Establishing Grants Administration Procedures

From **Program Priorities and Operations** in
**Foundation Building Sourcebook: A
practitioners guide based upon experience
from Africa, Asia, and Latin America**
A. Scott DuPree and David Winder with Cristina
Parnetti, Chandni Prasad and Shari Turitz

To obtain a complete 336-page Sourcebook,
contact Synergos or visit
www.synergos.org/globalphilanthropy/

Section 5   **Establishing Grants Administration Procedures**

This section explores how to review grant proposals and administer, monitor and evaluate grants. It examines the importance of ensuring fairness, transparency and efficiency.

Example 1   A Full Grantmaking Cycle
                 Equal Opportunity Foundation (South Africa)

Example 2   Recommendations to the Board, Letters of Acceptance and Rejection
                 Children and Youth Foundation of the Philippines

Example 3   Guidelines for Grantee Reporting
                 VITAE (Brazil)

Example 4   A Standardized Project Monitoring and Evaluation System
                 Foundation for the Philippine Environment

Why Establish Grants Administration Procedures?
This section focuses on how four foundations have approached the challenge of achieving fairness, transparency and efficiency in their grantmaking procedures. Clear policies and procedures in the application of their resources have helped them to earn reputations for being open and honest. They have found that standard procedures can assist in maintaining essential communication with grant seekers and grantees.

These foundations have established systems to track grant applications, approve proposals, disburse funding, monitor grants and evaluate results. Coupled with a professional staff that has the skills and experience needed to manage the grants program, these procedures can increase the impact of grants by assisting the foundation to identify the best possible grants and evaluate the impact they are having.

Proposal Review Process
Staff of the four foundations in this section are responsible for screening proposals, sometimes with the help of external advisors. They prepare recommendations for grant action for consideration by the board. In some cases, such as the Equal Opportunity Foundation (EOF), this is preceded by a step in which the program officer prepares a detailed recommendation for presentation to the executive director.

It is common practice among the foundations in this section to submit recommendation for grant approval to their boards or board sub-committees. Some boards delegate responsibility for approval of all or specific grants, i.e., below a certain cash limit, to the staff. This is unlikely to be the case at the outset when the foundation is still developing a professional staff since Board members, as trustees of the foundation's assets, are legally responsible for all actions taken by the foundation.

In some foundations the Board elects a program committee or grantmaking subcommittee that is charged with reviewing proposals forwarded by the staff and presenting recommendations for final approval by the full board. The recommendations will vary, but will generally contain concise summaries of proposals, with a recommendation for support (or not to support). Recommendations to support proposals that staff view as linked together in accomplishing a specific objective of the Foundation are sometimes presented as a package for approval. Grant recommendations to the Board are usually accompanied by a statement indicating how the grant would contribute to achieving the goals of the foundation in a specific program area. They will also specify specific targets and objectives to be achieved during the grant period, methods for evaluating the results and indications of potential obstacles and challenges which might affect the results. They may also indicate whether and under what circum-stances supplementary funding will be considered.

Monitoring and Evaluation

This section looks briefly at some approaches to grant monitoring and evaluation employed by two foundations: Equal Opportunity Foundation and VITAE. These examples suggest the importance of having clear, achievable goals for grant activities being supported so that progress can be measured. These foundations have adopted systems that seek to assist the grantee organization to develop its own monitoring and evaluation skills and procedures including standardized forms. Such a participatory monitoring and evaluation system ensures that the grantee receives direct benefit from the process and can use the results to improve the design of the project.

A common procedure used by foundations is to request regular progress reports from grantees. These can be quarterly, half yearly or annually. The foundations usually provide clear guidelines on reporting procedures. Some provide a form to be completed. The reporting guidelines of VITAE are given as one example. The results of these evaluations are useful in informing future decisions on grant renewals.

The staff will not normally present evaluations of individual grants to the board, though in the case of EOF an Evaluation Subcommittee reviews all evaluations. More commonly the staff will review a group of grants in a specific program and present the results to the board.

