



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

RISKNET2 INTERIM REPORT

May 2006

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by James Ayers and Judi Heichelheim of Population Services International, Inc. for the RiskNet2 project.

Recommended Citation: Ayers, James, and Judi Heichelheim. May 2006. *RiskNet2 Interim Report*. Bethesda, MD: Private Sector Partnerships project, Abt Associates Inc.

Contract/Project No.: GPO-I-00-04--00007-00 Task Order No. 06

Submitted to: Forest Duncan, Cognizant Technical Officer
Kip Beardsley, HIV/AIDS Advisor
Office of Democracy, Governance and Social Transition
Bureau for Europe and Eurasia
United States Agency for International Development



Abt Associates Inc. ■ 4800 Montgomery Lane, Suite 600 ■
Bethesda, Maryland 20814 ■ Tel: 301/347-5000 ■ Fax: 301/652-3916 ■
www.abtassoc.com

RISKNET2 INTERIM REPORT

DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) or the United States government.

CONTENTS

- Contents..... iii
- Acronyms v
- 1. **Executive Summary** 1
 - 1.1 Summary of Capacity Building Efforts..... 1
 - 1.2 Summary of Gatekeeper Reach Efforts 1
 - 1.3 Summary of Gatekeeper Effectiveness Efforts..... 2
- 2. **Background Information** 3
 - 2.1 Project Description..... 3
 - 2.2 Partner NGOs and Target Groups 4
- 3. **Capacity Building Efforts** 5
 - 3.1 Application Process..... 5
 - 3.2 January 2006 Workshop 5
- 4. **NGO-Specific Results** 7
 - 4.1 LET (Zagreb, Croatia) 7
 - 4.2 Terra (Rejika, Croatia) 7
 - 4.3 Panacea (Plovdiv, Bulgaria)..... 8
 - 4.4 Dose of Love (Burgas, Bulgaria) 9
 - 4.5 Initiative for Health Foundation (Sofia, Bulgaria)..... 10
 - 4.6 XY Association (Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina) 11
- 5. **Objectives For Remainder of Project**..... 13
- Appendix I. Explanation of Key Measures..... 15
- Appendix 2. RiskNet2 Performance Monitoring and Evaluation Plan... 17

ACRONYMS

CSW	commercial sex worker
DoL	Dose of Love, RiskNet NGO in Borgas, Bulgaria
GKE	Gatekeeper Effectiveness outreach model
GKR	Gatekeeper Reach outreach model
HEC	Hygienic Epidemiology Center (Bulgaria)
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus
IDU	injecting drug user
IfHF	Initiative for Health Foundation, RiskNet NGO in Sofia, Bulgaria
LET	Life Quality Improvement Organization, RiskNet NGO in Zagreb, Croatia
MSM	men who have sex with men
NGO	nongovernmental organization
PSI	Population Services International, Inc., RiskNet2 partner organization
STI	sexually transmitted infection
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
XY	XY Association, RiskNet NGO in Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

I.1 SUMMARY OF CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORTS

Attended by all the non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the January workshop in Bucharest kicked off the capacity building efforts of the RiskNet2 project. In recognition of the disconnect between most NGOs' stated goals and strategies and their ability to fund either, one of the workshop objectives was to improve strategic and financial planning. These sessions were led by Barbara O'Hanlon of O'Hanlon Health LLC and Lisa Tarantino from the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) - funded project Banking on Health.

Local consultants hired in each RiskNet2 country will continue this work by helping each NGO produce a three-year strategic plan. During the June workshop, these plans will inform the development of funding action plans that will identify potential sources of funding and outline plans to access this funding. Progress against these plans will then be tracked through the remainder of the year.

A second focus of the January workshop was the development of formal and informal mechanisms for optimizing staff behavior and improving organizational effectiveness. RiskNet2 partner, Crescent Consulting, a local Romanian organizational development firm, provided the skills building sessions which focused on delivering constructive feedback to direct reports. These sessions also served as a prelude to individual feedback workshops that will again be conducted by Crescent with each NGO during the April/May site visits. One of the results of those workshops will be the development of a formal performance evaluation system for employees.

I.2 SUMMARY OF GATEKEEPER REACH EFFORTS

The chart below summarizes progress made against key goals for the five NGOs that are implementing the Gatekeeper Reach model. Please refer to Appendix I for a definition of each measure.

