopia and NACID have developed effective procedures for dealing with conflict. The reality of conflict is acknowledged by both organizations, and issues are discussed openly and normally resolved by negotiation at the staff level. The thorniest issues are addressed through more formal and senior channels.

Successful resolution of differences appears to reflect consensus on basic mission, similar values, long experience in working together, a proclivity to discuss differences, and the existence of an established system for dispute resolution. When issues have arisen, CRS/Ethiopia has been flexible and adaptive in bending its rules and procedures and has been especially careful to be open and transparent about financial matters.

ward, it is almost always preferable to be forthcoming at the outset of the relationship.

There are several things USAID or an intermediary organization can do to encourage transparency:

- Set an example of openness and transparency in your discussions with the partners. This should include being unambiguous about USAID’s goals and expectations and about procurement rules and regulations. Early discussions about the meaning of “overhead” and the reality of salary differences are often warranted.
- Support an exchange of headquarters visits to help partners better understand each other’s systems.
- Encourage partners to include the subject of transparency and open-

ness in their partnership agreement.

- Encourage partners to spell out a process for dispute resolution. The partners should have a clear understanding of how they will resolve problems, when they might bring in a mediator, and how they will dissolve the partnership if needed.

Share Oversight of the Budget

It is particularly important that partners feel they share responsibility over money matters. More than any other area, budget and financial issues are lightning rods of controversy and disagreement. This is a difficult area because, under USAID procurement regulations, there must be a single organization that can be held accountable for the use of federal funds. Thus, from a technical point of view, budgetary re-

Case Study 4.17. Insights From a 28-Year-Old Partnership

Washington State University attributes the success of its 28-year partnership with the University of Jordan, in which the two collaborate in the delivery of services to third-party clients (such as the Ministry of Water and Irrigation in Jordan, or agriculture extension workers and farmers), to several fundamental factors:

- They have a shared strategic approach under which they choose to pursue joint activities only if there is a clear benefit to both partners. Many times one or the other will choose not to partner for a specific event. Because of their high level of trust and acceptance, this does not pose a problem.

- Both are committed to a diversity of funding sources.

- The partnership pursues a broad thematic scope of work—in this case including agriculture, water, environment, and information technology. In contrast to some partnerships that may have found it helpful to narrow their scope to ensure sustainability, this partnership welcomes a breadth of scope to help the partners ride out the ebbs and flows of donor funding and client needs.

- They continually maintain and nurture people in both partner organizations who will champion the partnership. This has to happen at the level of senior administrators (they need to be kept informed and on board) and at the operational level (where those who do the work—in this case, faculty and students—maintain an interest in promoting and renewing the partnership, seeking new clients and new talent within their organizations).

- Both partners are transparent in their mutual budgeting process and in developing implementation plans. Their high level of trust and functionality has allowed them to operate much more efficiently over time, resulting in tremendous reductions in transaction costs.

sponsibility cannot be “shared.” In most cases funds are committed to the American group. In some cases, however, the funding instrument can be structured so the local organization is the primary recipient. Regardless of who receives the funds, it is important that partners establish communication and decision-making systems that give both parties reasonable confidence that they know how funds are being allocated and that they can influence the process.

Grant agreements should spell out roles, responsibilities, outputs, budgets, and reporting requirements. It can help to use a third party to conduct audits that are part of accepted international institutional standards.

Acknowledge Cultural Differences

A factor critical to U.S.-host-country partnerships is cross-cultural sensitivity. Without this, logical and well-intentioned relationships often come apart prematurely because of differences in values that alienate the relationship. These often are expressed in subtle differences regarding the inherent meaning of the concept of ‘partnership’ and varying views regarding roles, relationships, and the distribution of benefits. These differences may be amplified through the application of well-intentioned U.S. procurement regulations that can be seen as placing the host-country organization in an inferior position.

It can be difficult to spot tensions that arise from cultural differences. Here are few things to watch for that could lead to cross-cultural tension:

- The prospective partners use different terminology to describe their relationship.
- The American organization has no overseas experience.

- The partnership has not scheduled a joint retreat or joint planning session.

- Staff from the American organization do not speak the partner's language.

Having staff exchanges is one way to strengthen a partnership and get a better understanding of different work styles.

Monitoring and Assessing Results

5

THE ABILITY to assess the impact of partnering depends (as any development result does) on two facets of development programming: performance monitoring and evaluation.

Performance monitoring is the ongoing process of collecting and analyzing data to measure the performance of a program, process, or activity against expected results. Partners should build performance and learning assessment from experience into their everyday work. By continuously assessing performance, they will acquire the knowledge and understanding needed to adjust activities to optimize achievement of results. Lessons learned will contribute to improvements for future programs and strategies.

To monitor performance effectively, a defined set of indicators is constructed to track the aspects of performance. Performance indicators are used to observe progress and to measure actual results against intended results. They serve to answer how or if an activity is progressing toward its objective, rather than why or why not progress is being made. Defining performance indicators for intended results is a powerful way to begin clarifying results statements. Clearly defined indicators that can be understood, agreed upon among partners, and monitored effectively can play a crucial role in defining and refining desired objectives. Therefore, indicators must be identified before the program is under way.

Evaluation is a relatively structured, analytic effort undertaken peri-

odically to answer specific questions about programs or activities. Evaluation looks at why results are or are not being achieved, at unintended consequences, and at issues of interpretation, relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, or sustainability. Evaluation can include quantitative methods or qualitative methods, or both. One type of method is not better than another; both are derived from multiple disciplines and can address almost any research topic.

Defining performance indicators for intended results is a powerful way to begin clarifying results statements.

Together, monitoring and evaluation are used to

- Assess progress in achieving results
- Identify corrective action needed to optimize the achievement of results
- Build capacity of customers and local stakeholders to reflect, analyze, and act
- Ensure financial accountability
- Provide organizational credibility and garner public support

Case Study 5.1. Monitoring Results of the Partnership Between Sinclair Community College and the Center for Vocational Education

During 1992–97, USAID invested \$750,000, with equivalent matching funds (cash and in-kind) from partners, to produce a financially sustainable NGO (formerly the Center for Vocational Education, now the Center for Workforce Development) located in Chennai, India. The center delivers vocational/technical education to rural and urban poor throughout the country. The initiative also resulted in the successful start-up of the first community college in the country, establishing the community college movement and contributing to workforce development in India.

Sinclair Community College (Dayton, Ohio) found that USAID's monitoring and evaluation methodology was invaluable in helping the partnership accomplish its goals. The template required by the Agency was "the best planning tool USAID has" and, though admittedly tedious, resulted in superior outcomes and timeliness. The quarterly report proved an invaluable planning tool, since the template is set up to assess each objective against each activity, aligning activities with resources needed, the source of funding, and an expected time line. This quarterly assessment helped the grant managers identify where problems are likely to arise and where accomplishments are occurring, and also significantly contributed to a general understanding of the partnering process. It helped tie financial resources to objectives in a way that facilitated partner communication, giving the parties opportunities to sort out potential problems or issues ahead of time. The reports also provided a useful means of disseminating to a broader audience in India and the United States the accomplishments and lessons learned from this pioneering and successful project.

Given the inevitable differences in cultural business practice between India and the United States, the reporting template also clearly defined USAID expectations and helped the partners avoid potential misconceptions. Whereas Indian practice tended toward less formal and more relational systems of accountability and planning, USAID requirements allowed all partners to operate from similar management and accountability structures. If these systems had been a requirement of the U.S. partner only, rather than of the donor, it would have been more difficult to convince the Indian partner of its utility for planning, evaluating, and making judicious use of donor money.

Source: Cook 1998.

Measuring The Effectiveness Of Partnerships

Partners need to see benefits from the relationship and understand ways to improve it. In most cases, partners

*In the process of developing this guide, the study team sought examples of partnership monitoring and evaluation plans. While all organizations noted the importance of such plans, no organization was able to share one. Many organizations said they were developing monitoring and evaluation systems but did not yet have them in place.

do not think about monitoring and evaluation until after they have begun working together. But it is important to have systems established from the beginning. Partners should agree to develop a monitoring and evaluation system in their memorandum of understanding, and the work plan should reflect anticipated results and indicators at the partnership activity level.*

USAID or the intermediary organization can help the partnership construct an effective monitoring and evaluation system by

- Including funds for training in monitoring and evaluation.
- Including funds to design and establish a joint evaluation unit.
- Orienting partners to understand and apply the principles and techniques contained in USAID's results-based program process (demystifying the language of the Agency process at the beginning of a partnership exercise is important).
- Emphasizing the need for partners to collect baseline data to provide a benchmark against which to measure the impact of the new relationship. What is most crucial, and sometimes overlooked, is to provide the partners—especially the host-country partner—with information from USAID's point of view on how the partnership relates to Agency results.

USAID staff and partners have noted that there are few conventional indicators to measure intangible results, such as those often associated with partnerships. There is a misconception that it is unacceptable to report qualitative indicators to USAID/Washington. Partnering, as with many other development activities, often produces intangible results, and qualitative indicators are necessary to assess them. Accurate judgments about results depend on the growing acceptance of the value and validity of qualitative indicators.*

While it is necessary to capture performance information that relates

*See the AIHA Work Plan Guidelines in appendix E for examples of outcome indicators. See the Catholic Relief Services Partnership Reflection Tool in appendix G for sample indications of partnership behavior.

directly to the original objectives, it is also important for partners to recognize the unintended benefits of the relationship. Showing how the partnering process has added value in new, unpredicted ways is beneficial to both the partners involved and to USAID staff who have to report on the activity.

Participatory Evaluation

While an outsider (one not associated with the program or activity) may conduct some evaluations to obtain an objective third-party viewpoint, most evaluations can benefit from a more participatory approach. Because of the nature of partnership activities, participatory evaluations are most useful in bringing together the perspectives of all stakeholders. Participatory evaluations involve the collective examination and assessment of a program or activity by stakeholders. In participatory evaluation, activity stakeholders are the principal actors in the evaluation process, not the objects of it. Involving various actors in planning, conducting, and interpreting evaluation findings ensures that data are collected and used in ways that meet the needs of everyone involved.

Participatory evaluation is based on the philosophical belief that reality is not a "given" to be discovered by a detached scientist; rather reality is "constructed" by actors and inquirers who are actively involved in the object of their inquiry. These actors and inquirers each have a unique perspective, and their various perspectives must be taken together to obtain a full and unbiased understanding of the situation at hand.

Evaluation outcomes are not descriptions of "the way things are"; rather, they represent meaningful constructions of actors' attempts to under-

Participatory evaluation uses qualitative and quantitative research methods that are grounded in an awareness that people in varying circumstances experience reality differently.

stand the situations in which they act. Evaluators, therefore, are not objective outsiders who set out to discover the truth about a situation, to judge its worthiness, and to recommend actions. Instead, evaluators are facilitators who assist stakeholders in constructing a shared reality about the project being evaluated and to make group judgments about project accomplishments and problems. Evaluators negotiate solutions to the major project issues identified by the stakeholders themselves.

A participatory evaluation starts with an issue, not a topic, making the work more dynamic and implying that differences of opinion about a situation—and perhaps even controversy—may exist. The issue is defined by the individuals involved in a situation (such as a partnership) who disagree about what is happening, about whether there is success, and about what the future course should be. An important goal of this type of evaluation is simply *to get the individuals working together* toward resolving the issue. This involves getting people to share their views about the issue and try to reach consensus on what to do about it.

The outcome of a participatory evaluation is jointly planned actions that will improve the working relation-

ships among stakeholders and consequently the project as a whole. This outcome is quite different from the outcome of a traditional evaluation, in which recommendations for improving the working relationships may be laid out but no attempt would be made to bring the individuals involved together to talk through the situation and reach agreement on how to improve it. In a participatory evaluation, action is inherent in the evaluation process. Process is a critical component. The evaluator becomes a process facilitator whose success is measured not by the validity of his judgments but by his ability to enlist project stakeholders in identifying and delving into the real issues of the situation.

A participatory evaluation

- Provides stakeholders with the opportunity to reflect on an activity's progress and obstacles
- Identifies differences in perspectives held by various participants and analyzes their reasons
- Generates knowledge that stakeholders can use to change activities to maximize results
- Provides stakeholders with the tools to transform their environment
- Builds evaluation capacity in stakeholder organizations or groups

Participatory evaluation uses qualitative and quantitative research methods that are grounded in an awareness that people in varying circumstances experience reality differently. The objective is to gather information about these realities and put it into context. *Rapid*

Case Study 5.2. Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy For the Institutional Partnerships Project

Managing 22 partnerships in the Institutional Partnerships Project demanded resourcefulness and flexibility from International Research and Exchanges Board staff in Russia, Ukraine, and the United States. IREX employed a multifaceted strategy to ensure that cultural differences and other obstacles did not overly hamper the partnerships' efforts. Day-to-day monitoring of the partnerships allowed IREX to provide guidance and assistance that was critical to their success. This approach was augmented with a series of technical assistance workshops for partners in all three countries, enabling them to network, share ideas on novel approaches, and learn more effective program implementation, financial tracking, and reporting skills. IREX staff also took pains to ensure that the distances between partners did not hamper effective communication, using the Internet and e-mail for internal communications and to keep in touch with the partners. Finally, to produce objective feedback from the partnerships, IREX hired sector specialists who conducted independent evaluations. The evaluators then shared the results with each of the partnerships and with IREX so that any problems could be resolved mutually.

appraisal is one of the most common tools used in participatory evaluation.

Rapid appraisal methods are quick, low-cost ways to systematically gather quantitative or qualitative data, or both. These methods fall on a continuum between extremely informal methods (such as casual conversations) and highly formal methods (such as censuses or large-scale surveys). Rapid appraisal methods use an approach to data gathering that is guided by two principles: 1) "optimal ignorance," or the art of knowing what is not worth knowing, and 2) "proportionate accuracy," or avoidance of unnecessary precision.

Rapid appraisal studies can be completed quickly because the scope of the study is limited. The number of sites visited, the sample size, the variables examined, and the questions asked are minimized to facilitate quick data collection and analysis. Rapid appraisal can gather, analyze, and report relevant information to decision-makers within days or weeks. Because rapid appraisal studies can be mobilized and completed

quickly, they can provide managers with information on an ad hoc basis as unforeseen problems and uncertainties arise during implementation. Rapid appraisal methods are useful to decision-makers who seldom have the option of holding up important decisions while awaiting information.

At the same time, information generated by these methods may lack reliability and validity because of informal sampling techniques, individual biases of the evaluators or interviewers, and difficulties in recording, coding, and analyzing qualitative data. But these problems can be minimized by taking steps to reduce bias during data collection and analysis, or by using more than one method to cross-check results (triangulation). Also, some degree of rigor can be obtained through the following approaches:

- *Purposive sampling.* Interviewing individuals who meet certain criteria (e.g., farmers who own less than two hectares) rather than using more time-consuming random sampling techniques.

- *Gathering of empirical data.* Using data collection techniques such as key informant interviews, focus group interviews, group interviews, observation, informal or minisurveys, and so forth.
- *Use of comparison groups.* For example, interviewing participant and nonparticipant farmers in a project.
- *Tabulation of data.* Quantitative analysis or aggregation of the data into analytic categories (qualitative analysis).

Rapid appraisals are particularly useful in situations where an understanding is required of the motivations and attitudes that may affect behavior, for instance of a development activity's customers or partners. They are often highly successful in answering the "why" and "how" questions.

Specific Tools for Evaluating Partnerships

Intersectoral Partnering Assessment Framework—USAID

Recently developed by USAID, the Intersectoral Partnering (ISP) Assessment Framework* provides a comprehensive view of partnering that recognizes the multiple dimensions of a partnership. It highlights three domains of intersectoral partnering: the values and capacity of the partnership, the process of partnering, and the impact of the partnership. While the framework was created for trisectoral partnerships (between civil society, the

private sector, and government), the concepts can be applied to partnerships between U.S. and host-country organizations.

The three domains in the framework are

- *Values and capacity.* The existence of the partnership itself is a result of an ISP. By assessing the values and capacity of the partnership's organizational capacity, organizational norms, and the external environment, it is possible to assess the nature and identity of the partnership itself.
- *Process.* The process of partnering is also a result. Process is often the most difficult of the three aspects to assess. The two dimensions of the process to evaluate are 1) mechanisms for communication and collaboration *within* the partnership and 2) mechanisms for communication and collaboration *outside* the partnership.
- *Impact.* The impact of intersectoral partnering can be assessed at three levels: the impact of the activity on the common issue addressed by the partnership; the impact on the partner members; and the impact on society.

Within each dimension, the framework identifies numerous categories and a menu of indicators. While the proposed framework is a new concept, the indicators are not; they have been developed and used by USAID and other organizations. Not every indicator in the framework will be relevant for every partnership, but the menu of indicators allows the partners to select those most appropriate. The framework is both flexible and fluid and can be used to fit

*ISP Assessment Framework: <http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/isp>

the needs and mission of each partnership.

Grass-Roots Development Framework—Inter-American Foundation

The Inter-American Foundation (IAF) developed one of the first sets of indicators that measure the results of partnerships. The Grass-Roots Development Framework (GDF)* attempts to capture both the *tangible* and *intangible* results of grass-roots development. IAF identified three levels of impact: personal, organizational, and societal. Each level is divided into the tangible and intangible aspects of the work NGOs carry out at those three levels. These six potential areas of impact are portrayed in an inverted cone shape that donors and NGOs can fill in. At the personal level, *standard of living* and *personal capacity* are assessed. At the organizational level, *organizational capability* and *culture* are assessed. Finally, at the societal level, the *policy environment* and *community norms* are assessed.

Each of these six sections contains three to five variables that can be measured by some of IAF's menu of 45 indicators. IAF has also developed a list of questions that can be used when gathering data to document an indicator. The GDF assists development practitioners in measuring the impact of all NGO projects. Thus, in some situations the framework could apply to partnerships.

Discussion-Oriented Organizational Self-Assessment—Pact

Pact's Discussion-Oriented Organizational Self-Assessment tool (DOSA)[†] is an effort to measure organizational capacity in civil society. With assistance from USAID's Office of Private and Vol-

untary Cooperation and private voluntary organization colleagues, Pact developed this tool to assist PVOs in strengthening their organizational capacity. The tool has been adapted to assess organizational capacity of smaller NGOs in developing countries and partnerships, as well. Specifically, DOSA measures organizational capacities and consensus levels in six critical areas and assesses the impact of these activities over time on organizational capacity (known as benchmarking). Currently, the tool serves not only to assess organizational capacity, but also as a springboard for organizational change. The six areas are

- Organizational learning, including teamwork and information sharing
- Strategic management, including planning, governance, mission, and partnering
- Service delivery, including field-based program practices and sustainability issues
- Financial resource management, including budgeting, forecasting, and cash management
- Human resource management, including staff training, supervision, and personnel practices
- External relations, including constituency development, fund-raising, and communications

DOSA and similar organizational capacity tools developed by Pact use

*The Grass-Roots Development Framework: <http://www.iaf.gov/results/menu01.htm>

[†]DOSA: <http://www.edc.org/INT/CapDev/dosapage.htm>

What gets measured gets done. The continuing evaluation panel creates an opportunity to measure the more qualitative and process-related aspects of the partnerships that were not captured in past evaluations.

self-assessment techniques through facilitated discussion. The DOSA tool measures organizational capacity by forming an internal assessment team (usually made up of the organization's staff) to discuss a series of questions (outlined in the tool). Each individual scores the discussion questions. Pact has adapted this same methodology for use with individual organizations. The methodology has been applied to measure the effectiveness of a partnership.

***Continuing Evaluation Panel—
American International
Health Alliance***

The American International Health Alliance (AIHA) is in the process of improving its monitoring and evaluation process through a continuing evaluation panel, or CEP.* The panel will be charged with conducting the midterm evaluation, which includes 1) developing an evaluation strategy, 2) conducting the evaluation through site visits and other methods, 3) analyzing data, 4) preparing reports, and 5) sharing findings and recommendations with AIHA and USAID. The CEP will consist of eight individuals, all of whom will be independent consultants or others not

directly associated with the partnerships program. The CEP will be multidisciplinary. The panel will serve as an informed but objective group of researchers charged with assessing certain aspects of progress toward program goals and objectives at its midpoint. This panel will be convened well before the midterm evaluation.

In comparing the advantages of the CEP approach to evaluation with those of the standard approach, the following benefits were identified:

- *Early involvement of panel members.* In addition to the benefit to the evaluators of having sufficient time to become knowledgeable about the program, this approach allows AIHA to have sufficient time to recruit quality evaluators.
- *Broad exposure to the project and the overall evaluation.* What gets measured gets done. The CEP creates an opportunity to measure the more qualitative and process-related aspects of the partnerships, such as collaboration and participation, that were not captured in past evaluations.
- *Team approach to conducting the evaluation.* The benefits of building a team over time (as opposed to convening a group just before the site visit) result in a more collaborative and cohesive approach to the evaluation.
- *Ongoing education of panel members about the project and its evaluation.* The CEP stands ready to understand the important issues while, because of careful management, not being co-opted. The evaluators are thus able to use the evaluation as a learning experience rather

*Continuing Evaluation Panel: <http://www.aiha.com/english/m&e/cep.htm>

than a punitive experience for all involved.

The only drawback associated with the use of the CEP is that it represents a more resource-intensive approach to evaluation than USAID's standard approach. Even so, AIHA is committed to using the CEP and investing the appropriate level of resources and time to support the mechanism. Over the short term

the CEP may prove more costly than the standard approach. But over the long term the depth and breadth of the evaluation findings arising from the synergy of quantitative and qualitative data (in addition to the level of rigor and consistency provided by a knowledgeable and experienced evaluation team) will render the CEP no more costly, if not less expensive, than the standard approach.

Sustaining the Partnership

6

AS DEFINED IN CHAPTER 1, a *sustainable partnership* is one that has demonstrated an organizational and financial capacity to continue the activities and benefits supported by the partnership without critical reliance on USAID funds. Sustainability can be assessed by examining financial, organizational, and programmatic factors.

If the impact of the partnership is sustainable, then the partnership can be considered a success. This reflects pro-

grammatic sustainability. Having the partnership itself be sustainable is a separate issue. A sustained partnership is one in which the relationship provides ongoing benefits to both partners – a condition that requires both financial and organizational sustainability. Table 6.1 describes possible ways in which partnerships are successful and sustainable.

