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Responding to the call for cultural and operational transformation to expand private-sector engagement (PSE) Agency-wide as a pathway to self-reliance, USAID’s Africa Bureau Division for Economic Growth, Environment and Agriculture (EGEA) launched the Practical, InnoVative, On-the-job Training (PIVOT) Cohort program in March 2019 to build internal capacities and support PSE readiness in six Africa Missions. Grounded in best practices and research evidence from PSE capacity building, staff development, and organizational change literatures, the PIVOT program provided an innovative alternative to the Agency’s existing capacity building efforts (e.g., traditional one-week trainings) to help staff shift from resource management to resource mobilization and address identified field staff needs for PSE.

The PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review, commissioned by the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda (SRLA) initiative in September 2019, aimed to capture promising practices, lessons learned, and evidence of change from the PIVOT Cohort program in its pilot year. To address its objectives, the Learning Review utilized both qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection and analysis, including a literature review of existing evidence and current thinking on PSE; key informant interviews with 38 program implementers, Change Team Leads, Mission Directors, and USAID/Washington leaders; focus groups with 35 Cohort members and implementing partners; Outcome Harvesting and Most Significant Change activities; a comparative analysis of PSE plans between PIVOT and non-PIVOT Africa Missions; and a Learning Review survey that included both a pre- and post-test analysis of changes in PIVOT Cohort members and their Missions, as well as a comparison group analysis of PIVOT Cohort members and non-PIVOT, field-based PSE points of contact (POCs).

Overall, results from the Learning Review indicated that PIVOT effectively contributed to:

- Significantly increasing participants’ knowledge and skills in PSE, CLA, and leadership;
- Providing responsive and timely PSE field support;
- Strengthening PSE working groups’ trust, collaboration, productivity, and innovation; and
- Significantly increasing participating Missions’ readiness for PSE (e.g., PSE integrated into planning and programming across offices and Program Cycle documents; improved cross-office collaboration; and increased use of proactive and collaborative approaches to PSE).
Cohort members and Mission Directors indicated, however, that organizational changes were still nascent and that PIVOT had yielded relatively few concrete results in terms of creating new private-sector partnerships or mobilizing private-sector resources. They emphasized that PIVOT’s internal capacity building and change management efforts were foundational, and that longer time frames are needed to see measurable results in these areas.

Program Overview

The PIVOT program built field staff capacities in technical PSE knowledge and skills, as well as interpersonal skills related to Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA), change management, and leadership. It did so through a combination of traditional training methods, on-the-job training and practice (learning by doing), mentoring, and peer learning approaches. The program was structured around cross-sectoral, cross-functional Change Teams within Missions that fostered team-based learning and action, as well as cross-Mission Affinity Groups and regular in-person Cohort meetings that encouraged peer learning and collaborating. The program was managed through frequent Change Team, Affinity Group, and Cohort calls to provide feedback loops that facilitated continuous learning and adapting, and strengthened connections between USAID/Washington and the field for more integrated, timely, and responsive support. Beyond that, the program was facilitated with intentional fun and safe-space activities to build trust and community among participants who supported each other in driving organizational change and advancing PSE efforts in their Missions.

What Worked Well and Areas for Improvement: Objectives One and Three

“This model of building a team of interested people from across offices—to learn technical and leadership skills, and have dedicated time and space to think and plan around a priority issue for the Agency, to meet and learn from other, similar teams from other Missions, and access support from across the Agency—that’s an important new model. Then they come back and share their learning and their plans with the Mission. They engage Mission management regularly in their planning and implementation and share their work out with the whole Mission. It has been very well received here. So, I think this is a good model for anything that is really important to the Agency.” —Mission Director

Participants liked PIVOT’s multi-faceted, Cohort approach that provided dedicated space, time, and assistance to deepen and expand PSE work across their Missions to address development priorities. They appreciated PIVOT’s efforts to build relationships within and across Missions, create leaders at all levels, and change organizational culture and operations in ways tied directly to PSE and Journey to Self-Reliance policies. Program stakeholders also raised a number of concerns about the program’s design and implementation that highlighted clear areas for improvement.

1. Integrated Technical and Interpersonal Skill-Building: Grounded in evidence-based PSE practices, PIVOT’s integrated curriculum was designed to support staff in proactively building and collaboratively managing relationships with private sector stakeholders. The Learning Review survey identified a number of significant increases in participants’ technical and interpersonal skills that were also corroborated by Outcome Harvesting, document analysis, and interview data. Some of these included:
   - In the Learning Review Survey’s pre- and post-test analysis, PIVOT Cohort members showed statistically significant gains in knowledge and skills related to PSE, CLA, and PSE/Journey to Self-Reliance policy implementation since the start of PIVOT.
   - While PIVOT Cohort members had significantly lower PSE scores than the PSE POC comparison group at the beginning of the program, by the end of the program there were no differences in scores between the two groups.
• The PIVOT Cohort had significantly better understandings of CLA than the PSE POC comparison group.

• A comparative analysis of PSE plans found that CLA principles and processes appeared more frequently in PIVOT PSE plans than in non-PIVOT PSE plans.

• Participants rated their new leadership and PSE skills as the most significant changes since the start of the PIVOT program.

Participants also highlighted areas for improvement in PIVOT’s capacity building efforts, including an earlier and stronger focus on PSE technical knowledge and skill-building; more practical applications of new information to staff jobs and Mission priorities; and earlier shifts to implementing PSE action items. Cohort members’ comments highlighted their strong interest in practical, results-oriented activities that would demonstrate clear and concrete added value to Mission PSE efforts.

2. **Responsive Field Support** practices within PIVOT such as multiple, tailored temporary duty (TDY) assignments, and regular meetings with backstops, sector- or function-specific Affinity Groups, and the full Cohort helped USAID/Washington staff provide more targeted, timely, and demand-driven assistance, develop sector-specific PSE roadmaps, field test new PSE tools, and assist participants in interpreting and operationalizing policy within their job contexts and Mission priorities. The Learning Review survey’s comparison group analysis found that, on a five-point scale, PIVOT Cohort members (n=28) rated USAID/Washington support significantly higher than the non-PIVOT PSE POCs group (n=22) in areas such as: “helps connect Mission with U.S. or multinational companies;” “is sustained so work can build;” and “is tailored to fit needs.”

![Responsive Field Support](image)

3. **Structured Opportunities for Peer Learning and Collaboration** helped build cross-office relationships within Missions and across Missions, which participants reported enhanced support, motivation, innovation, and accountability for PSE efforts. In the Learning Review survey, Cohort members rated their PSE Change Teams significantly higher than the PSE POC comparison group across all dimensions, including trust, communication, collaboration, productivity, and innovation. An unexpected result, highlighted by almost all USAID/Washington implementing partners, was PIVOT’s success in fostering a PSE community across USAID/Washington Bureaus and operating units as well.
4. **Learning-by-Doing Focal Activities** like PIVOT’s Change Management Plans, helped field staff apply new knowledge within their job contexts and served as a basis for their Mission’s PSE Plan and Country Development Cooperation Strategy (CDCS) planning efforts. In addition, meetings with private-sector companies provided mentored opportunities for staff to practice and refine their new presentation and relationship building skills, and hear private-sector perspectives.

5. **Program Implementation**: Participants liked PIVOT’s innovative design and adaptive implementation. They indicated that the frequent meetings and calls created community and accountability. The program’s CLA-focused implementation modeled processes and skills needed for effective change management, and the tailored, practical TDYs offered critical PSE skills and context-specific applications essential for PSE planning across the Mission.

Cohort members also indicated, however, that the PIVOT program, and PSE efforts more generally, required significant time commitments. They found it challenging to balance the competing priorities and responsibilities of their jobs with participation in the program, and recognized the need for longer time frames to effectively implement PSE activities. Participants emphasized the need to strengthen the involvement of Mission leadership in the program and ensure Change Teams include PSE POCs, Management Bureau Office of Acquisition and Assistance (OAA), and Front Office participation. Participants and implementing partners also noted that the Cohort’s diverse exposure to PSE, job types and levels, technical areas, etc. posed significant challenges for managing the different capacity building needs. They discussed the need to streamline calls, secure travel funds for Cohort meetings, and include a mix of subject matter expertise, process facilitators, and experienced USAID staff on the facilitation team. Finally, Cohort members highlighted the need to clarify program objectives and measures of success to help build participants’ confidence that their efforts are on track and set appropriate expectations for program stakeholders.

6. **Change Management Supporting Organizational Readiness for PSE**: In the pre- and post-test analyses, PIVOT Cohort members identified significant increases in their Mission’s organizational readiness for PSE (e.g., increased engagement of private-sector stakeholders across technical offices; PSE integrated into performance evaluations; etc.) During interviews, Cohort members and Mission Directors highlighted organizational changes since the start of PIVOT, such as:

1) More dedicated time, space, and support of PSE work aligned with Mission priorities;
2) Increased staff awareness and interest in PSE across the Mission;
3) PSE integrated into Mission planning and programming across offices in the Mission and within Mission documents across the Program Cycle;
4) Improved cross-office communication and collaboration; and
5) New approaches to PSE (e.g., more proactive PSE efforts, increased stakeholder consultations; judicious experimentation and risk-taking; more collaborative approaches; etc.)

*PIVOT has helped with coordination and integration of PSE across the Mission. All technical offices had started PSE work prior to PIVOT, but it was stove-piped: Staff didn't share information or work together. Our work in PIVOT has also helped develop a shared understanding of PSE.* — Cohort member

However, Cohort members noted that cultural and operational shifts supporting PSE in their Missions were still nascent, and their survey responses showed no significant differences from the PSE POC comparison group on most organizational readiness indicators. In addition, PIVOT field staff and Mission Directors indicated that the program had yielded only a few concrete results in terms of creating new private-sector partnerships or mobilizing private-sector resources. Participants emphasized that their PSE efforts are still new (i.e., they have just begun implementing their PSE plans) and that longer time frames are needed to see measurable results in these areas.
ORGANIZATIONAL FACTORS SUPPORTING AND INHIBITING PIVOT AND PSE EFFECTIVENESS: OBJECTIVES 2 AND 4

Enabling Conditions

- **Leadership support**: Clear signaling about PSE and Journey to Self-Reliance priorities from leadership provided:
  - Urgency and momentum for the program;
  - Improved access to decision-makers;
  - Participation and financial support from across the Agency;
  - Freedom to innovate in responding to identified needs; and
  - An environment conducive to changing organizational culture and operations.

