

END Fund Program Assessment Tool

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

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

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

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

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

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

For more information on completing the PAT Worksheet and on its relation to other due diligence tools, refer to the Due Diligence Handbook.

Project ID: 080194
Program/SI: END Fund
Organization: MENTOR
Initiative
Grant Amount: \$2.5 million
Duration: 5 years
Total Lives: TBD
Sector:
Sub sector:
Interventions: NTD Control
Location: Angola
Analyst: Mark Reiff

Project Summary — *Adapted from Executive Summary in MENTOR Submission*

The MENTOR Initiative, having spent nearly a decade building the capacity of the Angolan Ministry of Health (MoH) and National Malaria Control Programme (NMCP) towards sustainable malaria control, proposes Phase-1 of a long-term neglected tropical disease (NTD) program in Angola. With funding from the END Fund, MENTOR proposes to target two northern rural provinces of Angola with school, community and health facility based programs for NTD control.

While reliable surveillance data and mapping of diseases is minimal, passive surveillance at health facility level does demonstrate that the northern, significantly poorer, provinces carry a disproportionately high burden of NTDs. With this in mind, they aim to work with and support both the Ministry of Education (MoE) and Ministry of Health (MoH) to roll out a prevention and treatment campaign in schools and communities in two targeted provinces, Uige and Zaire, where MENTOR is already established and can keep costs at a minimum.

Specifically, MENTOR will work to target school-aged children in Uige and Zaire with a mass drug administration (MDA) program. In addition, they will ensure health facilities throughout the provinces receive treatments, as well as trainings on how to diagnose and treat NTDs. Finally, MENTOR will, where possible, coordinate with other partners carrying out community campaigns, to ensure that education and community MDA programs are included wherever feasible.

As MENTOR has built and maintained a strong presence in each of these two provinces over the last 9 years, through malaria programs funded by USAID, launching the NTD program in these areas will ensure a faster, stronger impact for significantly less cost. In both Zaire and Uige, MENTOR has already built relationships with key stakeholders and has staff, equipment, and logistics systems on the ground, ensuring that rolling out an NTD programme will be both expedited and facilitated, bypassing a protracted start up phase in a new location. Furthermore, as a significant component of the USAID funded public sector program is aimed at visiting rural communities and building the capacity of healthcare providers, MENTOR can carry this out jointly with the NTD program, ensuring that visits to communities also include MDA campaigns and training for healthcare providers in identifying and treating NTDs.

As part of all programs, MENTOR works hand in hand with the MoH to coordinate, plan and implement activities. Currently in the USAID funded public sector program, trainings and supervisions for healthcare workers are conducted jointly by both a MENTOR technical expert and a malaria representative of the NMCP/DPS. In line with this, MENTOR will closely support the provincial MoH teams to ensure the efficient execution of the NTD program and effective program monitoring. Additionally, MENTOR will facilitate sustainable capacity building of MoH partners responsible in the two provinces, as they take on increasing responsibility for overall implementation of NTD activities.

National scale MDA campaigns to control NTDs are the goal of the MoH NTD program. MENTOR proposes to support the MoH towards this national goal, commencing with an initial roll out of drugs targeting diseases that are known to be present and pervasive. Specifically, MENTOR will support MoH using existing MoH stocks of albendazole and praziquantel to target specific NTDs, including schistosomiasis and STH.

Context

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

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Environment: The recent political, social, economic, and cultural factors that comprise the area of implementation.</p>	<p>1. The current and local events and trends in the region are favorable for the project's implementation. If unfavorable conditions exist, the organization has taken adequate steps to ensure project's success.*</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Despite initial struggles for NTD control to receive attention, momentum has reached critical mass around the national plan launch - Increased staffing has been dedicated to MoH NTD team - Preferred implementing partner is established in targeted counties and has shown that public health intervention can be effective in rural context with poor infrastructure 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Angola is a hotbed for international investment connected to resource extraction industries, this highly competitive environment has created a skepticism of external organizations - Infrastructure on all levels remains a challenge stemming from the long period of conflict ending pre-2000

Context Summary

Angola has hardly been the easiest program development context for the END Fund, however, since the launch of the national plan in June, it appears that momentum for large-scale intervention is on the horizon. This momentum is reflected in an increased amount of staffing that has been assigned to the MoH's NTM team led by Dr. Pedro Van Dunem.

