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ABSTRACT

This study was undertaken to identify some of the factors that influence successful implementation of strategic plans for projects in not-for profit organizations.

The major objectives of the study were to test whether:

(i) Timely remittance of funds influences successful strategy implementation
(ii) Management staff turnover influences successful strategy implementation
(iii) Donor restrictions influences successful strategy implementation
(iv) Communication between donors, implementers and constituents/customers influences successful strategy implementation

The population was made up of all the vision 2000 projects in Africa (total of 15 at the time of proposal writing).

Data was collected through analysis of reports and administering of a questionnaire. The data was then analysed by use of graphs and tables to relate organisations identified to be successful with the results of each of the variable. For purposes of this study two key measures of success were used for the selected organisations. The first was absorptive capacity and implementation rate while the second was fulfilment of strategic plan objectives

The overall result of the study was that:

- Delays in remittance of funds affects the successful implementation of strategic plans by putting on hold activities due to lack of funds,
- High management staff turnover has a negative effect on successful implementation of strategic plans,
- Donor restrictions do not necessarily influence successful implementation of strategic plans and,
• The method of communication with constituents and donors, and timely submission of reports does not necessarily influence the successful implementation of plans.
1 CHAPTER ONE

1.1 INTRODUCTION

The International Planned Parenthood Federation (IPPF) is a not-for-profit organization in sexual and reproductive health sector. IPPF is responsible for monitoring, evaluating and providing technical assistance to the projects that it funds in the Family Planning Association (FPA) all over Africa. The funds are received from various donors and remitted to the member FPA’s for project implementation. There is a specific fund called the Vision 2000 Fund (V2F). This fund was established as a catalytic force to boost the efforts of the FPA countries so that they would become more innovative and even venture to meet the current and future challenges of sexual and reproductive health globally and within the context of IPPF strategic plan.

The V2F projects are expected to demonstrate and also have a long term effect on FPA’s, the communities they serve and their partners. In this respect, the fund seeks to encourage high quality, innovative projects, which emphasize capacity building and sustainability. There are 14 operational projects in Africa under this fund.

1.2 PROBLEM STATEMENT

According to F L Harrison (1992), the reasons for the success or failure of projects and project management are many and varied. A number of studies have been carried out to identify the principal factors. At first glance, a project that does not meet its time, cost and technical performance objectives would appear to be a failure, but this is not necessarily so. It is “perceived” success or failure that is important and provided a project achieves a satisfactory level of technical performance, in retrospect it may be considered a success by the parties involved, despite exceeding its cost and time targets. The criterion of success or failure is whether the project sponsor, owner, client and other parties concerned, including the project manager’s parent company, are satisfied with the final outcome of the project.
Most of the projects carried out in not-for-profit (NFP) organizations in Africa and other less developed countries of the world are those that deal with poverty alleviation and improvement of the quality of life of constituents. This may be through service provision, capacity building, relief aid etc. In Africa preparation of strategic plans was in the past mainly done by profit making organizations and it is only in recent years that the NFP sector has began the practice of strategic planning.

One of the requirements for V2F is the preparation of strategic plans. The study investigated the extent to which the identified organizations had been successful in implementing the plans. Failure to successfully implement the strategic plan is a problem to both the donor and the recipient of funds as it may result in reduced income based on what the donor perceives to be the cause of failure. The unsuccessful implementation may also result in higher monitoring and control costs in future as stakeholders attempt to minimize chances of greater losses.

These fourteen projects were selected for the study because they are projects of a similar nature that cover a wide region (Africa in this case). A study that covers 14 different organisations in different countries that are implementing the same strategic plan (vision 2000 strategic plan) is of great interest and the secondary data (reports) was available for review.

1.3 OBJECTIVE

The main objective of the proposed research was to determine some of the factors that influenced successful implementation of strategic plans in projects funded by IPPF Vision 2000. These factors have been detailed out in the next section where an analysis showing how the hypotheses were selected is carried out

1.4 HYPOTHESES

F.L Harrison (1992) reports a study carried out in the USA by Baker, Murphy and Fisher on the subject of project implementation. They studied 650 projects and identified a large number of factors that affected the success of projects, the failure of
projects and those that affected both success and failure. They also consolidated their findings and identified the following:

The prime factors leading to project failure were:

- Poor co-ordination
- Human relations

The prime factors leading to project success were:

- Adequate and appropriate organisational structures
- Adequate and appropriate planning and control mechanisms.

Other factors for effective implementation identified by Quest worldwide education Ltd. (1997) in their publication “make things happen”, are:

- An effective communication system
- Effective teamwork
- Information systems
- Contingency planning
- Progress monitoring and review
- Customer focus
- Working conditions
- Legal and health and safety

The above literature review coupled with field experience led to the identification of the following four hypotheses which this project proposes to test.

1) Timely remittance of funds influences successful strategy implementation
2) Management staff turnover influences successful strategy implementation
3) Donor restrictions influences successful strategy implementation
4) Communication between donors, implementers and constituents/customers influences successful strategy implementation
The independent variables were therefore:

1. Remittance of funds (d)
2. Management staff turnover (m)
3. Donor restrictions (r)
4. Communication (c)

While the dependant variable was “Successful strategy implementation.” This relationship can be shown as follows.