In addition, the ongoing personal connections that come from partnering

Table 6.1. Sustainability of Partnerships

Objective of Partnership	Outcome of Partnership	Success is	Sustainability is
Creation of a new entity	New entity	New entity can survive without the partnership	Relationship between partners continues to create more new entities
U.S. partner assists in strengthening capacity of host-country partner	Host-country partner capacity strengthened	Host-country partner no longer needs assistance from U.S. partner	Relationship between partners continues with new objectives
Host-country partner assists in strengthening capacity of U.S. partner	U.S. partner capacity strengthened	U.S. partner no longer needs assistance from host-country partner	Relationship between partners continues with new objectives
Technical assistance provided by U.S. partner to host-country partner	a) new entity formed b) new program formed	a) new entity can survive without the partnership b) new program continues without the partnership	a) partnership creates more new entities b) partnership creates more new programs
Increased project activity	Project activity increased	Project activity continues, regardless of partnership	Partnership continues new project activity through self-financing or from new donors
Development of new program	New program developed	New program can survive without the partnership	Partnership continues new program through self-financing or from new donors

Case Study 6.1. New Partnerships Develop From Old Ones

Thanks to the efforts of developing partnerships under the USAID Reaching out with Education to Adults in Development (READ) project, World Education continued a partnership with the Urban Trust of Namibia (UTN) that concentrates primarily on governance and civil society issues while working with local government ministries and city councils. The strong working relationship World Education had with UTN during the READ project contributed to the current World Education–UTN partnership, which is funded by the Ford Foundation and UNICEF. The program, known as the SESCIT project, is a school governance program in Namibia’s Oshakati region. Its primary goal is to engage parents in their children’s education through the establishment of active school boards.

A second spinoff partnership having its genesis in READ is the World Education–Rossing Foundation partnership. Rossing is one of the oldest, most thoroughly established Namibian nongovernmental organizations with a broad portfolio of activities. Under READ, Rossing was an enthusiastic participant in its Training of Trainers (TOT) program. Rossing sent several of its trainers to be trained by READ and at the end of the READ project took over the TOT program. Rossing employed numerous World Education–trained instructors. It now conducts successful TOTs of its own. NGO trainers from all over southern Africa attend the Rossing TOT course. The program not only continues the capacity-building work begun by READ but also generates revenue for Rossing.



Collegial relationships formed during the course of a partnership may endure far longer than the program activities or the institutional partnership.



are an important benefit that is sometimes lost in the big picture. Collegial relationships formed during the course of a partnership may endure far longer than the program activities or the institutional partnership. These relationships may give rise to new partnerships many years later.

A mature and longstanding partnership is usually more stable and probably more effective than a new relationship. The continuation of a re-

lationship often indicates that the partners place a value on the association. However, a long-term relationship is not necessarily synonymous with an effective relationship. At the same time, a short-term partnership is not necessarily an ineffective partnership. Just as it is healthy for organizations to evolve and go out of business, so is it healthy for partnerships to end when they no longer serve a useful purpose.

It is important for all the parties involved to agree on what sustainability means for their particular partnership. Discussing sustainability issues from the beginning makes it more likely that the partnership will last.* One should ask whether an emerging partnership is likely to be sustainable beyond the termination of USAID support and how Agency assistance can be structured to increase the likelihood of sustainability.

Issues to keep in mind when thinking about sustainability:

*See appendix F for a sample sustainability plan.

Case Study 6.2. From Partnership to Autonomous Organization: The PRIP Trust

The Private Rural Initiative Project (PRIP) Trust in Bangladesh is a well-documented example of a successful but difficult process of growth and independence from project to subsidiary to partnership to autonomy. The PRIP Trust began in 1988 as a capacity-building project for local NGOs funded by USAID and managed by Pact. In 1993 a decision was made to establish the trust as an autonomous national organization. Over the next five years the staffs of Pact and the PRIP Trust, with USAID and other donor support, crafted a plan for full independence that included recruitment and training of a board of directors, hiring of local staff, identification of alternative funding sources, and a range of efforts to launch a new organization. The strong support and active role of the USAID mission director was particularly important to establishing the trust.

Lessons learned include the following:

- The maturation process usually takes quite a while.
- It is important to deliberately engineer a deep sense of institutional ownership.
- A strong and credible local board of directors is invaluable.
- A clear and unifying organizational mission is critical, particularly when different donors are recommending their own priorities.

The PRIP story offers useful insight into the difficulties an emerging NGO faces when working with multiple donors in an attempt to diversify its revenue base. These include locating discretionary resources to cover management costs, finding multiyear funds that will sustain the organization during the growth and maturation period, recognizing the considerable time and cost of educating donors, and working with multiple donors with different systems, procedures, and funding cycles.

-
- The full cost of a partnership to the participating groups is much higher than the direct financial cost because of the time and energy that staff and management must devote to nurturing and building the relationship. Simply because two groups can raise the funds needed to finance the partnership does not mean it will continue.
 - Ongoing partnerships that existed before their relationship with USAID may be less dependent on Agency support and better able to achieve sustainability than partnerships created in part (or in whole) to tap donor funding.
 - Some types of organizations may find it easier than others to create sustainable partnerships. For example, groups that engage in revenue-generating activities can sustain joint projects from raised income. Groups such as advocacy organizations, for which the added cost of collaboration is minimal, are better able to support partnerships than, for example, service organizations for which the incremental cost of the partnership is high.
 - A partnership's positive or negative impact on overall fund-raising activity may depend on the nature and composition of current support. In general, dissimilarity in the

Table 6.2. Organizational Sustainability

Key Factor Related to Organizational Stability	Result and Benefit	Consequences, If Absent or Weak
1. Strong and concise mission statement and strong long-range plan	Indicates that the partnership is off to the right start to guide its activities	Difficult to carry out a set of activities that will lead to the intended result
2. Written partnership agreement	Indicates partners have addressed issues/differences	Differences with respect to goals or partnership
3. Systems for monitoring and evaluation	Provides objective source of information to gauge impact of partnership to make needed adjustments	Lack of feedback that could indicate when adjustments are needed; disagreement on value of relationship
4. System for dispute resolution	Indicates serious intent and provides for resolving differences	Unresolved differences that become increasingly problematic
5. Partnerships with other organizations	Indicates prior experience; reference point for resolution of difficulties	Longer learning period

list of donors suggests a valuable opportunity for collaboration. Where the list is the same, or where both groups appeal to a limited donor group (such as is the case with single-issue NGOs), the partners may find that the relationship hurts their fund-raising potential.

Indications of Organizational Sustainability

The factors discussed in this chapter are helpful in determining whether the partnership is likely to be sustainable. When there is a shared vision, a common culture, similar functions, compatible systems, and organizational maturity, the organizational aspect of the partnership is likely to be strong. Under these conditions, the partners

share a common language, basic agreement on goals and priorities, and a set of compatible values that will be helpful when differences arise.

In addition to these core principles, there are five specific characteristics of an emerging partnership that are often correlated with organizational sustainability (see table 6.2). While these factors are not essential, they may indicate whether a relationship is sustainable over the long term.

Indications of Financial Sustainability

With regard to financial sustainability, consider the following: *To what extent is the partnership capable of generating a stream of additional income equal to or greater than the cost of sustaining the relationship?*

Box 6.1. Financial Sustainability

Indications that a partnership may become financially sustainable:

- The partners are coordinating their fund-raising efforts.
- The partners have developed a long-range financial plan.
- The partners implement activities that have a potential to generate revenue.
- The partners have a diversified funding base and are not dependent on USAID.
- The partners have a complementary donor profile—that is, there is a minimum of overlap and duplication.
- The local organization is entrepreneurial and imaginative in its fund-raising strategy.
- The partners recognize the *full* cost of the relationship—including its indirect managerial and staff costs.
- The partnership agreement explicitly recognizes the central importance of financial sustainability, and the parties have taken concrete steps to address financial sustainability.
- The local organization has adequate internal control, knows the cost of doing business, has effective accounting and financial systems, and can distinguish between fixed and variable costs.

If the partnership is not generating extra income, then the sustainability plan should propose other venues for support. USAID should assist in identifying various options. Although a conclusive answer to the question of future financial self-sufficiency is unlikely, some characteristics of the partnership may indicate whether the relationship will be financially sustainable (see box 6.1).

There are a host of things (and several of them are mentioned below) that USAID, or the intermediary, can do to increase the likelihood that the future relationship will be financially sustainable. Some things can be done early in the planning stage of the relationship, others when it is operational:

- Promote the partnership to other donors.

- Include funds for organizational development.
- Provide training in organizational development.
- Make a multiyear commitment of USAID funds.
- Ensure that the partners compare their lists of supporters.
- Ask the U.S. partner for a multiyear commitment to the relationship.
- Encourage the partners to conduct a cost analysis of the relationship.
- Require a sustainability plan in the grant application and ask for periodic updates.

Case Study 6.3. Sustainability Grants

The New Independent States Health Partnerships program has sustainability grants to assist hospital partnerships that have existed for two or more years and require additional—but substantially reduced and time-limited—support to complete activities well under way, to disseminate or replicate partnership experience, or to develop a viable sustainability plan whereby important aspects of the partnership can continue without further USAID support. These sustainability grants are for one to two years, funded at \$50,000 to \$100,000 each year.

- Ensure that the two organizations understand time constraints and the necessity of finding alternative sources of funding.
- Provide only partial funding to encourage the partners to tap additional sources of support.
- Require significant cost-sharing and increase the cost-sharing percentage during the life of the grant.
- Include adequate funds for headquarters overhead—or make sure the U.S. partner includes adequate funds.

Appendixes

A

Case Studies and Web Sites

Table 1.1
Types of American
And Host-Country
Organization Partnerships

American International Health Alliance
Health Partnerships Program
<http://www.aiha.com>

From Albania to Kyrgyzstan, the American International Health Alliance establishes and manages partnerships and cross-partnership programs—founded on volunteerism and community-based programs—to improve the health care of individuals in the new independent states of the former Soviet Union and in central and eastern Europe.

United States Energy Association
Energy Industry Partnership Program
<http://www.usea.org>

The United States Energy Association has organized more than 75 cooperative partnerships between organizations in the United States and counterparts in developing and transitional countries. Through these partnerships, U.S. organizations have conveyed American experience and business/regulatory practices to other nations. These relationships have been applauded collectively as one of the most successful foreign assistance programs ever created. Activities have been conducted in Africa, Asia, central and east-

All uniform resource locators (Web addresses) were current as this document went to press.

ern Europe, Latin America, and the post-Soviet states. Areas of emphasis have included natural gas distribution; petroleum exploration, production, and transportation; and electric power production, transmission, distribution, and use.

Resource Cities Program
<http://icma.org/go.cfm?cid=1&gid=3&sid=229>

The International City/County Management Association, with its membership of more than 8,500 local government professionals, has provided management and strategic guidance for the Resource Cities Program. Through a cooperative agreement, ICMA facilitates the partnering of U.S. municipal officials or associations, or both, with foreign city officials to address local governance issues through technical transfers of expertise. The program grew rapidly from 6 partnerships in 1997 to more than 30 in 2000 among cities, counties, and other municipal support organizations.

University Development Linkages Program
http://www.usaid.gov/educ_training/udlp.htm

The University Development Linkages Program (UDLP) promotes and supports long-term collaboration between U.S. colleges and universities and developing-country institutions of higher education to

- Further the internationalization objectives of U.S. universities and colleges

- Strengthen developing-country institutions to meet the development needs of their societies more effectively

UDLP helps build long-term, mutually beneficial relationships between American and developing-country higher education institutions. USAID funding is considered seed money or venture capital that is provided for up to five years and requires up to 25 percent matching funds. Partnership initiatives such as the UDLP are an efficient and effective mechanism for eliciting higher education participation in development.

***Association Liaison Office
For University Cooperation
In Development***

<http://www.aascu.org/alo>

The Association Liaison Office for University Cooperation in Development (ALO), established in 1992, coordinates the efforts of the United States' six major higher education associations to build their partnership with USAID and help their member institutions plan and implement development programs with colleges and universities abroad. Uniquely situated to broaden and deepen the involvement of the American higher education community in partnerships for global development, ALO mobilizes the community's resources toward this end.

Fountain House and Human Soul

<http://www.fountainhouse.org>

The purpose of the partnership between Fountain House in the United States and Human Soul in Russia is to strengthen the Russian Network of Clubhouses by enhancing their relations with local authorities, sponsors, and the psychiatric community and to promote

social services that support people with mental health problems. A "clubhouse" is a form of psychiatric rehabilitation, providing a place where people with severe and persistent mental illness are given opportunities and the necessary support to live and work independently in the community. The major collaboration within the partnership has involved the adaptation and transfer of the MEMPHIS software program to Human Soul House. The program was developed by Fountain House and is used as a main tool to collect statistical data on the efficiency of clubhouse work. Beyond the ongoing software training, the project is working to provide assistance for Russian regional representatives who express an interest in setting up clubhouse programs in their areas.

Pact and Ethos

<http://www.pactworld.org>

Pact's mission is to contribute to the growth of civil society – organizations in which citizens acting together can express their interests, exchange information, strive for mutual goals, and influence government. They accomplish this by helping strengthen the community-targeted nonprofit sector worldwide and by working with strategic partners to identify and implement participatory development mechanisms at the community level that promote economic, social, and environmental justice.

<http://www.ethos.org.br>*

*This site is primarily in Portuguese. To read an English translation of the Ethos Institute's mission, go to its home page and click on *Mapa do Site*; then, under the item *Missão*, click on *Inglês*. To read an English translation of the institute's vision, go to the home page, click on *Mapa do Site*; then, under the item *Visão*, click on *Inglês*.

The Ethos Institute of Business and Social Responsibility is an association of companies of any size and sector interested in developing their activities in a socially responsible manner, in a permanent process of evaluation and improvement. Ethos's mission is to spread business social responsibility by helping businesses

- Understand and incorporate in a progressive way the concept of socially responsible business behavior
- Implement policies and practices that meet high ethical criteria, contributing to the achievement of long-term, sustainable economic success
- Take on their responsibilities with respect to all those affected by their activities
- Show their shareholders the relevance of socially responsible behavior to their long-term return on investment
- Identify novel and effective ways of acting in partnership with communities in the construction of a common welfare
- Prosper while contributing to socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable development

***United States-Asia
Environmental Program***
<http://www.usaep.org>

The United States-Asia Environmental Partnership is a public-private initiative that promotes environmentally sustainable development in Asia. US-AEP is jointly implemented by several U.S. government agencies, under

USAID's leadership. The partnership embodies a new model of cooperative development, one that encourages U.S.-Asian partnerships. With the participation of a wide range of partners—governments, NGOs, academia, and the private sector—US-AEP has become a flexible, responsive vehicle for delivering timely answers to environmental questions. It currently works with governments and industries in 11 target economies: Hong Kong, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Thailand, and Vietnam.

EcoLinks Program
<http://www.ecolinks.org>

EcoLinks seeks practical market-based solutions to industrial and urban environmental problems in central and eastern Europe and the new independent states of the former Soviet Union (at USAID this region is referred to as Europe and Eurasia, or E&E). The program promotes partnerships by linking businesses, local governments, and associations from the E&E region with U.S. businesses and other organizations. In working with their U.S. (or regional) partners, organizations in the region are better able to identify and remedy environmental problems by learning from their partners how to adapt the best environmental management practices and technologies available. As these partnerships mature, trade and investment in environmental goods and services will increase.

Case Study 2.1 Benefits to U.S. Partners

*Association Liaison Office
For University Cooperation
In Development Program*
<http://www.aascu.org/alo>

See notes for table 1.1 (page A1).

*Howard University School
Of Medicine and University
Of the Transkei*

See the portable document format at <http://www.aascu.org/alo/IP/1998/1998A46.pdf>.

*Metropolitan Community College
And Universidad Centroamericana
José Simeón Cañas Highline
Community College and
Polytechnic of Namibia*

See the portable document format at <http://www.aascu.org/alo/IP/1999/hcc.pdf>.

Case Study 3.1 Intermediary as Partnership Broker

*American International
Health Alliance*
<http://www.aiha.com>

See notes for table 1.1.

Case Study 3.2 Funding the Host-Country Partner

EcoLinks
<http://www.ecolinks.org>

See notes for table 1.1.

Case Study 3.3 Capturing the 'True' Value of Cost-Sharing

*Association Liaison
Office/Maricopa Community
Colleges and Universidad
Veracruzana*
<http://www.aascu.org/alo/IP/proposals.htm>
<http://www.maricopa.edu>

The purpose of the partnership between Maricopa Community Colleges and the Universidad Veracruzana is to strengthen public health education and to promote the competitiveness and environmental protection practices of businesses.

Case Study 3.4 Importance of Leadership

Dubna/La Crosse Partnership
<http://www.aiha.com/english/partners/dublac.htm>

AIHA's Medical Partnership Program between the cities of La Crosse, Wisconsin, and Dubna, in Russia, funded under a cooperative agreement with USAID, has existed since December 1992. Hospital No. 9, Central City Hospital, and the Bolshaya Volga Hospital (which houses the Diabetes School and the Children's Rehabilitation Center) are the Russian partners. Lutheran Health System, Franciscan Health System, Gundersen Clinic, Skemp Clinic, and the La Crosse Visiting Nurses Association represent the American side of the program. The general areas of partnership emphasis are orthotics, cardiac rehabilitation, diabetes education, renal dialysis, women's health, alcohol rehabilitation and education, and home care and hospice programs.

Case Study 4.1 Exploring Partnership Possibilities

*United States-Asia
Environmental Program*
<http://www.usaep.org>

See notes for table 1.1.

Case Study 4.2 The Use of Program Development and Learning Funds

*Automated Directives System
201.3.3.6: Program Development
and Learning Objectives*
[http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads/
200](http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads/200)

Bureaus may create one or more program development and learning (PD&L) objectives to finance program development costs and program assessments and learning efforts. The number of PD&L objectives per bureau should be managed to minimize congressional notification and other management burdens. Operating units and bureau offices that need to undertake analytical or evaluative work may create and fund such activities under their bureau PD&L objective (there is no requirement to establish an operating unit or office-level PD&L objective to receive bureau PD&L funding). The requesting unit manages the specific activity.

Case Study 4.3 Shared Experiences And Future Partnerships

Democracy Network
<http://www.ngonet.org/dnp.htm>

The Democracy Network (DemNet) is a major U.S. government-sponsored initiative to support the development of indigenous nongovernmental organizations in central and eastern Europe (CEE). The three-year program, begun in 1995, provides an array of financial, training, legal, and networking support to strengthen CEE's public policy-oriented NGOs active in four areas: democratization, economic development, social sector restructuring, and environmental protection. Support for NGO development is delivered through nine individual country programs (covering 11 countries) and two regional programs. All Democracy Network programs are administered by U.S. organizations. ORT/USAID Albania DemNet organized a February 2000 conference, CEE/NIS NGO Shared Experiences and Future Partnerships. Freedom House provided a travel grant to support participants from Yugoslavia and other Balkan countries.

Case Study 4.4 U.S. Private Voluntary Organization Relations With Namibian Nongovernmental Organizations

World Education
<http://www.worlded.org>

World Education is a nonprofit organization dedicated to improving the lives of the poor through economic and social development programs. It pro-

vides training and technical assistance in nonformal education for adults and children, with special emphases on literacy, income generation, small-enterprise development, education for the workplace, environmental education, reproductive health, HIV/AIDS education, refugee orientation, and maternal and child health. Projects are designed to contribute to individual growth and to community and national development.

Reaching Out With Education to Adults In Development (READ) Project
<http://www.worlded.org/projects/africa.htm#africa>

Through the Reaching out with Education to Adults in Development Project, better known as READ, World Education offered training and financial assistance to a wide spectrum of Namibian NGOs that provide nonformal education and skills training to disadvantaged adults throughout Namibia. The READ project offered training in participatory education and development techniques (“training of trainers”) to staff of NGOs providing literacy, income-generation, and HIV/AIDS education. The institution-strengthening emphasis incorporated financial assistance for program or staff expansion as well as for targeted training in planning, management, and other organizational development skills. The five-year project was completed in 1998.

Case Study 4.5 Collaboration in the New Independent States

*Initiative for Social Action
And Renewal in Eurasia*
<http://www.isar.org>

The Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia is a nonprofit organization with offices in Washington and seven cities in the former Soviet Union. Its mission is to promote citizen participation and development of the nongovernmental sector in the post-Soviet states by supporting citizen activists and grass-roots NGOs in their efforts to create just and sustainable societies.

Case Study 4.6 Finding Common Ground

Pact
<http://www.pactworld.org>

See notes for table 1.1.

Ethos
<http://www.ethos.org.br>

See notes for table 1.1.

Case Study 4.7 Partnerships Between Nongovernmental and Commercial Organizations

CorCom
<http://www.corcom.org>

CorCom creates links between businesses and nonprofits. It helps nonprofits become more effective in their work and more attractive to businesses as partners in joint endeavors

and to find business partners that can help achieve social objectives. CorCom helps businesses be more strategic in their community investments by linking with community development professionals and expanding into emerging markets through partnerships with nonprofits already in those areas.

Case Study 4.8 Overcoming Differences In Organizational Culture

*The Institute for
Development Research*
<http://www.jsi.com/idr>

PLAN/BIMAS is one of six case studies sponsored by USAID/Bureau for Humanitarian Response/Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation and implemented by the Institute for Development Research that concerns itself with the dynamics between Northern and Southern institutions. Since 1992, IDR has helped nongovernmental organizations identify and work through the challenges of cooperation. Through action research and consulting to PVO-NGO partnerships, IDR has built new knowledge about issues, structures, and dynamics that hamper partnership effectiveness and has developed expertise in assisting partnership improvement efforts. It has expanded the scope of its partnership research and practice to 1) include the role of donor policy and the impact of Northern organization structures and 2) address questions about the impact of partnership-based development strategies.

Case Study 4.9 Choosing the Most Cost-Effective Partner

Freedom From Hunger
<http://www.freedomfromhunger.org>

Freedom From Hunger (FFH) brings inventive and sustainable self-help solutions to the fight against chronic hunger and poverty. Together with local partners, it equips families with resources they need to build futures of health, hope, and dignity. FFH has more than 50 years of experience developing self-help solutions to the problem of chronic hunger. To date, its Credit With Education strategy has empowered more than 100,000 families to break the cycle of hunger that has gripped them for generations.

Case Study 4.10 Appreciative Inquiry Model For Building Partnerships

*Global Excellence in
Management Initiative*
<http://www.geminitiative.org>

Global Excellence in Management (GEM) is a university-based program of learning and education that works in partnership with American PVOs and international NGOs to conduct capacity-building programs that support new models of institutional excellence. GEM is known for programs that are original and intellectually alive; for its signature themes of appreciative inquiry, global partnership, and knowledge generation; for its human-centered approach that responds to the advanced learning agendas of PVO and NGO leadership teams; and for capacity-building work that is collaboratively constructed for enduring results. Participation in

GEM programs enables organizations to discover and heighten their capacities to learn, change, and innovate.