- **Alignment with policies and Program Cycle requirements**: Participants emphasized the relevance of PIVOT to new Agency priorities in the Policy Framework and Prosper Africa. They also discussed how Program Cycle planning helped prioritize and facilitate PIVOT efforts to integrate PSE into Missions’ work. PIVOT’s training and activities focused on helping field staff operationalize the PSE and Journey to Self-Reliance policies, as well as the Agency’s Leadership Philosophy within participating Missions. In addition, PIVOT Change Teams provided timely assistance in developing required PSE plans and integrating PSE into their Missions CDCSs and Project Appraisal Documents (PADs).

- **Existing in-house PSE experience and expertise**: USAID staff’s passion, engagement, and commitment for development work generally, and PSE specifically, were essential ingredients in program success. PSE POCs provided important expertise and leadership for PIVOT Change Teams, as well as within Missions and Bureaus more generally. Existing PSE experience and expertise across the Agency provided PSE knowledge contextualized within understandings of Agency and Mission procedures, mechanisms, resources, dynamics.

Addressing Organizational Barriers

- **Need for flexible funding mechanisms and expedited procurements both at headquarters and in Missions**: This includes innovation funds that support PSE exploration, experimentation, and Mission-led proposals; non-grant financial mechanisms open to a variety of sectors and stakeholders; more fungible resources with longer expiration dates; and more “friendly” funding processes that allow for quick deployment of capital and innovative partnerships.

- **Staff hiring and transitions for PSE**: Staffing shortages, rotations, and churn were significant organizational barriers to effective PSE efforts. They created additional demands on existing staff, limiting their time and bandwidth for new PSE efforts. Leaders also recognized the need to hire staff with private-sector finance expertise.

- **Staff time and incentives for PSE**: Participants highlighted the need for dedicated or flexible staff time for PSE outreach, relationship building, and management, and emphasized the need to integrate PSE into position descriptions, work objectives, and performance reviews. They suggested recognizing and rewarding excellence in PSE performance and providing leadership opportunities for staff with PSE skills.

- **Cultural and operational barriers needing attention**:
  - Managing resistance and counter-narratives to PSE within the Agency;
  - Ensuring openness to and opportunities for experimentation and reflection on PSE efforts;
  - Adding guidelines that support peer learning and collaboration across sectors, Missions, and Bureaus;
  - Increasing the practice of demand-driven technical assistance;
  - Creating time-saving tools for outreach, due diligence, and relationship management; and
  - Improving access to PSE knowledge resources and tools.

Key Considerations and Recommendations

The PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review’s mixed methods design, triangulation of data sources, and respondent validation processes helped enhance the reliability and validity of findings. The review had a number of important limitations, however. For example, its limited time frame resulted in missed opportunities for data collection at the end of the program. In addition, the lack of a travel budget limited access to field data and direct observation. Finally, the broad scope of the objectives guiding this review limited the depth and detail of analyses in areas such as specific program activities (e.g., TDYs), sector-specific learning, and country- or Mission-specific factors affecting PSE efforts. These issues may have affected the findings and and should be addressed in future Learning Review efforts.
A number of key recommendations emerged from the Review’s analysis of program outcomes and areas for improvement. Some of these include:

- **Set a “North Star” for PIVOT:** Clarifying program objectives, intended outcomes, and measures of success could help build participants’ confidence that their efforts are on track and set appropriate expectations with leadership.

- **Engage leadership intentionally:** Building consistent communication and feedback loops with both mid- and senior-level leadership into the program could help include their perspectives, inform them about activities, ensure alignment with Mission priorities, and authorize support.

- **Select and work with participants strategically:** Including a PSE POC, contract officer, and program officer on PIVOT Change Teams is critical, as is differentiating the needs of participants and Missions.

- **Keep balancing the curriculum:** Participants requested an earlier and stronger focus on PSE technical knowledge and skill-building; more practical applications of new information to staff jobs and Mission priorities; and earlier shifts to implementing PSE action items.

- **Embed flexible M&E within PIVOT:** Embedding flexible M&E approaches within the program that draw on collaborative field-headquarters relationships and facilitate the continuous learning and strategic thinking needed for adaptive management can help advance understanding of what works and what doesn’t, both for PIVOT and for PSE more generally.

- **Capture a range of program outcomes:** Capture the changes to which PIVOT contributes, including intangibles, cumulative learning, transfer beyond direct participants, and examples of PSE innovations, successes, and failures that focus as much on the “how” as on the “what” of PSE efforts.

- **Plan longer time frames to see PIVOT results:** Participants and implementing partners alike recognized that more time is needed to see concrete and measurable results in organizational change and PSE.

This Learning Review highlighted a variety of PIVOT’s unique contributions to PSE capacity building and change management, as well as a number of lessons that can help guide future PIVOT iterations and other Agency PSE or change management efforts. It points to the tremendous work still to be done in answering the call for cultural and operational transformation to expand private-sector engagement Agency-wide as a pathway to Self-Reliance.

“A great deal has been done in PIVOT, but a lot more is needed. This is a long, long journey of corporate cultural change in the Agency, even among some of the PSE champions, experts and teams, and forward thinking Missions like those in PIVOT that are on the leading edge of private sector engagement for the Agency. Everyone still has a lot of work to do. It is positive that we are undertaking this process, but the length of the journey is sobering.” —USAID/Washington Leader
PIVOT Cohort Program: In March 2019, the USAID/Africa Bureau Division for Economic Growth, Environment and Agriculture (EGEA) launched the Practical, InnoVative, On-the-job Training (PIVOT) Cohort program. The program responded to demands from Missions for clarity on the Journey to Self-Reliance policy expectations, more opportunities for peer-to-peer learning and exchange, as well as training and skill-building on private-sector engagement (PSE) and innovative finance. The inaugural PIVOT program aimed to build the capacity of field-based staff in six Missions in Africa—Ghana, Kenya/East Africa, Madagascar, Rwanda, Southern Africa, and Uganda—to advance the Journey to Self-Reliance and Prosper Africa through PSE. PIVOT was a year-long capacity building and change management program that provided remote and in-person trainings, targeted technical assistance, and an emphasis on building Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) and leadership skills to improve PSE implementation and achieve program goals.

SRLA: As part of the Journey to Self-Reliance, the USAID/Bureau for Policy, Planning and Learning (PPL) and the Global Development Lab (Lab) are leading USAID’s Self-Reliance Learning Agenda (SRLA). Both a process and a set of products, the SRLA generates, collects, synthesizes, and disseminates evidence and learning, and facilitates their use to inform USAID’s efforts to support countries on their journeys to self-reliance. In addition, the SRLA aims to contribute to broader discussions in international development around aid effectiveness and local ownership.

Learning Review: Recognizing the need to capture learning from both the implementation and outcomes of the PIVOT program in its pilot year, as well the opportunities that learning can offer in addressing SRLA questions, the SRLA initiative commissioned this Learning Review of the PIVOT Cohort program at its midpoint in September 2019. The Learning Review is designed to help capture promising practices, lessons learned, and evidence of change from the PIVOT Cohort program to address a variety of learning needs related to advancing PSE as a pathway toward self-reliance. Drawing upon rigorous research and evaluation methods, the Learning Review aims to contribute to shaping future iterations of PIVOT and PIVOT-like change management efforts across USAID, as well as explore evidence related to questions on the SRLA.

The Learning Review aims to capture promising practices, lessons learned, and evidence of change from the PIVOT Cohort program to address a variety of learning needs related to advancing PSE as a pathway toward self-reliance.
The following objectives, areas of investigation, and key questions guided this Learning Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA OF INVESTIGATION</th>
<th>KEY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **OBJECTIVE 1:** Identify what works, what needs improvement, and what other questions need to be explored to help improve PIVOT’s design and implementation, shape future iterations, and inform other change management, PSE, and self-reliance efforts. | • What worked well in the PIVOT program?  
• What changes are needed to improve the program?  
• What additional questions should be explored to improve the program? |
| Program Design and Implementation                         |                                                                               |
| **OBJECTIVE 2:** Highlight key factors or conditions that support and inhibit the effectiveness of the PIVOT program, including those influencing the shape and development of PIVOT at participating Missions. | • What key factors and conditions supported the effectiveness of PIVOT in advancing PSE?  
• What key factors and conditions inhibited the effectiveness of PIVOT in advancing PSE? |
| Enablers and Barriers to Advancing PSE through PIVOT      |                                                                               |
| **OBJECTIVE 3:** Collect and assess evidence that PIVOT’s capacity building and change management approach resulted in intended changes in participants and their Missions. | • What evidence is there that PIVOT contributed to improving staff competencies and organizational capacities to engage private-sector actors and foster self-reliance?  
• What evidence is there that program participants contributed to advancing PSE at their Missions? |
| Program’s Contribution to Outcomes                        |                                                                               |
| **OBJECTIVE 4:** Examine how evidence from the PIVOT program can help address questions in the Agency-wide PSE Evidence and Learning Plan and the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda. | • Q4: How can PSE support countries in advancing on the Journey to Self-Reliance?  
• Q13: How did USAID’s organizational structures and staffing, policies, guidance, technical assistance, and capacity building enable PIVOT to foster self-reliance? |
| Implications for SRLA Questions                           |                                                                               |
Learning Review Design: To address these objectives, the Learning Review examined the PIVOT Cohort program through an embedded case study design (Scholtz & Tietje, 2002) that provided both a holistic understanding of the PIVOT Cohort program’s design, implementation, and enabling conditions, as well as an assessment of program outcomes related to sub-units of analysis such as individual participants, Change Teams, and Missions. The review utilized iterative, mixed (qualitative and quantitative) methods for data collection and analysis to explore self-reported learning among participants, assessments by Mission Directors and implementing partners, as well as other metrics of change for advancing PSE (e.g., organizational conditions supporting PSE readiness) identified in the PSE literature. The review examined pre-and post-program changes in participants, Change Teams, and their respective Missions’ culture and operations. Finally, the review also conducted a comparative analysis of PIVOT and non-PIVOT Mission PSE plans, and provided a nonequivalent, posttest-only comparison of PIVOT Cohort participants with non-PIVOT, field-based PSE points of contact (POCs) on individual and organizational readiness for PSE.