Successful strategy implementation = f (d,m,r,c)
2 CHAPTER 2

2.1 REVIEW OF LITERATURE

2.1.1 Strategic Planning

Planning is the rational and systematic determination of where an organization presently stands, where it hopes to be, and how it will get there. It is a process concerned with the future impact of decisions that are made in the present. Long range and strategic planning encompass the entire organization as opposed to one area of operation, and focus on the organization's most pressing concerns. A strategic plan to address a problem area outlines how the organization will focus its energies and resources over the next few years to resolve the issue. (Duca, 1996).

A study carried out by Lloyd C. Harris (1999) on the means through which the entrenched values of an organizational culture can impede initiating planning found that six entrenched values appear to have impeded the initiation of planning within the company under study. These are reactiveness, management activities and practice; compartmentalization, short-term cost orientation, internal focus and stability. The study indicates that the initiation of planning is problematic for organizations; possibly explaining why so few organizations plan strategically. In the context of the case study, the initiation of planning involved confronting deeply held values which members of the retail store (the case study) had developed to make sense of their environment. Thus by rigidly adhering to existing values and avoiding planning, members of the store avoided a cosmology episode and ensured that their working environment remains rational and orderly. The study indicated that entrenched cultural values that are inconsistent with planning impose a substantial negative effect on the likelihood of planning initiation. Hence, it would appear that for planning to begin, certain cultural values need to be absent and it would seem inherently logical that other values would have to be present. This implies that the
instigation of a planning effort is culturally dependent and that management, initiating planning should be aware not only of the complexities of planning but also be conversant with the intricacies of organizational culture.

According to Luehrman T A (1998), when executives create strategy, they project themselves and their organizations into the future, creating a path from where they are now, to where they want to be some years down the road. In competitive markets, though, no one expects to formulate a detailed long-term plan and follow it mindlessly. As soon as we start down the path, we begin learning – about business conditions, competitors’ actions, the quality of our preparations and so forth – and we need to respond flexibly to what we learn. Unfortunately, the financial tool most widely relied on to estimate the value of strategy – discounted-cash-flow (DCF) valuation – assumes that we will follow a predetermined plan, regardless of how events unfold. A better approach to valuation would incorporate both the uncertainty inherent in business and the active decision making required for a strategy to succeed. It would help executives think strategically on their feet by capturing the value of doing just that – of managing actively rather than passively. Options can deliver that extra insight. Advances in both computing power and our understanding of option pricing over the last 20 years make it feasible now to begin analyzing business strategies as chains of real options. As a result, the creative activity of strategy formulation can be informed by valuation analyses sooner rather than later. Financial insight may actually contribute to shaping strategy, rather than being relegated to an after-the-fact exercise of “checking the numbers.”

As much as strategic plans are supposed to assist organizations achieve their objectives in the most efficient manner, due care should be taken not to be too rigid. We live in a dynamic environment and strategic plans should be written in pencil so that they can be rubbed and changed when the need calls for it. When organizations feel bound to continue following a strategic plan that has been overtaken by events and the decision makers do not respond to changes in good time a lot of resources are wasted in the pursuit of objectives that are no longer relevant. It is for this reason that one can question the relevance of strategic plans in the NFP sector. As most of the developing countries in which they carry out their activities operate in turbulent environments that are subject to frequent changes.
2.1.2 Focus on Not-for-profit Sector

Research studies show that Parastatals receiving higher proportion of income from commercial markets generally have higher performance [Gutu, 1989]

"On the basis of the case studies of eight major donors operating in Africa (The United States, United Kingdom, France, Sweden, Italy, Japan, World Bank and the European Union) it is clear that the principal causes of developmental ineffectiveness of aid have been two.

- The allocation of that aid for non developmental purposes – primarily diplomatic and commercial
- The lack of capacity on the part of aid agencies to undertake the kind of interventions they have attempted with the amount of aid they have tried to disperse" [Lancaster, 1999].

Regina Herzlinger, claims in a Harvard Business Review article that non profits lack the guidance the market provides corporations. The reactions of clients to the products and services that non profits offer are not as revealing as the responses of customers to the products and services sold by a for profit company because non-profits are usually subsidised and their services are frequently free. Clients are more likely to forgive poor quality and ignore inefficiency. Consequently, board members cannot rely on key indicator of corporate success – the value of services sold – to evaluate their organisations’ performance.... Consequently, the board must devise its own system of measurement and control. Based on studies of hundreds of non-profit organisations during the last 25 years she has developed four questions that can help board members create such a system:

1) Are the organization’s goals consistent with its financial resources?
2) Is the organization practicing intergenerational equity?
3) Are the sources and uses of funds appropriately matched?
4) Is the organization sustainable?
Together these four questions can offer a framework to help board members provide the critical oversight that non-profit organizations need in order to survive.

If a nonprofit is to effectively meet its goals, it must continually adjust its programs to changing or new demands, changes in its resources and organizational capacity, and changes in the social, economic, and political environment. Successful organizations maintain an open-minded attitude toward reassessment and reevaluation of their missions (DUCA, 1996).

