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Key operational risks/challenges

- Original design of program, esp. operational arrangements, can impact implementation
- Delays in implementation
- Low absorption
- Targets/impact not met

Situation
- Significant number of grants need to be signed
- 70% of allocated funds for next cycle will be in grant making in 2020

Target
- Implementation-ready grants with feasible implementation arrangements are signed

Challenges
- Proposed implementation arrangements may not facilitate program delivery

LFAs are critical partners of CTs to address these challenges
How LFAs can support CTs & next steps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposal:</th>
<th>Shift focus to more strategic LFA engagement during Funding Request and Grant Making</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Objective:</td>
<td>Ensure well designed and implementation-ready grants with feasible implementation arrangements are signed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Current LFA engagement

LFAs involved towards end of Grant Making process:
- Implementer capacity assessment (as warranted)
- Review of budget, LoHP and in some cases PF

**LFA do not consistently:**
- Participate (as observers) in discussions between CT/CCM/PR/Partners during Funding Request and Grant Making processes
- Comment on robustness of Concept Note
- Review feasibility of operational plans, implementation arrangements

=> **Result:** CTs may be missing valuable insights from LFAs

### Proposed LFA engagement

LFAs involved from start of Funding Request to end of Grant Making process:

#### During Funding Request
- Comment on robustness/operational feasibility of Concept Note
- Advise CT on stakeholder representation & critical discussions
- Review of feasibility of responses to TRP, as required

#### During Grant Making
- Ensure programs are well designed by focusing LFA reviews on feasibility of:
  - proposed implementation arrangements
  - workplan and budget
  - systems to report results
- Ensure grants are implementation-ready by reviewing:
  - Timely PR human resource planning, SR selection & key supplier contracting

**After grant signing**
- Regular check-ins on implementation readiness

**At all stages:**
- Flag operational challenges and risks to CT
- LFAs are involved/copied in discussions between CT/CCM/PR/Partners

=> **Result:** early identification of gaps/bottlenecks/risk for timely rectification

### Next steps

- LFAs to agree with their CTs the scope of work during Funding Request and Grant Making;
- Tailor LFA engagement to portfolio context and update LFA work plan as needed;
- Relevant guidance is being updated;
- For any questions, please contact LFA Coordination Team
Best practices of value-adding LFA engagement during development of Funding Request

**Ensure Concept Note is robust & feasible**

Based on LFA’s experience and knowledge of country context, system capacities and implementation challenges, the LFA may be requested to:

- Comment on content and robustness of assumptions used in Concept Note;
- Highlight risks of non-delivery on grant objectives;
- Review feasibility of proposed implementation arrangements, incl. flagging operational challenges and risks to CT;
- Provide contextual information & advice to CT that may impact operational feasibility of implementation (e.g. legislation that could affect implementation, political context, etc.)

**Benefits:**
- Improve operational feasibility of implementation arrangements;
- Support CT through early identification of issues for timely rectification;
- Inform value adding LFA review of Grant Making

**Outputs/Deliverables:**
- Documented information prepared for the CT
- On-site (spot) advice to the CT during or after meetings

**LFAs do NOT:** participate in Concept Note development

**Example:**
- New priority areas like Human Rights that may not be covered in National Strategic Plan and which are difficult to measure for Impact over 3-year grant cycle

**Ensure relevant stakeholders are consulted**

- Based on country context, advise CT whether Concept Note development process is inclusive and the right parties are consulted

**Example:**
- Management of malaria using community structures: check whether MoH department that manages Community Health Workers is involved – as opposed to only consulting with the National Malaria Program that typically covers delivery through the public health system

**Ensure CT is briefed on key discussions**

- Attend key discussions/meetings as observer and brief CT on pertinent issues/risks/things that require attention/follow up by CT

**Benefits:**
- Improve operational feasibility of implementation arrangements;
- Support CT through early identification of issues for timely rectification;
- Inform value adding LFA review of Grant Making

**Outputs/Deliverables:**
- Documented information prepared for the CT
- On-site (spot) advice to the CT during or after meetings
Best practice of value-adding LFA engagement during **Grant Making & Early Implementation**

**LFAs are consistently involved/copied in discussions between CT/CCM/PR/Partners**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ensure responses to TRP are feasible</th>
<th>Ensure programs are well designed and ready to be implemented</th>
<th>Ensure implementation readiness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• As needed and relevant, comment on country’s responses to TRP to check for adequacy and feasibility</td>
<td>What will <strong>continue</strong>: 1. LFA implementer capacity assessment (CAT); review of budget, LoHP, Performance Framework (as warranted).</td>
<td>What should <strong>change</strong>: 1. Focus of LFA efforts to shift to more strategic review of operational feasibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2. Request reviews of program design &amp; implementation readiness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifically, LFAs review and flag potential bottlenecks/risk to the CT related to the following:</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Review at regular intervals PR’s progress towards operationalizing implementation arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Periodic reviews to check operational effectiveness &amp; efficiency of implementation arrangements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program Design:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Implementation readiness:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feasibility &amp; phasing/chronology of activities &amp; budget when reviewing workplan, budget and PF;</td>
<td>• Timely contracting of PR human resources;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adequacy of implementation arrangements/service delivery mechanisms;</td>
<td>• Timely SR selection &amp; contracting of suppliers for critical products/services;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Check key operational drivers/enablers are in place/planned for (e.g. policies, guidelines);</td>
<td>• Adequacy and feasibility of year one workplan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Identify implementation efficiencies (e.g. synergies with Partner investments, savings across disease programs, etc.);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adequacy of governance and oversight arrangements (esp. for cross-sector interventions, e.g. AGYW);</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Feasibility of systems to report results from all levels and across all types of implementers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benefits:**
- Grants with feasible (“implementation-ready”) operational plans are signed

**Outputs/Deliverables:**
- Concise documented information prepared for the CT
- On-site (spot) advice to the CT during or after meetings