ANNEX 3: MISSION INTERVIEWEES' SUGGESTIONS TO PPL

This annex to the full Program Cycle Learning Study final report summarizes the suggestions that interviewees from the four study Missions made regarding support from PPL.

1. **PPL should continue to provide support to Missions in understanding and implementing the Program Cycle.** Many interviewees across all Missions appreciated in-person TDY support to improve their understanding, design, and execution of the Program Cycle because of the limited time and attention they have, given competing priorities. One approach mentioned by interviewees from Program Offices involved developing additional training resources and a more formalized strategy for disseminating information regarding "on the job" training opportunities, particularly for new hires and Program Office staff. A few interviewees also suggested providing a more supportive "home" for the 02 Backstop, including, for example, making better use of the Program Officer listserv.

2. **PPL should examine the connections between Agency processes and initiatives and the Program Cycle to improve the ease of application of the Program Cycle.** Many interviewees noted the connections—or sometimes conflicts—between the Program Cycle policy and other policies, in areas such as procurement and personnel. For example, a few interviewees brought up the proposed Development Information System (DIS) as an example of a tool that could support MEL work and save time currently spent collating, curating, and reporting on various data streams.

3. **PPL should continue to improve on its resources on the Program Cycle policy to improve its understanding and execution.** Many interviewees from Program Offices commented on the need for more detailed visuals, including timelines, checklists, and process maps, to supplement the standard circular Program Cycle visual.

4. **PPL should continue to review, iterate, and streamline Program Cycle processes.** Many interviewees also recommended reducing the amount of time spent on clearances where mandated in the current policy. Some interviewees mentioned a general desire for streamlining, while other interviewees suggested eliminating entire components of the Program Cycle, with strategies or projects mentioned as potential areas for elimination. Some interviewees noted the utility of projects but questioned the utility of PADs and PDPs. A few interviewees called for the ability to streamline CDCS assessments by using existing information rather than commissioning new assessments. Some interviewees also suggested that, for now, PPL provide more streamlined avenues for the strategy design process, stating that Missions might be encouraged to produce short executive summaries of the strategy and PADs for internal and external use. Some Program Office interviewees shared a desire for fewer changes to be made and more direct communication regarding any changes. A few interviewees noted inconsistencies in the ADS regarding the number of items mentioned and the types of acceptable format for items in terms of physical versus electronic copies.

5. **PPL should continue to build its understanding and knowledge regarding Mission Program Cycle implementation.** A few interviewees also suggested improving PPL's direct experience and knowledge of the Program Cycle in action through a program that placed PPL staff members in Missions for several months, much as PPL's FSN Fellowship program places FSNs in PPL's offices.