Q I 2006 TOTAL RESULTS						
	ACHIEVED QI 2006				GOAL QI 2006	% ACHIEVED vs. GOAL
	JAN	FEB	MAR	TOT/AVG		
Unique Clients	1476	1561	1583	1540 avg.	1836	84%
New Clients	85	101	102	288 tot.	333	86%
Client Contacts	3354	3442	3787	3528 avg.	3975	89%
Gatekeepers	22	28	28	26 avg.	36	73%
Clients Tested	25	22	72	119 tot.	372	32%

- Unique Clients, New Clients and Client Contacts are basically on track, being within about 15% of goal.
- The number of Gatekeepers is about 25% lower, or -10, versus goal. This is mostly attributable to Initiative for Health (IfHF), who has only five gatekeepers versus the 11 for which they are budgeted.
 - A significant reason that IfHF is short of their gatekeeper goal is because of the hiatus in the RiskNet project. This was during October – December 2005 while NGOs were applying for the second project. During this hiatus period, NGOs did not have incentives to offer the gatekeepers, and, perhaps as a result, some NGOs were not diligent in keeping contact with them.
- The Testing goal is significantly down because of Dose of Love (DoL) and IfHF, who, combined, represent 96% of the gap in goal versus achievement. DoL has been having problems with the local Hygienic Epidemiology Center (HER) where testing occurs, though this now looks to be resolved. IfHF's problems were only short term and have already been resolved.

1.3 SUMMARY OF GATEKEEPER EFFECTIVENESS EFFORTS

Panacea and XY Association are working with the Gatekeeper Effectiveness model. Having a long history of implementing long-format trainings with beneficiaries, XY is having more success with this than Panacea. They have already begun to recruit their gatekeepers and the trainings will start shortly. Panacea, on the other hand, is struggling to add this to their other activities. This NGO has a history of over-extending itself and not focusing its efforts. Being the weakest NGO in the network, PSI is less concerned about the results of Panacea's Gatekeeper Effectiveness efforts than its capacity building efforts.

2. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

2.1 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

RiskNet2 is the continuation to and final year of the RiskNet project. Closing in December 2006, RiskNet2 represents a regional approach to reducing the transmission of sexually transmitted infections (STIs), HIV and other blood borne viruses through NGO outreach activities by reaching vulnerable populations including ethnic minorities, injecting drug users (IDUs), commercial sex workers (CSWs), and men who have sex with men (MSM). The project supports local NGOs in Bosnia-Herzegovina, Bulgaria, and Croatia.

The goal of the program is to contribute to a reduction in HIV and STI transmission and to improve sexual health in select countries in Southeastern Europe. The objective is to increase the reach and effectiveness of interventions through cross-border support of NGOs already working with vulnerable populations. An additional objective, new to RiskNet this year, is to contribute to the sustainability of these organizations by helping their organizational development and providing skills training for management in areas that will aid their ability to secure additional funds.

- To increase reach, RiskNet2 utilizes the Gatekeeper Reach model of outreach, which involves focusing efforts on people who have influence over and access to the target population. These groups -- IDUs, CSWs, and MSM, are often difficult for NGO staff to reach because their actions are either illegal or the behavior they engage in is heavily stigmatized. By using Gatekeepers, RiskNet partners are able to reach normally inaccessible sub-groups of their target. This facilitates both the distribution of health products, such as condoms and lubricants, and access to health services, such HIV testing and drug dependency counseling.
- To increase the effectiveness of interventions, RiskNet2 uses the Gatekeeper Effectiveness model that leverages the influence that Gatekeepers have over their peers. With proper training and motivation, Gatekeepers can influence specific determinants of behavior change. For example, Gatekeepers can improve social norms by endorsing risk reduction behavior with their friends, knowledge by providing correct information about HIV transmission, and skills by teaching things such as sexual assertiveness.
- To improve sustainability, O'Hanlon Health and Crescent Consulting, are helping improve each NGO's long-term strategic thinking, management skills and internal systems in order that they operate more effectively and efficiently. Specific deliverables of this component of the project are three-year strategic plans and funding action plans for each NGO, as well as management skills, fund raising and public relations skills trainings. In addition, for those NGOs without any system for providing feedback on employee performance, performance evaluation systems will be developed.