Case Study 4.11 Mutual Accountability Reflected in Formal Agreements

*The Institute for
Development Research*
<http://www.jsi.com/idr>

See notes for case study 4.8.

Case Study 4.12 U.S.–Russian Partnerships

USAID/Russia
[http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/
cp2000/eni/russia.html](http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/cp2000/eni/russia.html)

USAID's program is part of the Partnership for Freedom and the companion Regional Investment Initiative, which target funds to the regions away from Moscow and emphasize the creation and strengthening of sustainable partnerships between U.S. and Russian organizations in all sectors.

Case Study 4.13 Katalysis Partnership Model

Katalysis
<http://www.katalysis.org>

Founded in 1984, Katalysis helped pioneer the microcredit model of economic development: the Bootstrap Banking model that the organization still practices today. Instead of offering handouts that increase dependency and

yield short-term results, Katalysis nurtures sustainable self-help enterprises. It provides microloans and training to businesspeople who already have small enterprises but lack the resources to make them profitable and sustainable. Such assistance builds self-sufficiency and self-confidence. Katalysis works in partnership with eight community-based organizations that bring Bootstrap Banking to those who need it most: the rural poor of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua.

Case Study 4.14 Changing Relationships: From Project Office To Partner

*World Learning and
The Development Center*
[http://www.worldlearning.org/
pidt/shared.html](http://www.worldlearning.org/pidt/shared.html)

In 1996, World Learning and USAID agreed to take steps to transform SHARED (formerly Services for Health, Agriculture, Rural, and Enterprise Development) into a local independent NGO by the project's conclusion in 2000. As a result of strategic planning sessions and informational networking, the local project management unit has established the Development Center, a non-profit organization that has developed mission, case, and capability statements for indigenous NGOs. The Development Center became a fully functioning Malawian NGO in July 1999 and has already attracted the attention of donors such as the United Nations and the European Union.

Case Study 4.15 Communicating With Partners

Freedom From Hunger

<http://www.freedomfromhunger.org>

See notes for case study 4.9.

Case Study 4.16 Catholic Relief Services/Ethiopia and The Nazareth Children's Center and Integrated Development

*Catholic Relief Services/Ethiopia
And the Nazareth Children's
Center and Integrated Development*
<http://www.catholicrelief.org>

The mission of Catholic Relief Services Ethiopia (CRS/Ethiopia) is to alleviate human suffering and promote social and economic justice while fostering human dignity. This mission derives its guiding principles from the fundamental precepts of Catholic social teachings. CRS/Ethiopia's strategic goal is to ensure that vulnerable populations are food secure. CRS/Ethiopia supports activities in health, emergency, general assistance, enterprise development, and agriculture/natural resource management.

*The Institute for
Development Research*
<http://www.jsi.com/idr>

The Nazareth Children's Center and Integrated Development case is one of six case studies sponsored by USAID/Bureau for Humanitarian Response/Office of Private Voluntary Cooperation and implemented by the Institute for

Development Research that concern themselves with the dynamics between Northern and Southern institutions.

Case Study 4.17 Insights From A 28-Year-Old Partnership

*Washington State University
And the University of Jordan*
[http://www.ip.wsu.edu/
Partners.htm](http://www.ip.wsu.edu/Partners.htm)

The project is called Improving the Management of Water & Natural Resources in Jordan and Washington State through Cooperation in Applied Research, Technology Transfer, and Graduate Education. Its purpose is to strengthen and further enhance education, research, and outreach performance and capacity of the University of Jordan (UOJ) and Washington State University (WSU) in water and the environment, through planning and managing sustainable collaborative programs and activities. The UOJ Water and Environment Research and Study Center provided leadership at UOJ for the program. Three Colleges at WSU—Agriculture and Home Economics, Engineering and Architecture, and Sciences—led the WSU efforts.

Case Study 5.1 Monitoring Results of The Partnership Between Sinclair Community College And the Center for Vocational Education

*A Community College Linkage to
Vocational/Technical Training and
Education Programs in Chennai, in
India: A Multiple Partnership*

[http://ccid.kirkwood.cc.ia.us/
exemp/cook.htm](http://ccid.kirkwood.cc.ia.us/exemp/cook.htm)

The primary goal of the international partnership was for American community colleges to provide operational, logistical, and programmatic support to the Center for Vocational Education (CVE) so that it becomes a proactive, self-sufficient, prototype institution for the delivery of vocational/technical education in India. The target population was women, slum dwellers, people with limited opportunities for skills training, adult early school leavers, and rural and urban poor. The partnership also provided 51 field experiences for American community college faculty and administrators to implement the CVE's short-term training programs. American community colleges represented in this work were Sinclair Community College in Dayton, Ohio (the lead institution), Eastern Iowa Community College District (the partner institution), Community Colleges for International Development, Kirkwood Community College, Muscatine Community College, Spokane Community College, Richland Community College, Tri-County Technical College, College of DuPage, and St. Louis Community College.

*East Meets West: Web Support
Of a U.S.-India Vocational
Training Project*

[http://www.isoc.org/inet97/pro-
ceedings/D4/D4_3.HTM](http://www.isoc.org/inet97/proceedings/D4/D4_3.HTM)

This paper explains how a five-year project that started with no expectation of using the Internet has adjusted to take advantage of World Wide Web capabilities. The project connects American community colleges with the Center for Vocational Education. It is funded by a USAID grant and includes partnerships with education, community, and business/industry groups around the world. The project has exceeded expectations and resulted in the August 1996 inauguration of Madras Community College. The Internet plays a vital role in the sustainability of this multifaceted U.S.-India relationship.

Case Study 5.2 Monitoring and Evaluation Strategy For the Institutional Partnerships Project

*International Research
And Exchanges Board*

<http://www.irex.org>
[http://www.irex.org/pastprograms/
ipp/index.htm](http://www.irex.org/pastprograms/ipp/index.htm)

The International Research and Exchanges Board (IREX) has managed the Institutional Partnerships Project since October 1994, when it signed subagreements launching the project's 22 two-year partnerships in five technical sectors between American universities and nongovernmental institutions and their counterpart institutions in Russia and Ukraine. The aim of the project is to help educational institutions, professional associations, and trade org-

anizations in the two eastern European countries build the capacity to provide professional training and education and to improve their member services.

Case Study 6.1 New Partnerships Develop From Old Ones

World Education
<http://www.worlded.org>

See notes for case study 4.4.

Case Study 6.2 From Partnership to Autonomous Organization: The PRIP Trust

The PRIP Trust
<http://www.geminitiative.org/aromafinal.html>

As the crowning achievement of the Private Rural Initiative Project (PRIP), Pact spun off management to an entirely separate and newly established, legally registered Bangladeshi organization called the PRIP Trust. The trust is in the process of diversifying its funding pool and has an independent board of directors and a distinct operational mandate provided by the Bangladeshi nonprofit community. See *On Becoming a Local NGO: PRIP's Metamorphosis – An Interview with Aroma Goon, Executive Director of PRIP Trust* at the Web address above.

Case Study 6.3 Sustainability Grants

*American International
Health Alliance*
<http://www.aiha.com>

See notes for table 1.1.

Specific Tools for Evaluating Partnerships

*Intersectoral Partnering
Assessment Framework – USAID*
<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/isp/handbook/isp2toc.html>

*Grassroots Development
Framework – Inter-American
Foundation*
<http://www.iaf.gov/results/menu01.htm>

*Discussion-Oriented
Organizational
Self-Assessment – Pact*
<http://www.edc.org/INT/CapDev/dosapage.htm> (case sensitive)

*Continuing Evaluation
Panel – American
International Health Alliance*
<http://www.aiha.com/english/m&e/cep.htm>

USAID Resources

Automated Directives System
<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads>

The Automated Directives System is USAID's official written guidance to its employees on policies, operating procedures, and delegations of authority for conducting Agency business. Intended to help USAID employees understand

their responsibilities and achieve the Agency's development goals—and consistent with applicable rules, sound policy, and management practices—the ADS 200 series outlines new Agency guidelines on planning, achieving, managing for results, and assessing and learning.

Cost-Sharing Policies

USAID's policies on cost-sharing are established in the USAID-U.S. PVO Partnership Paper of 12 April 1995 and ADS 216. It is USAID policy to apply these principles to U.S. and non-U.S. for-profit and nonprofit NGOs.

USAID-U.S. PVO Partnership Paper
<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/sourcebook/usgov/uspv.html>

ADS 216
<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/ads/200/216.htm>

Bureau for Humanitarian Response Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation

http://www.usaid.gov/hum_response/pvc

USAID's Office of Private and Voluntary Cooperation (PVC) provides direct support to efforts made by the American community of private voluntary organizations and by its local partners to address critical needs in developing countries and emerging democracies. Now in its 22nd year, the Matching Grants Program is PVC's principal vehicle to help American PVOs develop their community-based programs overseas. By matching dollar for dollar a PVO's own resources, the Matching Grants Program supports PVO programs that are consistent with USAID's evolving priorities (such as small enterprise

development and democratic pluralism) and geographic interests (such as the special needs of Africa, central Europe, and Eurasia). The Matching Grants Program enhances the capacity of American PVOs to plan and carry out their overseas programs, helping them better partner with host-country, nongovernmental, and community-based organizations or with local governments. These partnerships between American PVOs and their local development partners concentrate on sustainable development strategies.

Development Partner Resources

<http://www.dec.org/partners>

This site links the reader to USAID policy papers, R4s (Results Reviews and Resource Requests), and mission objectives. The site also has links to USAID's database of publications and to the latest information on Agency Tips and policy.

New Partnerships Initiative: Resource Guide

<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/npi/npiresrc.htm>

Vice President Gore launched USAID's New Partnerships Initiative in March 1995 at the World Summit for Social Development. NPI is an integrated approach to sustainable development that uses strategic partnering and the active engagement of civil society, the business community, and institutions of democratic local governance to bolster the ability of local communities to play a lead role in their own development. Following a three-month participatory design process, a report was released in July 1995. From March to October 1996, NPI was piloted in 15 USAID missions. The NPI Resource Guide brings together the results of this period of field

testing and provides numerous programming tools to help incorporate NPI into mission portfolios.

Participatory Development

http://www.usaid.gov/about/part_devel/docs.html

This Web site contains all the documents (Participation Forum Summaries, Participatory Practices series, and other documents related to participation at USAID) produced through USAID's Participation Initiative. The site also provides information about the Global Participation Network (GP-NET), a listserv that provides an opportunity for USAID staff (in Washington and in the field) and development practitioners around the world to exchange information, share ideas, and discuss issues related to participatory development. The page also provides links to other sites dealing with participatory development.

Partnering for Results – Intersectoral Partnerships

<http://www.usaid.gov/pubs/isp>

This Web site provides information on what Intersectoral Partnerships (ISPs) are, why they are an important development strategy, and how donors and other organizations can facilitate their growth. It includes two handbooks on ISPs, links to numerous Web sites on partnering, and a list for further reading.

Results Report and Resource Request Database

<http://www.dec.org/partners/pmdb>

The Results Review and Resource Request (R4) is an annual report that a mission or program office uses to describe its strategic objectives, report on

its performance over the past year, and make budget requests for the upcoming fiscal year. Only the Results Review (R2a) portion of the R4 is available from this site.

Non-USAID Resources on Partnering

Business Partners for Development

<http://www.bpdweb.org/index.htm>

An informal global network of businesses, civil society organizations, and relevant government ministries, Business Partners for Development (BPD) seeks to produce solid evidence of the positive impact of trisector partnerships by taking the example of numerous focus projects involving business, government, and civil society organizations and providing input to them. The BPD network's objective is to demonstrate that these partnerships provide win-win benefits to all three parties, can be used much more widely throughout the world, and can be scaled up to national and regional levels.

CIVICUS

<http://www.civicus.org>

CIVICUS is an international alliance dedicated to strengthening citizen action and civil society throughout the world by promoting citizen action as a predominant feature of the political, economic, and cultural life of all societies; private action for the public good; and the idea that a healthy society is one in which there is an equitable relationship between civil society, business, and government. CIVICUS's purpose is to help nurture the foundation, growth, protection, and resourcing of citizen action throughout the world and especially in areas where participatory de-

mocracy, freedom of association of citizens, and their funds for public benefit are threatened.

Community Initiatives

<http://www.communityinitiatives.com/fcc.html>

Facilitating Community Change is a practical, step-by-step workbook for community members and leaders wanting to build partnerships for healthier, more sustainable communities. It offers a highly flexible approach to harnessing the values, assets, and aspirations of a community. Rather than presenting untested theories, this guide provides a comprehensive summary of what works, based on extensive real-life experience with dozens of communities throughout the world.

Corporate Community Engagement

<http://www.pactworld.org/Services/CCE.html>

Pact's corporate community engagement services help businesses achieve effective social investments through community collaboration to determine local needs and maximize social and economic goals. Businesses create internal value by managing risk and improving decision-making and external value by building brand identity, increasing customer loyalty, and forging new community relationships. Pact's approach helps businesses identify and fully map their community of stakeholders, build a common development vision, and create collaborative action plans. Assessment tools and strategies support regular analysis of the corporate-community engagement experience.

Corporate Social Responsibility Forum

<http://www.csrforum.org>

The Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum is an international charity founded in 1990 to promote socially responsible business practices that benefit business and society and help achieve socially, economically, and environmentally sustainable development. The forum works at the highest levels in 60 of the world's leading multinational companies and is active in some 30 emerging and transition economies. The Corporate Social Responsibility Forum Web site's aims are twofold: first, to be a gateway to the broad topic of corporate social responsibility; and second, to provide a comprehensive introduction to the work of the forum itself.

Higher Education Partnerships for Social and Economic Development

<http://www.ip.wsu.edu/ipdc/jordan/default.htm>

This information helps institutions currently engaging or planning to engage in development partnerships better plan and implement collaborative development programs and activities. Combined with results and follow-up actions of two companion workshops in Latin America and sub-Saharan Africa, this information can be updated to reflect emerging successes and lessons learned. Carried out in Amman, Jordan, in April 1999, the conference was organized by the USAID-University Linkage Program.

Institute for Development Research

<http://www.jsi.com/idr>

See notes for case study 4.8.

The Inter-American Foundation

<http://www.iaf.gov/iaf1.htm>

The Inter-American Foundation (IAF) strategy for the 1990s recognizes that sustainable development requires the private, public, and nongovernmental sectors of society to work together to mobilize and concentrate local resources on improving its citizens well-being. Because funds for foreign development assistance are declining in the United States and because resources do exist in Latin America and the Caribbean, sustainable change must occur at the local—not the international—level. In Latin America and the Caribbean the IAF helps diversify sources of funding and lessen dependence on foreign aid.

The International Forum For Capacity-Building

<http://ifcb-ngo.org>

The International Forum for Capacity-Building (IFCB) is a global initiative launched by Southern nongovernmental organizations (SNGOs) from Asia-Pacific, Africa, and Latin America. It seeks to concentrate on future priorities of capacity-building for SNGOs to enhance their effectiveness in addressing poverty, marginalization, democratization, and strengthening of civil society, human rights, and sustainable human development. This multistakeholder forum is aimed at initiating a dialog so that policies, resources, programs, and practices of Northern NGOs and donors are influenced by the experiences of SNGOs. The IFCB Web site engages social development players in an interactive experience that will help shape policies, evolve imaginative strategies, and initiate programs and activities to help create sustainable development.

Partnerships Online

<http://www.partnerships.org.uk/part>

Resources on this page include

- A listserv on partnerships and participation
- A set of information sheets that provide detail on creating trusts
- *The Guide to Effective Participation*, a comprehensive guide to the wider issues of community involvement
- *The Guide to Development Trusts and Partnerships*, a guide to creating nonprofit organizations for community renewal
- *Introduction to Partnerships*, an overview of the nature of local partnership organizations and a brief A-Z of partnerships
- Other Internet resources on partnership and participation

Partnerships for Poverty Reduction

http://www1.worldbank.org/ppr/english/ppr_eng.html

This site, sponsored by the Inter-American Foundation, the United Nations Development Program, and the World Bank, presents the accumulated knowledge of a group of researchers and practitioners on the effect of partnerships on poverty reduction in Latin America and the Caribbean. The site contains a database of projects.

Workshop and Focus Group Participants and Interview Subjects

Workshop on Designing and Managing Partnership Activities

Date: 22 June 2000

Participants

Danielle Arigoni, USAID

Darcy Ashman, Institute for Development Research

Sharon Benoliel, USAID

Gary Bittner, USAID

Harry Blair, USAID

Jennifer Brinkerhoff, Rutgers University

Vincent Cusomano, USAID

Joseph Dudley, USAID

Antoinette Ferrara, USAID

Anne Fonteneau, World Council of Credit Unions

Ken Giunta, InterAction

Stephen Haykin, USAID

Steve Hellinger, Development Group for Alternative Policies

Martin Hewitt, USAID

Jerry Hildebrand, Katalysis Partnership

Paul Holmes, USAID

Evariste Karangwa, InterAction

Janet Kerley, USAID

Eliza Klose, Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia

Ada Jo Mann, Global Excellence in Management Initiative

Tina Malone, Save the Children

Sharon Pauling, USAID

Chris Reedy, Opportunity International

Bonnie Ricci, World Learning

Sandra Russo, USAID

Martha Cecilia Villada, Partners of the Americas

Beth Whitaker, Association Liaison Office

Emira Woods, InterAction

Facilitators

Michael Kott, Chanya Charles, and C. Stark Biddle – Academy for Educational Development

Notetakers

Anne Langhaug, Tom Kelly, and Andrea Usiak – AED

Focus Group Participants in Washington

Date: 19 October 2000

Participants

Bernice Bennett, American International Health Alliance

Forest Duncan, USAID

Martin Hewitt, USAID

Paul Holmes, USAID

Janet Kerley, USAID

Roshani Kothari, Pact

Alison Pajit, USAID

James Smith, AIHA

Abdul Wahab, USAID

Facilitators/Notetakers

Michael Kott, Anne Langhaug, Chanya Charles, Tom Kelly, and Tamer Ibrahim of Academy for Educational Development; Sharon Benoliel, USAID

Focus Group Participants/Interviewees in Nairobi, Kenya

Date: 8-13 October 2000

Participants

Steven J. Baines, Catholic Relief Services

Carleene Dei, USAID/AFR/SD

Ato Getahun Dendir, USAID/Ethiopia

Dirk Dijkerman, USAID/REDSO

Paul-Albert Emoungu, USAID/Democracy and Governance Team Leader

Elizabeth Hogan, USAID/South Africa

Joseph Igbiniedion, African Women's Development and Communication Network (FEMNET)

Rudo Jimmy, USAID/Zimbabwe

Evariste Karangwa, InterAction

Sheila Kawamara, Uganda Women's Network

Liz Regan Kiingi, USAID/Uganda

James Kimani, Kenya AIDS NGOs Consortium

Monica Koep, USAID/Namibia

Ivin Lombardt, Namibia Nongovernmental Organizations' Forum

David Madurai, South African National NGO Coalition (SANGOCO)

Steve Kirimi Mamba, National Council of NGOs – Kenya

Faarooq Mangera, USAID/RCSA

Ruth Mufuti, AfriCare

T.S. Muyoya, MWENGO

Amos Nakalonga, Zambia Council for Social Development

Mathews Kadewere Nogwe, Catholic Development Commission in Malawi

Solomon Nzyuko, Lutheran World Relief

Deborah Ongewe, National Council of NGOs – Kenya

Sharon Pauling, USAID/AFR/DP

Dr. Allan Ragi, Kenya AIDS NGO Consortium

Marie Memouna Shaba, TANGO

Frank R. Turyatunga, ACIDI/VOCA – EPED Project

John Zarafonetis, InterAction

Facilitators/Notetakers

C. Stark Biddle of AED; Sharon Pauling of USAID

Focus Group Participants In Kiev, Ukraine

Date: 6–10 November 2000

USAID/Kiev Participants

Tamara Babiuk

Sylvia Babus

Oleksander Cherka

Elena Choukhno

Ken Duckworth

Bruce Gelband

Irina Goncharova

Judy Hansen

Elena Haver

David Lieberman

Oksana Litvinovska

Paul Mulligan

Bert Oram

Olena Orlova

Eliot Pearlman

John Pennell

Tatiana Rastrigina

Stella Roudenko

Marilynn Schmidt

Andrew Snegirev

Irina Troyanovskaya

Oleg Vashkulat

Vladimir Yatsenko

Implementing Partners

Myroslava Andrushchenko, International Research and Exchanges Board

Megan Falvey, EcoLinks

Alicia Henson, U.S.-Ukraine Foundation

David Kerry, Alliance

Yuriy Knurov, U.S. Energy Association

Oksana Maydan, IREX

Stepan Maylo, American International Health Alliance

Mickey Mullay, Consortium for Enhancement of Ukrainian Management Education

Yilyen Pidgornyi, Alliance

Volodymyr Romaniv, Research Triangle Institute

Oleksander Sydozenko, CEUME

Elena Voskresenkayo, AIHA

Eugene Yesirkenov, EcoLinks

Ukrainian Partners

Natalia Apatova, Tavrida National University

Alexander Bondarenko, Ukrainian Real Estate Experts' Association

Viacheslav Dementiev, Donetsk State Technical University

Natalia Ivaniv, International Management Institute (IMI-Kyiv)

Inna Kirnos, National Electricity Regulatory Commission

Michael Krikynov, Institute for Entrepreneurship "Strategy"

Olga Melnik, Kyivoblenergo

Tetyana Melnyk, Cherkassy Institute of Management

Marina Mrouga, Testing Board of the Ministry of Health

Leonid Symonenko, National Electricity Regulatory Commission

Facilitators/Notetakers

Janet Kerley of USAID; Michael Kott and Chanya Charles of AED

Interviews

Bernice Bennett, American International Health Alliance

Gary Bittner, USAID

Alexander Borovikh, Center for NGO Support (Russia)

Jean Cook, Sinclair Community College

Megan Falvey, EcoLinks

Gill Garb, World Education

Ekaterina Greshnova, Center for NGO Support (Russia)

Jerry Hildebrand, Katalysis Partnership

Martin Hewiitt, USAID

Paul Holmes, USAID

Eliza Klose, Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia

Bertha Landrum, Maricopa Community College

Amanda Lonsdale, International City/County Management Association

Jan Noel, Washington State University

Alison Pajjit, USAID

David Payton, World Learning

Tony Pryor, USAID

Anne Quinlan, USAID

Mary Reynolds, USAID

Joseph Sellwood, Pact

James Smith, AIHA

Didier Thys, Freedom From Hunger

Paul Weishaupt, United States-Asia Environmental Partnership

Beth Whitaker, Association Liaison Office

Eugene Yesirkenov, EcoLinks

Sample Memorandums Of Understanding

C

American International Health Alliance MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

1.0. PARTIES TO THIS AGREEMENT

This is an agreement among the following parties:

- US partner
- NIS partner
- AIHA

2.0. PURPOSE

The purpose of this agreement is to develop a productive and lasting cooperative relationship between the U.S. Partner and the Ukrainian Partner. In the spirit of cooperation, the parties enter into this legally non-binding Memorandum with the understanding that it is a symbolic expression of their mutual commitment to develop a productive working relationship, to collectively and separately make their best efforts to overcome obstacles to accomplish the agreed-upon project goals, and within the means of the parties to contribute the necessary resources toward ensuring the success of this collaborative relationship (referred to herein as “the partnership”). The provisions of this Memorandum are intended toward that end.