There are a number of challenges associated with the Angolan context, as the country stabilized in the early 2000s, oil reserves were discovered off the country's coast and the extractive export industry developed very rapidly. At present, Angola is Africa's second largest exporter of oil behind Nigeria, much of which is sent to Asia. This international trading route has led to a large amount of foreign direct investment by the Chinese and other burgeoning economic powers, which has not always been viewed favorably by Angolan stakeholders because infrastructure development has prioritized economic return over good development practice for those at the bottom of the economic pyramid.

Moreover this disparate infrastructure development shapes how easily public health interventions can be carried out because access to marginalized populations have not been prioritized. To address these very significant challenges, MENTOR was selected as the preferred implementing partner for the END Fund. They do not have significant experience in integrated NTD control, but their strong public health background and relatively long track record in Angola enable them to engage with the stakeholders unlike introducing a new external organization. Additionally, given that MENTOR is already operating in the targeted rural provinces, they have shown capacity in implementing interventions in these areas of lacking/poor infrastructure.

Clarity

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

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

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
Project Design: The methodology of each intervention in the project.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project addresses at least one cause related to the need.* 2. Timing of implementation makes sense given the type of project and its location.* 3. Project design reflects adherence to best practices.* 4. Outputs and activities from the log frame support the likelihood of success.* 5. Beneficiary selection is fair. 6. Possible delays in beneficiary selection are mitigated by a well designed selection plan. 7. Beneficiaries contribute through commitment of time, labor, or financial resources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With Angolan stakeholders just beginning the process of NTD control plans, supporting them with technical assistance is prudent and waiting to create MDA plans enables indigenous leadership to take lead - Beneficiary selection within the targeted provinces is fair. The strategy targeting of two provinces aligns with believed high co-endemicity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Only the first phase of programming is currently planned, thus MDA component and plans are currently unknown - Beneficiary contribution is low in NTD control
Impact: The breadth (number) and depth (extent) of change realized among beneficiaries as a result of the proposed project.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Project implementation plan confirms that goals are realistic and achievable within the funding period.* 2. The depth and breadth of this project's impact is comparable with other projects using the same intervention in the same region. 3. The organization has a well-developed network. Where necessary, it will be able to partner with other organizations to achieve maximum results. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Phase 1 project goals are attainable and well-mapped for the \$300k initial budget - The depth and breadth of the intervention compares with other END Fund portfolio projects - MENTOR's current engagement in the region's Malaria control program positions them well within the area's public health sector 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With a lacking long term plan, assessing the feasibility of project goals is very difficult

Clarity Summary

This project's clarity revolves primarily around the proposal submission only focusing on the program's first phase of operation. Approaching the project in this phased manner embodies both strengths and weaknesses, which, if managed effectively, should embody good practice. There are two notable strengths of waiting to develop a full five-year implementation plan. First, it reflects that good implementation must be developed in the light of effective epidemiological mapping and baseline. It is impossible to effectively plan treatment targets and goals without sound mapping established. Second, this approach creates the space for the national NTD team to ideally lead the process of setting treatment targets nationwide, which facilitates good development practice.

The principal weakness of this approach is that in committing ourselves to a multi-year initiative without a full plan, exposes the END Fund to a significant amount of unknowns, and thus, risk when approaching years two through five. To mitigate this risk, it will be important for the END Fund's program staff to first have a good amount of trust regarding MENTOR's implementing capacity and maintain close attention to our substantive involvement clauses around program monitoring. Thus far in the program development process, MENTOR has shown to possess solid capacity as an implementing partner. Their planning

documents are robust and well-informed and their team in Angola is well-credentialed. Throughout the bid and project development process the END Fund has experienced a positive working relationship with MENTOR staff and it is expected that this would continue to mature into implementation.