2.1.3 Factors influencing strategy implementation

A study carried out by Rue and Ibrahim on the relationship between planning sophistication and performance in small businesses shows that greater planning sophistication is associated with growth in sales. In addition, there is a moderately significant relationship between planning and perceived performance relative to the industry. On the other hand, no significant relationship was found with respect to return on investment (ROI). This raises an important issue: although a higher sales growth was reported by companies with more sophisticated planning processes and their executives felt that their firms’ performance exceeded industry averages, one of the objective measures of performance ROI was not affected. Although those with a sophisticated planning process report higher rates of growth in sales, it is also possible that these revenues are not bringing about higher profits because of internal inefficiencies and capital constraints. This would be consistent with previous research that found small firms to be lacking in the specialized managerial and financial resources needed to acquire information in an accurate, timely or efficient manner. Furthermore, because of their capital constraints, they are especially vulnerable to environmental shifts (Carland, et al. 1984; Taylor and Banks 1992).

A study of 84 companies in Kenya (1992) by Aosa revealed that the firms experienced various problems in implementing strategic decisions at various levels of severity. The following problems were reported at relatively high levels of severity:

a) implementation took more time than was originally allocated
b) uncontrollable factors in the external environment had adverse impact on implementation

c) major obstacles surfaced during implementation that had not been identified beforehand

d) competing activities and crises distracted attention from implementing the strategic decision

e) key implementation tasks were not defined in enough detail

f) resources made available were not adequate

g) coordination of implementation activities was not effective enough

[Aosa, 1992.]

"The disconnect between strategy formulation and strategy implementation is caused by barriers erected by traditional management systems" [Kaplan, 1996]. Kaplan and Norton identify four specific barriers to effective strategy implementation.

- Vision and strategy not actionable
- Strategy not linked to departmental team and individual goals
- Strategy not linked to resource allocation; and
- Feedback that is tactical not strategic.

According to these two authors success for government and not-for-profit organizations should be measured by how effectively and efficiently they meet the needs of their constituencies.

2.1.4 Suggested solutions to implementation problems

Regina E. Herzlinger (1996) talks about how to restore public trust in non-profits and governments. She discusses the "DADS" as a remedy. Increased disclosure, analysis, and dissemination of information on the performance of non-profit and governmental organizations, and the application of sanctions against those that do not comply with these requirements can be a remedy to the lost trust.
Lloyd C Harris suggests that executives wishing to analyze cultural values as potential barriers to planning could observe the following agenda:

- Identify the work-oriented views which employees value (that is, in which ways do employees think that they and other employees should act);
- Categorise values according to their effect on initiating planning (for example, the widespread view that the company should look to the future will have a positive influence, whilst the view that each function should ‘fight their own corner’ will exert a negative effect);
- Categorise negative values according to the depth of feeling consistency across all types of employees;
- Finally, identify values that may be influenced by judicious internal marketing and attempt to change them (for example, the negative view that each function should “fight their own corner” could be manipulated by clever internal marketing into the organisation should ‘fight their own corner.’ In this way the value is maintained but the focus of the value redirected towards a more positive goal).

2.2 JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

Most of the studies that have previously been carried out on strategy implementation are on profit making organizations. This is because for a long time strategy was regarded as useful only for those firms that were in stiff competition and needed to get an edge over competitors so as to earn higher profits. Most of the contributors to strategic management have only recently started exploring the not-for-profit sector and strategy. The projects under this study are projects carried out at the grass root level and their orientation is bound to be much more different than that of big charitable organizations, or institutions like hospitals and international universities. The study is therefore focusing on projects that face a very different environment than those in the western world.

The benefits of this study are twofold, one on the part of the donors and the other to the project implementers.
For the organizations that implement the projects, the benefit will be that they will be able to avoid the same mistakes that lead to poor implementation of strategic plans that will be identified by the research. This is more so the case given that there are over 40 member associations in the Africa region that benefit from IPPF funds and these organizations are very similar in structure and organization. The study results would apply to these IPPF member organizations as well as other not for profit organizations.

For the donor organizations, it may better enable them appreciate the various factors that lead to poor implementation of the originally laid down strategies. This may enable them devise ways of assisting the organizations deal with these problems.
3 CHAPTER 3

3.1 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1.1 Population and selection of cases

The population was made up of all the vision 2000 projects in Africa (total of 14 at the time of proposal writing). Following is a table of the V2F projects that were being funded.