2.2 PARTNER NGOS AND TARGET GROUPS

The following chart lists the RiskNet2 partners that are currently receiving USAID funds:

Country	City	NGO	Model*	Target Group**			
				IDU	Roma	CSW	MSM
Bulgaria	Sofia	Initiative for Health	GKR	√√	√	√√	√
	Plovdiv	Panacea	GKR & GKE	√√	√	√√	√
	Borgas	Dose of Love	GKR	√√	√	√√	√
Croatia	Rejika	Terra	GKR	√√	√	√	√
	Zagreb	LET	GKR	√√		√√	
Bosnia	Sarajevo	XY Association	GKE		√√		√√

* GKR signifies Gatekeeper Reach, and GKE means Gatekeeper Effectiveness.

** A √√ signifies that this is a main target of the NGO. A √ signifies that this is either a secondary target or a group that is served because it also belongs to one of the main target groups (e.g., a Roma IDU).

3. CAPACITY BUILDING EFFORTS

3.1 APPLICATION PROCESS

It was decided that only NGOs who were active at the end of the first phase of RiskNet would be eligible to apply for the second phase. The learning curve for working with Gatekeepers is just too long to be viable for a new NGO within the ten-month grant period. Furthermore, whereas the first phase of RiskNet included Macedonia with funding from the local USAID mission there, the second phase did not. The local Macedonian mission decided instead to fund technical assistance for their Global Fund implementation. This meant that there were six NGOs who were eligible to apply for the last phase of RiskNet.

As past performance had shown that each organization works effectively with Gatekeepers and the target, the main criterion became how much they would benefit from the capacity building component of the project. Since these are all grassroots NGOs, clearly each has a need for such support. However, need must be matched with a desire for it on the part of management or attempts at organizational change will likely fail.

In this respect, there was one outlier, Panacea from Plovdiv, Bulgaria. They clearly exhibit the greatest need for such support, but it is PSI's opinion that their management is split on the subject. Half understands the need for radical improvement in the areas of strategic planning and management skills/systems; the other half seems reluctant.

In the end, it was decided that Panacea should be awarded a grant. This was because all the other NGOs look relatively strong in their prospects for longer-term sustainability. These NGOs are generally regarded as leaders in their countries, and to invest in them only would have been a safe bet for the project. By including Panacea, the project has the opportunity to maximize its impact in the area of organizational development with an NGO. Furthermore, without such assistance, Population Services International (PSI) is skeptical that Panacea has much chance for longer-term viability.

3.2 JANUARY 2006 WORKSHOP

The focus of the January 2006 network workshop in Bucharest was capacity building. The first two days focused on strategic and financial planning and were delivered by O'Hanlon Health and Lisa Tarantino from Banking on Health. The last two days focused on effective teamwork and providing informal feedback. A brief introduction was also given about public relations and community fundraising.

Information provided by the NGOs during the application process highlighted the fact that there was a wide range in the ability to articulate organizational missions as well as medium and long-term goals and strategies. For example, many strategies were not consistent with goals. Furthermore, many NGOs showed a near-term decline in funding support yet only one NGO listed financial sustainability as a medium term goal.

During the January workshop it quickly became apparent that more effort would have to be spent on strategic and financial planning. For this reason, local consultants were subsequently hired in each

country to assist NGOs in developing a three-year strategic plan. These plans will then be used to inform the development of funding action plans to be completed during the June 2006 workshop. Implementation of this action plan will then begin in the second half of 2006.

The teamwork and feedback sessions of the January workshop were a prelude to individual workshops that will be conducted with each NGO during the April/May site visits. The purpose of these workshops, which will be delivered by Crescent Consulting, is to build management skills and internal systems that facilitate effective management. As of the writing of this report, individual workshops have already been conducted with IfHF, Panacea and Dose of Love. Additional details on these workshops are provided below in each NGO-specific section

4. NGO-SPECIFIC RESULTS

4.1 LET (ZAGREB, CROATIA)

- Using the Gatekeeper Reach model, LET works primarily with IDUs through outreach workers and seven gatekeepers. They also serve CSWs whom they encounter during outreach.
- A local consultant has been hired to help guide LET through the process of drafting a three-year strategic plan and a one-year operational plan. They are on schedule to have this completed by the June RiskNet2 workshop.
- LET has enthusiastically embraced the idea of having a performance evaluation system with which to provide formal feedback to staff members. With the help of Crescent Consulting, they are working now to finalize Statements of Work, a first step in designing such a system.

