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# About the Program

\*\* Copy and paste Table\_S1 from your SOW, place it here, and update it for the extension as necessary.\*\*

\*\* Copy and paste Tables S2, S3, S4, S6, S8, S10, and S11 from your SOW here in this order.\*\*

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative E1** |
| **Changes to the program for the extension** |
|  |

# Methods

**FIPR CORE Methodology**

The “CORE” methodology of the FIPR is that which is used for all FIPRs whether or not one or both of the available options[[1]](#footnote-2) for an FIPR are added.

The FIPR uses a mixed-method evaluation methodology. Quantitative data used are (i) existing aggregate values (targets and actuals) for all performance indicators in the program’s Indicator Performance Tracking Table (IPTT) (ii) values from existing context variables and (iii) quantification of extent to which work plans were completed. In addition to this, new primary, qualitative data are collected for the FIPR. These are collected from Small Group Discussions (SGD) and Key Informant Interviews (KII). These SGD and KII are conducted only with the Prime contractor, sub-contractors and key partners as identified in the SOW.

Because the FIPR’s primary objective is to capture the collective experience and knowledge of the implementing entities, primary qualitative data are only collected from these entities (i.e. they are NOT collected from program participants). Primary quantitative data are never collected for an FIPR.

The core methodology is within the FIPR’s four phases, as detailed in the ‘Generalized Events’ documentation.

**Phase 1:**

1. Identify and operationally describe the program’s key interventions as implemented
2. Verify that TolaData (indicator tracker/IPTT) is complete, accurate and up-to-date (targets and actuals).
3. Verify your inventories of (i) deliverables and (ii) shocks and other events are up-to-date
4. Complete the FIPR SOW[[2]](#footnote-3) using guidance and tips in the report template

**Phase 2**

1. Adapt the FIPR Actuals vs Targets template to your program’s Results Framework and populate it with your (external) performance indicators, targets and actuals.
2. Begin review of key documents, work plans, BvA, etc
3. Complete the FIPR Inception report using guidance and tips in the report template

**Phase 3**

1. Summarize results from document, work plan and BvA review, learning plans etc.
2. Complete section 3 of FIPR report
3. Review context variables and/or internal indicators (qual and quant) and summarize findings
4. Conduct (i) operations-focused (ii) GEDSI-focused, and (iii) sustainability-[[3]](#footnote-4) focused KIIs
5. Conduct MEL team discussion of strengths/weaknesses of MEL system
6. Review and summarize results of safeguarding and accountability system monitoring

**Phase 4**

1. Conduct the SGDs using completed Actuals vs Targets tables and take notes in spaces provided per FIPR guidance
2. Conduct MEL team exercise on prioritizing interventions based on available evidence
3. Conduct the SGDs on key interventions using the FIPR discussion outline for these SGDs
4. Conduct SGD on Resilience within the program[[4]](#footnote-5)
5. Complete the FIPR report using the guidance and tips in the report template

NOTE1: There is no need to use software for quantitative data analysis with the FIPR because the Actuals vs Targets automates performance assessment from the IPTT and other relevant data (e.g. context variables, internal indicators) are used only to help explain the actuals vs targets in narrative format (not through statistical analysis). Also note that while it is possible to use qualitative software for the SGD and KII, it is NOT needed in that the tools themselves guide the user with the synthesis of the results.

NOTE2: when updating an FIPR report after an extension period, there is no need to update every table in the FIPR report. Instead, you will find a single table under sections[[5]](#footnote-6) 1, 3, 4, 5, 7 and 8 to make comments relative to those sections about the extension period. Thus, you are “adding” come content after an extension period rather than revising what was already written; this simplifies the task of updating an FIPR substantially. Of course, you must always revise the Actuals vs Targets table after an extension period.

# Results of the Progress Assessment

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 1** |
| **Summary of the BvA and Work plan completion and monitorability[[6]](#endnote-2)** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 2** |
| **Summary of Gender and Equity being taken into account via work plan development and implementation** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 3** |
| **Delivery of Deliverables** |
| **Expected (required) Deliverables** |
|  |
| **Unexpected Deliverables** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative E2** |
| **Work plan completion and additional deliverables during the extension period** |
|  |

# Finding during the inception period

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 4** |
| A. Quality and completeness of documents reviewed |
| \*\* (Summarized from inception report: ***Section IV: Tables*** **(I4, I5, I6, I7)**.\*\* |
| B. Quality of exit strategy and/or sustainability plan |
| \*\* Taken from Inception Report **Section IX: Table\_I12**\*\* |
| C. Relevant to CARM |
| \*\* Copy and paste from inception report **Section VI: Table\_I15** AND update if necessary \*\* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative E3** |
| **Any updated findings relative to Assumptions and CARM during the extension period** |
|  |

# Results of the Performance Assessment

For the FIPR, “performance assessment” is defined as the extent to which performance targets were met using the (external) indicators in the program’s IPTT. The FIPR methodology uses the institutional knowledge and experience of the program staff and key partners – during small group discussions (SGD) - to explore why results might have fallen below targets or have grossly exceeded targets. The assumptions on which the program’s design is based and external events such as shocks are used during the SGD for this purpose. Assumptions and external events/shocks that might have affected the program are listed below.