Table 1: Vision 2000 Projects in Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>PROJECT TITLE</th>
<th>APPROVAL DATE</th>
<th>NO. OF YEARS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KENYA</td>
<td>Reaching out to men: the forgotten 50%</td>
<td>Oct 1994</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TANZANIA</td>
<td>Expanded clinic &amp; CBD/FP Services</td>
<td>Jul 1994</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BURKINA FASO</td>
<td>Services for youth</td>
<td>Apr 1996</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETHIOPIA</td>
<td>FP Services/FLE for youth</td>
<td>Apr 1996</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GHANA</td>
<td>FP Service expansion</td>
<td>Apr 1996</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUINEA</td>
<td>Family health program for the under served</td>
<td>Apr 1996</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONAKRY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWAZILAND</td>
<td>Social Mobilization &amp; Dept./FP services</td>
<td>Apr 1996</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOGO</td>
<td>Community Based Distribution</td>
<td>Apr 1996</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COTE D’IVOIRE</td>
<td>Youth centers project in Lome and Sakode</td>
<td>Apr 1996</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOTSWANA</td>
<td>Integration of women in SRH services</td>
<td>Jan 1997</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SENEGAL</td>
<td>Promotion of integrated MCH/FP services</td>
<td>Apr 1997</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPE VERDE</td>
<td>SRH services for youth</td>
<td>Apr 1995</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIERRA LEONE</td>
<td>Services for youth</td>
<td>Sept 1998</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOUTH AFRICA</td>
<td>SRH Adolescents</td>
<td>Sept 1998</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3.1.2 Data Collection

The dependant variable was “successful implementation of strategic plans.” There were mainly two aspects to measure the success of implementation. First was the financial and second the programmatic. The determination on whether a project had been successful or not was done by a review of reports and other data on the projects (see observation tables under appendix B). After determination of whether a project was successful or not, the questionnaires were analyzed and answers rated. Questions that tested a particular hypothesis were assigned marks and different grading levels assigned. Following is a summary of the data that was required to test the hypotheses.

Table 2: Data Required to Test Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HYPOTHESIS</th>
<th>DATA REQUIRED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1) Delays in remittance of funds has led to ineffective strategy implementation | • Remittance of funds to the organizations  
• Date due and date received                                                |
| 2) Management staff turnover contributes to ineffective strategy formulation | • Management staff turnover                                                  |
| 3) Inflexible donor restrictions contributes to ineffective strategy implementation | • Frequency of progress reports  
• Response by donors to issues raised in progress reports  
• Project achievements in relation to objectives                          |
| 4) Poor communication between donors, implementers and beneficiary of service contributes to ineffective strategy implementation. | • Existing communication channels  
• Existing MIS systems                                                       |
Below is a table that shows the questions in the questionnaire that captured data related to each variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>CAPTURED BY QUESTIONS:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remittance of funds</td>
<td>8 - 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management staff turnover</td>
<td>12 - 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor restrictions</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>15 - 20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The research used questionnaires in gathering data. Open-ended questions were combined with structured questions in order to capture all the relevant factors without limiting respondents. (questionnaire under appendix A). The questionnaire was to be filled by the executive directors or program manager. Since 43% of the Vision 2000 projects were from French-speaking countries, the questionnaire was translated into French. After translating the questionnaire into French it was back translated into English so as to ensure the accuracy of the translation.

There were some reports submitted by the organizations under review that were reviewed as part of the observational studies (Appendix B). These were combined with the Questionnaires.

3.1.3 Operational Definitions Of Variables.

a) Successful Strategy Implementation – the extent to which the project has achieved the originally laid down objectives in the vision 2000 strategic plan and displayed good financial discipline according to IPPF standards and my analysis.

b) Delays in Remittance of funds – receipt of funds one or more months after the due date

c) Management staff turnover – frequency with which the Executive Director and his functional heads leave the organisation.
d) Inflexible Donor restriction – clauses within donor agreement that restrict the use of funds.

e) Poor Communication – delays in reporting and response from donors and coordinators or inability to transfer information effectively

Data was analyzed by use of statistical tools like frequency tables and graphs in order to identify the key factors.
4 CHAPTER 4

4.1 RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

Out of the 14 Questionnaires sent out, only 9 were returned. Our analysis therefore focuses on these nine organizations. These Nine organisations are listed under appendix C. However due to the need for confidentiality the following analysis has assigned the organisations numbers 1-9. The organisations had different implementation number of years but the average number of years was three years. Following is an analysis of the results in relation to the different dimensions of successful strategy implementation that were to be tested.

To test the dimension of project success, a review of reports submitted by the organizations and the vision 2000 strategic plan was carried out. As a rule of thumb in IPPF the acceptable expenditure to budget/expenditure to disbursement rate was 75%. Therefore projects that were unable to meet this rate were perceived to have either low absorptive capacity or implementation bottlenecks that may have resulted in idle funds. There were nine vision 2000 objectives that were relevant to the organizations under review. For purposes of this study, a project that was designed to address at least 50% of the vision 2000 objectives was categorized as successful from a strategic point of view. A project that was below this benchmark was deemed to be unsuccessful, whether expenditure to budget and disbursements was high or not. This was because expenditure for implementation that did not satisfy the strategic plan objectives could not be deemed successful. Failure in any two of the three indicators resulted in the project being categorized as unsuccessful subject to the above-mentioned condition on strategic plan objectives being met. Table 4 summarizes this analysis (detailed analysis under appendix B). Five of the Nine projects analyzed were successful.
Table 4: Determinants of Project Success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>%age Expenditure to budget</th>
<th>%age Expenditure to disbursements</th>
<th>Contribution to vision 2000 strategic plan objectives</th>
<th>OUTCOME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Proposals, reports and vision 2000 strategic plan (see appendix B for detailed analysis)

Table 5: Reasons Underlying the Preparation of Strategic Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>OBSERVATION STATUS</th>
<th>Reason for strategic planning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Requirement by donors, consultant recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Requirement by donors, consultant recommendation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Source: Questionnaires

All the organizations prepare strategic plans as a result of management decision. However three of the organizations prepared the plans also because it was a requirement by some donors while two of the selected organizations prepared the plans as a result of a recommendation by external consultants. All apart from one organization prepared five year strategic plans. Only one organization prepared three year strategic plans. Again the majority (7 organizations) reviewed their plans annually while one reviewed the plan after every three years and the other reviewed the plan whenever there was a need to do so. This data is presented under Table 5.