Coherence			
Critical Question: Does the organization’s experience in the <i>location</i> and its <i>track record</i> in the region and sector adequately prepare it to accomplish the project goals? If applicable, is the project an integral part of the <i>Strategic Initiative (SI)</i> ?			
Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
Location: The specific location where the project will be implemented.	1. Implementer has experience with similar types of projects in the same geographic area.	- MENTOR’s track record in Zaire and Uige positions them very well for this project	-
Track Record: The organization’s history and background as it relates to the proposed project. *If there is not a track record, please complete the ‘Expertise’ piece in the Capability and Capacity for Authorization.	1. Project aligns with organization’s goals and values.* 2. Organization has experience in region, sector, and intervention related to this project.* 3. Organization has experience with the project’s design and scale such that there are no significant changes which could hinder project’s success. 4. The proposed breadth and depth of impact is similar and does not significantly exceed those from previous, similar projects.	- MENTOR has significant experience in northern Angola’s public health sector - Most Malaria organizations that enter into integrated NTD control are effective - MENTOR is currently running regional scale interventions	- MENTOR does not have a background in NTD control, but does have a staffing that should be competent based on academic credentials
For projects within an SI: The proposed project’s contribution to overall SI goals.	1. The project is strategic and worthy of funding as it aligns with and contributes to the overall SI goals.* 2. The project complements other projects in the SI but still adds unique value.*	Not Applicable as project not part of an SI	
Coherence Summary			
<p>MENTOR has a significant track record in Angola and is currently running Malaria control programs in the same northern provinces we are targeting. While malaria control is different than integrated NTD control, there are examples of organizations that have transitioned into this field, one of which being the Malaria Consortium who have taken up integrated NTD control work in South Sudan. MENTOR’s Angola team is well credentialed, from a public health perspective, and appears effective in the Portuguese context. Given the complexity of implementing in the Angolan context it appears wise to prioritize using a pre-existing NGO partner over a partner with a track record for integrated NTD control.</p>			

Capability and Capacity

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

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Leadership: Individuals directly involved with the proposed project and the related system of developing and expanding leadership abilities.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is appropriate depth of leadership within the organization with a well-developed leadership contingency plan. The project could continue if something should happen to current leadership.* 2. The current leadership has been in charge of the organization for more than two years and the organization seems to be stable in terms of the leadership's commitment and abilities.* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Organization celebrated its 10 year anniversary in October 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MENTOR's Angolan Country Director resigned Sept. 28, 2012
<p>Expertise: Members of the organization or committed affiliates whose backgrounds (training and experience) provide the abilities necessary for project implementation.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Either project staff or project consultants have experience with similar design and scale and will be actively involved throughout the project.* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MENTOR's in-country team is well staffed with vector borne disease specialists - It is apparent through program planning documents that they are capable of managing the grant 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -
<p>Resources: Number, commitment, level of training and experience for staff and other necessary supplies.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number and quality of staff is adequate for the project's success.* 2. If the project relies on a third party in the surrounding area for implementation, the organization has mitigated the risk of the party being unable to fulfill its commitment.* 3. If the project requires an increase in staffing levels, the project plan includes sufficient time and resources to find, place, and train new staff members. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A hiring of new staff to run the program has been proposed, which will work in tandem with staff resources already present internally. The phase one plan includes adequate space for recruiting. - Apart from the MoH, there does not appear to be another third party which this program depends on 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - With the plan to hire new staff there is some risk in that Angola is presently facing broad human resource challenges in the health sector