**Outcome/Purpose 1: Actuals vs Targets summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **AvT1** |
| Paste image of Actual vs Targets summary table: |
| Example narrative:  *“As per the summary table above, the program met its level-5 and level-4 targets for Purpose 1 and Sub-purposes 1.1 and 1.2. Its two level-3 ratings were both Met, with only one indicator scoring Below for the entire Purpose (indicator 1, IO 1.2.1). This was due to delays in the roll-out of sensitization sessions across the district, caused by heavy flooding during the monsoon season.”* |

**Outcome/Purpose 2: Actuals vs Targets summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **AvT2** |
| \*\*Paste image of Actual vs Targets summary for Outcome/Purpose 2 here\*\* |
| \*\* Describe the image. \*\* |

**Outcome/Purpose 3: Actuals vs Targets summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **AvT3** |
| \*\*Paste image of Actual vs Targets summary for Outcome/Purpose 3 here\*\* |
| \*\*Describe the image.\*\* |

**Outcome/Purpose 4: Actuals vs Targets summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **AvT4** |
| \*\*Paste image of Actual vs Targets summary for Outcome/Purpose 4 here\*\* |
| \*\*Describe the image.\*\* |

**Outcome/Purpose 5: Actuals vs Targets summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **AvT5** |
| \*\*Paste image of Actual vs Targets summary for Outcome/Purpose 5 here\*\* |
| \*\*Describe the image.\*\* |

**Outcome/Purpose 6: Actuals vs Targets summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **AvT6** |
| \*\*Paste image of Actual vs Targets summary for Outcome/Purpose 6 here\*\* |
| \*\*Describe the image.\*\* |

**Outcome/Purpose 7: Actuals vs Targets summary**

|  |
| --- |
| **AvT7** |
| \*\*Paste image of Actual vs Targets summary for Outcome/Purpose 7 here\*\* |
| \*\*Describe the image.\*\* |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 5** |
| **Internal Indicators monitored under each Outcome/Purpose** |
| Outcome/Purpose 1: |
| Outcome/Purpose 2: |
| Outcome/Purpose 3: |
| Outcome/Purpose 4: |
| Outcome/Purpose 5: |
| Outcome/Purpose 6: |
| Outcome/Purpose 7: |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative E4** |
| **Changes in Performance as a result of the extension period?** |
|  |

# Reflections on the program’s Key Interventions

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Narrative 7** | | | |
| **Key take-aways from across all interventions** | | | |
| **Key Barriers** | | | |
| **Internal:** | | **External** | |
| **Key Enablers** | |
| **Internal** | **External** |
| **Sustainability across all interventions** | | | |
| **Unintended outcomes** | | | |
| **Lessons learned** | | | |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative E5** |
| **Additional reflections on key intervention from extension period** |
|  |

# Key take-aways from KII and other SGDs

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 8** |
| **KII(s) relative to GEDSI** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 9** |
| **KII(s) relative to program Operations (HR, procurement, collaboration, communication, etc)** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 10** |
| **SGD relative to program MEL system** |
|  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative E6** |
| **Additional reflections on KIIs and other SGDs from extension period** |
|  |

# Questions and Comments during dissemination session (if applicable)

|  |
| --- |
| **Narrative 12** |
|  |

# Annexes

* Images of Actuals vs Targets showing Assessment Level 1
* Actuals vs Targets assessment Excel workbook
* Final version of FIPR SOW
* Final version of FIPR Inception Report
* Inventory of Deliverables
* Inventory of Events & Shocks
* DAP from section 6 of inception (or final version if updated since inception period)

1. FIPR options are: 1) additional secondary analysis of existing data and/or 2) Value for Money [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. While most Evaluation Scopes of Work (SOW) are not considered part of the methodology, it is an integral part of the FIPR methodology because there are elements therein not found in a typical SOW that are essential to the analysis and interpretation of other FIPR data. This is also true of the inception report albeit to a lesser degree than the SOW. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Sustainability-focused KII are NOT conducted for short-duration programs [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Resilience-focused SGD are conducted ONLY IF it is a long-duration program AND has substantial resilience (expected) outcomes and interventions. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. The tables in question are labelled as follows: E1 (Section 1), E2 (Section 3) E3 (Section 4), E4 (Section 5), E5 (Section 7) and E6 (Section 8) [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. Monitorability: ability to meet {global project management minimum standard} of documenting which activities/milestones within a work plan are {not yet started}, {in progress}, or {completed} as well as if they are [behind schedule], [on schedule], [ahead of schedule] at any given time during the work plan’s period of execution. work plans should also indicate who is primarily responsible for completion of the activity and what changes occurred to the work plan. Lastly, it should document what happened to all uncompleted activities/milestones at the end of the work plan period of execution {were they dropped, modified, replaced, carried over} [↑](#endnote-ref-2)