The chart below summarizes progress made against key Gatekeeper Reach measures.

L E T						
	ACHIEVED Q1 2006				GOAL Q1 2006	% ACHIEVED Vs. GOAL
	JAN	FEB	MAR	TOT/AVG		
Unique Clients	338	343	344	342 avg.	302	113%
New Clients	13	15	15	43 tot.	45	96%
Client Contacts	1110	1119	1110	1113 avg.	1000	111%
Gatekeepers	7	7	7	7 avg.	7	100%
Clients Tested	7	9	8	24 tot.	27	89%

- Overall, LET's performance is quite strong versus their goals.

4.2 TERRA (REJKA, CROATIA)

- Using the Gatekeeper Reach model, Terra works primarily with IDUs through their outreach activities (which include three gatekeepers) and a drop-in shelter. They also have one gatekeeper each for CSWs, MSM and Roma. Interestingly, they have fewer CSW clients than MSM or Roma due primarily to the extremely underground nature of sex work in Rejka.
- A local consultant has been hired to help guide Terra through the process of drafting a three-year strategic plan and a one-year operational plan. These plans are the

continuation of an earlier three-year strategic plan that expired in early 2006. Terra is on schedule to have these plans completed by the June RiskNet2 workshop.

The chart below summarizes progress made against key Gatekeeper Reach measures.

T E R R A						
	ACHIEVED QI 2006				GOAL QI 2006	% ACHIEVED vs. GOAL
	JAN	FEB	MAR	TOT/AVG		
Unique Clients	309	346	352	336 avg.	341	98%
New Clients	8	12	14	34 tot.	42	81%
Client Contacts	504	520	543	522 avg.	530	99%
Gatekeepers	0	6	6	4 avg.	4	100%
Clients Tested	12	6	5	23 tot.	30	77%

- While the New Clients delivery is about 20% under goal, this equals only 8 individuals. Terra is confident that by the end of project they will have met this goal.
- The Testing goal is significantly under and this is because of problems with the county's Public Health Institute. This institute is the only location where such blood tests can legally be conducted. In the past, they have (reluctantly) permitted Terra to draw blood at their facilities for testing, but in February this changed. The reported February and March numbers represent only those people who absolutely refused to go to the Institute to have their blood drawn.
- Terra is trying to resolve the situation but is not hopeful. They have worked through every political means possible but to no avail. If the situation does not change, their testing goal will have to be revised downward.

4.3 PANACEA (PLOVDIV, BULGARIA)

- Using the Gatekeeper Reach model, Panacea serves IDUs through outreach (including two gatekeepers) and a drop in shelter. They are also attempting to use the Gatekeeper Effectiveness model to serve both IDUs and CSWs.
- Panacea has been struggling to implement the Gatekeeper Effectiveness model, primarily because they are currently overwhelmed with other obligations, including the RiskNet2 capacity building efforts. PSI is primarily concerned that they focus on the capacity building activities (i.e., develop a strategic plan) and their Gatekeeper Reach activities. As the weakest NGO in the network, these are the areas that will give them the most benefit.
- Anticipating such a situation, PSI had tried to persuade them to not use the Gatekeeper Effectiveness model, but to no avail. This is one of Panacea's biggest challenges – concentrating their efforts rather than trying to do everything at once. The local

consultant who is working with them on their strategic plan understands this tendency of Panacea and is working to address it.

- A local consultant has been hired to help guide Panacea through the process of drafting a three-year strategic plan and a one-year operational plan. Of all the NGOs in the network, Panacea stands to benefit the most from such an exercise as they are the weakest strategic thinkers and have the highest percentage of their funding from but one source, Global Fund. They are on schedule to have the strategic plan completed by the June RiskNet2 workshop.
- Crescent Consulting conducted a feedback workshop with Panacea during the March site visit. As a result of the workshop Panacea will designate one day each month for staff to provide feedback to each other. This will precede the design of a formal feedback, or performance evaluation, system later this year once their workload has lightened.