Figure 1: Delays in Remittance of Funds

Source: Questionnaires

Organization numbers four, five, six, seven and nine were unsuccessful in their implementation according to report analysis carried out under this research. The analysis shows that the organizations registering the highest scores hence greater delay in remittance
(i.e. organization numbers one and eight) were rated as successful. However, two of the four successful organizations registered low scores in experiencing delays in remittance of funds. From a total score of 25, all the unsuccessful organizations had scores below 20.

**Table 6: Relating Management Staff Turnover to Successful Strategy Implementation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>OBSERVATION STATUS</th>
<th>MANAGEMENT STAFF TURNOVER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>LOW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>HIGH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Questionnaire

Out of a total of five management staff directly involved in the implementation staff turnover was rated as high if more than one person had occupied three of the positions over the past five years and moderate of there had been a change in only two of the positions. Turnover was considered low if there had been change in only one or none of the positions over the past five years.

There was clearly a direct relationship between successful implementation of strategy and staff turnover. All the unsuccessful organizations had high to moderate staff turnover among the key management staff.
Figure 2: Effect of Inflexible Donor Restriction on Successful Implementation

![Bar chart](chart.png)

Source: Questionnaires

Out of a total score of 25, organizations 2,3,4,5,8 and 9 had scores of over 15. All the successful implementers save for one organization reported significant problems in inflexible donor restrictions.

Table 7: Relating Successful Implementation with Communication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>OBSERVATION STATUS</th>
<th>MODE OF COMMUNICATION USED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Mail, computer, telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Mail, computer, telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Computer, telephone, fax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Mail, Computer, telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Mail, Telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Mail, Computer, telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>UNSUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Mail, Computer, telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Mail, Computer, telephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>SUCCESSFUL</td>
<td>Mail, telephone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Questionnaires
All the successful implementers commonly used computer or e-mail mode of communication.
5 CHAPTER 5

5.1 SUMMARY DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Although fourteen questionnaires were sent out, only nine were received back. This is a 60% response. The discussion therefore focuses on these nine questionnaires. Following is a detailed analysis of the results in relation to the different dimensions of successful strategy implementation that were to be tested.

5.1.1 Successful Strategy Implementation

Five out of the nine organisations analysed were considered successful (see table 4). In as much as secondary data (reports) was used to determine this aspect of the study, a clear trend appears to emerge with successful organisations all coming from one region and most of them being Anglophone. On the other hand, two of the unsuccessful organisations were from the Southern region of Africa while the other two were from West Africa. There are clearly other factors that affected the success. For example, one of the unsuccessful organisations was from a country that had been experiencing rebel attacks over the last couple of years and this had an impact on implementation. For purposes of this study, the success was determined by reviewing financial and programmatic discipline and absorptive capacity of the organisation (see detailed analysis under appendix B).

After the determination of which projects were successful or unsuccessful from the analysis of reports, proposals and the strategic plan, an attempt was made to link these results with those of the questionnaires.
5.1.2 Data analysis

Nine out of the fourteen organizations selected responded to the questionnaire. Following is a detailed review of the answers given in relation to the variables that were being tested.

General

One would have expected a greater degree of successful implementation in the organizations that prepare strategic plans as a result of management decision as this would imply greater commitment on the part of management. However, there is one organization that prepared strategic plans as a result of consultant recommendation and as a requirement by some donors and still managed to implement successfully. The commitment from top management does not therefore only arise when the strategic planning exercise is as a result of an organization's own decision but can also arise when external factors influence the planning exercise.

Conclusion:
Successful implementation of strategic plans is not necessarily influenced by the reasons given by the organization for planning. Rather, it is the management commitment that will influence the implementation of the strategic plan.

Remittance of Funds

The vision 2000 funds are supposed to be remitted quarterly to the organizations and this was understood by all the organizations except one. Only three of the nine organizations usually received their funds on time. Figure 1 displays the results of the scores earned by each organization in relation to delays in remittance of funds.

Organization numbers four, five, six, seven and nine were unsuccessful in their implementation according to report analysis carried out under this research. The analysis shows that the organizations registering the highest scores hence greater delay in remittance (i.e. organization numbers one and eight) were rated as successful. However, two of the
four successful organizations registered low scores in experiencing delays in remittance of funds. From a total score of 25, all the unsuccessful organizations had scores below 20. The two firms who answered positively to timely remittance of funds are among those rated successful. A factor that might explain this discrepancy for firm numbers one and eight is that the successful organizations had other sources of funding available for use while awaiting the vision 2000 funds. Another important factor is that out of the seven organizations that claimed funds are not always remitted on time, four had an average delay periods of 1-2 months, one had nine months, another four months and the final organization had indefinite periods. In general, the average delay period specifically for these two organizations (two months) was too low to negatively impact the implementation. The organizations that had four months, nine months and indefinite delay periods were all unsuccessful.