<p>Sustainability: Organization's ability to maintain proposed scale including leadership, staff, and funding resources.</p>	<p>1. The organization has plans in place to maintain and grow leadership, staff, and financial resources in ways that sustain the proposed project's scale of service. This includes building donor support and/or financial sustainability through fees, self-sustainability initiatives, etc.</p>	<p>- Staff leadership would expect to be encouraged through outside hiring</p>	<p>- No outline for expanding or developing funding base was outlined in proposal documents and a provided reference noted their weakness in this area</p>
<p>Capacity for Expansion: Organization's ability to manage this project's level of funding and programs.</p>	<p>1. This project represents a manageable and sustainable level of expansion given the budget size relative to last year's operating expenses. (Provide the ratio of this project's budget to last year's operating budget.)*</p> <p>2. Does the organization have commitments to other projects (new or continuing) in the coming year that, when considered together with this project, could exceed the organization's capacity and prevent it from achieving the goals of this project? (If so, determine the total amount of the organizational budget for this year and compare with the previous three years' budgets. Include all four figures in the summary.)</p>	<p>- MENTOR's 2011 Grant Expenses roughly totaled over \$8 million. EF annual grant of as high as \$500,000 is not unreasonable</p> <p>- Financial reporting processes appear well managed and documents were readily available upon request</p>	

Capability and Capacity Summary

MENTOR's capacity as an organization is comparable to other implementers in the END Fund's portfolio, but it is on the smaller end of the spectrum. In this context, its relatively smaller size should not result in any capacity issues, but might rather be a strength as they have been rather attentive to the END Fund granting process and providing necessary documents.

MENTOR's Angola team has the technical capacity to carry out a program of this scale and has proposed to hire added staff to provide capacity for NTD programming. This hiring plan has been included to ensure that the program is properly staffed with an awareness that including personnel assigned to each province would be uniquely important in the Angolan context requiring a budget priority. The plan to hire new staff also presents potential risk considering that it is well known that Angola is struggling with human resource constraints in its public health sector, which could potentially lead to challenges.

Financially, MENTOR appears more than competent of managing a grant of this size. They are presently managing grants for USAID and DFID totaling somewhere in the range of \$8 million (depending on the currency rates used to translate the UK grants). Their annual expenditures for each grant portfolio are as follows:

2011: \$3,554,084 – UK Expenditure is not included in abbreviated accounts, but balance sheet reflects significant expansion from 2010
2010: £3,616,514 \$3,639,383
2009: £3,789,977 \$2,596,132

These financial figures reflect a more than adequate capacity to manage this END Fund grant.

[Redacted text block containing multiple lines of blacked-out information]

Credibility

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

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
<p>Reputation & Results: Verification from: local reference who has seen the organization and its related projects other implementers previous organization funders</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on the Site Visit Reference, an independent source's assessment compares well with the organization's self-assessment.* 2. The organization is seen as effective by others working locally in the same sector. 3. The organization is viewed positively by previous funders. There is evidence of ongoing support by these funders. 4. Evidence strongly supports a clear endorsement for the organization from the community. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Both WL and EA reported positively about MENTOR's reputation as experienced in their trips to Angola - A reference for MENTOR's reputation in Angola spoke very highly of their presence in the Angolan context 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MENTOR does not have a background in NTD control, but they are respected within the global public health sector for their Malaria work
<p>Integrity: Character and financial transparency and honesty verified by: at least one objective reference (one who is not related to the organization and will not benefit from the grant) who comments on the project leader's integrity a suitable financial reporting system</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least one objective reference supports the fact that the organization and the project have a reputation for integrity (no history of graft/ corruption/misuse of funds)* 2. The financial reporting and auditing system promote transparency and integrity throughout the organization (will be assessed by the Financial Analyst).* 3. Connection to terrorists or terrorist networks. The U.S. government requires that we check all organizations and their leadership against certain lists. The required lists are all checked by the Complinet system. All organization and project leaders, including board members, should be checked through the Complinet system and results included in the summary for this section. Results of this search must be included in the summary for this section. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Audited financials are in order and provided promptly from MENTOR. This includes financials from both UK and US bilateral grant portfolios - External references to MENTOR as a grantee returned rather positively - Complinet check appears clean 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -

<p>Governance: System that provides organizational oversight and maintains standards and principles</p>	<p>1. The governing board maintains enough independence to properly manage leadership and organizational success.</p>	<p>- Advisory board, while small includes a reasonable amount of diversity</p>	<p>- Warren Lancaster is a member of MENTOR’s advisory board, which presents some potential questions around conflicting interests</p> <p>- Advisory board is significantly smaller than other portfolio grantees</p>
--	---	--	---

Credibility Summary

Dr, Jules Mihigo, a staff member from USAID’s PMI, spoke very highly of MENTOR’s work in Angola. He noted that MENTOR is one of the few well-respected NGOs in Angola and has developed this opinion over a 5 year working relationship. He strongly recommended MENTOR as a partner to the END Fund. Other references of MENTOR as a grantee had similar comments, including those of Kevin Starace of the UN Foundation. Mr. Starace’s comments were largely positive, however he noted that MENTOR is not very effective at increasing the fundraising base for programs, which is something that should be noted. Overall, the references recommended by MENTOR spoke well of their reputation and work.

In regards to governance, there is some area of risk surrounding Warren Lancaster’s role on MENTOR’s advisory board. This has been raised as part of the due diligence process and it should be noted that Ellen Agler made the final decision to select MENTOR as preferred implementing partner and Scott Morey will hold final approval power for this due diligence process. It should also be noted that Warren also has comparable ties to World Vision’s UK affiliate, which counterbalanced any conflicts in the bid process between MENTOR and the WV/Africare consortium.

Audited financials reflect positively on MENTOR’s organizational processes. With receiving funds from both USAID and DFID, each of these portfolios are examined by rather stringent professionals and do not include significant irregularities. The 2011 summary of UK accounts was abbreviated, which was minorly irregular, but the balance sheets would reflect that the funding portfolio had expanded between 2010 and 2011.

Continuous Improvement

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

Definition	END Fund Standards	Strengths	Weaknesses
Monitor: System by which the organization assesses progress through each stage of the project	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The organization has developed an achievable plan to determine the status of benchmarks throughout the project.* 2. The organization has a well-developed system to monitor projects. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MENTOR's approach is modeled after their effectively implemented Malaria programming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To our knowledge MENTOR's approach to monitoring has yet to be tested in an NTD context - MENTOR has not included robust benchmarks since the proposal only focuses on phase one presently
Evaluate: System by which the organization assesses project results (outputs and outcomes).	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The plan for a baseline and follow up assessment is thorough and well defined and staff are equipped and available to perform this evaluation.* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Baseline and follow up of disease prevalence and intensity is a standard component of END Fund programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Little information has been included on the establishment of a baseline
Revise/Refine: "Learning loop," by which the organization utilizes information gained through monitoring and evaluation to improve program design and implementation.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strong evidence supports the fact that the organization has a system to incorporate learning from previous experience to improve and refine its program design.* 2. The organization has a developed network of other organizations working in the same sector and is able to learn from this network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MENTOR brings an outside approach to program monitoring which should provide the foundation for learnings to be distilled and incorporated to future programs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - MENTOR is not a significant member of the NTD control community, partnerships would need to be formed as necessary

Continuous Improvement Summary

MENTOR's approach to monitoring would be unique to the END Fund portfolio, in that, they will be adapting the approach they use for their malaria programs. The core process to their monitoring and evaluation is the joint field supervisions, which are conducted with both a government representative and a MENTOR staff member. Visiting these sites in tandem is actually a bit more diligent than other integrated NTD programs and could provide an interesting case study for the END Fund's base of knowledge in the field.