The chart below summarizes progress made against key Gatekeeper Reach measures.

P A N A C E A						
	ACHIEVED Q1 2006				GOAL Q1 2006	% ACHIEVED vs. GOAL
	JAN	FEB	MAR	TOT/AVG		
Unique Clients	221	197	155	191 avg.	260	73%
New Clients	41	32	25	98 tot.	90	109%
Client Contacts	556	468	530	518 avg.	656	79%
Gatekeepers	2	2	2	2 avg.	5	40%
Clients Tested	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

- Panacea has not been able to identify enough suitable candidates to be IDU Gatekeepers. Last year they had two different IDU gatekeepers but both left the city. The two IDU gatekeepers they have now are new and they are struggling to identify more.
- As Panacea is keen to work more with MSM, they will also try to recruit an MSM gatekeeper during April/May.
- The Unique Clients and Client Contacts are significantly under goal. Panacea attributes this to increased police activity and poor weather during the winter months.

4.4 DOSE OF LOVE (BURGAS, BULGARIA)

- Using the Gatekeeper Reach model, Dose of Love works primarily with IDUs and CSWs with through outreach (including three gatekeepers for each target) and a drop in shelter. They are also working with MSM but to a much lesser degree, and this is almost entirely through two gatekeepers.
- DoL had previously secured a local consultant to help them draft a three-year strategic plan and a one-year operational plan, and they are finishing this process now. Of all the

Bulgarian NGOs, DoL has embraced the need for this most enthusiastically and is making the most headway.

- Crescent conducted a feedback workshop with DoL during the March site visit. As a result of the workshop, a formal performance evaluation system is being designed for the organization.

The chart below summarizes progress made against key Gatekeeper Reach measures.

DOSE OF LOVE						
	ACHIEVED Q1 2006				GOAL Q1 2006	% ACHIEVED vs. GOAL
	JAN	FEB	MAR	TOT/AVG		
Unique Clients	238	244	275	252 avg.	260	97%
New Clients	19	35	37	91 tot.	90	101%
Client Contacts	596	643	843	694 avg.	699	99%
Gatekeepers	8	8	8	8 avg.	9	89%
Clients Tested	6	7	37	50 tot.	192	26%

- All goals except Clients Tested are on track.
- DoL has been having many difficulties working with the local Hygienic Epidemiology Center (HEC) where free STI/HIV testing occurs in Borgas. Despite pressure from the Ministry of Health, they have been very slow to provide services to DoL clients. Because of this, January and February delivery was at about 10% of goal and March at only 60%. Soon a contract will be signed between DoL and HEC and this should help improve the situation.

4.5 INITIATIVE FOR HEALTH FOUNDATION (SOFIA, BULGARIA)

- Using the Gatekeeper Reach model, IfHF works primarily with IDUs and CSWs through outreach (including three IDU gatekeepers and two CSW gatekeepers) and a drop in shelter. They are also working with MSM and Roma they encounter during outreach and have one MSM gatekeeper.
- A local consultant has been hired to help guide IfHF through the process of drafting a three-year strategic plan and a one-year operational plan. They are on schedule to have this completed by the June RiskNet2 workshop.
- The Romanian organizational development partner conducted a feedback workshop with IfHF during the March site visit. As they have just recently instituted a formal performance evaluation system, time was also spent discussing ways in which this system could be improved.

The chart below summarizes progress made against Gatekeeper Reach measures.

INITIATIVE FOR HEALTH FOUNDATION						
	ACHIEVED QI 2006				GOAL QI 2006	% ACHIEVED vs. GOAL
	JAN	FEB	MAR	TOT/AVG		
Unique Clients	370	431	457	419 avg.	673	62%
New Clients	4	7	11	22 tot.	66	33%
Client Contacts	588	692	761	680 avg.	1090	62%
Gatekeepers	5	5	5	5 avg.	11	47%
Clients Tested	0	0	22	22 tot.	123	18%