Data Collection and Analysis: The Learning Review initially envisioned using Theory of Change (ToC) methods to map out the PIVOT Cohort program’s underlying assumptions and causal links explaining how and why implementing the program would lead to more effective PSE and self-reliance. Early discussions with the program lead and implementing partners resulted in a draft ToC chart and a co-created PIVOT Roadmap (see Annex 1). These efforts revealed, however, that PIVOT’s innovative, adaptive, and complex pilot did not lend itself well to a ToC evaluation or more traditional, model-testing approaches. While an explicitly articulated ToC might result from PIVOT’s inaugural year to be tested and refined in subsequent iterations, the program’s initial dynamic, responsive design suggested that a modified evaluation approach would be more appropriate and useful. This review remained focused on addressing the learning objectives and key questions; however, it also provided ongoing data summaries and feedback to program implementers and participants to help capture ongoing learning and support program development and improvement. Data collection and summaries included:

- A Literature Review highlighted a broad range of existing evidence and current thinking within the Learning Review’s targeted areas of investigation. (see Annex 2).
• **Key Informant Interviews** with 38 program stakeholders (see Annex 3 for a list of participants), included:
  – Implementing partners, **Affinity Group Leads (AGLs), and backstops** (Annex 4)
  – **Mission Directors from PIVOT Missions** and USAID/Washington leaders (Annex 6).

• **Focus Group Interviews and Individual Reflection Sheets** from 35 PIVOT Cohort members, IPs, and AGLs addressed questions related to the Learning Review objectives (Annex 4).

• **Outcome Harvesting and Most Significant Change Activities** elicited program changes and rankings of those considered most significant, since the start of PIVOT from 26 Cohort members (Annexes 9 and 11).

• **Comparative Analysis of PSE Plans** from five PIVOT and six non-PIVOT Africa Missions informally examined similarities and differences across plans on program-related criteria such as cross-sectoral PSE effort, integration of CLA, etc. (Annex 10).

• A **Learning Review Survey** helped identify staff and organizational changes since the start of PIVOT, compared Cohort members to non-PIVOT PSE POCs, and provided baseline data for PSE readiness for future efforts (Annexes 12). The survey analysis included:
  – A re-test of PIVOT’s baseline survey for 24 Cohort members provided data for a statistical analysis of staff and organizational changes since the start of PIVOT.
  – A comparison group analysis of the 28 PIVOT Cohort members with 22 non-PIVOT PSE POCs provided data for a statistical analysis of individual knowledge and skills as well as organizational conditions that support PSE between the two groups.

**Limitations**: The Learning Review used a mixed methods design, triangulation of data sources, and respondent validation to enhance the reliability and validity of findings. However, the review faced several limitations. First, its limited time frame resulted in missed opportunities for data collection at the end of the program. Second, the lack of a travel budget limited access to field data and direct observation. Third, while the review supplemented participants’ self-reports with a variety of other data sources and comparisons, the analysis would have benefited from additional perspectives (e.g., participants’ supervisors, private-sector partners) as well as comparisons with other PSE, change management, or self-reliance efforts within USAID. Finally, the broad scope of the objectives guiding this Review limited the depth and detail of analyses in areas such as specific program activities (e.g., TDYs), sector-specific learning, and country- or Mission-specific factors affecting PSE efforts.

To protect participants, learning reviewers ensured informed consent prior to all interviews and surveys, and reported results either in aggregated form or in quotes identifying only participants’ roles. The lead reviewer, an independent consultant contracted through the LEARN mechanism and SLRA budget, acknowledged a potential conflict of interest, as LEARN was an implementing partner for the PIVOT program. To mitigate potential biases, the lead reviewer reported to LEARN’s MERL team lead and USAID/PPL’s SRLA lead rather than LEARN staff involved in program implementation (see Annex 13 for full methods section).
The PIVOT Cohort program builds field staff capacities in technical PSE knowledge and skills, as well as interpersonal skills related to CLA and leadership. It does so through a combination of traditional training methods, on-the-job training and practice (learning by doing), mentoring, and peer learning approaches. The program is structured around cross-sectoral Change Teams within Missions that foster team-based learning and action, as well as cross-Mission Affinity Groups and regular in-person Cohort meetings that encourage peer learning and collaborating. The program is managed through frequent Change Team, Affinity Group, and Cohort calls to provide feedback loops that facilitate continuous learning and adapting, and strengthen connections between USAID/Washington and the field for more integrated, timely, and responsive support. Beyond that, the program is facilitated with intentional fun and safe-space activities to build trust and community among participants who support each other in driving organizational change and advancing PSE efforts in their Missions.

**PIVOT Implementers and Participants:** PIVOT is supported by USAID’s Division of Economic Growth, Environment and Agriculture (EGEA) Office of Sustainable Development (SD), Africa Bureau (AFR) and is designed and led by Amy Lovejoy, Economist. The program includes:

**Four implementing partners** with distinct but complementary knowledge and skills in PSE, CLA, and leadership, LEARN and PEPSE worked closely together to develop, integrate, and deliver PIVOT’s curriculum:

- **LEARN** (contracted with USAID/PPL) facilitated the co-design of PIVOT with the program lead and other IPs, managed the program, facilitated Cohort calls and in-person meetings, and provided content on CLA, change management, and leadership.
- **PEPSE** (contracted with the Lab’s Center for Transformational Partnerships) developed targeted materials and provided training, mentoring, and TDYs in PSE.
- **INVEST** (part of USAID/E3’s Private Capital and Microenterprise office) played a more limited role providing materials, technical assistance, and TDYs on mobilizing private capital and addressing investment constraints.
- **ISP** (contracted with USAID/Bureau for Food Security’s Markets, Partnerships and Innovations office) played a limited role in providing PSE and investment tools, and working with Cohort members on an as-needed basis.

- **Four Washington-based backstops from the LEARN team** played a coaching and connecting role for Mission Change Teams as needed.

- **Six Change Teams:** PIVOT’s 36-member Cohort is organized by cross-sectoral, cross-functional Change Teams of 5 to 7 members at each participating Mission: Ghana, Kenya/East Africa, Madagascar, Rwanda, Southern Africa, and Uganda. Team members were selected by Mission leaders at the beginning of the program based on expressed interest in PSE, experience in the Mission, and, where available, experience with PSE. Members represented a variety of technical offices, as well as program and contract offices, and in some cases, the Front Office. They included a mix of FSNs and FSOs, junior and senior staff, and were often, but not always, led by the Mission’s PSE POC.

- **Eight Affinity Groups:** Sector- and function-specific groups included Cohort members from across Missions and were facilitated by USAID/Washington Bureau-related PSE specialists. Affinity groups included: education, EG/AG,
environment, health, democracy and governance, leadership, program officers, and contract officers. Affinity Groups met to discuss sector-specific questions and challenges, and share experiences in their respective technical areas. Affinity Group Leads worked with participants in a variety of ways to provide sector- or function-specific strategies, tools, knowledge resources, and connections to relevant private-sector companies.

The PIVOT Cohort program’s goal is for individual Cohort members, and the Mission as a whole, to be able to strategically and intentionally engage the private sector for greater impact on development objectives and to advance the Journey to Self-Reliance. The program was designed to address identified needs within the Agency for more clarity on PSE and Journey to Self-Reliance policy expectations, increased training on innovative finance and PSE, more opportunities for peer-to-peer learning, improved interpersonal and management skills at all levels, and better access to the Agency’s PSE resources (USAID PSE Field Needs Study, 2018).

While each PIVOT Mission has different PSE goals based on its strategic priorities, Change Teams emphasized the following common elements in their PIVOT goals:

- Take a whole-of-Mission approach to doing PSE differently;
- Build staff capacities and change mindsets about PSE across the Mission;
- Institutionalize PSE across offices by integrating it into planning and programming, and promoting cross-office collaboration and learning; and
- Strengthen relationships with private-sector businesses to support innovative partnerships that address development challenges and advance the Journey to Self-Reliance.

PIVOT activities: PIVOT activities included bi-monthly Cohort calls and webinars, Affinity Group calls, and backstop calls as requested. In addition, PIVOT included four 4-5 day, in-person Cohort meetings in Accra, Ghana (May, 2019); Baltimore, MD (September, 2019); Nairobi, Kenya (December, 2019); and Washington, DC (February, 2020). IPs also conducted eight, targeted TDYs as requested by participating Missions:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IP</th>
<th>COUNTRY</th>
<th>TDY TOPIC</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PEPSE</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Developing a Mission-wide PSE plan</td>
<td>August 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Market systems mapping and integrating PSE into the Program Cycle</td>
<td>October 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Developing a Mission-wide PSE plan</td>
<td>November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Action planning for PSE plan implementation</td>
<td>January 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>Action planning for PSE plan implementation</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INVEST</td>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Blended finance training aligned w/key Mission priorities by sector</td>
<td>March 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Blended finance training/support for Change Team's TDY to N. Ghana</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S. Africa</td>
<td>Market systems analysis relevant to designing PSE opportunities</td>
<td>April 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Building Staff Competencies:** From its inception, the PIVOT Cohort program focused on integrating PSE, CLA, and leadership skills. As the pilot year progressed and implementing partners with diverse skill sets collaborated more closely, PIVOT’s curriculum matured around five program competencies focused on practices and behaviors rooted in these skills:

1. Promote personal and team readiness to engage in a change management process around PSE in the Mission.
2. Identify areas of alignment between private-sector interests and USAID’s development priorities.
3. Design and facilitate processes that involve people across the Mission (multiple sectors and functions) in service of PSE implementation at the Mission.
4. Convert PSE opportunities into strategic programmatic approaches.
5. Develop and manage relationships with private-sector contacts.

These competencies guide PIVOT’s curriculum, which has been developed and refined over the course of the pilot.
This section summarizes information gathered from six focus groups and 32 key informant interviews with program participants and implementers, Mission Directors, and USAID/Washington leaders to address the Learning Review’s first objective:

OBJECTIVE 1: Identify what works, what needs improvement, and what other questions need to be explored to help improve PIVOT’s design and implementation, shape future iterations, and inform other change management, PSE, and self-reliance efforts.