Conclusion:
We can therefore conclude that delays in remittance of funds do affect the successful implementation of plans. This is particularly so where the delay is significant in terms of the number of months. Insignificant delays like one or two months do not necessarily have significant impact on successful project implementation.

Management Staff Turnover

There was clearly a direct relationship between successful implementation of strategy and staff turnover. All the unsuccessful organizations had high to moderate staff turnover among the key management staff (see Table 6). These results are to be expected because when key management staff change, the commitment to the project is not often as high as the staff who started off the project. In most cases the pre-planning meetings and orientation to the project workshops go a long way in creating a sense of ownership among the management staff to the project. It is important to note that because each of the organizations are from different countries, various environmental influences affect staff turnover. For example in Botswana staff turnover may tend to be high because of employment opportunities and higher remuneration offered by e.g. government agencies. In Sierra Leone also there may be high staff turnover due to rebel activities. Therefore the classifications of low to moderate are fuelled by different factors in different countries.
However, whatever the factor, the study shows a direct relationship between high staff turnover and unsuccessful implementation of projects.

**Conclusion**

High staff turnover has a negative effect on successful implementation of strategic plans.

**Donor restrictions**

Out of a total score of 25, organizations 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9 had scores of over 15 (see Figure 2). All the successful implementers save for one organization reported significant problems in inflexible donor restrictions. Organization number 7 is the only one that experienced a less than ten score in this variable and yet it was still unsuccessful. The fact that the organizations were still successful despite the problems experienced may lead us to the conclusion that donor restrictions per se may not influence success of a project in a negative manner, but may slow down implementation as approval for changes are sought. Donor restrictions are mainly put in the agreement to act as checks and controls. Although a number of organizations have often complained that these restrictions act as a deterrent to the successful implementation of projects, it appears that the bureaucracy associated with the approval of deviations from the agreement is what affects the implementation process.

**Conclusion**

Donor restrictions do not necessarily influence successful implementation of projects as most of these are put in place to act as controls. With appropriate communication most of these restrictions can be changed.

**Communication**

All the successful implementers commonly used computer or e-mail mode of communication. This method facilitates rapid flow of information between the implementers and the donors. However, there are also some unsuccessful implementers who used the e-mail mode of communication therefore the results are not conclusive in any one particular direction. All these organizations are in African countries that generally have poor infrastructure and therefore an organization might have e-mail in principle but because
the telephone lines are down on a frequent basis the e-mail may be inactive more often than not. There appears therefore to be marginal benefits from using one mode of communication over another.

Five out of the nine organizations usually met their reporting deadlines and the other four who never met the deadlines all had an average delay period of one month. Five of the respondents considered the frequency of reporting (quarterly) very high while the remaining four considered it average.

Conclusion:
When the reporting frequency is high, most organizations are unable to meet the deadlines, and monitoring on a timely basis becomes ineffective. The method of communication does not necessarily influence the successful implementation of plans, rather it is what the management do with the information communicated that will lead to corrective action. Timely submission of reports does not necessarily lead to successful implementation, rather, it is the speed with which the issues in the report are addressed and communicated to the project implementers that will influence success.

Other problems

Other problems experienced by the selected organizations in the course of implementing their plans are:

- Delays in approvals of proposals, purchases etc.
- High staff turnover within the donor organisation which in turn influences established relationships with regard to reporting, approvals etc.
- Weak supervision and technical assistance from the donor
- Poor sustainability structures leading to collapse of project once funding is over
- Environmental problems unique to each country e.g. Socio-cultural barriers, poor government support etc.
5.1.3 Limitations of the Study

The study proposed to investigate fourteen organisations in fourteen countries. Only nine organisations responded leading to data analysis being carried out on these nine. There is the probability that the conclusions arrived at might have been different had all the fourteen organisations responded. However, despite the sample for the case study being small, previous studies that have been carried out corroborate the results of this study. For example, a study carried out by Aosa (see Literature review) identified some factors causing implementation problems as resources being inadequate, ineffective co-ordination, unforeseen factors and delays in implementation among others. Regina Herzlinger (1996) also cites four questions that can enable board members devise a system of measurement and control based on studies of hundreds of non-profit organisations. These questions address the consistency of organisational goals with resources, matching of sources and use of funds, practice of intergenerational equity and sustainability of the organisation.

Another limitation or weakness is that the organisations were all in different countries subject to different environmental influences. This made standardisation of assumptions difficult. For example, what may be considered as high staff turnover in Tanzania or Kenya would not be considered high in Botswana. This is because on average staff turnover tends to be higher in Botswana due to availability of employment opportunities.