- IfHF has fewer than half of the gatekeepers for which they budgeted. They attribute this to the fact that during the October-December hiatus between the close of RiskNet and the beginning of the RiskNet2 grants, they lost many of their gatekeepers. This was partly because they did not have incentives to offer the gatekeepers, and partly because they were not proactive in keeping contact with the gatekeepers. In addition, they lost some of their gatekeepers through the usual “churn” of people moving on to other cities.
- Progress against all the remaining goals is behind. IfHF attributes this to increased police activity and to their lack of gatekeepers. IfHF is the only NGO that includes indirect contacts (i.e., contacts made through their gatekeepers and not only through their outreach workers) in their goals and reported delivery numbers. Their system of monitoring gatekeepers is more sophisticated than the other NGOs in that gatekeepers are required to complete weekly journals or reports summarizing their activities.
- Another factor has impacted the under-delivery of the Testing goal. The National Center for Addictions usually provides IfHF with the equipment they need to take blood samples and also runs the blood tests. In January and February, the Center began testing in prisons and did not have enough extra equipment to give to IfHF. Half way through March, they were able to provide IfHF with the equipment they needed, and testing resumed.

4.6 XY ASSOCIATION (SARAJEVO, BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA)

- XY is using the Gatekeeper Effectiveness model with MSM and Roma, planning to train 150 Roma Gatekeepers and 100 MSM Gatekeepers. They are not continuing their work with the Gatekeeper Reach model.
- XY has recruited and trained their MSM and Roma outreach worker teams. The MSM team consists of gatekeepers from the previous RiskNet project, while the Roma team is new.
- Space has been secured for the gatekeeper trainings. XY has recently created a new drop in shelter for MSM, and the Roma team has secured a space in the target neighborhood.

- The outreach teams have already begun recruiting gatekeepers. Fifteen MSM have been assembled for the first training, and soon 15 will be gathered for the first Roma training.

5. OBJECTIVES FOR REMAINDER OF PROJECT

The major objectives for the remainder of 2006 are as follows:

- **Produce Three-Year Strategic Plans** – One NGO already has a three-year strategic plan; another was in the process of developing one before RiskNet2 began. This project is supporting the development of three-year strategic plans with the remaining four NGOs. These plans should be completed before the June Workshop.
- **Produce Funding Action Plans** – These strategic plans will then inform the development of funding action plans for each of the NGOs. These action plans, to be written during the June workshop, will highlight funding gaps in their strategic plans and propose courses of action for filling those gaps.
- **Begin execution of Funding Action Plans** – The project will track progress against the action plans through the end of the year.
- **Complete individual NGO Management Skills Workshops** – These workshops remain to be conducted with XY, LET and Terra. Like the previous ones, they will focus on providing management skills in order to improve organizational effectiveness. Specifically, the topics are providing informal verbal feedback and designing a formal evaluation system.
- **Provide skills training on Public Relations, Fund Raising, Relationship Building, etc.** – This will occur at the June workshop and was specifically requested by the NGOs. As traditional donors leave the region, the NGOs want to develop skills that would help them raise funds through alternative means.
- **Produce and distribute small media** – The NGOs have requested that more copies of the original RiskNet brochures be produced.
- **Conduct Evaluation** – During the final site visits in September/October, PSI and Abt Associates Inc. will conduct a final evaluation of the RiskNet project. This will include the Gatekeeper Reach and Effectiveness models as well as the capacity building efforts. Details are provided in Appendix 2.

APPENDIX I. EXPLANATION OF KEY MEASURES

Unique Clients...	<u>provides the “reach” of the program by showing the number of unique individuals the NGO served each month.</u> Any quarterly numbers are an average of the delivery over the relevant three months. For example, if Month 1 was 50; Month 2 was 100; and Month 3 was 150, the Monthly Average of Unique Clients for that quarter equals 100.
New Clients...	<u>shows the increase in reach achieved.</u> This measure represents the number of new individuals encountered during outreach or visiting the drop-in centers.
Client Contacts...	<u>is the total number of contacts made with all clients in a given period.</u> For example, if 100 people were contacted twice and 50 people once, the total number of Client Contacts is 250 ($100 \times 2 = 200$. $50 \times 1 = 50$. $200 + 50 = 250$). Note that this number is not cumulative across months or quarters. Then you can divide this measure by the number of Unique Clients to calculate the average number of times an NGO serves each of their clients. To continue the example above, if the number of Unique Clients for that quarter is 100 and the Client Contacts is 250, then it can be inferred that the NGO serves each of those clients 2-3 times during a given month. ($250 \div 100 = 2.5$)
Gatekeepers...	<u>provides the total number of Gatekeepers working in a given period.</u> Note that this number is not cumulative across months or quarters.
Clients Tested...	<u>provides the number of clients the NGO has directly tested or taken to be tested at another facility.</u>