---

In this report, the term program participants refers to PIVOT’s 36 Cohort members; program implementers refers to all IPs, AGLs, and backstops; and Learning Review participants refers to everyone who was interviewed, including program participants, implementers, Mission Directors, and USAID/Washington leaders.
A. PROGRAM STRENGTHS—WHAT WORKED WELL

Overall, Learning Review participants had very positive reflections and reviews about the PIVOT Cohort program. Cohort members found PIVOT’s design, especially the cross-sectoral Change Teams within Missions and the cross-Mission interactions, to be very helpful in fostering peer learning, collaboration, and support for their PSE efforts. They highlighted the PIVOT Change Management Plans as an important focal point for team-building and applying new learning (i.e., learning by doing) in the first half of the program. They highlighted proactive PSE opportunity mapping, meeting with private-sector companies, and practicing relationship building and management skills as key strengths during the second half of the program. Cohort members also appreciated PIVOT’s demand-driven support efforts and integrated capacity building around technical and interpersonal skills. Finally, many discussed the value of “high touch” facilitation through regular calls and meetings for keeping everyone engaged and accountable.

Field staff, including Cohort members and Mission Directors liked that PIVOT provided dedicated space for staff to focus on PSE—a priority area of work within all PIVOT Missions. They indicated that the program added depth to and support for work they were already doing, expanded PSE efforts beyond the economic growth (EG) office and integrated it into planning and activities across offices, deepening PSE knowledge and skills for Change Teams, and more generally increasing staff awareness and interest in PSE across Missions.

“This model of building a team of interested people from across offices—to learn technical and leadership skills, and have dedicated time and space to think and plan around a priority issue for the Agency, to meet and learn from other, similar teams from other Missions, and access support from across the Agency—that’s an important new model. Then they come back and share their learning and their plans with the Mission. They engage Mission management regularly in their planning and implementation and share their work out with the whole Mission. It has been very well received here. So, I think this is a good model for anything that is really important to the Agency.” —Mission Director

Implementing partners and Affinity Group Leads echoed these assessments about what worked well. They added that Cohort members show high levels of participation in, enthusiasm for, and commitment to advancing PSE. They also indicated that the PIVOT program was building a PSE community not only within and across participating Missions, but across USAID/Washington offices and Bureaus involved in the program as well. USAID/Washington staff and leaders really liked the program’s innovative approach to building commitment, competencies, and confidence for PSE among field staff; its efforts to engage FSNs and create leaders and all levels; and its focus on changing organizational culture and operations in ways directly tied to the PSE and Journey to Self-Reliance policies. They suggested that PIVOT addressed a number of identified staff needs through its non-traditional, on-the-job, and peer learning methods; demand-driven support efforts; and the collaboration it fostered across Agency operating units.

“The PSE policy calls for a major cultural and operational shift in the way we do business. I think that the PIVOT program—in the way it was designed, and in the way that it pulls from across the Agency to support these Missions and Change Teams—is probably the best pilot we could possibly have for a deliberate attempt at changing the way we do business in the Agency to enable greater engagement and collaboration with the private sector.” —USAID/Washington leadership

PIVOT’s integrated, multi-faceted approach makes it difficult to describe the program model succinctly and assess its aspects separately. However, the following section examines specific program elements highlighted by Learning Review participants as particularly effective.

1. Developing PSE, CLA, and Leadership Competencies: The Learning Review’s literature review (see Annex 2) on PSE capacity building found that best practices encourage an integrative approach that combines technical PSE knowledge and skills with interpersonal or “soft” skills, such as effective communication, cooperative planning and problem-solving,
and adaptive management (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; OECD, 2016). For example, studies indicate that good relationships and relationship management are critical to PSE success and that interpersonal skills play an essential role in uncovering alignment, building trust, and treating partnerships as relationships rather than transactional contracts (Rubin & Nordehn, 2015; Hervey & Gilboy, 2014).

Overall, participants appreciated PIVOT’s efforts to combine technical PSE knowledge and skills with interpersonal skills in CLA and leadership. Within the diverse Cohort group, some members emphasized the importance of the technical PSE knowledge, skills, and tools, while others noted the usefulness of CLA and leadership skills both in their PSE efforts and other aspects of their jobs.

“PIVOT is providing both capacity building on PSE-related skills needed and confidence to lead others comfortably.” —Cohort member

“Knowing the kind of language, how to approach, how to engage, and how to motivate people in the private sector has been very useful.” —Cohort member

“Effective PSE requires changing our mentality to recognize that relationships matter, and they don’t always have to be predicated on funding. This is a key point that PIVOT has helped staff understand. For example, it has helped improve our relationships with our government counterparts. Staff are meeting and working more closely with industries and civil society organizations too—just talking, sharing information, and seeing what’s out there. And out of these conversations, all of these additional opportunities that nobody ever saw are coming to the fore.” —Mission Director

Many Cohort members underscored the usefulness of pause and reflect processes and adaptive management inherent in CLA that were embedded in PIVOT programming, while others focused on leadership training and practice opportunities that helped staff promote PSE within the Mission and supported career advancement.

“PIVOT is different in a very significant way: It develops skill sets that USAID staff usually don’t get time to work on such as leadership skills, effective feedback, how to work with different personalities in the Mission.... These issues can keep us from doing any kind of work well. We are applying these new skills to engaging with the private sector and implementing the PSE policy.” —Cohort member

Across all interviews, Learning Review participants consistently praised PIVOT’s staff development approach as an important counterpoint to USAID’s traditional training and capacity building efforts. They liked its focus on building a supportive learning community that tapped into participants’ strengths and operationalized the Agency’s leadership philosophy.

2. Structured Opportunities for Peer Learning and Collaboration: Field staff consistently reported that the peer and team-based learning opportunities were one of the most successful aspects of the PIVOT Cohort program. These opportunities addressed needs identified in USAID’s PSE Field Needs Study (November 2018), to provide learning modalities beyond traditional training, including communities of practice (CoPs), opportunities for peer learning, and cross-Mission sharing of examples, experiences, and lessons learned. In addition, these methods are grounded in research evidence showing that staff learn best from each other (Jennings, 2015; Matey & Fickell, 2014; Rubin &

3 The PSE literature often refers to these non-technical skills as “soft skills,” however, throughout this Learning Review report they are referred to as “interpersonal” skills, in keeping with the phrasing used by the PIVOT Cohort program.
Nordehn, 2015; Englehardt & Simmons, 2002). Studies indicate that staff usually turn to colleagues first in seeking knowledge needed to do their jobs. Increasingly, organizations are encouraging peer learning opportunities and CoPs as vehicles to generate learning and enhance organizational performance. Facilitated CoPs have proven effective in improving knowledge creation and sharing by focusing on interactive, people-centered learning processes and fostering trust (Moreno, 2001; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999).

In particular, field staff appreciated PIVOT’s structured opportunities for peer learning and collaboration through Change Teams, in-person Cohort meetings, and Cohort calls.

- **Change Teams** brought together staff, many of whom had never worked together before, from across technical and functional offices in their Mission to collaborate on PSE planning. Cohort members described Change Teams as providing opportunities for ongoing peer learning, feedback, support, motivation, and accountability and as an important vehicle for advancing PSE within their Missions. Mission Directors indicated that PIVOT Change Teams supported inter-office communication, collaboration, and knowledge sharing about PSE across their Mission. They noted that PIVOT’s strong facilitation of group dynamics and team-building had created teams that work well together in completing tasks. In all Missions, these teams have become, or formed the core part of, their Mission’s PSE working group.

> “PIVOT Change Teams have energized the Mission around PSE as a priority, generating both enthusiasm and innovative ideas.” —Mission Director

> “Change teams promote open and fluid communication … For example, if someone in our Programs Office needs help with an Education issue, they don’t hesitate to pick up the phone and call a team member in the Ed office. It has provided an opportunity to understand different initiatives and identify ways of coordinating and collaborating. I also like having a team to bounce ideas and challenges off of, and it keeps me accountable. The structure is great!” —Cohort member

Peer learning across Missions through in-person Cohort meetings, regular Cohort calls, and Affinity Group meetings was also highlighted by participants as working well. Cohort members emphasized how helpful these structured activities were for sharing experiences, examples of success and failure, private-sector contacts, and innovative tools for advancing PSE.

> “I would say the Cohort networks are working really well—having the contacts that we can now reach out to. The learning that we get from their different experiences—like in the Affinity Groups—stuff that we adopt from each other. For example, with the [country name removed] team … I was able to say, ‘if you guys won that proposal, how can we do that?’ I was able to work directly with [name removed] on some consultations. It’s difficult to quantify these ancillary conversations. It’s a discussion over lunch or waiting for a session to start.” —Cohort member

> “Saving our PSE Change Management Plans on the Cohort Google Drive and allowing others to compare, contrast, and comment on them has allowed for cross-Mission learning and integration of ideas…We had good peer feedback with [team name removed] about their Change Management Plan—that’s something I encourage others to do and seek out—to hear what their approach was and how they deal with different issues and provide mutual feedback.” —Cohort member

Program implementers created opportunities for a variety of participant-generated and led activities that had high levels of engagement and energy. For example, during Cohort meetings, “Open Space” sessions invited Cohort members to raise PSE-related questions or issues of interest (e.g., blended finance, PSE stakeholder mapping, working with multinationals vs. local, smaller companies) and self-organize into small-group discussions.
• **PSE learning and collaboration across USAID/Washington Bureaus and offices:** An unexpected result, highlighted by almost all USAID/Washington implementers, was PIVOT’s success in fostering a PSE community not just within and across Missions, but across USAID/Washington operating units as well. Implementers suggested that Cohort calls and cross-office meetings, planning, and discussion embedded in PIVOT’s design fostered a sense of community that facilitated peer learning, collaboration, and cross-fertilization on issues related to PSE across operating units in the Agency.

“*We don’t really do other multi-Bureau programs so this brings us together in unique ways.*” —Affinity Group Lead

“As PSE lead in [bureau name removed], I have felt isolated, and PIVOT has been helpful in bringing me into a community.”