There are also inherent weaknesses to the mail survey and questionnaire method of data collection. According to Cooper and Emory (1995), it is generally believed that respondents will refuse to co-operate with a long and complex questionnaire. The questionnaire administered was not considered to be long and complex, but some of the interviewees were new in their posts and were therefore unable to answer some questions accurately. The questionnaires were to be filled by the Executive Directors or program managers and all of them were filled by one of these two individuals.

5.1.4 Recommendations for project managers

As a result of the conclusions drawn from the study, the following recommendations can be made to managers of projects in charge of implementing plans.
Project managers should ensure as much as possible that funds are remitted to the project sites in time in order for the activities not to stall. Long delays of over two months may have a negative effect on the implementation of activities and subsequently success of the project.

The project managers should also ensure that there are open channels of communication between them, the donors and the beneficiaries. This can ensure that any bottlenecks caused by restrictive clauses within the donor agreement can be addressed on a case by case basis and permission for deviations granted on a timely basis.

Of great importance to the project managers is the need to motivate staff and elicit loyalty and commitment from staff. Staff should be involved in the project right from the time of proposal writing. This ensures that the staff are made to feel like part and parcel of the project and creates a sense of ownership to the project. This is of paramount importance since the study has shown that there is a direct relationship between high staff turnover and unsuccessful implementation of plans.

Although reporting methods and timeliness do not necessarily influence successful implementation of plans, the study found that too high a frequency of reporting is no more effective than a low or moderate level. It is the feedback given by those who review the report that will have an impact on implementation. Project managers should therefore make attempts to always seek feedback on the reports that they submit in order to ensure timely corrective action in the event of problems.

5.1.5 Recommendations for future research

This study attempted to test four hypotheses that could have an impact on successful strategy implementation. In reality there are a number of other factors that influence strategy implementation.

Given adequate time and resources, it would be interesting to focus on any one aspect and study the variations across different regions. For example, communication within different countries (regions) is at different levels of development. To what extent does the
level of development affect implementation of plans due to the need to communicate to donors and beneficiaries.

Given the extent of liberalisation and Global tendencies, regional characteristics are of great value to donors. For example the European Union has realised the importance of viewing projects from a regional perspective and now prefers to fund regional initiatives. They argue that it does not make any sense to say tackle the Aids problem in Kenya and leave out Uganda and Tanzania. Experience has shown that regions with more or less similar cultures and characteristics (e.g. East Africa, South Africa or West Africa) usually experience similar problems and these should be solved in a unified manner if possible.

Future research should therefore attempt to explain some of the factors that affect successful implementation of strategic plans with specific regional emphasis.
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APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - QUESTIONNAIRE:

FACTORS INFLUENCING SUCCESSFUL IMPLEMENTATION OF STRATEGIC PLANS IN VISION 2000 PROJECTS

I  GENERAL INFORMATION

1) Country________________________________________

2) Title of interviewee_____________________________________

II  STRATEGIC PLANNING

3) Does your organization prepare strategic plans? Yes/No

4) Which of the following factors best describes your organization’s reasons for preparing the strategic plans?
   a) It is a requirement by some donors
   b) It is a management decision
   c) It was a recommendation by consultants/technical advisors
   d) Other (please specify)______________________________

5) What is the time frame covered by your strategic plan?
   a) 1 year
   b) 2 years
   c) 3 years
   d) 5 years
   e) other (please specify)______________________________

6) How frequently are your strategic plans reviewed?
III IMPLEMENTATION

7) How often are vision 2000 funds remitted to your organization
   a) Monthly
   b) Quarterly
   c) Annually
   d) No definite interval
   e) Other (please specify no. of months) 

8) Are funds often remitted according to schedule? Yes/No

9) If not what is the average delay period?
   a) 1 month
   b) 2 months
   c) 3 months
   d) 4 months
   e) Other (please specify no. of months) 

10) To what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements concerning remittance of funds to your organization under the vision 2000 project.

   Strongly disagree        strongly agree
   
   a) The funds are always remitted on time
        1     2     3     4     5
b) There are no problems experienced
   In remitting the funds
   1  2  3  4  5

c) An attempt is usually made to
   Minimize exchange losses when
   Funds are remitted
   1  2  3  4  5

d) There are often alternative
   sources of funds available
   When delays are experienced
   1  2  3  4  5

11) How many of your MANAGEMENT staff are/were directly involved in the
    implementation of the vision 2000 project? (list the staff titles below)

   a) __________________________________________

   b) __________________________________________

   c) __________________________________________

   d) __________________________________________

   e) __________________________________________

   f) __________________________________________

12) For each position, indicate the number of people who have occupied it over the
    past five years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>No of people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13) Indicate the extent to which the following factors were or were not a problem in the course of implementing the vision 2000 project in your organization.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was not a problem</th>
<th>was a major problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| a) There were too many clauses
  Within the donor agreement
  Restricting the use of funds | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| b) There was/is a need to change
  Original timetables &
  Objectives | 1 2 3 4 5           |
| c) The donor/technical advisors
  needed to agree to these |                     |

36
changes

1 2 3 4 5

d) Getting approval from the
Donor involved a lot of
Bureaucracy
1 2 3 4 5

e) Delays in getting prompt
Approval for changes within
The project had an adverse impact
On project implementation
1 2 3 4 5