APPENDIX 2. RISKNET2 PERFORMANCE MONITORING AND EVALUATION PLAN

Project Component	Purpose	Outputs	Type of data	Indicator ¹	Data Source/Method of data collection	Frequency of collection
Gatekeeper Reach Dose of Love, Bul. IfHF, Bul. Terra, Croatia LET, Croatia	NGOs use Gatekeeper Reach model to extend their reach to the target population (Improve Opportunity factors related to behavior of target groups)	Gatekeeper Reach model has been effectively implemented	Quantitative	# of gatekeepers trained per NGO	Reports from NGOs	Monthly, Final evaluation
				# of new clients registered by type ² and by any given gatekeeper by NGO	Follow up visits and monthly calls	
Gatekeeper Effectiveness Panacea, Bulgaria XY, Bosnia&Herz	NGOs use Gatekeeper Effectiveness model to increase their influence over the target population (Improve Ability and Motivational factors related to behavior of target groups)	Gatekeeper Effectiveness model has been effectively implemented	Quantitative	pre- and post-training tests of GKs	Pre-post test survey results	Following training
				# of GKs who successfully complete the assigned number of conversations following training	Supervisory Reports	Monthly
			Qualitative	Evidence directly from GKs on changes in behavior among those with whom they interact	Supervisory Reports using checklist of key questions for effectiveness model; GK reports	Monthly

¹ Note, the indicators listed under Gatekeeper Reach model will serve to track success where Gatekeeper Effectiveness is implemented as well

² Type= IDU, CSW, MSM, Roma, as applicable

³ Type= IDU, CSW, MSM, Roma, as applicable

Project Component	Purpose	Outputs	Type of data	Indicator ¹	Data Source/Method of data collection	Frequency of collection
Capacity Building All	Improve organizational capacity of local NGOs	Baseline of NGOs capacity completed	Qualitative	N/A	NGO proposal analysis (SWOTs)	Baseline
		NGOs trained in financial planning, budget management and reporting	Quantitative	# of NGO staff trained in how to cost and budget programs	Reports from NGOs/follow up visits	Monthly / Spring & fall 2006
			Qualitative	# of NGOs that completed new financial analysis on total organizational costs and projected needs Demonstrated capacity of the NGOs to use new skills	Follow up visits	Spring & fall 2006
		NGOs trained in long-term organizational planning	Both	Long term goals and strategies for each NGO well defined and feasible	Reports from NGOs/Follow up visits and monthly calls	Monthly, Final evaluation
				Medium and long-term goals for each NGO are in line with financial projections and donor proposals		
NGOs strategic plan, mission and vision updated	Qualitative	NGOs have a revised strategic plan, mission and vision that better defines them and better positions them for donor support # of NGO staff who spontaneously understand goals and strategies of the organization	Reports from NGOs/Follow up visits and monthly calls	Monthly, Final evaluation		

Project Component	Purpose	Outputs	Type of data	Indicator ¹	Data Source/Method of data collection	Frequency of collection
cont.		NGOs management of external environment strengthened	Both	# of NGOs with feasible Funding Action Plan NGOs have taken steps toward making new donor contacts NGOs community and political ties strengthened # of NGO staff who underwent PR and advocacy skills training	Reports from NGOs/Follow up visits and monthly calls	Monthly, Final evaluation
		NGOs internal management improved	Qualitative ⁴	Increased ability by NGO leadership/management to recognize strengths and weaknesses in capacity Increased capacity by NGO leadership/management to motivate improved performance of staff	In-depth interviews with NGO management and staff	Final Evaluation

⁴ The survey instrument used at baseline showed NGO assessing themselves very high at baseline. RiskNet will look at the results of a second interview with the NGOs to make assessments about the ability of these NGOs to perceive their internal capacity to manage, and to identify and manage strengths and weakness. The analysis will not be quantitative, but rather subjective and within context of how the NGOs have been trained.