3.0. FOCUS OF THE PARTNERSHIP

This partnership focuses on the integration of community-oriented primary care services and mental and behavioral health into an urban polyclinic setting. The polyclinic will serve as the base for the development of a family practice organization that will serve as a model for the future development of primary care in the city of ___ (NIS) ___ and the U.S. partners will assist the city in the reorganization of the primary care network and the replication of additional sites in the future. Training and retraining of staff in clinical, organizational and management areas will be a major focus of partnership activities, as well as the integration of a mental health component to the primary care setting. The partners will also develop strategies to incorporate health promotion and prevention services and to effectively improve the health of the ___ (NIS) ___ population. The partnership will develop methodologies to assess and monitor the health status of the population that will result in more focused interventions. In addition, the partnership will develop a set of primary care guidelines, develop a residency program in family practice, develop clinical training programs for other health professionals and develop Ukrainian-language, patient-education materials.

4.0. STRUCTURE

The U.S. and NIS partners are equal members of the partnership and have equivalent responsibilities and authority. The partners shall work closely with AIHA and its designated coordinators (collectively “AIHA”) throughout every stage of the program, and they will carefully coordinate partnership activities to ensure that the program is developed and implemented in a manner that is consistent with the health care needs of both communities.

5.0. RESPONSIBILITIES THE US AND NIS PARTNERS

5.1. Development of Agenda and Implementation Plan. In cooperation with AIHA, the U.S. Partner and the Ukrainian Partner shall:

5.1.1. develop a set of realistic objectives to accomplish the goals identified in section 3.0 above.

5.1.2. develop quantifiable measures by which the partnership’s progress toward its goals and objectives can be measured;

5.1.3. establish a detailed and realistic project timeline for the partnership’s efforts setting forth, among other things, a schedule of conferences, meetings, training exchanges, and report preparation;

5.1.4. establish a detailed itinerary for each scheduled conference, meeting, or training exchange setting forth, among other things:

- the personnel involved;
- the travel and accommodation arrangements;
- the curricular material necessary for the meeting or visit;
- the equipment and materials necessary for the meeting or visit;
- the persons responsible for preparation of required reports.

5.2. Work Plans and Reports. Working with AIHA, the U.S. Partner and the Ukrainian Partner shall collaboratively prepare the following reports in a timely fashion and submit them to AIHA:

5.2.1. a Partnership Workplan, consisting of those items (Objectives, Activities, Quantifiable Outcomes, Timeline, and Budget) set forth in Sec. 5.1, to be prepared annually; and

5.2.2. a Partnership Quarterly Report covering exchange visits occurring during the reporting quarter, as well as other significant events or project developments that may not involve travel. These activities may include teleconferences, in-country training workshops or conferences, significant e-mail or phone consultations, transfer of medical/educational supplies and materials, or other capacity-building activities. Quantifiable process and outcome indicators identified in the workplan will be reported on both a current and ongoing basis.

5.3. Execution of Implementation Plan. The U.S. Partner and the Ukrainian Partner shall fully cooperate in the execution of the implementation plan by, among other things:

5.3.1. providing the resources necessary for implementing the plan including, but not limited to, encouraging and allowing staff and other personnel to participate in partnership activities; and

5.3.2. making efforts to secure local transportation and low-cost accommodations (room and board) for visiting partners in order to maximize resources available for participation in partnership activities.

5.4. Evaluation. In addition to the reports described in Part III (see above), the U.S. Partner and the Ukrainian Partner shall cooperate with any monitoring and evaluation activities undertaken by AIHA or by the United States Agency for International Development (USAID).

5.5. Educational, Research, and Clearinghouse Activities. As part of the education, research, and clearinghouse activities planned by AIHA, the U.S. Partner and the Ukrainian Partner shall:

5.5.1. fully participate in education and training programs sponsored by AIHA, including both the training of partnership staff and the sharing of partnership experiences with other institutions and organizations;

5.5.2. provide information to the AIHA Clearinghouse on partnership experiences and other relevant materials relating to U.S. and Ukrainian health care; and

5.5.3. fully participate in public education and information dissemination efforts undertaken by AIHA.

5.6. Compliance with USAID Procedures and Regulations. The U.S. Partner and the Ukrainian Partner will be briefed on the policies and procedures governing the use of USAID funds (including but not limited to AIHA's policies and procedures as set forth in the subagreement between AIHA and the US partner) and shall abide by those policies and procedures.

6.0. RESPONSIBILITIES OF AIHA

This section sets forth some of the details of AIHA's obligations to the cooperative relationship.

6.1. AIHA, in cooperation with Omega World Travel, will provide logistical support to persons traveling abroad as participants of the partnership, including making travel arrangements, obtaining necessary travel documents and insurance, and securing the required governmental approval for site visits;

6.2. AIHA will provide domestic and international air transportation (subject to USAID limitations) for persons participating in partnership activities;

6.3. AIHA will assist the partnership's efforts to transport material and equipment as necessary for Trips/Events;

6.4. AIHA will provide the partnership with certain non-medical equipment (e.g., office and training equipment) necessary for partnership activities;

6.5. AIHA will promote the partnership in other ways, such as the preparation and circulation of public-relations materials; and

7.0. TITLE TO PROPERTY

Title to property purchased by AIHA for the sole use of the partnership established under this Memorandum shall vest in AIHA. AIHA may in the future and at its discretion transfer title to such property to the NIS partner, with the concurrence of USAID.

8.0. TERM, TERMINATION AND AMENDMENTS

8.1. Term. This Memorandum shall be effective immediately and shall remain in force unless terminated by one of the parties.

8.2. Termination. This Memorandum may be terminated by any of the parties, with or without cause, upon 30 days written notice to the other parties.

8.3. Amendments. This Memorandum may be amended at any time by unanimous consent of the parties.

9.0. MISCELLANEOUS

9.1. This Memorandum shall not be interpreted as having established a “partnership,” as such term is defined under the laws of the United States or Ukraine.

9.2. No party assumes liability for any third-party claims arising out of this agreement.

9.3. This Memorandum is solely for the benefit of the parties; nothing in this Memorandum, expressed or implied, is intended to confer upon any other person any rights or remedies of any nature.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties hereto have executed this Memorandum by their duly authorized representatives.

UKRANIAN PARTNERS

U.S. PARTNERS

By: _____
[name and title]

By: _____
[name and title]

DATE: _____

DATE: _____

AMERICAN INTERNATIONAL
HEALTH ALLIANCE

By: _____

DATE: _____

Katalysis North/South Development Partnership

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING

Original Document: 1990; Revised: 1997

A. PREAMBLE

This Memorandum of Understanding "MOU" is entered into by Katalysis North/South Development Partnership of Stockton, California, U.S.A.; Katalysis/Honduras of Tegucigalpa, Honduras; Organización de Desarrollo Empresarial Femenino (ODEF) of San Pedro Sula, Honduras, Asociación de Mujeres en Desarrollo (MUDE) of Villa Nueva, Guatemala; Cooperación para el Desarrollo Rural de Occidente (CDRO) of Totonicapán, Guatemala; Corporación de Proyectos Comunes de El Salvador (PROCOMES) of San Salvador, El Salvador; and Familia y Medio Ambiente (FAMA) of Juticalpa, Honduras, individually referred to as "Partners" and collectively as "the Partnership." The purpose of the MOU is to establish an understanding of how we wish to operate in partnership. It is entered into in a spirit of friendship, equality and cooperation.

B. NAME

The name of the Partnership will be Partners in Development.

C. PURPOSE

The purpose of the Partnership is to enhance the ability of each Partner to accomplish its mission of sponsoring and facilitating the administration of programs and activities that promote economic and social development, culture, and environmental preservation. The Partnership is a vehicle whereby we can exchange information, technical expertise, mutual support and goodwill. We wish to do this in an open and public manner and to be identified by the development community as Partners. We expect that the Partnership will continue to evolve complementary in scope and activities and that our understanding and practice of true partnership will likewise evolve.

D. TERM

This MOU will remain in effect until changed or terminated by the Partners by consensus.

E. ORGANIZATION

The Partners in this venture are: Katalysis/USA, Katalysis/Honduras, ODEF, MUDE, CDRO, PROCOMES, and FAMA. The Board of Directors of each Partner formally recognizes and supports the Partnership.

Page 1 of 4

The Board of Directors of each Partner delegates the Director of its organization to form the "Partner Directors Board." The function of the Partner Directors Board is to manage the relationship and growth of the Partnership. The development of the Partner relationship focuses on the global program structure of each Partner. It is a process that must begin with certain defined areas of work, particularly areas that are clearly common and similar among the Partner's programs.

The Partner Directors Board is responsible for promoting the exchange of experiences and information among the Partners. This exchange can be conducted to a greater or lesser degree between Partners depending on the capacity and internal structure of each partner. For example, the practice of having a member of the Partnership on the board of another Partner or a technical representative on their own board. [NOTE: All Partners serve on the Katalysis international Board of Directors.]

In every case, the formality of the Partnership relationship should be stated in writing.

It is the responsibility of each Partner Director to share and promote the concept of Partnership and its implications with their staffs in order that an open dialog be established between the staffs of the Partners. One goal of such dialog, for example, is to define a mutually workable concept of partnership in the technical area.

Katalysis is the sponsoring Partner. However, with respect to the development of the Partnership, Katalysis does not have responsibility to fund the individual Partners partially or totally per this MOU. The resources of Katalysis will be available and utilized to seek out financing for the majority of the Partnership's activities. These activities (meetings, exchange visits, etc.) will not result in changes to the decision making process of individual Partners or in the operation of the Partnership.

Per this MOU and Katalysis' experience within the Partnership, Katalysis will provide consultant and special assistance involving its staff and Board of Directors. The Director of Katalysis will serve as Coordinator of the Partner Directors Board.

F. ADDING NEW PARTNERS

It is anticipated that new Partners may be added by mutual consent.

G. FUNCTIONS AND PRINCIPLES

The Partnership will be guided by a set of functions and principles approved by the Partner Directors Board and ratified by the Partners.

The functions and principles of the Partnership will be modified and/or eliminated from time to time by the Partners. This will generally take place in the semi-annual Partners meetings, but may take place outside those meetings by mutual consent of the Partners. At the date of signing of this MOU, functions of the Partnership include:

-
-
- 1) Joint participation in grant implementation.
 - 2) Joint participation in the raising of unrestricted operating funds in the United States.
 - 3) Joint participation in the design, implementation, and grant support of a specific number of development projects.
 - 4) Information sharing on a wide range of matters including programs, operations, and administration.
 - 5) Documentation and promotion of the Partnership model.
 - 6) Attendance at Partner Directors Board meetings.

H. RESPONSIBILITIES AND DUTIES

Each Partner undertakes the following:

- 1) To respond openly, thoughtfully and promptly to a Partner's request for assistance.
- 2) To actively seek the way to build mutual trust by fully sharing information, confidences, and problems with the other Partners.
- 3) To comply fully and promptly with the conditions of any projects involving the Partners and to act in a fiduciary relationship with mutual respect.
- 4) If one Partner believes that another Partner is not living up to the MOU, the first Partner will communicate this to the other Partners.

I. DECISION MAKING

Decisions affecting the Partnership are to be made by mutual consent. One Partner cannot make a decision affecting another Partner without the consent of the other. All Partners have the right to submit proposals which involve a mutual decision. The Partner Directors Board will discuss and make decisions it considers beneficial to all Partners.

The decisions will be made respecting the particular characteristics of each Partner and with its mutual consent.

Any decision which impacts a particular Partner, and which presents special conditions not previously considered, will require ratification by the Partner Directors Board.

J. ADDITIONAL AGREEMENTS

Partners may have additional agreements among themselves or other organizations outside the MOU.

K. WITHDRAWAL

In case of disagreements and misunderstandings, every effort will be made to settle the matter through dialog and negotiation. A Partner may withdraw from this MOU by giving six months' written notice to the other Partners. A Partner may be expelled from the Partnership by the unanimous vote of the other Partners, with six months' written notice to be given.

Any case of expulsion from the Partnership will include a process to guarantee the Partners the opportunity to defend themselves.

Signed in friendship,

Executive Director, CDRO

Regional Director, Katalysis/Honduras

Executive Director, FAMA

Executive Director, MUDE

President, Katalysis/USA

Executive Director, ODEF

Executive Director, PROCOMES

Date: _____

Catholic Relief Services
MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Instruction Guidance

This model MOU has been prepared to help facilitate the development of a partnership agreement between partners. The text is based on external studies and examples of “best practice” in formulating agreements within CRS. The intention is to help formulate agreements that reflect the CRS Partnership Principles and the mutual understanding of the parties. It should be considered a model and therefore adapted and changed to accurately apply to each unique partnership.

More than just a document, the formulation of an MOU is a process for discussion, clarification and negotiation that is critical to partnership. This process could take 2 months, 6 months, even a year and should be considered joint work. *The Partnership Toolbox: A Facilitators Guide to Partnership Dialogue* has a section on creating an MOU and exercises that may be useful in guiding the process (found in Chapter 4: Putting It Together). Engaging an external facilitator may be considered if the facilitation skills are not available or if a neutral facilitator would be more effective. The end result is a document but, more importantly, a clearer understanding and communication about why each has entered into the partnership, expectations and how both parties will engage one another. *Editing the document and sending it to a partner for comment will be counterproductive because it is not practicing the partnership principles!*

Some suggestions from past practice suggest that engaging a facilitator for the process is helpful. Also a combination of small and large group discussions helped the large group work more quickly and productively, i.e., a small joint task force produces a draft discussion paper.

A note on formatting: For ease of editing, the model has been electronically formatted in such a way that it can be quickly edited through the use of search/replace functions for commonly used phrases, such as the name of the partner and the country. Text highlighted in red is intended to apply particularly to church partners. All highlighting can be easily removed by using “select all” and changing the highlighting to “none” and text color to black.

1.0 **Organizations to the MOU**

Identify each organization and their relationship to one another, especially within the country. This document may also be applied to partnerships with multiple partners. If the MOU is being used for an umbrella project, for example, adapt the model accordingly.

2.0 **Identity of the Organizations**

Add the mission statements of both organizations to this section.

Memorandum of Understanding

Instruction Guidance

3.0 **Goal and Values**

This section describes the overall goals and operational values of the partnership. Make explicit the intention of the partnership and the partnership values that parties will strive toward. If local principles of partnership have been developed with partners, these should be reflected here.

4.0 **Operating Principles**

This gives general guidance regarding how programs are managed. However, each specific project should be governed by a project agreement, which outlines critical information, such as time frame, objectives, activities, and outcomes of the project. Most sections are self-explanatory, but a few merit discussion.

- 4.1 *Decision-Making* – Venues for mutual decision making is key to a successful partnership and should be addressed here.
- 4.2 *Fundraising* – Specify how funds for joint programs will be raised. Who will be approached and by whom? Is joint fundraising possible?
- 4.3 *Capacity Strengthening* – Not every partnership needs to involve capacity strengthening. But if both parties agree that it would be beneficial, a section outlining its contents should be added. Note that capacity strengthening flows both ways. CRS should identify ways that partners strengthen CRS capacity.
- 4.4 *Solidarity* – This section identifies the ways of working together that enhance the intangible principles, such as mutual trust and transparency. This “code of conduct” should be generated and mutually agreed upon by both parties.

5.0 **Organizations’ individual contributions**

Recognizing that each partner both gives to and receives from the partnership, detail the different types of resources each brings to the interaction. This is a way to value non-material assets that are critical to any successful partnership or project. The mutuality discussion should be tied to the agency’s global solidarity mission. Country programs should use this opportunity to define global solidarity priorities with their partners and enlist them in the CRS mission of educating and mobilizing U.S. constituencies.

6.0 **Conflict resolution**

While hopefully not needed, an agreed upon way to resolve conflicts is important so that it is not viewed as CRS taking unilateral decision making.

7.0 **Consultative Committee**

When there is more than one partner in a country, a consultative committee of all the partners and CRS might be an effective way to facilitate communication and joint action. If not, other mechanisms, such as annual retreats, should be specified.

8.0 **Modifications to the MOU**

Decide how the agreement will be amended or changed.

9.0 **Period of the MOU**

This section follows the philosophy that partnerships grow and change but continue until they are no longer useful to the parties. The life of a partnership may include many projects of collaborations that do have explicit time frames and objectives to be completed, but that the partnership itself does not end until one or both parties are no longer being served.

10.0 **Withdrawal from the MOU**

If the partnership reaches a point in which it is no longer mutually beneficial and changes are not possible, ending the partnership and withdrawing from the MOU with respect is best.

11.0 **Effective Date and Signatures**

Self-explanatory.

MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING
Between

<PARTNER>

and

Catholic Relief Services – USCC

Preamble

This memorandum between <partner> and Catholic Relief Services (CRS) – USCC establishes the broad mutual understanding of our two organizations regarding our strategic relationship in establishing and operating programs of development for the poorest in <country>. We recognize the autonomy of each organization and enter this agreement in a spirit of mutual trust, respect and a shared commitment for social justice and the preferential option for the poor. This Memorandum of Understanding is therefore a statement of mutual intent to which the two organizations are bound. For specific jointly developed programs, agreements will be entered into in the form of grant agreements or other documents based on specific program plans and budgets.

1.0 Organizations to the Memorandum of Understanding

- 1.1 Organizations to this Memorandum of Understanding are <partner> and the United States Catholic Conference (USCC) respectively, hereinafter called the organizations.
- 1.2 CRS is in <country> at the invitation of the <Episcopal Conference> to work with <partner> as its partner of preference.
- 1.3 This MOU does not preclude each organization from working independently with other commissions of the church, as well as with other organizations in <country> engaged in humanitarian relief and development efforts. However, the organizations shall be transparent about the establishment of these collaborations with other organizations, as they affect the collaboration.

2.0 Identity of the Organizations

2.1 <partner> and CRS affirm that they are both autonomous Catholic organizations with a common goal. The parties shall therefore work together to fulfill their common goal while affirming their different identities.

2.2 Mission Statement of <partner>

"- Enter partner's mission statement here.-"

Memorandum of Understanding between:
Catholic Relief Services and <partner>

Page 1 of 7

2.3 Mission Statement of CRS – USCC

“Catholic Relief Services was founded in 1943 by the Catholic Bishops of the United States to assist the poor and disadvantaged outside the country.

It is administered by a Board of Bishops selected by the National Council of Catholic Bishops and is staffed by men and women committed to the Catholic Church’s apostolate of helping those in need. It maintains strict standards of efficiency and accountability.

The fundamental motivating force in all activities of CRS is the Gospel of Jesus Christ as it pertains to the alleviation of human suffering, the development of people and the fostering of charity and justice in the world. The policies and programs of the agency reflect and express the teaching of the Catholic Church. At the same time, Catholic Relief Services assists persons on the basis of need not creed, race or nationality.

Catholic Relief Services gives active witness to the mandate of Jesus Christ to respond to human needs in the following ways:

- by responding to victims of natural and man-made disasters;
- by providing assistance to the poor to alleviate their immediate needs;
- by supporting self-help programs which involve people and communities in their own development;
- by helping those it serves to restore and preserve their dignity and to realize their potential;
- by collaborating with religious and nonsectarian persons and groups of goodwill in programs and projects which contribute to a more equitable society;
- by helping to educate the people of the United States to fulfill their moral responsibilities in alleviating human suffering, removing its causes and promoting social justice.

3.0 Goal and Values

3.1 Goal:

The organizations shall work together, each according to the means it can contribute, for the development of the people of <country>, while enhancing their respective capacities and that of the Catholic Church as a whole in <country>.

3.2 Values:

The organizations recognize they have a common vision, based on the Gospel of Christ, for addressing people’s immediate needs and the underlying causes

Memorandum of Understanding between:

Catholic Relief Services and <partner>

Page 2 of 7

of suffering and injustice with peace and restoration of human dignity, promotion of self-reliance and sustainable development, addressing the needs of the poor, and an integral approach to mitigate on human suffering.

The organizations commit themselves to a relationship based on values embodied in the CRS Principles of Partnership: subsidiarity, complementarity and mutuality, equitability, openness and sharing, mutual transparency, sustainability, community participation, strengthening civil society and mutual capacity building.

4.0 **Operating Principles**

This Memorandum of Understanding shall be based upon the following operating principles:

4.1 Structure

The organizations shall utilize and strengthen already existing local structures on the ground or jointly establish any necessary new structures at the national, diocesan and parish level.

4.2 Implementation

Local structures shall be the primary implementers in undertaking programmatic activities.

The organizations shall complement each other in the process of implementation of programs in full recognition of the requirements of being accountable to donors, communities and other stakeholders.

<partner> shall facilitate the process of implementation with the assistance of CRS.

4.3 Decision-Making

Decisions affecting the partnership will be made by mutual consent. One organization cannot make a decision affecting the other organization without its consent. All organizations have the right to submit proposals that involve a mutual decision and will respect the particular characteristics of each organization and its right to mutual consent.

4.4 Resources

The organizations shall pool together private and public resources as well as resources from sister Catholic organizations, international and otherwise, for the purpose of empowering local structures in the implementation of activities.

4.5 Programs

Any shared program interventions shall be undertaken in a joint manner between *<partner>* and CRS while respecting the principles of subsidiarity.

The organizations shall respect initiatives from other development players and advocate for information-sharing at all levels.

The organizations shall share the responsibility to take a participatory and holistic approach to technical issues and program quality.

4.6 Fundraising

The organizations shall be transparent in approaching funding agencies, especially church donors, and approach them together for funding of joint ventures, whenever possible. Transparency will be maintained through dialogue, consultations, and sharing of reports and budgets. The Director of *<partner>* and the CRS Country Representative shall decide through their regular meetings and on a case-by-case basis what donors should be approached, based on the nature of the project.