—Affinity Group Lead

“There is a gap in DC…how does [Bureau name removed] connect to PSE. PIVOT is taking the change process home to our Bureau and making PSE a sphere for engagement.” —Affinity Group Lead

3. **Responsive Field Support:** Learning Review participants praised PIVOT’s demand-driven approach that featured tailored training and TDYs, and sustained collaboration between headquarters and field staff. The program addressed field support issues raised in the PSE Field Needs Study, which found that:

“*Missions want demand-driven and responsive support services. This includes tailored support available when they need it, and a single point of contact in Washington for continuity and sustained PSE support to help field staff navigate resources and options. Need technical expertise that complements Missions’ local knowledge, and improved coordination across Pillar/Regional Bureaus and “central” Washington support teams.*” (USAID, November 2018)

Cohort members received support in a variety of ways through the program. For example, each Change Team had a DC backstop, each Cohort member was part of a sector- or function-specific Affinity Group led by a senior USAID/Washington staff member with both PSE and organizational experience in their field, and the whole Cohort met regularly for participatory calls and in-person meetings with the full implementing team. In addition, all PIVOT Missions received one or two targeted TDYs based on their expressed needs and priorities.

**Demand-driven TDYs:** Cohort members indicated that PIVOT’s TDYs were critical in providing depth to participants’ PSE technical knowledge and skills, as well as context- and Mission-specific applications needed for effective PSE planning and integration. Grounded in practical, interactive, and participatory methods, these TDYs worked inclusively with staff from across the Mission to expand awareness, interest, and buy-in for PSE efforts. In addition, PIVOT’s sustained support provided opportunities for Change Teams to practically apply learning from initial TDYs within their Missions and work with IPs to design second TDYs that built on successes and addressed new challenges and needs.

Program implementers emphasized that they work closely with Cohort members to develop PIVOT materials and TDYs. Based on participant feedback, they also adapted their PSE training approaches to provide more practical, interactive skill-building in areas such as how to conduct a landscape assessment and use it to make programming decisions, how to find alignment and shared value with private sector entities, and how to turn new relationships into a programmatic approach.

“*80 percent of our work for this program is designed and tailored specifically for the Missions and staff in the program. We hardly use any off-the-shelf materials. As a result, participants are showing real interest and excitement about our TDYs.*”

—Implementing Partner

Implementing partners and Affinity Group Leads noted that consistent contact and longer-term relationships between headquarters and field staff helped USAID/Washington staff:

• **Provide more targeted assistance:** Having a better understanding of field staff’s priorities, needs, constraints, and challenges helped them design assistance that was tailored and specific to Mission and country contexts.
“There is no substitute for face-to-face interactions. People love it. USAID/Washington staff want the ongoing interaction and engagement. They get to be a resource and be helpful. And it helps them do their work better. They get a window into what is happening in the field.” —Implementing Partner

- **Design technical assistance that builds cumulatively:** Implementing partners appreciated opportunities to provide assistance that built on previous efforts and was more cohesive.

  “PIVOT is actually more sustainable than the usual way we do training...Having a consistent person allows for work to build. Field staff don’t have to tell someone all over again what they know and need. PIVOT supports relationships and knowledge creation in an informal way that promotes continued connection even after the program is over.”
  —Affinity Group Lead

- **Develop sector-specific PSE roadmaps and options:** Based on participant requests, some Affinity Group Leads began developing sector-specific PSE roadmaps with clear steps and decision points that focus on the “what” of options available and the “how” to do it.

- **Help interpret and operationalize policy within job contexts:** Some AGLs reported that working with PIVOT participants helped strengthen coherence of policy and practice. Their mentoring helped field staff better interpret and operationalize PSE and J2SR policies within their sectors, country contexts, specific development objectives, earmarked funds, and job descriptions.

- **Field test new tools:** PIVOT provided some USAID/Washington operating units with opportunities to field test and get feedback on new PSE tools and products (e.g., screening tool from BFS; indicator framework from CTP).

- **Connect U.S. companies to Missions:** Implementers also made concerted efforts to facilitate meetings and connections between field staff and U.S. companies and industries.

- **Transfer new responsive support practices beyond PIVOT:** Some IPs noted that their experiences in PIVOT has helped shift mindsets within their operating unit and resulted in changes in how they work with other requests for PSE technical assistance. They indicated that they are designing to fit requests more now; sharing insights from the work in PIVOT during discussions with others; and using examples from PIVOT to illustrate points.

Cohort members agreed that PIVOT’s demand-driven support model helped address their learning needs.

“People in Washington listen to Change Team members. They take feedback and address it directly.” —Cohort Member

“I feel very supported by people in DC. Communication has been consistent and reliable. PIVOT’s DC team is very proactive and responsive to the needs of Change Team members.” —Cohort Member

In the Learning Review survey, Cohort members rated USAID/W support significantly higher than the non-PIVOT PSE POCs group in:

- Connecting their Mission with relevant U.S. companies;
- Providing assistance tailored to fit their needs; and
- Providing support that has continuity and is sustained so that work can build cumulatively.

4. **Learning by doing:** In addition to peer and team-based learning, PIVOT’s explicit focus on practical and applied learning by doing opportunities was a highly valued part of the program. As one Cohort member noted, “PIVOT is helping us do something our bosses have already asked us to do. It’s helping us do it better.” —Cohort Member

Much of the literature on organizational learning focuses on the positive impacts of experiential learning, “learning in situ,” and learning by doing (Jennings, 2015; Matey & Fickell, 2014). Studies have found that structured, workplace/on-the-job learning increases the efficiency and overall impact of learning, and lowers costs in competency
development (Liu & Bat, 2005; Keenan, 2004). Participating in concrete experiences or tasks already required by the job, in an environment that encourages active experimentation, accepts mistakes, and fosters reflection on learning, is considered one of the most effective approaches to building practical competencies (Rodriguez & Morant, 2019; Rubin & Nordehn, 2015; Englehardt & Simmons, 2002).

- **PIVOT Change Management Plans:** Cohort members highlighted PIVOT’s Change Management Plans as an important, focal activity during the first part of the PIVOT program. Participants worked within their new Change Teams to create Change Management Plans that mapped out their Mission’s PSE priorities and long-term goals, stakeholders to involve, existing and needed resources, and action steps required to achieve identified goals. Cohort members indicated that this activity was very practical and useful for applying new knowledge and skills, building an effective team, and developing actionable steps for advancing PSE tailored to their specific Mission and country contexts. These Change Management Plans served as the basis for their Missions’ official PSE plans and many also informed CDCS development efforts.

  “I think just having the Change Management Plan as a focus for the group works really well because it outlines concrete action for us to take within our Mission. It’s not just training five people in the Mission on PSE, it’s training them to have a plan to get the rest of the Mission on board.” —Cohort Member

  “Structuring learning around the Change Management Plan has been helpful in understanding how I engage with our PSE plan. I have learned a lot. I also understand myself better and I am a better teammate now.” —Cohort Member

An informal analysis of PSE plans across five PIVOT Missions and six non-PIVOT AFR Missions found that CLA principles appear more frequently in PIVOT PSE plans.

- **Meeting with private sector companies:** PIVOT implementers drew on relationships across the Agency to involve private-sector companies in Cohort meetings and foster relationships between U.S. companies and relevant Mission staff. For example, at PIVOT’s second in-person Cohort meeting in Baltimore in September 2019, implementers organized a private-sector panel and reception including representatives from Pepsi, Corteva, Mars, and Calvert to discuss challenges and interest areas in their partnerships with USAID Missions. Relationship building between PIVOT participants and private-sector companies, especially those working in PIVOT Mission countries or specifically requested by participants, was a priority focus during the second half of the PIVOT program. Learning Review participants noted that this was a unique and useful aspect of the PIVOT program and appreciated the opportunity to hear a range of private-sector perspectives, and refine their presentation and relationship building skills with guidance from mentors.

  “PIVOT has really made an effort to bring in private-sector companies to the meetings and build connections with Mission staff. I haven’t seen that in any other PSE training. It’s been really useful to hear these companies’ perspectives, make contacts, and use the skills we have been learning to build a relationship.” —Cohort Member
5. **Program Leadership and Facilitation:** Throughout the interviews, participants praised PIVOT’s innovative design, fun and adaptive implementation, and inspiring leadership. IPs were impressed by the support that PIVOT has garnered from USAID/Washington staff, Bureaus, and leadership.

“Amy has done a great job making connections for PIVOT within the Agency, and this seems to be growing over time as well. This has helped raise PIVOT’s profile and gotten leadership attention on the value of this change management approach.”

—Affinity Group Lead

“Working on PIVOT has been creative and fun. Amy saw an opportunity where she could align resources with a need she saw for capacity building … The program really found a sweet spot between the PSE policy roll-out and the latitude to invent and reinvent itself. The collaboration with Amy has been great!”

—Implementing Partner

Cohort members also highlighted the fun and safe environment that program facilitators created at in-person meetings. They indicated that program implementers were successful in building a community and container that was conducive to learning and collaborating.

- **In-person Cohort meetings and regular calls** were both mentioned as effective in supporting learning, enthusiasm, momentum, and accountability. Participants commented that in-person Cohort meetings added depth to peer learning and “cross-pollination” of ideas about what works and what doesn’t in PSE, both for field staff and USAID/Washington staff. In addition, the regular check-in calls with Change Teams and monthly cohort calls provided important opportunities to discuss issues and keep participants on track.

“The Cohort meetings have been really good. They’re productive weeks, and coming out of the May one, we had a lot of momentum. I expect we will from this one too. It has also strengthened cross-office communication. I’m not sure we ever really talked or worked together before PIVOT.”

—Cohort Member

“The regular calls help keep everyone awake and on their toes.”

—Cohort Member

- **CLA modeling in program implementation:** IPs consistently modeled CLA principles and processes throughout program implementation. For example, they integrated “pause and reflect” opportunities throughout the program, and consistently and intentionally invited participant feedback, input, and opportunities for co-designing program content and process. IPs also adaptively managed the program to meet the various and changing needs of participants.