Summary Points

Clearly written grant administration procedures help ensure a smooth-running grant program. Many mature foundations have developed a grant administration manual. These manuals cover all elements including proposal review procedures, responses to applicants, grant reporting requirements and grant monitoring and evaluation. They provide a valuable guide for existing and also incoming staff.

The grant selection process should provide the decision-makers (CEO and/or Board) with sufficient information on which to make a decision. In reviewing grant proposals foundation staff usually evaluate the aims, objectives and methodology of the proposed program/project and also the organization's human, technical and resource capacity and prospects for sustainability. It is an advantage if they have first hand knowledge of the institutions and individuals. They then prepare a recommendation for either support or rejection. In some cases the recommendation for support may be conditional on additional information being provided. Where grants in a new program area are being presented, it is useful for the relevant program officer to attend the Board meeting to answer questions.

Grant evaluation should involve staff of the grantee/partner organization and contain recommendations for strengthening the organization and/or program. The evaluation should identify project achievements and also problems encountered and recommended solutions to those problems. If there is high level of involvement of the grantee organization staff in the evaluation process the organization is more likely to commit to taking the steps required to implement the proposed recommendations.

There are no easy answers to the challenge of grant evaluation. Foundation staff need to meet the challenge of developing qualitative indicators to evaluate programs in fields that have proved difficult to evaluate in the past, such as non-formal education, health education, children and youth programs. These should be shared more broadly with the foundation community.

Example 1   A Full Grantmaking Cycle
Equal Opportunity Foundation (South Africa)

The Application Form
The Equal Opportunity Foundation (EOF) accepts unsolicited proposals; although, it may also request proposals from specific organizations from time to time. As discussed in Chapter 3.2 it seeks to support projects in the fields of Early Childhood Development, Income Generation, Women and Gender and Primary Health Care in nine provinces considered to be in greatest need. It has a standardized application form requesting the following information:

- Organization
- Project name
- Type of project/sector
- A copy of the organization's constitution
- Physical address

- Postal address
- Telephone number/fax number/email address
- Directions to the project location
- Name of auditor
- Address
- Telephone number/fax number
- Organization/project background
- Socio-economic background
- Historical background
- Major achievements to date
- Management Committee
- Description of the process in which the management committee is elected/appointed
- Staff
- Program purpose
- Overall objectives of the program
- Objectives specific to this request
- Activities to be supported
- Expected results
- Means of measuring if the expected results have been achieved
- Budget
- Current donors
- Other income
- Networking activities
- Current sustainability plans
- Future sustainability plans[33]

Tracking Grant Proposals

EOF has a computerized grants-management system that utilizes software designed by a South African computer consultant.[34] This software is also used by the Open Society Foundation in South Africa. The software allows for the systematic handling of grant requests. Once applications are received they are date stamped and sorted according to:

- Those proposals that need to be declined immediately as they fall outside of the Foundation's program area

- Those applications that require guidance from the Foundation in order to submit a more detailed proposal

- Those project proposals that fall within the Foundation's funding criteria and that will be acknowledged in writing as having been received. These submitters will also be informed that a project officer will be in touch with them, either for more information or to make an appointment for an on-site field visit

In general, the Foundation strives to respond to all applications within a period of one month.

Files are opened for these various categories and regularly followed up on by the project coordinator and/or relevant project officer.

Screening Process

If the Foundation decides a pre-selection on-site field visit is in order, the following procedures apply.

- As a rule, the Foundation does not fund projects that have not been visited and appraised by a project officer
- At the appropriate time, a project officer will liaise with projects in the province that s/he works regarding a suitable date and time to conduct on-site visits
- When the project is visited, the request or needs identified in the proposal along with the budget are assessed in terms of local material conditions, program quality, support and services available in the broader community, project sustainability and overall developmental impact on the community, sub-region or region. In addition, it is assessed whether projects are—in real terms—community-driven or owned, whether there is the prospect for the replication of programs in regions and across regions, and whether the possibility of cluster-type projects that promote symbiotic relationships and the sharing of resources exist[35]
- After visiting a project, the project officer will write a summary of the project, and where appropriate, make a recommendation for funding. Decisions on whether or not to recommend funding are then made, in turn, by the project coordinator, the Executive Director and, finally, the Trustees