4.7 Communication

The organizations shall advocate for open communication between each other and other institutions at all levels and shall be committed to the ownership of the relationship thus equally bearing the responsibility for initiating the communication process.

Some modes of communication the organizations shall use shall be the following:

- quarterly technical meetings
- monthly meetings between the *<partner>* Director and the CRS Country Representative
- joint communiqué

4.8 Capacity Strengthening

(If appropriate.) Capacity strengthening involves a long-term commitment to complete a mutually agreed upon process of organizational development. This commitment is

characterized by a spirit of accompaniment, flexibility and responsiveness. This commitment goes beyond a specific project activity, based rather on a shared vision of and commitment to ongoing joint action.

Each organization agrees to uphold the following:

- To facilitate and promote the strengthening of each other's capacities.
- To engage in joint and mutual organizational self-assessment and planning processes in which both organizations collaboratively identify their strengths, prioritize areas needing improvement, and create their own action plans.
- To work together to in turn strengthen the capacities of local communities or development organizations.

4.9 Solidarity

Each organization undertakes the following:

- To respond openly, thoughtfully, collaboratively and promptly to a partner's request for assistance, especially in emergency situations.
- To find flexible and mutually agreeable solutions to situations beyond the control of either organization that affect program implementation (e.g., social/political conflict, natural disaster, etc.)
- To actively seek the way to build mutual trust by fully sharing information, confidences and problems with the other organization.
- To recognize and respect other stakeholders to which each organization is accountable (e.g., communities, donors, etc.)
- To periodically review their partnership jointly and continually seek ways to nurture and strengthen it.
- To comply fully and promptly with the conditions of any projects involving the other organization and to act in a fiduciary relationship with mutual respect.
- If one organization believes that another organization is not living up to the MOU, the first organization will communicate this to the other organization.

5.0 Organizations' Individual Contributions

Both <partner> and CRS are committed to building a collaborative institutional relationship by sharing their respective experiences and expertise.

Each organization agrees to share its respective materials and approaches in an attempt to develop new materials or approaches, or enhance existing ones.

Each organization will contribute to this relationship the following:

Memorandum of Understanding between:

Catholic Relief Services and <partner>

Page 5 of 7

<Partner>

- List the physical, material, structural, social, intellectual and spiritual resources the partner brings to the partnership in separate points.
- List the ways in which the partner will support CRS's global solidarity mission, e.g., assisting CRS in educating and mobilizing U.S. constituencies by providing information to or with meeting with U.S. media, as appropriate, etc.

CRS

- List the physical, material, structural, social, intellectual and spiritual resources CRS brings to the partnership in separate points.
- List the ways in which CRS will support this partner's global solidarity mission, if appropriate.

6.0 **Conflict resolution**

- 6.1 We enter into this MOU in a spirit of mutual trust and intend that all unforeseen matters on issues that arise, as the relationship evolves, will be resolved in a spirit of mutual understanding.
- 6.2 In the event that there is a conflict it shall be resolved in a peaceful and amicable manner. Every effort will be made to settle the matter through dialog and negotiation and to accommodate the policies and intention of each other's respective conference of bishops, board, donors and constituents.

7.0 **Consultative Committee**

A Consultative Committee shall be established in the spirit of the MOU and shall consist of:

- 1) the Director of <partner>
- 2) the Country Representative of CRS
- 3) others appointed by the aforementioned members

8.0 **Modifications of the MOU**

- 8.1 Either party can initiate dialogue and call for a meeting of the Consultative Committee.
- 8.2 This MOU shall be subject to annual review by the MOU Consultative Committee to strengthen cooperation between the two organizations.

9.0 **Period of Memorandum of Understanding**

This MOU shall remain in effect until changed or terminated by either organization through mutual consent. OR The period of this MOU shall be <duration> subject to extension by mutual consent.

10.0 **Withdrawal form the Memorandum of Understanding**

Any organization may withdraw from the MOU by giving six (6) months' written notice to the other organization.

11.0 **Effective Date**

This Memorandum of Understanding is effective <date>.

Signed:

For <partner>

For Catholic Relief Services

Date: _____

Date: _____

Witnesses:

Witnesses:

Address:

Address:

Designation:

Designation:

Date: _____

Date: _____

Memorandum of Understanding between:

Catholic Relief Services and <partner>

Page 7 of 7

Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum

Sample partnership agreement

1. Note: *This model is in the form of an early-stage Memorandum of Understanding rather than a legally binding document. Legal documents have to be drawn up in accordance with national legal frameworks*

1.00 PARTNER ORGANISATIONS

1.01 Name of organisation
Contact details
Contact person
Description of organisation
(with registration details, if any)

Name of organisation
Contact details
Contact person
Description of organisation
(with registration details, if any)

Name of organisation
Contact details
Contact person
Description of organisation
(with registration details, if any)

2.00 COMMON OBJECTIVES AND STATEMENT OF INTENT

2.01 We, the undersigned, acknowledge a common concern about / commitment to

.....

2.02 By working together as partners, we see the benefits and added value each of us can bring to address this concern/ fulfil this commitment.

2.03 Specifically, we expect each partner to contribute to the project/programme in the following ways:

Partner A
Partner B
Partner C
All partners

3.00 STRUCTURES AND PROCEDURES

3.01 Partner roles and responsibilities

3.02 Administration

3.03 Working group(s)/committee(s)/advisor(s)

3.04 Decision-making processes

3.05 Accountability

4.00 RESOURCES

We will provide resources in the following ways:

Core resources

Project/programme resources

5.00 REVIEW/AUDIT AND REVISION ARRANGEMENTS

5.01 In recognition of the importance of transparency, we agree to make all relevant information relating to this partnership available to the partners and stakeholders in the following ways ...

5.02 We will review the partnership itself every ... months in the following ways ...

5.03 An independent audit of the financial arrangements of the partnership and any projects or programmes resulting from it will be undertaken on at least an annual basis in the following manner ...

5.04 We will make adjustments to the partnership, including rewriting this agreement, should the reviews and audits indicate this is necessary.

6.00 CAVEATS

6.01 This agreement does not permit the use of copyright materials (including logos) and dissemination of confidential information, or allow staff of any of the partner organisations to represent the other without prior agreement.

6.02 This agreement does not bind partner organisations or their officers to any financial or other liability without further formal documentation.

SIGNED

..... on behalf of partner A
..... date
..... on behalf of partner B
..... date
..... on behalf of partner C
..... date

Katalysis Sample Potential Partner Criteria

KATALYSIS PARTNERSHIP

POTENTIAL CORE PARTNER PRE-SELECTION CRITERIA

BASICS:

- Registered NGO in country of origin.
- *Personeria Juridica* is in place.
- Good legal standing in the country.
- Current with financial reports.
- C or higher ranking on Partner Performance Ratio Scale.

1. Potential Core Partners will have microcredit as a pivotal institutional focus.
 2. Client base will be 2000 (exceptions can be made for NGOs that are in a fast track growth mode).
 3. Capable of expansion; institutional (board and staff) ability to make businesslike decisions regarding operational efficiency and growth; vested interest in expanding to increase client levels and setting appropriate cost-recovery policies (i.e., sustainable interest rates) that will promote sustainability.
 4. Commitment to financially sustainable development through microcredit; ability to achieve full financial sustainability in three to five years given appropriate technical and financial support.
 5. Institution-wide (board, management, staff) commitment to implementing Partnership institutional standards and microcredit industry best practices in a timely fashion with relevant training and technical assistance.
 6. Commitment to strengthening management capacity in standardized financial and accounting systems; willing and able to report on institutional financial status through uniform balance sheet, income statements, and budget analysis, as well as regular loan portfolio reports (with back-up TA and training).
 7. Dedicated to working with very low income populations, especially women; interest in working with community and solidarity microcredit systems, as well as individuals.
 8. Women are represented at all levels of the organization: board, management, staff.
-
- 

-
-
9. Expressed interest in Partnership relationship, both North and South; there is complementarity of need, skill and willingness to share experience; respectful compliance with the principles of Partnership.
 10. Acceptance of the conditions governing one-year probationary status prior to be accorded full membership in the Partnership.

NEW PARTNER DIAGNOSTIC CRITERIA

Prior to the selection of a new Partner, a comprehensive diagnostic is conducted on-site by four levels of the Partnership: Headquarters' CEO, Partner Executive Directors' representative, Regional Field Director, and the RFO Technical Team. Each Partnership contact assesses particular sectors of the prospective Partner organization.

HEADQUARTERS' CEO

- Mission
- Organizational Structure
- Board of Directors: Composition and Function
- Executive Director
- Partnership Potential
- Funding Sources
- Reputation with Donors
- Project Field Visit

PARTNER DIRECTORS' REPRESENTATIVE

- Organizational Structure
- Executive Director
- Partnership Institutional Standards
- Partnership Practices
- Project Field Visit

REGIONAL FIELD DIRECTOR

- Legal Status
- Managerial and Technical Capability
- Board of Directors: Role and Performance
- Administrative Policies
- Participation in Regional Networks
- Partnership Institutional Standards
- Attitude toward Best Practices

RFO TECHNICAL TEAM

- Strategic Plan
- Technical Capability
- MIS
- Accounting System
- Financial Reports and Audits
- Best Practices Implementation
- Table One (MIP)
- Technical Ranking and Assessment of Needs

AIHA Sample Work Plan Guide

Guidelines for completing the 16-Month Workplan Template

The U.S. Partnership Representative, based on collaborative work with partners from the US and the NIS, is responsible for submitting the 16-month workplan for partner activities, which spans from June 1999 through September 2000. Information from the first 4 months of the partnership should be included in this workplan as well.

Feel free to copy and paste to expand any of the sections (e.g. trips, objectives, activities, etc.). However, please complete each section as set forth in the template.

The workplan is a collaborative planning tool that serves as a guide to strategically articulate how the partners intend to implement a series of action steps to achieve the goals and objectives of the partnership. The workplan follows initial assessment by both partners and represents a key step in the planning phase of partnership development. It is endorsed by all team members and mobilizes the appropriate resources within the funds budgeted and in-kind contributions to implement a variety of activities over an agreed upon time period. The workplan serves as the main document to monitor and evaluate partnership progress.

In most cases, the workplan should be completed during the first NIS partner visit to the US based on group work using such tools as the initial assessment and logic model frameworking, as well other information learned during exchange trips. The template to be used in completing the workplan is attached and is due to AIHA no later than **August 31, 1999**. This will provide sufficient time for partners and AIHA to discuss any workplan issues for partners to make any necessary revisions and for AIHA to prepare new sub-grant budgets, which must be issued prior to September 30, 1999.

The workplan is a working document and as such may change over the duration of the partnership. However, the workplan sets the tone for partnership activities and is used to monitor and evaluate partnership activities and progress toward workplan objectives.

Forms are being provided to you through this e-mail. Forms are also available at AIHA's website at www.aiha.com. Please feel free to adjust the margins of the answer spaces according to your needs.

A copy of the workplan, initial assessment, and logic framework modeling tool should be sent to your Program Officer via e-mail no later than August 31, 1999. A hard copy with signatures should be mailed to AIHA direct for submission to USAID. E-mail addresses of program officers are as follows:

<u>Program Officer</u>	<u>E-mail Address</u>
Bernice Bennett	bbennett@aiha.com
Eun-Joo Chang	eun-joo@aiha.com
Laura Kayser	lkayser@aiha.com
Terry L. Richardson	trichardson@aiha.com

The workplan is comprised of 12 sections, which follow below. Detailed information about completing each section is provided.

1. Partnership and Workplan Information
2. Background and Priorities
3. Goals and Objectives
4. Planned Inputs and Activities
 - 4-1. Planned Activities
 - 4-2. Anticipated Exchange Trips
 - 4-3. Anticipated In-Kind Contributions
5. Outputs and Outcomes
6. Performance Indicators
7. Factors Influencing Change
8. Plans for Collaboration
9. Sustainability Strategies
10. Strategies for Communicating Partnership Activities
11. Strategies for Communicating Between Partners
12. Workplan Timeline

Section 1. Partnership and Workplan Information

Date: List the date of submission since various versions may be completed.

Version #: The initial workplan, Version 1, is due August 31, 1999. As modifications are made, new versions should be submitted and numerated respectively. All modified workplans must be approved by AIHA.

Signatures: This workplan should be signed by program coordinators from both US and NIS on behalf of both partner sites.

Section 2. Background and Priorities

Background/Problem Statement: Based on the initial assessment, SWOT analysis, and LOGIC model, provide a concise summary of the background or problem statement.

Priorities Identified in the Assessment: Based on the initial assessment, SWOT analysis, and LOGIC model, list the overall priorities that were identified.

Section 3. Goals and Objectives

Overall Goal of Partnership: State overall goal of the partnership.

Specific Objectives of Partnership Activities: List objectives of the partnership. Each objective should meet SMART criteria – specific, measurable, attainable, realistic, and time-framed.

Section 4. Planned Inputs and Activities

Overview of Proposed Activities: Provide a brief overview of proposed activities. Specific activities should be described in sections that follow.

Planned Activities: List and describe specific interventions and timeline for implementation that are planned as part of this partnership. Each activity (or intervention) should contain reference to specific objectives of partnership activities. List strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats for each planned intervention.

List planned activities of the partnership including anticipated exchange trips, in-kind contributions, conferences, workshops, and other training events, etc.

Anticipated Exchange Trips:

List planned exchange trips that are anticipated to occur in either direction during the 16 months of the workplan. Each trip should contain reference to specific objectives of the partnership. With each planned trip, list origination and destination of the trip, travelers (individual names where known) and their occupation as well as the role they will be playing on the trip. Also list the overall purpose of the exchange trip. What is to be achieved? List all trips you expect to occur within the period of the workplan.

In-kind contributions:

List and quantify all in-kind time (hours and monetary value) and services by person and occupation (physician, registered nurse, manager, technician, executive, health educator, epidemiologist, etc.) that are expected to be contributed to help meet workplan objectives. This time includes time of both US and Regional Partner Coordinator. A formula for human resources valuation will be assigned by AIHA. However, if the value of time for each person is known, please include this amount.

Also estimate medical equipment and supplies, educational materials, pharmaceuticals, and other inputs expected to be contributed in-kind by the US partner and its community.

Section 5. Outputs and Outcomes

Outputs and Outcomes: List and describe specific changes that are anticipated as the result of partnership program activities.

Outputs are synonymous with work or process. Outputs are the quantity, quality, or timeliness of work products and services provided by the organization and supplied to the customer and targeted users (e.g. patients).

Outcomes are synonymous with results. Outcomes are the ways in which users (patients) benefit or, put another way, outcomes are the strategic results experienced by the patients from the organization's products or services.

Each output/outcome should contain reference to specific objectives of the partnership. Examples of outputs and outcomes are listed below:

<u>Type</u>	<u>OUTPUT (something you do)</u>	<u>OUTCOME (something that results)</u>
Clinical Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Number of mammograms performed ■ Number of pap smears completed ■ Number of patients seen ■ Number of clinicians trained ■ Introduction of new technologies or improvements in technical skills ■ Re-organization of clinical oversight committees ■ Introduction of new or revised treatment protocols ■ Development of new patient flow mechanisms ■ Development of new patient services ■ Development of model or practice standards 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Changes in clinical practices ■ Changes in provider/patient interaction ■ Changes in record-keeping or information gathering ■ Changes in efficiency ■ Incidence of late-stage diagnosis of breast cancer ■ Mortality rates from breast cancer ■ Percentage of women initiating prenatal care in the first trimester

Organizational Changes (e.g. management/financial)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Reorganization of organizational structure ■ Changes in responsibility structure ■ Development or revision of job descriptions ■ Changes in personnel policies ■ Changes in medical staff organization ■ Introduction of new budget models ■ Changes in financial monitoring systems ■ Changes in budget operation or budget control ■ Changes in procurement policies and programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Changes in organizational culture ■ Job satisfaction of employees ■ Satisfaction of clients or patients ■ Understanding of job responsibilities of staff ■ Changes in fiscal accountability
Educational	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Development of new curricula ■ Changes in teaching methodology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Understanding of core competencies ■ Job performance of staff ■ Changes in skills and technical expertise ■ Understanding of concepts
Community, Regional, or National Level Changes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Identification of community needs ■ Mobilization of multi-disciplinary team to address community problems ■ Prioritization of issues ■ Lobbying for new regional or national policies or legislation concerning clinical care ■ Lobbying for policies or legislation concerning credentialing or certification of personnel or licensing of facilities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ■ Passage of new regional or national policies or legislation ■ Reorganization of healthcare infrastructure ■ Changes in community, regional or national information exchange

Section 6. Performance Indicators

Performance Indicators:

List each performance indicator the partnership has chosen to demonstrate outcomes. For each indicator, note why this indicator was chosen as a performance measure for verifying or showing evidence of change. Also describe underlying assumptions for choosing this indicator. Does it really measure appropriate outcomes consistent with partnership goals? Describe how data is being collected. What is the baseline for the indicator chosen? If a baseline is not available, how will you collect it? Describe any barriers or issues related to data collection.

Section 7. Factors Influencing Change

Factors Influencing Change:

List factors (positive and negative) concerning the partnership or conditions external to the partnership that are likely to influence change. What factors might hamper or contribute to partnership objectives? What factors might hamper the achievement of partnership objectives? Is this influence positive (+), negative (-), or difficult to determine (+/-)?

Section 8. Plans for Collaboration

Plans for collaboration with other partners, NGOs, other donor projects

List international and local NGOs and other organizations working on partnership-relevant issues. What is the nature and scale of their activities? What are your intentions for interaction with these groups? Please include specific plans, if any, describing how activities of these other organizations can be employed for the benefit of the partnership.

Section 9. Sustainability Strategies

Sustainability Strategies:

List all sustainability strategies designed for the achievement of partnership goals and objectives.

Section 10. Strategies for Communicating Partnership Activities

**Public Relations,
Media, and
Dissemination Strategies:**

List plans or strategies your partnership will employ to disseminate information regarding partnership activities as well as gain media coverage via newspaper, radio, or television.

Section 11. Strategies for Communicating Between Partners

**Partnership Communications
and Information Exchange:**

List activities planned to include promotion of information exchange between partners such as using electronic mail, the Internet, or any other communications technologies, which may include e-mail consultations, on-line chat sessions, telemedicine applications, videoconferencing.

Section 12. Workplan Timeline

Gantt Chart:

Lastly, we ask that you show your objectives and activities in a Gantt Chart. A Gantt chart is a visual display chart used for scheduling which is based on time, rather than quantity, volume or weight.

For Planned trips, place an "N" under the month in which a trip is anticipated to the NIS by US partners. Place a "U" under the month in which a trip is anticipated to the US by NIS partners.

Type each workplan objective in the appropriate space. Copy and paste rows as necessary. Under each objective, communicate each activity, task, or input necessary for the accomplishment of this objective. Shade cells under month and year that have activities. Use the following codes for the timeline, placing the code under the appropriate month:

B: Begin activity, task or input

E: End activity, task or input

O: Ongoing activity, task or input

AIHA Healthcare Partnership Program WORKPLAN*

SECTION 1. PARTNERSHIP AND WORKPLAN INFORMATION

Partnership:	
---------------------	--

Date of Submission:		Version #:	
----------------------------	--	-------------------	--

This workplan and budget proposals were jointly developed and have been carefully reviewed by the representatives of [*click here and type US Partner Organization*] and [*click here and type NIS Partner Organization*]. As signatories for these partner organizations, we are in full agreement on all aspects of these proposals, including the proposed activities, outcomes, timeline, and budget as described herein represents collaborative efforts.

Signature, NIS Project Coordinator

Signature, US Project Coordinator

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

SECTION 2. BACKGROUND AND PRIORITIES

Background/Problem Statement:	
--------------------------------------	--

Priorities Identified:	
-------------------------------	--

SECTION 2. BACKGROUND AND PRIORITIES

Overall Goal of Partnership:	
-------------------------------------	--

SECTION 3. GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

Specific Objectives of Partnership Activities	
Objective 1:	
Objective 2:	
Objective 3:	
Objective 4:	
Objective 5:	

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

SECTION 4. PLANNED INPUTS AND ACTIVITIES

Overview of Proposed Activities	

Section 4-1. Planned Activities

Activity #1: (Provide description below & include timeline in Section 12 of the workplan)	
Title of Activity:	
Description of activity and tasks to be accomplished:	
Timeframe for Implementation:	
Relates to Workplan Objective Numbers:	

Activity #2: (Provide description below & include timeline in Section 12 of the workplan)	
Title of Activity:	
Description of activity and tasks to be accomplished:	
Timeframe for Implementation:	
Relates to Workplan Objective Numbers:	

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

Activity #3: (Provide description below & include timeline in Section 12 of the workplan)	
Title of Activity:	
Description of activity and tasks to be accomplished:	
Timeframe for Implementation:	
Relates to Workplan Objective Numbers:	

Activity #4: (Provide description below & include timeline in Section 12 of the workplan)	
Title of Activity:	
Description of activity and tasks to be accomplished:	
Timeframe for Implementation:	
Relates to Workplan Objective Numbers:	

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

Section 4-2. Anticipated Exchange Trips

Trip #1		
Trip Objective #1:		Relates to Partnership Objective # _____.
Trip Objective #2:		Relates to Partnership Objective # _____.
Trip Objective #3:		Relates to Partnership Objective # _____.
(Origination/Destination)	to	
Travelers:	<u>Traveler</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
	1.	
	2.	
	3.	

Trip #2		
Trip Objective #1:		Relates to Partnership Objective # _____.
Trip Objective #2:		Relates to Partnership Objective # _____.
Trip Objective #3:		Relates to Partnership Objective # _____.
(Origination/Destination)	to	
Travelers:	<u>Traveler</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
	1.	
	2.	
	3.	

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

Trip #3		
Trip Objective #1:	Relates to Partnership Objective # ____.	
Trip Objective #2:	Relates to Partnership Objective # ____.	
Trip Objective #3:	Relates to Partnership Objective # ____.	
(Origination/Destination)	to	
Travelers:	<u>Traveler</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
	1.	
	2.	
	3.	

Trip #4		
Trip Objective #1:	Relates to Partnership Objective # ____.	
Trip Objective #2:	Relates to Partnership Objective # ____.	
Trip Objective #3:	Relates to Partnership Objective # ____.	
(Origination/Destination)	to	
Travelers:	<u>Traveler</u>	<u>Occupation</u>
	1.	
	2.	
	3.	