14) How does your organization communicate with the vision 2000 fund coordinators and donors?

a) by postal mail
b) by E-mail /Computer
c) by telephone
d) other (specify) _______________________

15) How does your organization communicate with the project staff on site?

a) By postal mail
b) by E-mail/computer
c) by telephone
d) other (specify) _______________________

16) How frequently are vision 2000 reports actually submitted?

a) monthly
b) quarterly
c) annually
d) no definite interval
e) others (please specify no. of months)

17) In the above-mentioned frequency, how do you consider the rate of reporting?

a) very low
b) low
c) average
d) high
e) very high

18) Does your organization often meet the deadline for these reports? Yes ( )/No ( )

19) If No, indicate the usual extent of delay in terms of months

a) 1 month
b) 2 months
c) 3 months
d) 4 months
e) Other (please indicate no. of months)

20) What other problems are/were experienced by your organization during vision 2000 project implementation? (please list below)

a) ____________________________

b) ____________________________

c) ____________________________

d) ____________________________
APPENDIX B - OBSERVATION CHARTS

Measurement of absorptive capacity and implementation rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ORGANISATION</th>
<th>BUDGET TO 1999</th>
<th>DISBURSEMENTS</th>
<th>EXPENDITURE</th>
<th>% expenditure to budget</th>
<th>% expenditure to disbursements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4,893,658</td>
<td>4,192,093</td>
<td>3,993,025</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>264,675</td>
<td>291,953</td>
<td>251,144</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>924,177</td>
<td>586,950</td>
<td>524,740</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>257,681</td>
<td>233,716</td>
<td>173,046</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>904,311</td>
<td>472,109</td>
<td>434,214</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>290,875</td>
<td>220,921</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>535,429</td>
<td>482,834</td>
<td>475,920</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1,799,291</td>
<td>1,879,303</td>
<td>1,819,017</td>
<td>101%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2,000,000</td>
<td>1,265,723</td>
<td>1,091,142</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Summary of vision 2000 quarterly reports submitted to the Central and Regional Office.
II Realization of vision 2000 strategic plan objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>Objective 1</th>
<th>Objective 2</th>
<th>Objective 3</th>
<th>Objective 4</th>
<th>Objective 5</th>
<th>Objective 6</th>
<th>Objective 7</th>
<th>Objective 8</th>
<th>Objective 9</th>
<th>TOTAL SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data analysis: Project proposals and vision 2000 strategic plan (summarised below)

KEY

0  OBJECTIVE NOT REALISED BY PROJECT
1  OBJECTIVE REALISED BY PROJECT
GOAL 1

Advance the basic human right of all women, men and youth to make free and informed choices regarding their own sexual and reproductive health, and advocate for the means to exercise this right. Ensure that women’s equality and right to family planning, sexual and reproductive health remain a priority in national and international development policies.

OBJECTIVES UNDER GOAL 1

1. To increase efforts to safeguard the individual’s right to make free and informed choices in regard to reproductive and sexual health and advocate sound government policy in support of this right
2. To bring about the removal of political, legal and administrative barriers to the provision of sexual and reproductive health care services
3. To actively work for the establishment of equal rights for women to enable them to exercise control over their own reproductive and sexual health choices
4. To eliminate the high incidence of unsafe abortion, and increase the right of access to safe, legal abortion
5. To increase men’s commitment and joint responsibility in all areas of sexual and reproductive health and sensitize men to gender issues, as an essential element in ensuring women’s equality and an enriched couple relationship for both men and women.
6. To promote family life education as a means of preparing youth for responsible parenthood in the future and increase the access of young people to appropriate information, education and services in addressing their reproductive and sexual health care needs

GOAL 2

Respond to the increased unmet need for family planning, sexual and reproductive health services; address in particular the needs of marginal and disadvantaged groups within society; and work in partnership with governments, international agencies and private organizations.
OBJECTIVES UNDER GOAL 2

7. To provide an authoritative source of information on family planning and sexual health issues, trends, policies and services.
8. To expand the number of available, accessible and appropriate reproductive/sexual health services, including family planning, to all those who need and want them.
9. To develop and maintain high-quality, sustainable programmes in reproductive and sexual health programmes.

GOAL 3

Operate a democratic Federation and provide leadership in planned parenthood through the efforts of a capable and committed body of volunteers and staff; sustain a secure, diversified funding base for the federation, and maintain accountability in all aspects of IPPF’s work.
# Appendix C - Organisations that Submitted Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Family Planning Association of Kenya (FPAK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>Chama Cha Uzazi Na Malezi Bora Tanzania (UMATI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood Association of Ghana (PPAG)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>Botswana Family Welfare Association (BOFWA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>The Family Life Association of Swaziland (FLAS)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Leone</td>
<td>Planned Parenthood Association of Sierra Leone (PPASL)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Association Burkinabe Pour Le Bien - Etre Familial (ABBEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cote d'Ivoire</td>
<td>Association Ivoirienne Pour Le Bien-Etre Familial (AIBEF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Family Guidance Association of Ethiopia (FGAE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>