Project Officer Recommendation

A recommendation includes information as requested in the application form plus the following data. These are actual form headings:

- Project Officer (name)
- Date of (site) Visit
- Province
- Urban/Rural
- Organization's Awareness of EOF
- Geographical Location
- Goal
- Program Impact
- Staff Capacity
- Networking Program Support (non-Financial)
- Budget (Itemized)
- Recommendation[36]

Board Committee Review

The next steps in the process are to forward the approved recommendation on to the Grantmaking Subcommittee, and then onto the Board of Trustees.

Subject to the approval of the project coordinator and Executive Director, recommendations for funding from project officers are forwarded to the Grantmaking Subcommittee for scrutiny two weeks before it sits. At the actual Grantmaking Subcommittee meeting, project officers present applications to Trustees who either accept or reject them for funding.

Once an application is approved or declined by the Grantmaking Subcommittee, the minutes of their meeting are prepared and forwarded to the board of Trustees two weeks before it sits for final discussion and approval or rejection.[37]

Evaluation of Projects

The evaluation of projects follows rigorous guidelines. Approximately six months after the disbursement of funds, projects and programs are given an initial evaluation. The purpose of evaluation currently is to monitor and assess funded projects in relation to financial accountability and to assess programmatic progress. This process involves the following steps.

First, grantees evaluate themselves by completing a standard evaluation form that contains the following headings:

Assessment of Objectives

Objectives
1. Program name funded by the Equal Opportunity Foundation
2. Please describe in detail the objectives of the program being evaluated
3. Please discuss your progress in achieving these objectives.
4. a. What problems did you experience during the implementation of your program?
   b. How did you manage to overcome these problems or how do you intend to overcome these problems?
5. What are the positive results of this program?
Results During and After Project Implementation
6. a. How many people in your target group were positively affected by this program?
   b. Discuss in detail the benefit of this program to this group.

Job Creation
7. a. Were any jobs created as a result of this project?
   b. How many were created?
   c. Please provide the names and addresses of employers
   d. What types of jobs were created?

Training
8. a. Have people been trained as a result of your program?
   b. How many staff members were trained?
   c. How many community members were trained?
   d. Who provided the training?
   e. What type of training was received? List the courses and workshops.
   f. What were the aims of the training?
   g. How did it assist in the better understanding of your project?
   h. What training will be needed in the future?

Funding
9. a. Have you received further funding from other sources?
   b. For this program? List sources and amounts.
   c. For your other programs? List sources and amounts.

<u>Sustainability and Future Plans</u>

10. a. What is the intended life-span of your organization? Please explain your answer.

   b. If funding was obtained from the EOF for a specific program, what was the intended lifespan of this program? Please motivate your answer. What are your financial and other   plans to sustain your organization/program? Please explain all your answers.

11. Does your organization have a funding deficit? If yes, please explain what you will do to overcome this situation.

<u>Networking with Other Organizations</u>

12. During the course of program implementation, have any links been forged with other NGOs? If yes, please describe these and the benefit to your organization.

<u>Financial Reporting</u>

13. EOF Grant – Summarized breakdown of expenditure, e.g. total training or equipment or travel, etc. expenses thus far.[38]

Then project officers conduct an evaluation visit to assess progress, and where appropriate, after consultation, make interventions to maximize the development impact of the project.

Finally, evaluation forms from grantees are returned to the Foundation, they are compiled with the project officer's written evaluation report and presented at an Evaluation Subcommittee meeting. The project officer's report contains the following headings:

Organization
Project Name
Province
Sector
Grant Period
Conditions as set out in terms of grant
Results of the program
Problems Encountered
Solution(s) to Problems Encountered
Positive Affects
  Did the project receive press coverage?
  Is the project self-sustainable?
  Number of people positively affected _____
  Number of jobs created _____
  Number of people trained
Future Needs _____
General Comments[39]