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

Section 4-3. Anticipated In-Kind Contributions

In-Kind Time and Services to be contributed to help meet workplan objectives by persons & occupation	<u>Person</u>	<u>Occupation</u>	<u>Hours</u>
Medical Equipment and Supplies:			
Educational Materials:			
Pharmaceuticals:			
Other In-kind Inputs & Contributions			

SECTION 5. OUTPUTS AND OUTCOMES

Type	OUTPUT <i>(something you do)</i>	OUTCOME <i>(something that results)</i>
Clinical Changes		
Organizational Changes (e.g. management/ financial)		
Educational		
Community, Regional, or National Level Changes		

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

SECTION 6. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Indicator #1	
Why chosen and assumptions?	
How is data being collected?	
Baseline data:	
Barriers/Issues with Data Collection:	

Indicator #2	
Why chosen and assumptions?	
How is data being collected?	
Baseline data:	
Barriers/Issues with Data Collection:	

Indicator #3	
Why chosen and assumptions?	
How is data being collected?	
Baseline data:	
Barriers/Issues with Data Collection:	

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

SECTION 7. FACTORS INFLUENCING CHANGE

Factor	Influence (+,-, +/-)	Explanation

SECTION 8. PLANS FOR COLLABORATION

<u>Plans for collaboration with other partners, NGOs, other donor projects</u>

SECTION 9. SUSTAINABILITY STRATEGIES

<u>Sustainability Strategies</u>	
Strategy #1:	
Strategy #2:	
Strategy #3:	

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

SECTION 10. STRATEGIES FOR COMMUNICATING PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES

PR/Media, and Dissemination Strategies

SECTION 11. STRATEGIES FOR COMMUNICATING BETWEEN PARTNERS

Partnership Communications and Information Exchange

** Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"*

SECTION 12. WORKPLAN TIMELINE

Objective: Activities & Inputs	1999							2000							Output/Outcome
	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	

PLANNED TRIPS (Codes: To NIS = N; To US = U)

Objective: [click here and type *objective*]

Activity/Task/Input:

[click here and type]

Activity/Task/Input: [click here and type]

Activity/Task/Input: [click here and type]

Activity/Task/Input: [click here and type]

Objective: [click here and type *objective*]

Activity/Task/Input: [click here and type]

Objective: [click here and type *objective*]

Activity/Task/Input: [click here and type]

* Follow "Guidelines for Completing Workplan Template"

The Alliance for Collaboration On Enterprise Development Sample Sustainability Plan

Three-Year Strategic Plan for Creating a “Leave behind” Organization

Over the three-year period of the current Cooperative Agreement, Alliance members will select and cooperate with Business Support Organizations, including business consulting organizations, both for-profit and non-profit (hereinafter BSOs) with the aim of developing stimuli for private sector development. These activities will have two primary objectives:

- 1) to identify, select and assist BSOs that can provide business services to Alliance clients and new clients; and
- 2) to leave behind personnel through which private sector volunteer services can be delivered should funding be available to support those assignments.

Selected BSOs can be for-profit, non-commercial organizations, associations, or cooperatives, but the organizations should have technical capacity to deliver business services and an identifiable means of financial support apart from USAID funds, including paid consulting assignments.

In order to achieve these objectives, the Alliance members will engage in the following activities:

- BSOs’ staff training will be developed, by Alliance staff in the field, volunteers, or other programs, to build selected BSO capacities to deliver business services to local clients.
 - Alliance staff members will be provided with training programs. These will include regional training programs, conducted by Alliance volunteers working on piggy-back projects, as well as training at formal business educational centers. It is intended that this training will support their involvement or employment with the successor BSOs. This will be determined on a case-by-case basis, according to the requirements of all parties involved. Where possible, the training provided by Alliance volunteers will be provided to a combined group of staff from the Alliance, potential successor BSOs and clients.
 - Potential successor BSOs will be selected and encouraged to develop close relationships with the four Alliance partners so they can call on these organizations in future, when technical expertise is required that could be provided by a partner’s volunteer on a cost-reimbursable basis.
 - In addition, the BSOs will learn how to use volunteers to complement the work they already do, as well as receive volunteer assistance to grow and improve their own operations. Volunteer assignments will be specifically designed to assist the BSOs in development of management practices, pricing, marketing and the delivery of business and consulting services.
-
- 

-
-
- Once successor BSOs are identified, Alliance members will introduce the successor organizations to each other, host events that encourage the successor BSOs to interact, and network with each other.
 - It will be the responsibility of the successor organizations to register, and implement financial management systems so that they are eligible, at their option, to bid on contracts and enter into legal agreements to work with, or for, a variety of donor or business organizations. It is intentioned that equipment from the existing Alliance program will be transferred to the successor organizations at the end of the Alliance program.

Implementation Scheme

Implementation of the above strategy is anticipated in 3 phases. Basing on the following outline, and maintaining flexibility to account for changes in circumstances over successive years, each phase will be further developed in yearly work plans:

Phase 1 - Year 1:

- Training of the Alliance’s local staff, covering personal empowerment and the development of skills necessary to oversee implementation of the Alliance’s leave-behind strategy.
- Identification of, and non-exclusive cooperation with, potential successor Business Support Organizations (BSOs), including:
- Training of both BSOs’ staff and Alliance staff by volunteers and locally hired experts (linked where possible with training of other clients’ staff).
- Researching and developing market opportunities – jointly arranging business training seminars, linking services for clients.
- Empowering potential successor BSOs through in-company volunteer assistance projects.

Phase 2 - Year 2:

- Ongoing cooperation with potential successor BSOs as described above and extended to include introducing BSOs/leave behind organizations to each other to encourage cooperation.

Phase 3 - Year 3:

- Finalizing relationships with successor BSOs.

The Alliance members have had previously documented success in working with local consulting companies and Business Support Organizations with their programs in countries ACDI/VOCA has worked with VISTAA, an indigenous firm, in supplying local volunteers to work in tandem with U.S. volunteers. Eventually VISTAA was able to attract donor funding for its independent volunteer services. IESC contracts with local consultants in their programs in Jordan, Egypt, and Bulgaria, where IESC’s office provides local consultants as a cost-effective remedy to problems its clients are facing which do not require a full Technical Assistance project. CDC is now working on partnering its operations in Russia with local

consulting companies. The Alliance members will share their experiences and work to ensure the development of a successful leave-behind program for the Alliance. It is anticipated that this program will develop at varying speeds through the Alliance's offices, as the business resources available to them will be of different sizes and strengths.

**Implementation Plan,
Phase 1 - Year 1**

Staff empowerment

The Alliance's local staff will be given the opportunity to attend local business education establishments, to participate in courses they personally select for their further business education. Subject to case-by-case approval of the staff's selected courses by the Alliance partner (the employer), while taking into account CA budgets and its published policies, the Alliance partner may fund course costs. It is anticipated that funding on this specific topic will not exceed a maximum of \$500 per employee in the first year of the CA.

Alliance staff will join together with clients and BSO staff in attending training seminars presented locally by Alliance volunteers. They will also attend seminars presented locally by other donor-funded organizations.

Identifying and cooperating
with potential successor BSOs

The Alliance will attempt to identify potential successor BSOs in each of its office locations with whom it can cooperate initially on a nonexclusive basis. The initial scope of cooperation in the first year may include:

- Marketing each other's services to clients
- Linking services, to provide a greater range of services
- Training/empowering the BSOs staff through in-company technical assistance
- Joint participation in organizing seminars/training programs

Partnership Behavior Identification Tools

Catholic Relief Services Partnership Reflection Tool

Each partnership is unique and depends on the environment, culture, organizations, and even the personalities found around the world. There is no model by which to describe or judge any relationship a CRS Country Program may have with its local partners. The one thing they do share, however, is their need for one another in order to most effectively implement programs and benefit the people we both serve.

Just as projects need regular monitoring and evaluation, so do relationships. The complexity of bringing two autonomous organizations together with different strengths, constraints, and histories can be challenging. Open communication, dialogue, and continual effort are critical to negotiating this path.

This partnership reflection is designed to guide discussion and planning in monitoring partnership relationships. Based on the CRS Principles of Partnership, this tool is an opportunity to “take stock” of various aspects of your partnership and identify areas and behaviors both partners would like to strengthen in the future. The process is designed to reflect the partners’ view of good partnership locally, rather than a global standard of excellence expected to describe every partnership. It is hoped that this tool will then be used regularly at annual partnership meetings or other gatherings to monitor progress.

The following is a suggested flow for the process. However, be creative and adapt everything!

Step 1: Partners review the CRS Partnership Principles together and adapt them as needed. The end result should be a set of principles that both parties agree reflect their idea of excellent partnerships. The checklist is consequently adapted in light of the changes.

Step 2: The revised checklist is given to each partner to complete separately. How this is done can be decided locally, although a suggestion would be to have each partner organization hold an internal meeting to discuss the different points and agree on the level they believe their partnership meets that principle – interactive, functional, consultative, passive.

Step 3: Partners come together to share their responses, note commonalities and differences, and discuss their rankings for any clarification that may be needed. Together they identify the key principles upon which they would like to focus for the next year.

Note: The number of principles may vary, although it is suggested that it be limited to about 3 in order to give each one appropriate attention. It may be the principles



given the lowest ranking or it may be others most critical to the functioning of the relationship. Ironically, partnerships reflecting a number of principles that need improvement may want to choose only one or two, while stronger partnerships may want to choose more. The point is not to bring the partnership to perfection, but only to take the next step and make it a solid one.

Step 4: For each principle identified, the partners jointly brainstorm on behaviors that would indicate that the principle is being met. A list of sample behavior indicators are included in this tool. *This list is not finite but only intended to stimulate thinking!* The list is reviewed and the ones partners both commit to work on are chosen. Time frames are established for how often this will be done.

Step 5: Go to work engaging in the behaviors and strengthening your partnerships. In one year's time (or however long you choose), repeat the process. Note how much progress was made over the year, chose new principles or new behaviors or stay with the old ones, according to group discussions.

Reflection Checklist

Partners indicate the level which the partnership meets this principle from their own perspective. The following elaboration of the scores may be helpful.

Interactive Partnership—Partners participate in joint analysis and development of SPPs, and action and project plans. Participation tends to involve interdisciplinary methodologies that seek multiple perspectives and make use of systematic and structured learning processes. Partners share in local decision-making and have a stake in maintaining structures or practices.

Functional Partnership—Partners participate by forming groups to meet predetermined objectives related to the project, which can involve the development or promotion of externally initiated social organization. Such involvement does not tend to be at early stages of program cycles or planning, but rather after major decisions have been made.

Consultative Partnership—Partners participate by being consulted and CRS field staff listen to the views. CRS defines both the problems and solutions, and may modify these in light of partner responses. Implementation is then handed to the partners to carry out.

Passive Partnership—Partners participate by being told what is going to happen or has already happened. It is a unilateral announcement by an administration or project management without listening to peoples' responses. The information being shared belongs to CRS.

CRS Partnership Principles	Interactive	Functional	Consultative	Passive
<p>P Participation of communities</p> <p>CRS and its partners <i>maximize community participation</i> in all aspects of programming to ensure community ownership of, and decision-making within, the development process.</p>				
<p>A Autonomy and mutuality</p> <p>CRS achieves <i>complementarity and mutuality in its partnerships</i>, recognizing and valuing that each brings a set of skills, resources, knowledge, and capacities to the partnership in a spirit of mutual autonomy.</p>				
<p>R Responsibility for decision-making</p> <p>All of CRS's partnerships assign responsibility for decision-making and implementation to a level as close as possible to the people whom decisions will affect.</p>				
<p>T Transparency</p> <p>To foster healthy partnerships, CRS promotes <i>mutual transparency</i> regarding capacities, constraints, and resources.</p>				
<p>N Needs assessment and capacity strengthening</p> <p>CRS facilitates and promotes the strengthening of partners' abilities to identify, build on, and address their vulnerabilities, strengths, and specific-capacity building needs through a process that leads to sustainability.</p>				
<p>E Equitability</p> <p>CRS fosters equitable partnerships by engaging in a process of mutually defining rights and responsibilities, in relation to each partner's capacity, required to achieve the goal of the partnership.</p>				
<p>R Respect, openness and sharing</p> <p>In its relationships with partners CRS promotes <i>openness and sharing of perspectives</i> and approaches.</p>				

<p>S Shared vision</p> <p>CRS bases partnerships upon a shared vision for addressing people’s immediate needs and the underlying causes of suffering and injustice.</p>				
<p>H Helps strengthen civil society</p> <p>By building partnerships, CRS seeks to make a <i>contribution to the strengthening of civil society</i>.</p>				
<p>I Institutional Development</p> <p>The engagement of CRS and the local partner in Local Capacity Development involves a long-term commitment to complete a mutually agreed upon process of organizational development.</p>				
<p>P Partnership</p> <p>Overall satisfaction with the partnership.</p>				

Principal Indicators List

Complete one indicator list for each principle identified for action. Think of what behaviors indicate that this principle is present. Place the complete principle at the top of the table. List as many indicators as you feel are useful, adding additional spaces if needed. (Look at the sample list to get your thinking started.) Once the list is agreed upon, come up with a time frame for the frequency of action.

Principle:

Behavior Indicator:

Time Frame

1.	
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Sample Indications of Partnership Behavior

The following is a list of possible indicators for each partnership principle. The list is intended to be illustrative only. Feel free to use, change, or not use the indicators only as useful and applicable to your specific and unique situation and partnership environment.

Participation of communities

- Communities are recognized to have capacities and coping mechanisms that should be identified, understood, and strengthened as the primary source of solving local problems.
- Participatory methods are used to maximize joint planning, evaluation and analysis.
- Partners conduct joint field visit and working session while designing projects to determine how they will work with community groups and beneficiaries.
- Outputs/results of projects are sustained, protected, managed and utilized by community beyond life of project, even during times of change.
- CRS and partners participate in community projects/ programs.
- All stakeholders (comm. members, local CBOs, local government officials, private business, etc.) are committed to and involved in reaching community goals.
- Local officials lobby higher levels for increased resources or other relevant changes

Autonomy and mutuality

- Partners get to know each other and identify issues of common interest through meetings without preconceived projects in mind.
- Field visits/contacts are held to learn more about each organization.
- All stakeholders understand and know goals of relationship. Local partners express their views of partnership, their needs and what they're looking for from CRS; CRS is clear and direct with counterparts about its hopes and expectations for partnership
- Partners explore the best kind of relationship for two organizations (subcontractor, joint venture, donor, service provider, technical assistance, etc.), institutional development arrangements, policy support and development education responsibilities.
- Comparative advantages of each organization and how the two can complement one another are discussed.
- Each partner willingly takes responsibility.
- Mutual assistance is given.
- Identify concrete ways in which each organization can contribute to strengthening the other during the course of the relationship; identify innovative

- Management approaches practices by Southern partners.
- Identification of the technical, financial, and human resource capacities of both partners.
- IB is as a reciprocal relationship with both organizations having areas of strengths and areas in which each can serve as a resource to the other.
- Advocacy work is done jointly, e.g., local partner representatives speak in U.S. on effects of U.S. policy on poor, partner representative on visit congressional representative to discuss issues of concern.
- Each organization continues to exist and interact with other partners and their reputation remains independent.
- Sharing of information-gathering and analysis exercises.
- Defining a mutual learning strategy. Acknowledging examples of mutual exchange of learning and access to knowledge and skills, innovative methodologies.
- Expression of mutual satisfaction with relations.
- Communication is conducted in both/ common languages.
- Celebrations are held together.

Responsibility for decision-making

- Priority needs and opportunities are identified through local partner's network.
- Joint decision-making structures are defined and utilized.
- Clearly defined and agreed upon fiscal accounting.
- Willingness to modify expectations and roles to address lessons learned.
- Projects are developed together (e.g., joint field visits and working sessions while designing projects; determining responsibilities and ownership of the project, etc.).
- Participation in decision making is regularly employed.
- Workshops and meetings are held to discuss decision-making, project implementation, and risk evaluation.
- Guidelines are established for how the budget will be managed and controlled.
- Joint planning for SPP and projects. Partners are engaged in project activities from the earliest stages of problem identification and project planning to ensure appropriate and meaningful collaboration.

- Existence of a strategy for active solicitation of views and perspectives of partners in the processes of program exploration and selection
- CRS country programs and headquarters departments collaborate with European Catholic agencies to educate and engage constituencies in common global citizen concerns, as well as link those constituencies with local partner constituencies to enrich constituency education, and form global networks for action.

Transparency

- Periodic review of expectations, roles, and responsibilities.
- Regular meetings are held to review project achievements, check on working relationship, and solve problems.
- Willingness to modify expectations and roles to address lessons learned.
- Mutual monitoring systems guide how each is accountable to the other and how both are accountable to community/beneficiary groups.
- Information is shared between organizations, such as financial information, long-range plans and organizational assessments, organizational strengths/weaknesses and challenges faced.
- Sharing of information on grant conditions and donor requirements.
- Clearly defined and agreed upon fiscal accounting.
- Guidelines are established for how the budget will be managed and controlled.
- Sharing of information-gathering and analysis exercises.
- Indicators to monitor project progress are mutually agreed upon.
- Evaluations are used as management/training tools so that both Northern/Southern partners and community groups/beneficiaries can learn and grow through them, and the relationship can be strengthened.
- Identification of the technical, financial, and human resource capacities of both partners.
- IB activities are coordinated with other donor and partnership NGOs.
- Advocacy work is done jointly, e.g., local partner representatives speak in U.S. on effects of U.S. policy on poor, partner representative on visit congressional representative to discuss issues of concern
- Donor agencies are engaged as a partnership team.
- Joint reports are submitted to donors or systems are established so each knows what goes to a donor.

Needs assessment and capacity strengthening

- Capacity-building assessments are regularly conducted with major counterparts, using self-assessment tools whenever appropriate.

- CRS country programs and headquarters departments collaborate with European Catholic agencies to educate and engage constituencies in common global citizen concerns, as well as link those constituencies with local partner constituencies to enrich constituency education, and form global networks for action.
- Adequate financial and staff resources are invested in capacity building plans.
- Baseline study and monitoring system followed to measure capacity-building progress. Sustainability indicators, including financial sustainability, are developed and monitored. Benchmarks agreed upon.
- When goals are completed, new roles and responsibilities assigned and taken.
- Existence of an exit strategy and an independent capacity to access/generate resources
- Existence of plans for strengthening managerial, organizational, and technical capacities of partner organizations
- Linkages with a diversity of funding sources.
- Plan for fundraising skills transfer.

Equitability

- The number of organizational partnerships matches the capacity to provide sound and regular financial, management, administrative, technical, and moral support consistent with CST.
- Partner roles and responsibilities are clearly defined within a project. Written agreements outline each organization's responsibilities and norms of behavior and amount and type of resources and skills each brings to the table.
- Projects are developed together (e.g., joint field visits and working sessions while designing projects; determining responsibilities and ownership of the project, etc.).
- Participation in decision making is regularly employed.
- Forums are held for both partners to have dialogue with respect to the design and implementation of the project.
- Identify concrete ways in which each organization can contribute to strengthening the other during the course of the relationship; identify innovative management approaches/practices by Southern partners.
- Keeping the vision alive, supporting each other through thick and thin
- Partners commit to working on common organizational challenges, like fundraising or board development, and learn from and support each other.
- The partnership is monitored through ongoing dialogue and annual partner meetings.
- Donor agencies are engaged as a partnership team.
- Joint reports are submitted to donors, or systems are established so each knows what goes to a donor.

Respect, openness, and sharing

- Cultural sensitivity.
- Frequent communication.
- Partners take time to develop trust before starting a project.
- All stakeholders understand and know goals of relationship. Local partners express their views of partnership, their needs, and what they're looking for from CRS; CRS is clear and direct with counterparts about its hopes and expectations for partnership
- Partners attend fora together (such as conferences, workshops).
- Partners seek to understand and address root causes of the targeted symptom of poverty or injustice (such as high infant mortality, high erosion rates, illiteracy, or food insecurity).
- Staff are provided with opportunities to learn why and how CRS works with partners, using the Principles of Partnership, the CRS Justice Strategy, and principles of Catholic Social Teaching as guidelines.
- Sharing information-gathering and analysis exercises.
- Engage in staff exchanges or internships.
- Partners are appropriately supported in their efforts to uphold country policies related to their mission/work, such as policies related to rights of woman, labor codes, etc.
- Joint experiences are documented to share with other organizations interested in partnerships.
- Joint international, regional, or country-level workshops are held with other development organizations.

Shared vision

- Partnership is based on shared values of justice and social change.
- Clear and well-defined visions for each organization are expressed in mission statements and charters. Discussions are held on the compatibility of any differences that may exist.
- Strategic plans of both reflect at least some common approaches and program areas.
- Project documents integrate shared vision and strategic approaches.
- Both organizations have congruent charters/mission statements and each is discussed.
- Alignment on program and implementation issues.
- Agreement on values and ideology.

Helps strengthen civil society

- CRS undertakes dialogue and/or action to strengthen or improve civil society arenas.
- CRS encourages its partners to engage in dialogue, and action with other members of civil society, in order to contribute to the transformation of unjust structures and systems.

- Country programs collaborate with other PVOs and local NGO support organizations to provide training for organizational development in an effort to increase consistency, avoid repetition, increase cost-effectiveness, provide networking opportunities, and decrease dependence of local NGOs on a single PVO.
- Country programs seek to create linkages between local partners and organizations sharing similar purposes and mission at both the regional and international level, including those in the United States, for the purpose of sharing information, strengthening institutional capacity, building alliances, and accessing resources.
- Country programs facilitate and support networking and coalition building within civil society as well as between civil society and the business and government sectors through various approaches, including:
 - providing funds for workshops, conferences, and training opportunities;
 - managing umbrella projects that involve multiple local organizations working together;
 - supporting intermediary or support organizations that offer training, networking opportunities, advocacy assistance, and other services to local organizations; and
- Engaging local government and small businesses in development efforts with civil society partners.
- Country programs assist local partners and their networks in strengthening legal, policy, and operating environments through such nonviolent means as:
 - providing contacts in other countries to encourage and facilitate exchanges of information;
 - supporting advocacy training, events, and activities, including public awareness campaigns; and
 - convening fora for discussion and action among local civil society, PVOs, U.N. agencies, donors, and host-government bodies.
- Integration of advocacy educational modules in CRS projects/sectors

Institutional development

- Comprehensive IB plans developed with major counterparts to address their needs.
- Country programs engage local partners in joint and mutual organizational assessment and planning processes through which all parties, including CRS, collaboratively identify their own strengths, prioritize the areas in need of improvement, and create their own action plans.
- Strengthening of local partners' organizational capacities are based on shared action plans, project-specific interventions, occasional trainings, etc.
- Partners expand their operational network with other NGOs/donors.
- Opportunities are provided for training and dialogue on strategic issues: justice lens.