Plans for establishing a baseline are presently unclear as the proposal only focuses on phase one and attempts to create space for the MoH to take the lead in developing a more formal national NTD strategy. While this is the wise approach, it will require increased amounts of monitoring on the part of the END Fund to

ensure that effective and feasible targets are set in the program development process, including the completion of full prevalence and intensity baselines. MENTOR is shouldering a good bit of risk as well in this approach.

MENTOR’s current outsider status as it relates to the integrated NTD control community should ultimately prove a strength in this program. However, in the early stages of program development their lack of relationships with other organizations with expertise in the space could present a mild risk. Between the END Fund’s oversight and MENTOR’s strong public health expertise with other tropical diseases should enable these risks to be mitigated successfully.

Conclusions

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

Definition	Questions to Consider	Recommendations
<p>Risk/Return: The potential threats to the project success measured against the potential impact and strategic results for this project.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Upon completion of the Cs above and the Risk Score Sheet, what does the analyst see as the significant risks which could prevent the project from achieving its goals?* 2. What does this project do the overall portfolio risk of the SI (if applicable)? 3. What potential “return on investment” does this project offer that makes it worthy of recommendation? How does the ROI contribute to the success of the SI (if applicable)? * 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Significant risks lie primarily in the work that is expected after phase 1. This project is to be a multi-year initiative and presently, the plans are unknown for subsequent phases and expected to be spearheaded by the MoH. - This program’s potential ROI is huge. If a successful program can be established in a context as tough as Angola it will provide a strong win for the END Fund portfolio. Additionally, the Angolan public health situation is one of the world’s worst and addressing their NTD burden will certainly support in their work towards becoming a healthier population.
<p>Capacity Building: Areas in which specified funds, training, or other resources could benefit the organization in a sustainable way.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Can any of the project’s significant risks be prevented through capacity building? If yes, what do the analyst recommend to be included for capacity building within the grant?* 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Building MENTOR’s capacity would not help mitigate any project risks. The investment made in this project’s human resource is already rather significant.

External Monitoring: The degree to which this project will need external monitoring and the areas in which the organization requires a strong level of accountability.	1. Where should END Fund focus our efforts as we monitor this project?*	- Strong emphasis should be placed on the development of all programming beyond phase 1 and the role that the MoH has taken in the process
<p>Conclusions Summary</p> <p>Phase one of this project is low risk and should significantly support the Angolan NTD control program’s efforts in Zaire and Uige. As phase two is developed, the project risk elevates significantly given the fact that the process is to be led by the MoH and currently all plans have yet to be determined. Since this initiative is to be multi-year, this program carries significant risk in its current state. However, based on the confidence we have in the Angolan political momentum and MENTOR’s expertise in navigating its currents, we believe that this period of transition will be handled effectively and produce a sound program for the people in Zaire and Uige. Additionally, project development in the Angolan context has certainly not been easy, but the END Fund has remained committed to establishing roots there as a major part of the program portfolio. With this prior investment in mind the potential of turning back now is much greater than when we first started. Given this overall context, the return of funding MENTOR programming in Angola is recommended despite the apparent areas of risk.</p>		

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

- Goal
- Impact
- Outputs
- Activities
- Inputs

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

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

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

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

Results Reporting Plan

- MOU
- Banking information

Checklist before finalizing MOU

- Completed Application and Representation letter (see end of application)
- Agreed upon and finalized Logical Model/ Logical Framework
- Agreed upon and finalized budget
- Agreed upon and finalized benchmarks by year (benchmark language and numbers consistent on all documents: Logic Model, Benchmarks table, and MOU)
- Completed PAT Worksheet, signed off by supervisor
- Completed PAT Scoresheet, signed off by supervisor
- Reference letters received from at least 1 other source (preferably 2 – 3 sources)*
- 3 most recent year audited financials*
- All relevant materials above, and any other important documents such as project narrative, any list of staff and their qualifications provided by org, etc, attached in Oasis

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