Should the Evaluation Subcommittee be satisfied that a project is progressing and that the grant is making a significant difference, it recommends a further term of funding when the funding period is longer than one year. EOF sees its role as creating chances for communities to develop themselves toward self-sustainability and, thus, does not renew funding too many times.[40]

Example 2   Board Recommendations, Letters of Acceptance and Rejection
Children and Youth Foundation of the Philippines

The Children and Youth Foundation of the Philippines (CYFP) chooses partners
that it believes are doing the most effective work to address priority issues
for children and youth in the Philippines. It then strengthens, expands and
replicates these programs through grants and other forms of support including
technical assistance, advocacy, research and the building of collaboration with other
sectors. Its grant approval process is closely guided by its development philosophy
and organizational values. Staff members review and evaluate proposals from
organizations working in CYFP's focus areas and make recommendations to a board
committee. They are also responsible for communicating the board's decisions and
advice to the applicants.

Recommendations to the Board
CYFP has developed the following format for grant recommendations to be
presented to the Board Program Committee:

I. Title of the Project
II. Description of the project
    A. Status of the Project: New ( )   Ongoing ( )
       • If new, how does this project relate to Alger's (Consuelo Zobel Alger Foundation, CYPF's parent foundation and major funder) and CYFP's vision, mission, and goals?
       • What has it done in the past?
    B. Objectives
       • Short-, medium-, and long-term objectives
       • Milestones that can be monitored
    C. Target clients
    D. Interventions

III. Evaluation of the proponent
    A. What is its program expertise?
    B. Does it have a track record in implementing a similar project?
    C. Management
       • What is the management structure of the organization?
       • Is decision-making centered around a single person?
       • If so, what plans, if any, are there to develop a stronger management resource base?
       • Should CYFP's proposed assistance be linked to these plans?

IV. Project goals
    A. An appraisal of the chances of achieving the goals.
       • What is the environment for implementation? Is it favorable or hostile?
    B. Comparative performance
       • Compare the activities and track record of proponent with those of other organizations also working in that field (e.g., street children).
       • What, if anything, is unique about the proponent or its approach to the problem it addresses?

- What are its particular strengths?
- What special challenges does it face?
- Assess their ability to meet their objectives compared with other implementers in similar fields?

V. Duration of support
    A. How long should the project be supported? Why?
    B. How will the proponent continue once CYFP funding is ended or withdrawn?

VI. Total cost of the project
    A. What are the other sources the proponent intends to tap apart from CYFP funding and its counterpart?
    B. If there are other funds coming already, how long have they been supporting proponent?
    C. In what areas has this other funding been used?
    D. How would the above relate to CYFP funding?
    E. Comments/assessments from the other donors.
    F. What is or how much is the proponents' counterpart?
    G. How much is requested from CYFP?
    H. Where is the funding going?
    I. How does the cost compare with a similar project CYFP supports?

VII. Assessments of performance of partners [i.e. existing grantees being recommended for supplemental support]
    A. How long has the partner been with the network? What and how much is the total support provided to date?
    B. How would you assess the partner's performance so far?
    C. Assessment of the impact of the project
- This should go beyond an enumeration of number of children/youth attended to, training programs conducted, etc., but where possible should attempt to describe changes in attitudes, income, lifestyle, health, etc.
    D. Financial sustainability
- Does the project have a developed sustainability plan? How realistic is it?
- What are the milestones of the plan to be considered? At what stage is the proponent in the implementation of this plan?
- How, if at all, should CYFP's proposed assistance be linked to this plan?

Letter of Acceptance
The following sample letter serves to notify an organization of CYFP's approval of its proposal. CYFP points out both the virtues of the program and areas where it might be strengthened. This particular letter indicates that the applicant met with a board committee to explain the proposed program and answer questions. Few foundations take this approach. A more common practice is for staff members to seek any required clarification from the applicant by telephone, email or letter or during a visit to the organization. In some cases the board defers a decision, pending additional information or clarification to be obtained by the staff.

We are pleased to inform you that the CYFP Board of Trustees at its meeting on ___date___ approved your proposal entitled ___proposal name___. The project will have a maximum funding of ___amount___, which will go to activities spelled out in the proposal.