- **Mid-course pivots within PIVOT:** As PIVOT’s strong feedback loops surfaced new requests or areas for improvement from Cohort members, IPs took steps to adapt the program and make mid-course changes to address them. Some examples included:
  - IPs began identifying specific PIVOT competencies, including both discrete and overlapping PSE, CLA, and leadership behaviors and practices;
  - IPs shifted to focus on more concrete, external PSE activities, such as helping PIVOT participants build relationships with relevant private-sector companies;
  - LEARN shifted to more explicitly highlighting CLA and leadership principles, skills, and methods that were implicit in and modeled throughout the program to facilitate conscious learning. They also began articulating the relevance and use of CLA and leadership skills to Change Teams’ efforts more explicitly;
  - PEPSE dropped its pre-planned curriculum (e.g., PowerPoint presentations) of basic PSE knowledge and shifted to more practical, interactive, skills-based content and methods that apply PSE within the context of participants’ work;
  - Change Teams expressed interest in developing more sustained mentorship with IPs and AGLs. Questions remain about how best to do this.
B. PROGRAM CHALLENGES/AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

While Learning Review participants expressed strong support for the Agency’s PSE Policy in general, and PIVOT’s approach to capacity building and change management in particular, they also raised a number of concerns about the program’s design and implementation that highlighted clear areas for improvement.4

I. Staff Time and Program Time Frame: Cohort members indicated that the PIVOT program, and PSE efforts more generally, required significant time commitments. They found it challenging to balance the competing priorities and responsibilities of their jobs with participation in the program, and recognized the need for longer time frames to implement PSE activities effectively. Participants also made a variety of suggestions for addressing these challenges.

• Significant time commitments for staff: Learning Review participants consistently highlighted staff’s limited time and bandwidth as one of the biggest program challenges. Field staff indicated that managing the competing priorities and responsibilities in their jobs made full participation in the program a stretch. The time commitments were particularly difficult for those who didn’t have PSE in their job descriptions. Mission Directors expressed concerns about the demands of PIVOT on staff time as well. Particularly in smaller Missions, Directors indicated that the number of staff traveling for multiple PIVOT meetings over the year and missing other work had created a noticeable burden. Cohort members and Mission Directors said that they had underestimated the level of effort and commitment required by PIVOT.

“My biggest concern has been that the program has been extraordinarily time consuming for the individuals who are engaged in it. While we may have been aware of that when we signed up for it, I don’t think that the supervisors or team leaders of participants were really walked through the fact that this was going to be such a significant time commitment. They don’t really have control to say, ‘you have other responsibilities, you can’t go to every PIVOT meeting’. It’s been a bit awkward because they aren’t able to manage for results.” —Mission Director

Program implementers also emphasized that managing this “high touch,” dynamic program, developing tailored materials, and bringing in U.S. and multinational companies took considerable time and was a heavy lift.

Learning Review participants made a variety of practical suggestions for addressing these challenges, such as helping staff prioritize their participation through calendars, task management tools, and differentiated programming; setting clearer expectations for staff LOE at the outset of the program; integrating more long-distance learning opportunities; allocating more staff time for PIVOT and PSE more generally; and filling Mission hiring needs to allow more staff time for PIVOT and PSE. A few participants suggested that a shorter program time frame (e.g., six months) could help them manage the time demands better by allowing them to get back to tasks they had put on hold during the program. However, the majority of participants recommended extending the program time frame to help support their new PSE activities and change management efforts.

Cohort members generally appreciated the dedicated time and space that PIVOT created for PSE work, and continued to participate actively throughout the pilot year.

“The structure of PIVOT is outstanding! The value of the program is that it creates the focus, the structure, and the space to approach PSE. Before PIVOT, we didn’t have that. There is no substitute for creating this structure. So, when I say the time aspects of the program can be demanding—well, PSE itself is demanding, at least doing it in an engaged, sustainable, scalable way is an enormous task. But it’s needed. And what we’ve gained in PIVOT is irreplaceable: it is really worth it.” —Cohort member

• A longer time frame needed to implement PSE activities: Recognizing that start-up, team building, and planning processes take some time, even when managed efficiently, the majority of program participants and implementers

4 PIVOT’s strong feedback loops (including data shared from the Learning Review) surfaced most of these challenges as they arose and IPs took steps to adapt and adjust the program to address them during implementation.
suggested extending the time frame for the PIVOT program. They indicated that one year was not long enough and suggested that 2 to 3 years was a more realistic timeline for achieving measurable advances in PSE. These comments also relate to the primary barrier identified to PSE implementation and outcomes (see Barriers and Outcomes section below for additional discussions of this issue).

“Change the time frame for PIVOT—one year is just not enough. It should be closer to two years. PIVOT took some time to get off the ground, even to properly understand the direction it would take and how we could work together. Action Plans have only recently started to move forward, and there’s only a short time left.” —Cohort member

“This program was designed to take place over a year, which is longer than most, but still only a year. We all know that any cultural shift takes time. PSE readiness and the cultural shifts that need to happen to improve that readiness across a Mission—not just among individuals or a team—needs much longer. Maybe a three-year period would be optimal. This one-year pilot really forced the program into action, though—rather than getting stuck in a design mode—and there are a lot of positive points to that.” —USAID/Washington Leader

2. Challenges Related to Internal Stakeholder Involvement: While Learning Review participants all highlighted the passion, commitment, and diversity of PIVOT Cohort members, many also recognized that the program needed to ensure the involvement and improve communication with additional organizational stakeholders to increase program impact.

• Involving and communicating with leadership: All Learning Review participants discussed leadership support as an essential enabling condition for PIVOT (see Enabling Conditions section below). While PIVOT, and PSE efforts more generally, had broad support from leaders, the program did not include regular or structured opportunities to involve and inform them. This resulted in uneven communication, participation, and support by Mission leadership across PIVOT Missions. All Learning Review participants highlighted the need to engage leadership more often to include their perspective, inform them about activities and outcomes, ensure alignment with Mission priorities, and solidify support. Field staff, in particular, emphasized the importance of intentional and systematic inclusion of, and communication with, mid-level and senior leaders in the PIVOT model. Cohort members and Mission Directors indicated that leadership involvement would fit Missions’ more centralized decision-making and accountability structures better; empower PIVOT Change Teams, and support cultural and operational shifts. USAID/Washington implementers and leaders suggested that structured communication with supervisors and operating unit leaders could help support increased cross-office/Bureau learning and collaboration around PSE.

“We initially underestimated the LOE and need for leadership support in this effort, especially given all the competing priorities. Once supervisors and the front office give their blessings and allocate some time, the work is much easier.” —Cohort member

• Ensuring Change Teams include PSE POCs as well as contracts and program officers: Change Team Leads consistently indicated that their teams had the “right people,” including diverse representation and experience from across the Mission. They also highlighted the importance of including PSE POCs and staff from the contracts and program offices on the team.

• Addressing the diverse needs of participants: Learning Review participants consistently appreciated the Cohort’s diverse representation of technical and functional offices, junior and senior staff, FSNs and FSOs, age, gender, and range of exposure to PSE. They indicated that this diversity created a variety of peer learning and collaboration opportunities and supported effective PSE integration and change management efforts within Missions. Cohort members and implementers alike also recognized, however, significant challenges in managing the different capacity building needs and interests within the Cohort. Many Learning Review participants raised questions about how best to manage the differences in the group. Some suggested that program leaders specify who the target participants are at the outset of the program (e.g., PSE novices or experts, junior or senior staff, etc.), while others requested that implementers differentiate roles, expectations, and training levels for the range of participants.
3. Challenges Related to Program Curriculum:
Participants highlighted a few areas where PIVOT’s capacity building efforts needed additional adjustment, including an earlier and stronger focus on PSE technical knowledge and skill-building; more practical applications of new information to staff jobs and Mission priorities; and earlier shifts to implementing PSE action items. Cohort members’ comments in this area highlighted their strong interest in practical, results-oriented activities that would demonstrate clear and concrete added value to Mission PSE efforts.

- Connecting training and application: While participants recognized that PIVOT provided many more learning by doing opportunities than other USAID capacity building efforts, more than half of Learning Review participants emphasized the need for even tighter links between new skills and their practical application in staff’s daily jobs. They requested that implementers more consistently connect new technical and interpersonal training with concrete, job-related applications and clarify how new learning can work within Mission processes and dynamics to achieve Mission priorities. They also recommended that training materials include and address a variety of concrete market challenges relevant to participants’ national contexts. A few Mission Directors indicated that staff needed additional practical guidance on when, where, and how to engage private-sector companies, including how to address resistance among a variety of stakeholders (e.g., implementing partners that prefer Mission staff did not talk directly with their private-sector partners). Some suggested that including USAID staff who are familiar with both PSE and organizational dynamics and procedures on the facilitation team could help participants contextualize new knowledge and skills and provide guidance in translating theory into practice.

- Earlier focus on action: Because PIVOT’s launch coincided with PSE Plan development requirements and phases one and two of CDCS development for participating Missions, the first half of the program had a strong focus on PSE planning. In addition, early PSE efforts often included opportunity mapping and action-planning within Cohort members’ respective technical offices. Cohort members indicated that they would have liked PIVOT to shift from planning to action earlier.

“The first months were about planning and laying the foundation. We need to pivot (pun intended) sooner into practicing PSE, so we can go back to our Mission leadership and provide concrete examples and guidance. We are the change agents across the Mission so we need to be able to add value there. —Cohort member

- Balancing technical and interpersonal skills: While most participants expressly valued the combination of PSE, CLA, and leadership skills in PIVOT’s curriculum, many also discussed the need for a stronger focus on PSE knowledge and skills (introduced earlier in the program), better integration of technical and interpersonal skills in trainings and TDYs, and clearer articulation of how CLA can support change management efforts. Implementing partners also mentioned that getting the balance right (e.g., topics and level of PSE, CLA, and leadership content) was challenging given the diversity of participants’ needs, roles, level of exposure to PSE, etc., and required an iterative approach. A few participants indicated that they would have preferred less “process work” and a tighter connection between process and content.

“We need more structured and advanced technical training. We have done a lot of planning and leadership training—and we are really valuing that—but we need more PSE skills. If someone could speak more to the PSE tools and approaches—like the work PEPSE did in Ghana—that would really build the confidence of staff who were new to this area and give the program a more rigorous technical aspect.” —Cohort member
• Strengthen individualized and sector-specific learning: Affinity Group Leads indicated that participants in their groups were requesting more sector-specific PSE strategies and mechanisms, knowledge resources and tools, connections to relevant companies, and examples of successful efforts. Cohort members and implementers also noted the need for more mentoring, one-on-one consultations, or exchanges to help those new to PSE better navigate the private-sector landscape.