American International Health Alliance High-Performance Teams Evaluation

Two prominent researchers, Carl E. Larson and Frank M.J. LaFasto, recently identified eight characteristics that they believe explain how and why effective teams develop. These crucial factors associated with team success were found in an extraordinarily diverse collection of highly effective teams, including the McDonald's Chicken McNuggets team, the space shuttle *Challenger* investigation team, the crew of USS *Kitty Hawk*, executive management teams, cardiac surgery teams, mountain climbing teams, and the 1966 Notre Dame championship football team.

High-Performance Teams Evaluation Checklist

Directions

Look at the characteristics of high-performing teams shown below and rank your team. A "10" indicates that your team clearly exhibits this characteristic. A "1" means that you can see little or no evidence of this being present.

- **A clear, elevating goal (Vision)** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
A sense of purpose; worthwhile and challenging objectives; clear consequences connected with achievement of or failure to reach goals; shared vision compelling enough to create a team identity

- **A Results-Driven Structure** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
A team design determined by the results to be achieved; clear lines of authority, responsibility, and accountability; communication system allowing informal opportunities to raise issues, methods for documenting issues and decisions; effective methods for monitoring individual performance and providing feedback; decision-making processes encourage fact-based judgment

- **Competent Team Members** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
Members possess essential skills and abilities to accomplish mission; individuals demonstrate a strong desire to contribute; members are confident in abilities of others, individuals are capable of collaborating effectively with each other

© 1999 AYRE, CLOUGH & NORRIS AND THE GROVE CONSULTANTS INTERNATIONAL

-
- **Unified Commitment** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 Achieving team goals is a higher priority than any individual objective; personal success is achieved through team success; willingness to devote whatever effort necessary to ensure success

 - **A Collaborative Climate** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 Trust among team members is high enough to share information and feedback; members compensate for each other's shortcomings; members trust each other to act competently and responsibly; team embraces a common set of guiding values

 - **Standards of Excellence** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 High standards are established; members require each other to perform to the standards; the team exerts pressure on itself to improve performance

 - **External Support and Recognition** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 Necessary resources are available; support from critical constituencies; sufficient recognition for accomplishments; an effective reward and incentive structure that is clearly defined, viewed as appropriate and tied to individual and team performance

 - **Principled Leadership** 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
 Leads in an inspired way: exhibits personal commitment; doesn't dilute team effort with too many priorities; stands behind team with open support; fair and impartial toward all; exhibits trust by giving meaningful levels of responsibility; doesn't compromise values and principles for "politics."
Note: Assume that team leadership is shared among ALL members of the team.

American International Health Alliance Leadership Inventory

Use this leadership inventory, created by Donald Hackett and Charles Martin, to gain a sense of your preferred leadership style. Then, on the next page, note the differences between facilitative and traditional leadership styles.

A Leadership Quiz

Check what your colleagues would say is typical of your leadership:

1. Task-oriented
2. One-way
3. Power-oriented
4. Uses threats
5. Makes all the decisions
6. Works one-on-one
7. Motivates with money
8. Pushes change top-down
9. Good at office politics
10. Values structure
11. Quality-oriented
12. Good discussion
13. Open and trusting
14. Stresses consensus decisions
15. Works well with groups
16. Motivates by involving people
17. Designs change through groups
18. Works across departments
19. Encourages risk-taking
20. Defines jobs broadly

SOURCE: *FACILITATION SKILLS FOR TEAM LEADERS* BY DONALD HACKETT AND CHARLES MARTIN

© 1999 AYRE, CLOUGH & NORRIS AND THE GROVE CONSULTANTS INTERNATIONAL

TRADITIONAL AND FACILITATIVE LEADERSHIP COMPARISON

Traditional	Facilitative
TASK/QUALITY	
Emphasizes task completion	Focuses more on quality of output
COMMUNICATION	
Uses one-way communication to fix a problem	Empowers and encourages team members to originate and implement solutions
CONTROL	
Uses threats and power	Uses openness and trust while encouraging innovation and risk-taking
DECISIONS	
Receives some input but still calls the shots	Toils to get all team members to support a position before they call it a decision
RELATIONSHIPS	
Expert at working one-on-one with subordinates to gain support or to motivate	Works with groups both within their department and across departmental boundaries
MOTIVATION	
Relies heavily on money and promotions to drive performance	Praise, achievement, and involvement are central motivational tools
CHANGE	
Pushes change from the top and “sells the change” with reasons why people should embrace the new way	Uses groups to evolve change and thus build receptivity

*Note: Items 1–10 on the quiz are more representative of traditional leadership.
Items 11–20 are more suggestive of facilitative leadership.*

SOURCE. FACILITATION SKILLS FOR TEAM LEADERS BY DONALD HACK~ AND CHARLES MARTIN

Leadership Self-Assessment Test

Different Leadership Styles Predicting Partnership Success

Some organizations are better than others at forming, building, and sustaining effective partnerships. The reasons for this often are difficult to predict and can even be ephemeral. But one set of factors seems always to be important: management and leadership style. These tend to filter down through an organization and influence the way it interacts with other groups.

Studies of organizational behavior suggest that certain types of management structures and styles of leadership appear more conducive to forming partnerships. Spotting positive or negative attributes in advance can help you deduce which partnerships are most likely to flourish.

Leadership styles range from autocratic to fully participatory. There are several useful scales to help you think about this range of behaviors:

Different Ways of Classifying Leadership Styles			
Autocratic		Democratic	
Autocratic	Paternalistic	Consultative	Participatory
Leader controls	Shared control	Shared control	Group controls
Leader decides	Leader consults	Leader shares	Leader delegates
Tellings	Selling	Participating	Delegating

Source: Handy 1993.

Finding the optimal leadership style means finding a style that incorporates the personal qualities of the leader, the values and personal preferences of the staff, the nature of the task, and the environment where the organization is working.

While there is no “right” or “wrong” leadership style as such, over the past 25 years there has been a trend in organizations toward so-called open leadership styles. These are characterized by accessible information systems, the inclusion of staff in the decision-making process, heavier reliance on teamwork, and a greater effort to reach consensus on key decisions.* This shift has been particularly evident in social purpose organizations that place a high value on democratic processes (Terry 1993).

In a partnership, it is important that the management and leadership styles of the two collaborating organizations be compatible. Thus, a partnership between an organization on the autocratic end of the spectrum and one on the democratic end may be problematic.

*For example, see Cleveland N.d.

There is growing evidence that partnerships are more likely to be workable under a leadership style that falls toward the democratic side of the spectrum. The reasons are relatively clear:

- Partnerships are voluntary associations and tend inherently to resist compliance by “command and control” management structures.
- Partnerships tend to be organic and exploratory, thus they are more likely to grow and evolve under an open and responsive management system.
- Democratic management styles tend to encourage open and free communication and to promote an atmosphere of trust—the bedrock of a strong partnership.

What follows is a self-assessment survey designed to profile leader/management styles with the intent of building strong partnerships. Responses to these questions will help you indicate whether the leader/management style of two organizations is at odds with or supportive of a partnership relationship. Keep in mind that the responses measure management and leadership style only. Other factors, such as clear and tangible gain from the relationship, may offset a problematic management fit.

You can use this survey in either of two ways. First, you can send it to the leadership of both organizations you plan to work with and suggest they complete it to evaluate their own leadership style from the perspective of partnership building. Alternatively, you can use it as a checklist to help you assess whether a particular partnership is likely to succeed.

Leadership Self-Assessment

This is a self-assessment survey. It is for your private use only. No one will rate your response. There are no “right” or “wrong” answers.

Please respond to the following eight propositions and then refer to the corresponding analysis in the subsequent section:

1. I have full confidence in the staff of this organization. If something were to happen to me, I believe the organization would function effectively for at least six months without a leader (Bennis and Nanus 1985). Rate yourself along a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 indicating that the statement does not apply to you and 10 indicating that it applies quite strongly.

1.....5.....10

-
-
2. I am good at tolerating ambiguity and uncertainty. When things become confusing, I tend to defer to the judgment of my most experienced staff. Rate yourself along a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 indicating that the statement does not apply to you and 10 indicating that it applies quite strongly.

1.....5.....10

3. I believe that effective leadership is based on the following abilities (Maccoby 1981). Check only three:

- To understand the future implications of current events
- To gain and protect power and influence
- To figure out a problem and persuade others to solve it
- To articulate the core values of the organization
- To find points of agreement and build consensus

4. The following best describes how I like to make difficult decisions. Check the approach you believe applies to you:

- I ask my staff to give me their views in writing; I then synopsize the pros and cons on a piece of paper and pick the best alternative.
- I discuss a particular problem individually with staff members; I then synopsize the pros and cons on a piece of paper and pick the best alternative.
- I convene a group discussion where everybody has his say; I then go into my office, sketch out the pros and cons, and pick the best alternative.
- I convene a decision meeting at which everybody has his say; I then write the pros and cons on a chalkboard and make my decision in a group setting.
- I convene a decision meeting at which everybody has his say; I then write the pros and cons on a chalkboard and allow the group to decide.

5. The following two paragraphs begin with the premise that there are two kinds of people: bipods and tripods. As described below, which of the two do you think best applies to you?

- The bipods are thinkers and see the world in terms of their relations with other people. The bipods tend to define success or failure in terms of their

relationship with other people – whether they are loved, whether they are followed, whether they win or lose in a sporting event or a relationship.

- The tripods are builders and tend to see the world in terms of a task or a purpose. The tripods tend to define success in terms of achieving a result or making a change. Tripods don't give as much importance to winning or losing but on the results of playing the game.

6. Studies of leadership have identified eight *functions* of a leader. Of these eight, identify the four you believe are the most important attributes of an effective leader:

- Defining the task
- Planning
- Briefing
- Controlling
- Evaluating
- Motivating
- Organizing
- Setting an example

7. Several studies have identified a group of *personal traits* that are associated with effective leadership (Adair 1983). Of the following eight such traits, four are associated with effective leadership and four are not. Review the list and mark the four traits you believe are associated with effective leadership.

- A high level of intelligence
- A capacity to communicate persuasively
- An irreverent and questioning attitude toward authority
- A willingness to subordinate practical benefits to idealistic goals
- A high level of personal ambition
- A commitment to winning at all costs
- A complete commitment to the mission of the organization

-
-
- *Distributive bargaining.* One side will win and one will lose. It is important to be extremely competitive and play to win. We will state our position clearly and take a hard-line position. Concessions will weaken our position. It is dangerous to reveal information that can weaken our position.
 - *Integrative bargaining.* We need to find an optimal solution that constitutes a “win-win” for both sides. We will state our position in terms of desirable and important attributes of the solution. We will share information that explains why these attributes of the solution are important to us. We will help test alternative solutions to see whether they are feasible.
 - *Coalition bargaining.* The only way to win is to build a coalition of people who are willing to support one another. As the coalition grows, a consensus will gradually emerge. Eventually one coalition will dominate. Those who do not concur initially will eventually either join the most powerful coalition or be outvoted.

Responses to Leadership Self-Assessment

1. If you rated yourself on the high end (from 6 to 10), you are more likely to delegate responsibility, seek advice from your staff, and be responsive to their suggestions. In general, these are attributes related to strong partnerships.
2. If you rated yourself on the high end (from 6 to 10), you are likely to have the patience needed for a consensus-building approach. The ability to tolerate uncertainty correlates with the ability to manage in an open and participatory manner.
3. All of these abilities have been cited in one study or another as important to effective leadership. Every good leader will employ some of these abilities at one time or another. But the abilities that appear most directly related to a capacity to sustain a partnership relations are the last two:
 - To articulate the core values of the organization
 - To find points of agreement and build consensus

If you checked these two abilities, it suggests that you place a value on those attributes important to managing an effective partnership.

4. All of these techniques are perfectly acceptable, and the appropriate approach will depend on the context and the nature of the particular decision. Yet, techniques toward the bottom of the list (“I convene a decision meeting at which everybody has his say; I then write the pros and cons on a chalkboard and make my decision in a group setting” or “I convene a decision meeting at which everybody has his say; I then write the pros and cons on a chalkboard and allow the group

to decide”) are more participatory than those toward the top and are better suited to decision-making in a partnership.

5. The bipod mentality (seeing the world in terms of personal relations) tends to advance by using interpersonal techniques of power, control, and domination. Both success and failure tend to be highly personalized. Bipods may be highly successful in the short term but tend to alienate and self-destruct over time. Tripods tend to depersonalize and place primary emphasis on tangible outcomes. Tripods are uncompromising in pursuit of a goal and less likely to be derailed by short-term failures. Tripods tend to be better than bipods at managing partnerships because they keep the relationship aimed at results and are less concerned about ups and downs in relationships.
6. All of these functions are important for effective leadership. But, on the one hand, if you picked *planning, briefing, motivating, and setting an example*, you are reflecting functions that are important in the management of partnerships. On the other hand, if you picked *defining, controlling, evaluating, and organizing*, you are placing emphasis on functions that can become problematic in managing a partnership if they are too dominant.
7. A recent study of leadership traits suggests that two of these personal traits are positively correlated with the capacity to manage partnerships, while in other cases there is a negative correlation.

Positive traits (and the reasons why) include

- *A capacity to communicate persuasively* – critical in partnerships where misunderstanding and misinterpretation are likely to occur.
- *An irreverent and questioning attitude toward authority* – indicates a willingness to be flexible, pragmatic, not dogmatic.

Negative traits (and the reasons why) are

- *A willingness to subordinate practical benefits to idealistic goals* – effective leaders tend to be pragmatic; idealistic leaders are often inflexible and dogmatic.
- *A commitment to winning at all costs* – unrealistic and difficult to negotiate and deal with.
- *A complete commitment to the mission of the organization* – reasonable flexibility is important if partnerships are to take root.
- *An ability to identify and correct mistakes* – effective leaders tend *not* to be particularly concerned with past behavior. They learn from mistakes but spend relatively little time thinking about the past or rectifying errors to “set the record straight.”

-
-
8. All three bargaining strategies are legitimate and appropriate, depending on context. But *integrative bargaining* is the approach most strongly correlated with good partnership relations. *Distributive bargaining* will tend to divide partners. *Coalition building* will establish a majority but will tend to upset the balance in a relationship.

Facilitation Tools

THIS APPENDIX describes some of the facilitation tools available to partners. While the tools may appear simple, they should be used with the help of a trained facilitator.

Group Process Techniques

Process Mapping

Process mapping is a simple flowcharting technique used to display the steps of a work process and their interrelationships. A process itself is a particular method of doing work that usually involves multiple steps or operations. The basic characteristic of a process is that it *does* something; it is an action. The root cause of many problems lies in the fundamental way work is carried out. Process mapping provides a visual display of the work process to 1) make it easy to understand how things are done, 2) identify bottlenecks, barriers, and problems, and 3) develop new ways to complete work. Process mapping is helpful when a work team wishes to improve the current way of doing things, when two or more organizations hope to improve their working relationship, or when a new work system is being designed.

Storyboarding

A highly visible process of gathering, evaluating, and organizing information, storyboarding is a structured form of brainstorming. It is useful for selecting themes, identifying problems, or generating solutions.

SWOT Analysis

An activity conducted during the planning phase of a project, a SWOT (for strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats) analysis concentrates on members' perceptions of their community. The activity produces "soft" data that can later be integrated with "hard" data in selecting important performance areas.

Decision-Making Framework

Some decisions are made most effectively by an entire team. In those situations, consensus is vital. Other decisions are best made by an individual. Between these clear extremes are decisions that require more or less input from the team. A decision-making framework is useful for identifying activities that require individual, small-group, or team decisions.

Force Field Analysis

Force field analysis helps display the forces that help a group close – and those that hinder its attempts to close – the gap between where the group is at a given point and where it wants to be. It can help the group make changes by forcing members to think together about all the facets of a desired change (thereby encouraging creative thinking) and by helping it reach consensus on the relative priority of factors.

§

The foregoing information in this appendix derives from *Facilitating Community Change* by

Darvin Ayre, Gruffie Clough, and Tyler Norris. *Facilitating Community Change* is a practical step-by-step resource for community members and leaders who wish to build partnerships for healthier, more sustainable communities. It offers a highly flexible approach to harnessing the values, assets, and aspirations of a community. Rather than presenting untested theories, this guide provides a comprehensive summary of what works, using extensive real-life experience of dozens of communities worldwide. For more information about the guide, see <http://www.communityinitiatives.com/fcc.html>.

Another source, *Facilitation Skills Training* by Dian Svendsen, Pam Foster, and Rolf Sartorius, derives from highly effective training programs in Zambia and elsewhere around the world. *Facilitation Skills Training* provides a training approach to build the knowledge, attitudes, and skills of development managers to actively involve diverse interest groups in development processes and program management. This publication provides a basic narrative framework for understanding the role of the facilitator, guidance on how to plan and organize workshop and planning events, and step-by-step training sessions to build the facilitation skills of workshop participants. It is based on principles of adult learning and is designed to maximize participants' commitment to the learning process and their own personal development. When used at the organizational level, the guide builds the capacities of organizations to become more effective catalysts of change through greater stakeholder involvement. At the project level, it provides a foundation of skills for managers who are seeking to improve their use of participatory approaches to project design, implementation, and evaluation. For more information about the manual, see <http://www.socialimpact.com/facskills.html>.

Participatory Learning And Action Tools

Observation

Information can be gathered systematically through direct observation of an occurrence, an event, a process, or a physical object. The observation team should consist of people with contrasting backgrounds and training because each member will be attuned to different features. Direct observation is useful for

- Collecting preliminary, descriptive data
- Collecting data on an ongoing behavior or an unfolding event
- Collecting physical information, such as data on layout or physical structures for roads, housing, and irrigation systems

Direct observations may reveal social and economic conditions or problems and behavior patterns that informants may be unaware of or unable to adequately describe.

Semistructured Interviews

A semistructured interview is constructed from a short list of themes that are used to guide conversations with individuals or small groups that are likely to provide information, ideas, and insights on a particular subject. The interview guide can be pretested. In general, the interview is driven by the themes—rather than by a more structured list of questions.

The interview team should consist of people with contrasting backgrounds and training, so they will notice the different features of the interviews and the contexts in which they take

place. The team should spend as much time together reviewing and analyzing the interviews as they do conducting them. Team members may decide to revise the list of topics and their approach to subsequent interviews as they learn together, because interview data often provide new, in-depth, inside information. The team should maintain flexibility to explore new ideas and previously unanticipated issues as they arise.

Focus Groups

A focus group is a discussion session conducted to explore a specific topic. The number of participants in a focus group should be limited to no more than 12. As with a semistructured interview, a guide is developed to steer the conversation around specific themes. A facilitator conducts the focus group, creating a climate and forum for participants to discuss their ideas, issues, insights, and experiences around the topics identified in the guide. Focus group discussions can also be flexible enough to respond to unanticipated themes or issues raised in discussion. The facilitator should ensure that no one person dominates the group and that everyone is given a chance to speak. Focus groups are useful for

- Explaining responses of the local population
- Collecting recommendations and suggestions
- Eliciting reactions to recommended changes
- Collecting ideas and hypotheses for designing a development intervention
- Assessing stakeholder needs and determining whether they have been met

- Examining and analyzing major implementation problems whose nature and implications are unclear

Mapping

Mapping is a spatial data-gathering tool that provides a visual representation of the community. Mapping can generate many different kinds of information. It can clarify a specific information such as the skills of community members, which families use family planning, the number of children in and out of school in each household, and households with family members who have migrated elsewhere. Mapping can be used to gather more general information such as infrastructure, types of facilities, geographical features, natural resources, land use, and water sources. Mapping has enormous potential to generate discussion among community members, because everyone can participate.

Time Lines

Time lines are time-related data-gathering tools that link dates with historical events. A time line is usually divided into many sections, with the date written on one side of the line and the event written on the other side. Time lines can cover any period, but they are most commonly used to examine a sequence of events over many years. They can be used to describe community, personal, or project histories. In addition to presenting significant events, time lines identify changes over time.

Venn Diagrams

Venn diagrams are social data-gathering tools that use circles to illustrate how different institutional or community components are linked. They are especially useful for showing relation-

ships within an institution or community, which is important to understand when seeking solutions or sources of help for problems. Larger circles represent larger or more important components; smaller circles represent smaller or less important organizations. The distances between circles represent the level of interaction between organizations. The circles are drawn overlapping one another in areas where the different components of an institution collaborate or participate in joint decision-making.

§

Information in the foregoing section derives from material found in the following documents:

- *The Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Tips* series by USAID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation provides guidelines, advice, and suggestions to USAID managers on how to effectively plan and conduct performance monitoring and evaluation activities. To access the Tips series on the Web, see http://www.dec.org/usaid_eval/#004.
- *Empowering Communities: Participatory Techniques for Community-Based Program Development* (by Berengere de Negri and Elizabeth Thomas of the Academy

for Educational Development, Aloys Illinikumugabo and Ityai Muvandi of the Center for African Family Studies, and Gary Lewis of the Johns Hopkins University Center for Communication Programs) is a participant handbook intended to accompany the training course *Empowering Communities: Participatory Techniques for Community-Based Program Development*. The handbook aims to provide course participants with central points for each session as well as case studies, exercises, and a structured format for keeping notes during their field experience. Thus, while the handbook is not meant to serve as a stand-alone guide to participatory program development but as a hands-on tool for use during the course, it provides useful, basic background information on participatory approaches to development. The document is available on the Web at <http://www.aed.org/pcs/documents.htm>.

The Eldis Web site is an excellent resource for information on participatory tools. The page on participation, <http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/pa/pa.htm>, contains links to manuals, Web sites, bibliographic sources, and organizations and networks. The Eldis page on participatory methods, tools, and manuals, <http://nt1.ids.ac.uk/eldis/hot/pm3.htm>, lists 24 recommended guides.