During the discussion of your project, the Board made some comments that we would like to share with you. It noted with satisfaction your beginning effort to reach out to the community where some of the ___partner organization___ children come from in order to minimize relapse of children reconciled with their families.

Your fundraising activities to make ___partner organization___ sustainable did not go unnoticed either. The Board members thought that you were on target in tapping government sources for some of your activities. They have always believed that one way of insuring NGO's financial sustainability is to work closely with local government units. They have funds that can be channeled to organizations like yours, if only they are made aware that NGO efforts are meant to support the government's plan to improve the conditions of its constituents, the street children in your case. You could help in dramatizing this symbiotic relationship between the public and the NGO sectors, especially in a place like ___place___, where, the Board realizes, extraordinary efforts are needed.

We would also like to thank you for participating in the meeting. You certainly have been able to communicate the significance of your project and make us visualize more vividly what is happening to the children who go through _____.

Ms./Mr. ___name___, CYFP Program Officer, will guide you through the requirements (e.g., the IRS form, MOA among others) that will have to be satisfied to avail of this funding assistance. All the best and we wish you success in this endeavor.[41]

Letter of Rejection
A number of letters are used by CYFP in rejecting proposals. In this example, the Board welcomes another meeting to discuss a revised proposal and suggests points for consideration:

This has reference to the ___organization's___ application for a grant amounting to ___amount___ for ___title of proposal___, which was reviewed by the CYFP Board in its meeting last ___date___. The Board has several concerns regarding the proposed program, but could take up your revised proposal at its next meeting. ___Specific concerns___.

Please know that the Board would simply like to help increase the chance of the project's succeeding and staying in place, and are optimistic that you will consider the following points, revise your proposal, and resubmit it for review.

Please do not hesitate to contact us should there be need for further clarification on any of the preceding points. We look forward to hearing from you.[42]

Example 3   For Grantee Reporting
VITAE (Brazil)

VITAE has developed a comprehensive set of documents providing guidelines on grantee reporting requirements. Such documents help avoid misunderstanding between grantor and grantee. These documents accompany the grant letter which stipulates when grant payments will be made, sets out narrative and financial reporting requirements, as well as restrictions on the use of funds.

The packet of materials going to new grantees contains a letter requesting that everyone involved in the project, both on the technical and financial aspects, be familiar with the documentation.

> Dear Sirs
> We hereby inform you that the Terms of Agreement (here attached) is the document that will regulate the relations between your institution and Vitae relative to guiding the implementation and execution of the referred project.
>
> Consequently, we would like to emphasize that all those involved in executing the project from both the technical and financial functional areas must have a complete knowledge of this document.
>
> In our experience, this procedure ensures a more effective flow of activities related to the implementation of the project. In the annex, we make some suggestions that will certainly facilitate project reporting, both for the coordinating team responsible for the proposal and for Vitae.
>
> We would like to take this opportunity to inform you that due to the high volume of reports that Vitae analyses, it is of fundamental importance that the technical and financial reports be presented using the specific Summary Form. We emphasize that we will not accept reports that have not been completed according to this procedure.[43]
>
> The terms of agreement are in two sections. The first section is a one-sheet form that asks for this grantee information (in addition to address, telephone, etc.):
> • duration of project
> • objective
> • goals
> • amount requested
> The second section asks for:
> 1. particulars for bank deposits and a time line for disbursements–number, date and amount, and percentages applied to each budget line item
> 2. confirmation that the funds will only be utilized in accordance with the original authorization assurances that all involved in the project will observe and comply with the general conditions in the agreement, seek to achieve the objectives agreed to in the original proposal, strive for maximum impact, send technical and financial reports, raise matching funds, and send to the foundation copies of all materials used or produced in the project

Attachments to the reporting package include summary forms for technical and financial reports, guidelines for filling out the forms, including definition of terms; a two-page list of 25 conditions of the VITAE grant; terms of agreement, and two

annexed tables indicating the timeline for the use of funds. VITAE asks its grantees to use the following summary forms for technical and financial reports:

Summary Technical Report Form

                                    Project #   Due date _/_/_

Grantee: _____

Name of project: _____

Grant period: _____

Brief summary of progress during period [more space given]

Brief summary of problems encountered [more space given]

Annexed documents, number and specify [more space given]

Summary Financial Report Form

                      Project #   Due date _/_/_

Grantee: _____   Name of project: _____

Grant period: _____

Receipts:		Expenditures (*by item and sub-item*)	
1 Previous balance	R$ _____	1 _____	R$ _____
2 Deposits	R$ _____	2 _____	R$ _____
3 Expenditures	R$ _____	3 _____	R$ _____
Total receipts	R$ _____	4 _____	R$ _____
Projected budget	R$ _____	Balance available[44] R$ _____	

Example 4   A Standardized Project Monitoring and Evaluation System
Foundation for the Philippine Environment

The Foundation for the Philippine Environment (FPE) developed a standardized project monitoring and evaluation system. This system includes forms for monitoring site visits, a project monitoring checklist and an internal monitoring form.

Each grantee, referred to as a partner organization, signs a grant agreement specifying an annual work plan with objectives and activities. Progress is evaluated by the grantee and one of FPE's program officers through project status reports required on a quarterly basis. The quarterly reports submitted by the grantee include program accomplishments and updated financial reports. Funds are also disbursed four times a year and are released on receipt and review of these reports. If the field is a new area of involvement for FPE and/or the organization is a first-time grantee, foundation staff or consultants undertake site visits to meet with project staff, beneficiaries and other stakeholders and review progress and shortcomings, and if necessary make recommendations for getting the project back on track.

In its grants administration manual, FPE provides information about its monitoring and evaluation process, as well as the necessary forms. First is the project monitoring form to be used by foundation project staff and consultants on site visits undertaken twice a year:

Project Monitoring Form for Staff/Consultant Six Monthly Field Visit (outline)
Purpose: To assess project progress and accomplishments vis-á-vis plan of action.
Output: Semi-annual or annual status report
Suggested overall flow of activities:
   - Initial meeting with project staff
   - Review and assess accomplishments, inputs, results,
     problems, solutions
   - Identify key informants (proponent [grantee], community/beneficiaries, external)
   - Records/documents review
   - Management reports
   - Financial records
   - Field site inspection
Community beneficiary interviews
Interview with key (external) informants [including govt officials]
Individual staff interviews
Group meeting with and feedback from project management staff [clarification of objectives]
Group meeting with and feedback from proponent [grantee] board and management [e.g. policy issues of hiring/relations with government, support from government[45]

Second, the Project Monitoring Checklist accompanies the monitoring form and suggests questions to ask about projects in the areas of project objectives, community participation, and project management:

Project Monitoring Checklist
1. Accomplishment of Project Objectives
- Did the project accomplish its set objectives for the period?
- What are the concrete and measurable indicators for project accomplishment? What methods did the proponent use to assess or measure accomplishments?
- What major inputs or critical activities contributed to the accomplishment of objectives?
- Does the accomplishment for the period contribute to accomplishment of overall or general project objectives?
- What problems or situations significantly affected accomplishment of project objectives?
- What steps were taken by the proponent to counter or resolve these problems?

2. Community/Beneficiaries' Participation
- In what ways were the community/beneficiaries involved in critical project activities?
- What capabilities of community/beneficiaries were enhanced in relation to project objectives?
- How did community members benefit from the project?

3. Project Management
- Were project staff effective in fulfilling their work? Did they produce results?
- Was the project manager or coordinator effective in facilitating better staff functioning and producing results?
- Was the project management structure effective for decision-making, coordination, action, and controls?
- What particular difficulties or problems were encountered in relation to project management?
- How are these problems (proposed to be) solved?[46]

Third, FPE consolidates its monitoring effort into a single project status report. This report is prepared every six months by the Program Officer responsible for the project. It uses this format:

Foundation for the Philippine Environment Semi-Annual/Annual Project Status Report (Outline)

IDENTIFYING INFORMATION
Project name
Project type
Project site
Ecosystem/resource base
Status: (New, Ongoing)
Start-up date
Proponent's name and address
Contact person
Total amount of grant
Cumulative releases (to date)