• Additional focal areas: A few Learning Review participants requested specific topic areas and processes be added to PIVOT’s curriculum, including:
  – Multi-sector PSE: A Mission Directed requested more focus on concrete PSE project design and action-planning with strong guidance that walks teams through the process from a multi-sector perspective. This could help move beyond integrating PSE into different technical offices and support more collaborative, multi-sectoral activities. They also suggested helping staff learn design processes that link directly to the Program Cycle and the questions asked at each phase.
  – PSE for inclusive development and local ownership: Recognizing that PIVOT’s focus was largely internal (e.g., organizational capacities and changes needed to support PSE) and relationship building with private-sector actors, one IP and one Cohort member suggested additional content and processes that focus on involving local implementers and beneficiaries, especially around issues of inclusion and local ownership.
  – PSE in difficult political, economic, and business environments: A couple of Cohort members indicated the need for more content around how to address barriers to PSE and private-sector investment within local or national contexts (e.g., conflict zones, stagnant economies, fragmented private sectors).

4. Challenges Related to Program Management and Staffing: Implementing partners discussed a variety of challenges in managing this dynamic program. They noted issues around managing adaptively, streamlining calls, the need for travel funds, and the importance of having an implementation team with a variety of skills and experience.

• Adaptive management: IPs found it challenging to organize and structure PIVOT so that all of the moving parts and pieces of the program fit together as a whole. Adaptively managing the program was time-consuming because the program was designed quarter by quarter, changing and growing in response to feedback and learning. Implementers described the difficulties of addressing all of the different needs in the group and keeping everyone on the same page. In addition, participants’ busy schedules and geographic dispersion made it difficult to manage communication and stay on track. IPs expressed challenges in being chronically understaffed for managing this innovative, dynamic, and evolving program.

“The PIVOT program was launched before it was fully designed, so there has been the need to make ongoing adjustments and corrections to deal with unforeseen or emergent issues. Dealing with these types of issues has been time-consuming and inefficient, but it has allowed us to keep tailoring the program to meet shifting needs and priorities.”
—Implementing Partner

• More efficient calls and meetings: While many participants highlighted PIVOT’s regular meetings and calls as a program strength that created momentum and accountability for PSE work, some also suggested that calls could be reduced or streamlined. Fewer and more focused check-ins would allow participants more time to implement their PSE activities between calls and could help make discussions more specific and task-focused. These suggestions were often made in conjunction with others for improving time management and supporting staff participation in the program.

“So many calls and meetings! Participants need a Sherpa to navigate all of them. And there is already so much we are all doing. No one realized the magnitude of this program and it’s hard to participate fully. Participants need incentives, like for leaders or supervisors to build in job-time and reward accomplishments.” —Affinity Group Lead

• Improved external communications: Several participants mentioned the need for PIVOT to have a more systematic and cohesive plan for external communication about program activities and lessons. For example, desk officers
could include a PIVOT point in every briefer. This could help the program reach wider audiences to attract resources (human and financial), broaden change management efforts, and strengthen links with other PSE initiatives across the Agency.

- **Funding for travel:** Field and headquarters staff alike mentioned the need for program funding to send staff to the in-person Cohort meetings.

> “There needs to be discussion on how this [attending in-person Cohort meetings] is done realistically given the locations and budgets. When it’s time to travel, we are met with people saying there’s no money.” —Cohort Member

> “A critical component to PIVOT’s success is the participation of USAID direct hire staff both in Washington and the field. Direct hire staff have very limited funding resources. The program is stronger when more senior USAID reps participate. The issue of covering the cost of their travel would have to be addressed if the agency wants this component of the model to succeed.” —USAID/Washington Leader

- **A more integrated implementing team:** During the program, IPs with distinct but complementary expertise in PSE, CLA, and leadership skills recognized the need to work closely together in developing competencies and providing support. For example, IPs recommended that future backstop calls and TDYs should be co-led by partners with technical and interpersonal competencies. In addition, some field staff suggested including more USAID staff (field or USAID/Washington) on the facilitation teams to help participants connect and contextualize new PSE knowledge and skills within: a) USAID’s organizational policies and procedures; b) Mission processes and dynamics; and c) country contexts. They suggested that future PIVOT implementation and facilitation teams include a mix of process/facilitation experts, subject matter experts, and experienced USAID staff. They also recommended balancing external (contractor’s) expertise with internal (USAID) organizational experience to help accelerate staff behavior change and improve efficiency.

5. **Program Objectives, Success Measures, and Theory of Change:** Participants and implementers noted the importance of clarifying PIVOT’s objectives, intended outcomes, and measures of success to help build participants’ confidence that their efforts are on track and set appropriate expectations.

- **Clarifying program objectives and measures of success:** Participants asked a number of questions about what PIVOT’s objectives and intended outcomes were as well as what “success” for the program meant at individual, organizational, and PSE activity levels. Some suggested the need for clearer objectives to help assess whether the program was on track and help manage expectations among participants and other program stakeholders.

> “Is this adaptive management? It seems adaptive, but sometimes it’s more like we are asking Missions what they want and just going with that. There is no real North Star for what we are trying to accomplish. PIVOT is going to have to deal with this. At some point there is going to be a reckoning if we don’t develop an approach that allows for adaptation but also identifies what constitutes success and that we have moved along that path. If we can’t do that, it just won’t be funded. The key to that is probably in the adaptive M&E. We need to bring that in.” —Implementing Partner

> “Having measurable outcomes would build confidence for participants. Missions are often metrics driven. The old saying is relevant here, ‘you can’t manage what you don’t measure.’ You can’t know whether or not you are successful unless success is defined and tracked.” —Affinity Group Lead
• **Explicitly articulating PIVOT’s Theory of Change:** Some implementing partners and leaders suggested that PIVOT keep making its underlying assumptions about how change happens explicit to help participants internalize the program’s efforts to support staff and organizational change. Tying elements of PIVOT’s design and curriculum directly to that model and intended changes could help clarify the relevance of each aspect and increase incentives to participate. Program implementers and participants recognized that PIVOT’s emergent Theory of Change will not be static, but rather continually revised and refined as its effectiveness is tested through implementation. Some Learning Review participants also hoped that PIVOT’s change management strategies and activities would include a more explicit multi-level approach to addressing how changes in individuals and relationships within the PIVOT Cohort might contribute to changes beyond the group such as within Mission culture and operations, other Agency staff and operations, private-sector stakeholders, and larger business environments.

“We need a Theory of Change so in the future, when people ask, ‘what is PIVOT all about?’ you can say, ‘here is our Theory of Change.’ And people will be able to look at it and say, ‘That totally aligns me with the PSE policy and the J2SR. It is what people in Missions have been asking for, and frankly, it aligns with what I’ve been saying my whole career.’”

—Affinity Group Lead
The following section reviews some of the key factors and conditions that supported and inhibited the PIVOT Cohort program. The information in this section relates to Objective Two of the Learning Review, but also addresses SRLA questions identified in Objective Four. To reduce redundancies in this report, information relevant to the specific SRLA questions has been pulled together within Summary Tables III and IV in Annex 14.

OBJECTIVE 2: Highlight key factors or conditions that support and inhibit the effectiveness of the PIVOT program, including those influencing the shape and development of PIVOT at participating Missions.

OBJECTIVE 4: Examine how evidence from the PIVOT program can help address questions in the Agency-wide PSE Evidence and Learning Plan and the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda.

Because PIVOT’s efforts centered around internal capacity building and change management, and learning reviewers had limited access to field data, this section focuses primarily on organizational enablers and barriers affecting PIVOT. However, it also includes some brief descriptions of local or national contexts shaping PIVOT Missions’ PSE efforts that emerged from interviews with Change Team Leads and Mission Directors.

A. ENABLING CONDITIONS

I. Organizational

How can USAID’s structures and staffing, policies, guidance, technical assistance, and capacity building enable us to foster self-reliance? (SRLA Question #13)

The PIVOT Cohort program began shortly before the launch of the Agency’s new PSE Policy and PSE Plan requirements, and announcements of various restructuring and change initiatives. These changes were all designed to advance the Journey to Self-Reliance through private-sector engagement. These conditions created an urgency and momentum that supported experimentation and innovation around PSE more generally, and PIVOT in particular. Within the Agency, key enabling factors or conditions for PIVOT included:

• Leadership support for PSE: Learning Review participants mentioned leadership support most often as a key factor supporting the implementation of the PIVOT program. Because PIVOT coincided with the new PSE priorities, the program leader had increased access to and partnerships with decision makers. “Leaders see PIVOT as a vehicle to implement PSE policies and connect with Mission staff on PSE” —AGL. Leadership support also provided the PIVOT program with opportunities to innovate in responding to identified needs (e.g., peer learning opportunities, access to PSE resources).
Mission Directors who already prioritized market-based development strategies found opportunities to expand and strengthen their staff’s PSE capacities through the PIVOT program. Cohort members indicated that Mission Directors’ support for PIVOT paved the way for interest and support from Office Directors and other Mission staff, facilitated the procurement of human and financial resources for the program, and created an environment conducive to integrating PSE into Mission activities.

“Any time the Mission Director has time to talk to people, she highlights the issue of PSE and this makes the Mission talk about PSE. Today it’s standard that technical offices talk about PSE in activity design—even DRG staff talk about PSE.” —Cohort member

Alignment with Agency policies and Program Cycle requirements was mentioned often as an enabling condition for the PIVOT program as well. Participants emphasized the relevance of PIVOT to new Agency PSE priorities in the Policy Framework and Prosper Africa. They also discussed how Program Cycle planning helped prioritize and facilitate PIVOT efforts to integrate PSE into Missions’ work.

“One good thing is that the vision for PIVOT remains quite relevant, especially with Prosper Africa, and the other Agency PSE policies. Sometimes you design a program and the whole point of it goes away and it’s not relevant right away.” —Cohort member

“Due to the Mission’s current priorities—design of CDCS, PADS, and PSE plan—the PIVOT program is being highly prioritized.” —Cohort member

“I think that PIVOT is really timely. We’re working on our CDCS and the discussions in PIVOT are helping in the exercise of doing a CDCS. We are now talking about integrating PSE as a big pillar of our CDCS. We want to see our PIVOT change plan integrated there.” —Cohort member
• **Interest in PIVOT’s capacity building and change management approach:** Program implementers and USAID/Washington leaders indicated that PIVOT’s innovative capacity building and change management approach generated widespread interest from staff across the Agency. Many suggested that the approach offered an important alternative to traditional one-week training programs and PowerPoint webinars. Grounded in research evidence, best practices for staff development, and organizational change literature, the Cohort model responded to a variety of identified field staff needs (e.g., peer learning, tailored support), Agency priorities (e.g., operationalizing PSE and the Journey to Self-Reliance), and management issues (e.g., promoting cross-sector, cross-office collaboration; adaptive management) that resonated with many staff. Interest in the program was evidenced by the 12 Africa Missions that applied for the five available places in the program. Within Missions, Cohort members indicated that their Mission culture’s openness and readiness to change, as well as their leadership’s general interest in PSE and PIVOT’s change management approach, were critical elements supporting PIVOT implementation.