Bibliography

- Ad Hoc Group on CRSP Results. 1998. "Notes from 8/20 Informal Meeting on Improving USAID-CRSP Results Processes." Memorandum.
- Adair, J. 1983. *Effective Leadership*. Aldershot, United Kingdom: Gower Publishing.
- Aguirre International. 1996. "The NIS Exchanges and Training Project: A midterm evaluation of process and preliminary impact." Rosslyn, Va.
- Allen, Vernon. 1985. *Mid-Point Program Evaluation of Jamaica/Western New York Partners of America Partners Voluntary Technical Assistance Service*. Creative Associates.
- Amin, Ruhul. 1998. "Final Report—University Development Linkage Project Between Morgan State University, Baltimore (Lead University), and Jahangirnagar University, Savar, Dhaka, Bangladesh." PD-ABR-806. Washington: USAID.
- Angel, David; and others. 1997. *United States-Asia Environmental Partnership: Five-Year Review Contract No. PCE-1-00-96-00002-00*. Washington: USAID.
- Ashman, Darcy. 1999a. "The Partnership Between PLAN International Kenya and Business Initiatives and Management Assistance Services." PN-ACH-281. Institute for Development Research. Washington: USAID.
- . 1999b. "The Partnership Between Farming Systems Kenya and Lutheran World Relief." Institute for Development Research. Washington: USAID.
- . 1999c. "The Partnership between Nazareth Children's Center and Integrated Development and Catholic Relief Services/Ethiopia." PN-ACH-282. Institute for Development Research. Washington: USAID.
- . 2000. "Strengthening North-South Partnerships: Addressing Structural Barriers to Mutual Influence." Vol. 16, No. 4. Institute for Development Research.
- Ashman, Darcy; and T.S. Muyoya. 1999. "Strengthening North-South Cooperation: U.S. PVOs & African NGOs: Report of the Conference held March 2-5, 1999, in Nairobi, Kenya." PN-ACH-284. Institute for Development Research. Washington: USAID.
- Ashman, Darcy; and Kisuke Ndiku. 1999. "The Partnership Between Kangaroo Child and Youth Development Society and Save the Children Fund/USA, Ethiopia Field Office." PN-ACH-283. Institute for Development Research. Washington: USAID.
- Ayre, Darwin; Gruffie Clough; and Tyler Norris. 2000. *Facilitating Community Change*. Boulder, Colo.: Community Initiatives, Inc.

- Bando, Amit; and others. 1997. "United States-Asia Environmental Partnership: Five-Year Review-Notes for the USAID Administrator." PD-ADP-440. Washington: USAID.
- Beebe, J. 1995. "Basic Concepts and Techniques of Rapid Appraisal." *Human Organization* (54)1.
- Bennis, W.; and B. Nanus. 1985. *Leaders: The Strategies for Taking Charge*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Biddle, C. Stark. 1993. "Evaluation of the Baltic Democracy Network Program." Washington: USAID.
- . 2000. *Durable Partnerships: Phase II Desk Study*. Washington: Academy for Educational Development.
- Bilimoria, Diana; and others. 1995. "The Organization Dimensions of Global Change: No Limits to Cooperation." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 4(1): 71-90.
- Blakeslee, Katherine M.; Bruce A. Johnston; and Ramzi Kawar. 1991. *Evaluation of the United States Agency for International Development Private Services Sector Development Project in Jordan*. XD-AB-054-A. Washington: USAID.
- Bongiovanni, Annette; and others. 1994. *NIS Medical Partnership Program: An Assessment*. USAID Health and Population Division, Office of Human Resources, Bureau for Europe and the New Independent States. Washington.
- Brown, L. David. 1991. "Bridging Organizations and Sustainable Development." *Human Relations* 44(8): 807.
- . 1997. "Creating social capital: Nongovernmental development organizations and intersectoral problem-solving." In W.W. Powell and E. Clemens, eds. *Private Action and the Public Good*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Brown, L. David; and Jonathan Fox. 1998. "Accountability within transnational coalitions." In L.D. Brown and J.A. Fox, eds. *The Struggle for Accountability: The World Bank, NGOs and Grass-Roots Movements*. Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Bureau for Europe. 1993. "Democratic Pluralism Initiatives: Amendment No. 1 to the Project Memorandum." PD-AB-413. Washington: USAID.
- Butler, Malcolm; and Shirley Buzzard. 1998. "Evaluation of the American International Health Alliance Partnerships Program." PD-ABQ-112. Basic Health Management International. Washington: USAID.
- Buzzard, Shirley. 1999. "Partnerships With Business: A Practical Guide for Nonprofit Organizations." PN-ACH-286. Corporate Community Investment Service (CorCom). Washington: USAID.
- CARE International. 1997. *CARE USA'S Program Division Partnership Manual*. PN-ACG-776. Washington: USAID.
- Catholic Relief Services. N.d. "CRS Principles of Partnership."
- Centech Group. 1995. "Matching Needs and Resources : UDLP [University Development Linkages Project] Guide to Higher Education

- Partnerships for Development." PN-ACA-855. Washington: USAID.
- Chambers, Robert. 1981. "Rapid Rural Appraisal: Rationale and Repertoire." *Public Administration and Development*.
- Charles, Chanya; and Stephanie McNulty. 1999. *Assessing the Impact of Intersectoral Partnering*. PN-ACG-107. Academy for Educational Development. Washington: USAID.
- Cleveland, Harland. N.d. "Control: The Twilight of Hierarchy." *New Management* 3(2).
- Collins, Randall. 1983. *The Strengths of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited*. Sociological Theory. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Cook, Jean; and others. 1998. "Final Report: A Community College Linkage to Vocational/Technical Training and Education Programs in Chennai, India." PD-ABR-322. Sinclair Community College. Washington: USAID.
- Cooperrider, David. 1995. "A Call to Organizational Scholarship; The Organization Dimension of Global Change: No Limits to Cooperation." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 4(1).
- Coston, Jennifer. 1998. "A Model and Typology of Government-NGO Relationships." *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly* 27(3).
- Counterpart Foundation, Inc. 1995. "The Volunteer Executive Service Team Initiative: Final Evaluation." Washington: USAID.
- Daniel, Thomas M. 1998. "Final Report: University Development Linkages Project—Case Western Reserve University-Makerere University: Public Health Linkage." PD-ABQ-979. Case Western Reserve University. Washington: USAID.
- Datex, Inc. 1990. *A Seminar Report: PVO/NGO Partnership in Mali*. Vol. I. PN-ACH-285. PVP/NGO Initiatives Project. Washington: USAID.
- Datex. N.d. "University of Minnesota and Warsaw School of Economics."
- de Negri, B.; and others. 1998. *Empowering Communities: Participatory Techniques for Community-Based Program Development. Volumes I and II*. Nairobi: The Center for African Family Studies, Johns Hopkins University Center for Communication Programs, and the Academy for Educational Development.
- de Kanter, Dana; and Martina Morgan. 1999. "1998 PVC Matching Grants Program: Business Plan." PD-ABS-081. Small Enterprise Education Promotion (SEEP) Network. Washington: USAID.
- Edgcomb, Elaine; Candace Nelson; and Julie Redfern. 1996. "Moving forward: Emerging strategies for sustainability and expansion." SEEP/Pact Publications.
- Edwards, Mike; and Louisa Gosling. 1999. *Toolkits: A Practical Guide to Assessment, Monitoring, Review, and Evaluation*. London: Save the Children.

- Fernandez, Adriela. 1991. "The Purdue-Vicosa Project: A Case Study in Institution Building." Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, West Lafayette, Ind.
- Fleisher, Craig S. 1999. "Using an Agency-Based Approach to Analyze Collaborative Federated Interorganizational Relationships." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 27(1): 166.
- Fletcher, Leroy S. 1996. *APEC [Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation] Partnership for Education: Private Sector Training Component-United States Agency for International Development - cooperative agreement No. AEP-0005-A-00-5011-00 - final report*. PD-ABN-021. Texas A&M University. Washington: USAID.
- Foster, Christian; and Paul Novick. 1998. *Interim USAID Assessment of Agribusiness Partnerships-II (AP-II): Program for Western NIS*. PD-ABR-357. Washington: USAID.
- Fowler, A. 1998. "Authentic NGO Partnerships in the New Policy Agenda for International Aid: Dead End or Light Ahead?" *Development and Change*, 29(1): 137-59.
- Gale, Steven. 1999. "NPPR [National Pollution Prevention Roundtable] Partnership Grant Assessment: Final Report - Highlights." PD-ABS-080. Washington: USAID.
- Gillespie, Duff; and Nancy Cecatiello. 1999. "Report on Partnerships Survey." Washington: USAID.
- Global Excellence in Management (GEM) Initiative. N.d. "Appreciative Inquiry: An Approach to Organizational Analysis and Learning." Rosslyn, Va.: Case Western Reserve University, Weatherhead School of Management.
- Goodin, Joan; and others. 2000. *Participatory Evaluation of Partners of the Americas Grant From the U.S. Agency for International Development (LAG-G-00-93-00032-00) Focusing on the Inter-American Democracy Network: Final Report*. PD-ABS-017. Washington: USAID.
- Granovetter, Mark. 1983. "The strength of weak ties: a network theory revisited." *Sociological theory*. 201-33.
- Gray, Barbara. 1981. "Fostering collaboration among organizations." In H. Meltzer and W.R. Nord, eds. *Making Organizations Humane and Productive: A Manual for Practitioners*. New York: John Wiley, Inc.
- Gray, Barbara; and Sonny S. Ariss. 1985. "Politics and strategic change across organizational life cycles." *The Academy of Management Review*, 10(4): 707-23.
- Gray, Barbara; and Tina M. Hay. 1986. "Political limits to interorganizational consensus and change." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 22(2): 95-112.
- Gray, Barbara; and Donna Wood. 1991. "Collaborative alliances: moving from practice to theory." *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 27(1): 3-22.
- Handy, Charles. 1993. *Understanding Organizations*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Heaton, George. 1997. *United States-Asia Environmental Partnership: Five-Year Review Contract No. PCE-*

- 1-00-96-00002-00. Washington: USAID.
- Hlatshwayo, Godwin; and others. 2000. *The Dawning of the Development Center in Malawi: A Case Study of North-South Cooperation in Transforming World Learning's SHARED Experience*. Case Western Reserve University/GEM Initiative.
- Holloway, Richard. 1997. *Exit Strategies: Transitioning From International to Local NGO Leadership*. Washington: Pact Publications.
- . 1998. *Supporting Citizens' Initiatives: Bangladesh's NGOs and Society*. Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Horkan, Kathleen. August 1996. "Lessons Learned From USAID Linkages Projects: Information Memorandum." Washington: USAID.
- Initiative for Social Action and Renewal in Eurasia. Fall/Winter 1999-2000. *Give & Take*.
- International Center for Not-for-Profit Law. N.d. "Guidelines for Enabling Legal Structures." Washington.
- International City/County Management Association. 1995. *U.S. Resource Cities: Model Urban Programs for New Partnership Initiatives*. PN-ACA-579. Washington: USAID.
- International Research and Exchanges Board. 1998. "Final Report: Institutional Partnership Project—Strengthening the Foundations of Civil Society in the Russian Federation and Ukraine, October 1994–August 1998." PD-ABR-468. Washington: USAID.
- Johnson, Scott; and James D. Ludema (eds.). 1997. *Partnering to Build and Measure Organizational Capacity*. PN-ACH-280. Christian Reformed World Relief Committee. Washington: USAID.
- Jordan, Patricia. 1996. *Strengthening the Public-Private Partnership: An Assessment of USAID's Management of PVO and NGO Activities*. PN-ABS-548. Washington: USAID.
- Kaczmarski, Kathryn; and Gurudev Khalsa. 1995. "A Call to Organizational Scholarship; The Organization Dimension of Global Change: No Limits to Cooperation." *Journal of Management Inquiry* 4(1).
- Kaiser, Joyce; and John Braley. 1997. "Partnerships: A Tool for Achieving Strategic Objectives. A Guide for Implementation. Draft." San Mateo, Calif.: Aguirre International.
- Katalysis. 1991. *North/South Development Partnerships – First Annual Report to USAID (A Collaborative Strategy for Sustainability Cooperative Agreement OTR-01580A-00-0108-00)*. Washington: USAID.
- Landrum, Bertha. N.d. *Higher Education and Business: Building Partnerships*.
- Leach, Mark. 1995. "Organizing Images and the Structuring of Interorganizational Relations." Doctoral dissertation, Boston University, Mass.
- . 1997. "Models of Inter-Organizational Collaboration in Development." *IDR Reports*. 11(7).

- Leach, Mark; and others. 1998. "PVO Perceptions of Their Cooperation With NGOs." PN-ACH-247. Institute for Development Research. Washington: USAID.
- Letts, Christine. 1997. "Virtuous capital: what foundations can learn from venture capitalists." *Harvard Business Review*. March-April: 36-44.
- Lewicki, Roy. N.d. *Decision-Making in Conflict Situations*. Washington: National Institute for Dispute Resolution.
- Lofstrom, Michael; and Howard Lusk. 1990. "Evaluation of the Partners of the Americas Program With Emphasis on AID Core Grant-Funded Activities." PD-ABL-080. National Association of Partners of the Americas. Washington: USAID.
- Logsdon, Jeanne M. 1991. "Interests and Interdependence in the Formation of Social Problem-Solving Collaborations." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 27(1): 23.
- Lubin, Nancy; and Monica Ware. 1996. "Aid to the Former Soviet Union: When Less Is More." Bethesda, Md.: JNA Associates, Inc.
- Lyman, P. 1989. "Beyond Aid: Alternative Modes of Cooperation." In R. Berg and D. Gordon. *Cooperation for International Development*. Boulder, Colo.: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Maccoby, M. 1981. *The Leader*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Magnani, Nanette Brey. 1990. *A Training Manual: Building Organizational Effectiveness Through Participation and Teamwork*. Pact Publications.
- Management Systems International, Inc. 1989. "End of Project Evaluation of Partners of the Americas: Central America Regional Strengthening Democracy." PD-ABA-059. Washington: USAID.
- . 1995a. "Midterm Evaluation Report: Environmental Policy Technology Project." PD-ABM-029. Washington: USAID.
- . 1995b. "Evaluation of Institutional Development for Agricultural Training: USAID Project number 615-0239." PD-ABM-075. Washington: USAID.
- Mann, Ada Jo. 1998. *An Appreciative Inquiry Model for Building Partnerships*. Case Western Reserve University. GEM Initiative.
- Mant, A. 1983. *Leaders We Deserve*. Oxford, England: Martin Robertson.
- Marshall, Karen. 1999a. *GSG/US-AEP State Environmental Initiative: Summary of Activities Cooperative Agreement 4990015*. Washington: USAID.
- . 1999b. "SEI Quarterly Report #20 to US-AEP for the period July 1-September 30, 1999." Memorandum. The Council of State Governments.
- Martin, Frank D.; and others. 1999. *USAID Graduation: Recent Experience and Outstanding Issues*. PN-ACA-926. Washington: USAID.
- Meltzer, H.; and Walter Nord. 1982. "Making Organizations Humane and Productive: A Handbook for Practitioners—Fostering Collaborations."

- ration Among Organizations." In *Fostering Collaboration Among Organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Miles, Raymond; and Charles Snow. 1992. "Causes of failure in network organizations." *California Management Review*, 34(4): 53-72.
- Mudge, Arthur W.; and others. 1994. *NIS Medical Partnerships Program: An Assessment*. Pragma Corp. TvT Associates. PD-ABJ-988. Washington: USAID.
- Najam, A. 1996. "Understanding the third sector: revisiting the prince, the merchant, and the citizen." *Nonprofit Management and Leadership*. 7(2): 203-19.
- National Association for Foreign Student Affairs. 1996. *Project ASPIRE: Final Program/Financial Report-IA-ASMA G3190142*. PD-ABQ-029. Washington: USAID.
- Noel, Jan C.; and others. 1999. "Final Report: University Development Linkages Project—Improving the Management of Water and Natural Resources in Jordan and Washington State Through Cooperation in Applied Research, Technology Transfer, and Graduate Education." PD-ABR-805. University of Jordan, Water and Environment Research and Study Center. Washington State University, Pullman, Wash. USAID.
- ORT. 2000. "CEE/NIS NGO Shared Experiences and Future Partnerships Conference Report."
- Pact. N.d. "The Partnership Project: Project Summary." Washington.
- Pasquero, Jean. 1991. "Supra-organizational Collaboration: The Canadian Environmental Experiment." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 27(1): 38.
- Peters, William C.; and Daniel Bienstock. 1987. "Final Summary Report: USAID/GOI—Alternate Energy Resources and Development Program in India." PD-ABC-207. U.S. Department of Energy. Pittsburgh Energy Technology Center. Washington: USAID.
- Putnam, Robert D. 1993. *Making Democracy Work: Civic Transitions in Modern Italy*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- . 1995. "Bowling alone: America's declining social capital." *Journal of Democracy* (6): 65-78.
- Regelbrugge, Laurie. 2000. "Civil Society Partnerships and Networks Coming of Age." Presentation at the Japan-U.S. Community Education and Exchange *Fellowships Creating Partnerships Forum on U.S.-Japan Collaboration*, Washington, 1 November 2000.
- Sabol, Tomas. 1997. *Future Efforts Involving the Association of Carpathian Region Universities and the U.S. Higher Education Association and Institutions*. Technical University of Kocise.
- Sanders International, Inc. 1997. "Final Report: Trade in Environmental Services and Technologies." PD-ABN-846. Washington: USAID.
- Segil, Lorraine. 1999. "Alliances for the 21st Century." *Executive Excellence*. 16(10): 19-21.

- Skaggs, Timothy; and Christopher Szecsey. 2000. *Images of a New Future: Documentation on the Application of Appreciative Inquiry at SC Philippines Field Office*. Philippines: Global Excellence in Management and Save the Children Field/U.S.
- Smith, Elise; and Bonnie Ricci. 1990. "Sailing in Uncharted Waters: OEF International's Experience in Developing Partnerships With Southern Organizations." In Phyllis and Jerry Ingersoll, eds. *Toward Partnership in Africa*. Washington: InterAction and Forum for African Voluntary Development Organization.
- Sobhan, Babar. 1988. "The PRIP Trust: Becoming an Organization." Pact. Washington: USAID.
- Stedman, William P. 1980. "Evaluation of the Partners of the Americas." PD-AAG-338-c1. Washington: USAID.
- Stewart, James. 1991. "University Center Workshop Report." International Science and Technology Institute. Washington: USAID.
- . 1992. "Sustainability of International Higher Education Linkages." International Science and Technology Institute. Washington: USAID.
- Sunley, Traer. 1998. "Case Studies Protocol: Pact/PWBLF Partnership Project." Pact. Washington: USAID.
- Svendsen, Dian; Pam Foster; and Rolf Sartorius. 1998. *Facilitation Skills Training: An Introductory Guide*. Reston, Va.: Project Concern/Social Impact.
- Sweetser, Anne T. 1997. "Improving the Practice. PLA: Participatory Learning and Action." The International Association for Public Participation.
- Tennyson, Ros. 1998. *Managing Partnerships: Tools for Mobilizing the Public Sector, Business, and Civil Society as Partners in Development*. Prince of Wales Business Leaders Forum.
- Terry, Robert W. 1993. *Authentic Leadership: Courage in Action*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- United Way International. 1995. "RAPSUDE/USAID grant No. 118-0007-G-00-5149-00: Progress Report to 30 September 1995." PD-ABM-363. Washington: USAID.
- University of Montana. 1997. "USAID University Development Linkage Project: Montana and Belize Partnership for Resource Conservation and Development – Institution Building and Internationalization at the University College of Belize and the University of Montana: Models for Sustainable Resource Development." PD-ABP-088. Washington: USAID.
- USAID. 1983. "AID grant No. PDC-0212-G-SS-3129-00 to Town Affiliation Association of the U.S./Sister Cities International, Inc., to assist American cities to plan and implement technical assistance programs with their Third World sister cities." PD-FAJ-135. Washington.
- . 1987. "AID grant to Town Affiliates Association to support development assistance collaboration between U.S. and LDC sisters cities

- in the areas of public health and vocational training." PD-AAY-973. Washington.
- . 1991. "Project Assistance Completion Report [PACR]: Agricultural Technology Transfer Project, project No. 664-0304." PD-ABH-889.
- . 1992a. *New Independent States: Democratic Pluralism Initiatives*. PD-ABD-933. Washington.
- . 1992b. "Private Services Sector Development." PD-ABF-054.
- . 1995a. *Participatory Evaluation*. Participation Forum Workshop Notes #2. Washington.
- . 1995b. *Rapid Appraisal and Beyond*. Participation Forum Workshop Notes #1. Washington.
- . 1996a. "Project Activity Completion Report: Commercial Agricultural Production and Marketing." PD-ABN-136.
- . 1996b. *American-Russian Partnerships: Accelerating the Social, Political, and Economic Transitions in Russia*. PN-ACH-246.
- . 1997a. *NPI Resource Guide: A Strategic Approach to Development Partnering – Report of the NPI Learning Team*, two volumes. PN-ACA-864. Washington.
- . 1997b. "UDLP University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and Indian Institute of Health Management Research, Jaipur: 1992-99 – End-of-Project Report." PD-ABR-314. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Indian Institute of Health Management Research. Washington.
- . 1999a. "Factors That Contribute to Successful International Partnerships: Results of Higher Education Linkages – Proceedings of the African Partnerships USAID – UDLP Higher Education Conference." PN-ACH-007. Eastern Washington University. University of Cape Coast. Washington.
- . 1999b. "A Guide to Improved Higher Education Partnerships for Economic and Social Development: Proceedings of the USAID – University Development Linkage Programs Higher Education Conference for Asia Near East, Russia, and Northern Africa." PN-ACH-006. The University of Jordan. Washington State University. Washington.
- . 1999c. "From Transition to Partnership: A Strategic Framework for USAID programs in Europe and Eurasia." Washington.
- . 2000. "Building a Results Framework.." PN-ACA-947. Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Tips #13. Washington.
- Westley, Francis; and Harriet Vredenburg. 1991. "Strategic Bridging: The Collaboration Between Environmentalists and Business in the Marketing of Green Products." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*. 27(1): 65.
- White, Joshua Searle. 1998. "Russian-American Cooperation in Organi-

- zational Context." *Organization Development Journal*. 16(2), 73-80.
- Wilburn, Michael. 1985. *Mid-Point Program Evaluation of Jamaica/Western New York Partners of America Partners Voluntary Technical Assistance Service*. Creative Associates.
- Wines, Michael. 2000. "Freedom's Toll: A Fit City Offers Russia a Self-Help Model." *New York Times on the Web*, 31 December 2000.
- Wood, Donna. 1991. "Collaborative Alliances: Moving From Practice to Theory," *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 27(1): 3-22.
- World Bank. 1996. *The World Bank's Partnership With Nongovernmental Organizations*. Washington.
- World Learning, Inc. 1997. *Partnership Across Borders: Final Report*. PD-ABP-536. Washington: USAID.
- Worthington, Barry; and Ruth Cherenson. 1999. *Utility Partnership Program for Central and Eastern Europe - Final Report 1991-98*. PD-ABR-884. U.S. Energy Association. Washington: USAID.



U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