Amount of funds utilized
Funds balance (or released amount)
Grant balance (unreleased amount)

SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
Brief over-all description of the project
Major accomplishments of project objectives
Major difficulties or problems encountered
Recommendation for project continuation

ACCOMPLISHMENTS PER OBJECTIVE
Objective
Critical activities

Accomplishments	Problems encountered	Solutions/recommendations
Results obtained from critical activities and project inputs	*Problems or difficulties in project operations*	*Action or steps to solve problems and results (so far)of such step*
Concrete indicators or measures of accomplishment	*Hindrances to full accomplishment of objectives*	*Recommendations or decisions to mitigate problems and improve operations; when these will take effect*
Level of attainment (quantitative or qualitative of objective) Sources of key information (if relevant or indicating reliability)	*Assessment of causes of problems*	

Annex detailed results, descriptions, documentation, or plans.

OTHER PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED and SOLUTIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS
Problems or setbacks pertaining to overall operations or a combination of
objectives and components:
1)   Internal (i.e., in project management, operations, staffing, controls,
      documentation)
2)   External (i.e., developments in project environment, other
      institutions, policies, etc., affecting project
Solution or recommendations of proponent [i.e. grantee] vis-a-vis above
problems. Resources or inputs needed to put recommendations into effect.

FUNDS USAGE AND MANAGEMENT
Summary of funds usage (attach detailed report)
Total grant amount
Cumulative releases
Funds utilized (of released funds)
Variance in funds usage

Item	Budget	Expenditure	Variance %	Reason for variance
	(In project plan of action)	*(in financial report)*		

Problems/solutions related to funds and financial management
Proposed budget modifications [FPE is careful to note any variance between projected and actual administrative and program costs]

RECOMMENDATIONS
For project improvement, continuity
For proponent development and capability-building
For linking project results and learning with other projects

In 1998, FPE's total grant portfolio was managed by a group of nine program officers. They work closely with staff of the finance unit in reviewing grant reports. Project financial analysts from FPE's finance unit make an assessment of the grantee's financial management system. This includes an inspection of accounts (including on-site visits once a year) and the mentoring of the grantee's program management and finance staff on the development of their financial systems. Both program officers and project financial analysts can recommend training for the staff of grantees.

In the course of using the above instruments certain lessons have been learned. The first is the need to give more feedback to the community on the results of the monitoring and evaluation. The second is the need to take into consideration external factors such as the action of local government that can affect the results of the project. FPE is in the process of revising its system to take these lessons into account.

References

[32] Child Relief and You. Internal document. Undated.

[33] Equal Opportunities Foundation, Application Form. 1998.

[34] Customized computer software for grantmaking programs is available from a number of sources. EOF and the Open Society Foundation of South Africa use software designed by a local consultant, James Kydd. Two popular software packages in the US geared specifically for grantmaking are Micro Edge and Brommel Kamp. According to the US Council on Foundations, these tend to be used more by community foundations that do not necessarily require fundraising software. FIMS is a software package that handles both grantmaking and fundraising management solutions. Such organizations as the International Association for Grantmakers, the European Foundation Centre, the AP Consortium and the Mexican Center for Philanthropy (CEMEFI) can offer guidance and assistance about selecting software for managing grantmaking and fundraising.

[35] Emmett, Anne. Presentation, *op cit*.

[36] EOF. Summary and Recommendations to the Trustees Form. 1998.

[37] Emmett presentation, *op cit*.

[38] EOF. Evaluation report on program activities. Internal document, 1998.

[39] EOF. Project officers evaluation and monitoring form. Internal document, 1998.

[40] Emmett. Presentation, *op cit*.

[41] Children and Youth Foundation of the Philippines. Internal document.

[42] CYFP. Internal document.

[43] Taken from sample VITAE letter.

[44] Summarized from VITAE reporting documents. 1997.

[45] Foundation for the Philippines Environment. Project Monitoring Field Visit Guide, c. 1998.

[46] FPE. Project monitoring checklist. Internal document, undated.