• **Leveraging existing PSE expertise and experience across the Agency:** PIVOT drew upon, connected, and was strengthened by pre-existing PSE expertise, relationships, and related initiatives within the Agency. The program leveraged existing PSE technical experience and expertise across Pillar Bureaus to provide rich resources to PIVOT Missions. Cohort members also indicated that, within Missions, PIVOT activities have been supported and enhanced by existing PSE capacities (e.g., PSE units, private-sector advisors), previous successful experiences with private-sector partners, and explicit PSE goals already integrated into work plans and Program Cycle documents.

• **PIVOT funding:** PIVOT’s strategic leadership and fortuitous timing provided an unusual opportunity to capitalize on flexible funding from the Africa Bureau, and other Bureaus across the Agency, to support PIVOT’s innovative design and implementation.

2. **Country Contexts Supporting PSE**

While PIVOT focused primarily on internal capacity building and change management, staff PSE efforts and PIVOT outcomes were directly affected by national and local contexts. During interviews, PIVOT participants briefly discussed some of the key elements and conditions that supported their new PSE efforts. These clearly differed between Missions, but the conditions most commonly mentioned by participants included:

• **National government support for enterprise-driven development** and private-sector investment as a core strategy for addressing development challenges and supporting self-reliance, including:

---

5 The reviewers recognize that PSE enabling conditions are sector and industry-specific, rely on analyses of different local systems and political economies, and are continually changing. The broad scope of the Learning Review questions and limited opportunities for field data collection, however, resulted in very broad discussions and analyses of these contextual factors.

6 See Annex 7 for brief descriptions of contextual enablers and barriers by country.
National development plans and investment policies where private-sector companies play a key role in helping reach development objectives;

Explicit national commitment to attracting foreign investment and responsible corporate actors, and to tapping into global markets to fund sustainable growth and foster self-reliance;

Prioritization and support for new forms of financing;

Support for development of specific sectors or types of businesses (e.g., SMEs); and

Commitment to fighting corruption, improving transparency, and creating strong business enabling environments.

All Cohort members and Mission Directors mentioned that they had good relationships and successful past experiences with their government counterparts on which to build.

- **Vibrant private sector:** A few field staff noted that the private sector in their countries offered a wide range of potential business partners, innovations and expertise, and untapped investment capital. Some mentioned the growing involvement and advocacy of private-sector actors in improving services and accountability. In addition, some indicated that multinational companies considered their countries a regional hub for business.

  Staff based in countries with strong and diverse business communities indicated that they had plenty of opportunities for PSE. However, they also faced many challenges and questions around which opportunities they should focus on, with whom, and how. Several Cohort members and Mission Directors indicated that they had good past experiences with private-sector companies and had relatively strong networks of contacts to support future efforts.

- **Commercial bank support for innovative finance:** A few participants mentioned that commercial banks in their country were interested in diversifying their loan portfolios and exploring innovative financing solutions.

- **Motivated, young workforces:** Some Cohort members mentioned large, youthful populations in their country that have proven to be ready to learn new skills (e.g., in agriculture) to improve their standard of living. This has encouraged private-sector investment and activities and supported staff PSE efforts.

- **Stability:** Some Cohort members indicated that investors and foreign companies considered their country a stable democracy. This supported their PSE and innovative finance efforts.
B. BARRIERS FOR IMPLEMENTING PIVOT

I. Organizational

Participants identified a wide range of barriers or inhibiting conditions that affected PIVOT implementation and outcomes as well as PSE more generally.

- **Limited staff time and bandwidth:** While staff often mentioned the significant time commitments required by PIVOT as a program challenge (see Program Challenges section above), they discussed staffing shortages, rotations, and churn even more frequently as an organizational barrier to effective PSE efforts. Program participants emphasized the need for allocated or flexible time to engage with private-sector stakeholders and manage partnerships. They recognized that relationship building with potential business partners takes time, both to identify aligned interests and to build trust. In addition, multi-stakeholder partnerships add complexity to project design and implementation, placing higher demands on staff time. Participants indicated that they need time to host or attend networking events, initiate dialogues, and manage new relationships with private-sector stakeholders.

  “Right now PSE is encouraged by leadership and something many staff want to do it, but they still have 100 percent LOE allocated to other things.” —Cohort Member

  “Staff want to know, ‘is this going to help me with my targets?’ If not, they don’t want to hear about it. Many Missions just don’t have the capacity in terms of staff and time at this point.” —Cohort Member

Cohort members commented that there were few structures that allowed them to make strategic trade-offs in their time or to document/get recognition for less tangible aspects of PSE.

- **Funding constraints and inflexibility** were frequently mentioned as well. Earmarked funds and inflexible, time-consuming procurement procedures made it difficult for Missions to work with private-sector partners. Participants highlighted the need for flexible funding mechanisms and procedures outside existing programmatic frameworks both at headquarters and Missions. This includes innovation funds that support PSE exploration, experimentation, and Mission-led proposals; non-grant financial mechanisms open to a variety of sectors and stakeholders; more fungible resources with longer expiration dates; and more “friendly” funding processes that allow for quick deployment of capital and innovative (rather than procurement-driven) partnerships.

- **Organizational structures and practices** were also mentioned by several participants as creating barriers for implementing PIVOT. For example, some participants noted that the departure/rotation of FSOs from PIVOT Change Teams (and more generally) interrupted program momentum and created issues around knowledge management. Others highlighted the lack of Agency guidelines and institutionalization backing PIVOT’s integrated approaches (e.g., cross-sector and cross-Mission work) and PSE more generally. Finally, staff often spoke about the need to include PSE in job descriptions, work objectives, and performance appraisals.

  “Our inability to integrate PSE into the program design or Mission Order to give PSE the Mission authority it needed has been a real barrier.” —Cohort member

  “My only challenge is how do I make sure that my boss understands that we have made important but intangible progress on PSE in my appraisal.” —Cohort member

- **Guidance, requirements, and incentives for PSE:** Some Directors suggested that the Agency require and reward PSE efforts rather than making it optional and highlighted the importance of recognizing superior PSE efforts. For example, some Mission Directors include PSE as part of the annual award ceremony.

  “Providing staff incentives and rewards would raise the profile so people would know that if they do PSE work, even if it’s not traditional aid work, they are still being recognized for it.” —Cohort member
• **Managing resistance**: Participants also suggested that, “**USAID’s organizational culture, procedures, and processes often work against widespread adoption of PSE in practice.**” Some Mission cultures are resistant to change or to PSE. Affinity Group Leads indicated that many staff in the Agency are not clear about what PSE is and is not, while others, “see the private sector as evil, ‘just another forced task’, or ‘the same initiative with a new name.’”

Beyond their assessments of the PIVOT program, Mission Directors’ comments often highlighted broader changes at headquarters that would create an enabling environment for effective PSE at their Missions.

“The environment is changing faster than the Agency is able to respond. PIVOT is a great start for making shifts at the individual, relationship, and activity levels. We also need other, complementary activities and changes in the organization to effectively implement the PSE policy.” —Mission Director

• **More collaborative, individualized technical support processes**: Mission Directors expressed concerns about existing Agency support efforts for PSE and highlighted the need for more PIVOT-like technical support. This included Missions’ early input and co-design of support so that assistance is context-sensitive and clearly aligns with Mission strategies and needs.

• **Workforce planning for PSE**: Mission Directors emphasized that the Agency can’t effectuate cultural change without hiring additional expertise in PSE and innovative finance.

“Currently, people with the right technical skills and background in PSE are more the exception than the rule. In terms of workforce planning, Missions need to bring in more people with strong private equity backgrounds to complement PIVOT’s efforts to build that capacity with existing staff. This will alleviate major time constraints affecting staff PSE efforts.” —Mission Director

• **A PSE change management strategy for USAID/Washington**: Inspired by PIVOT’s approach within Missions, some Directors suggested that USAID/Washington also needs a change management strategy and process with clear metrics to support new ways of doing business. They suggested that a change management strategy should focus on improving:

  – **PSE coordination across Bureaus**: Mission Directors noted that PSE across the Agency is very uneven and unclear, which can be confusing to Mission staff. They highlighted the need for improved coordination and increased accountability around PSE.

    “For example, humanitarian assistance doesn’t have clear options or tools for PSE. There needs to be a stronger nexus between the humanitarian and resilience processes. If one is not really on board with PSE, it makes it difficult to manage transitions along the continuum from relief to development. That’s a problem. Bureaus are not coordinating and there is no accountability. Lack of coordination means Missions are left to figure things out for themselves. What we have is Bureaus carrying out their own activities in the country without any serious discussion about the effectiveness of those activities and whether they are aligned at all with private-sector engagement. They are beyond accountability with respect to pivoting toward PSE. People observe these counter-narratives going on inside the Agency right now.” —Mission Director

  – **Connecting private-sector companies with Missions**: Some Mission Directors suggested that USAID/Washington should become more proactive in building relationships between U.S. companies and Missions.

    “One of the big challenges that headquarters needs to address is engaging the U.S. private sector in a much more robust way and building bridges of engagement with Missions, at least on the African continent. We have all of these international alliances with private sector companies—big deals with HQ and big name companies—but we don’t see people trying to pull those relationships down into the countries where we are working. So it all becomes very ethereal and not very practical. There are a lot of things, systemically, out of HQ that are left to the Missions to figure out on their own. Headquarters could be a lot more proactive in driving these initiatives and bringing Missions into relationships with regional and global private sector networks.” —Mission Director
• **Models for scaling up PSE capacity building:** While PIVOT offers an intensive, cohort approach to staff PSE capacity building within certain Missions, some Mission Directors discussed the need for additional efforts that scale up PSE efforts. They mentioned that PSE should be a strong focus at the Mission Directors’ conference with longer-term opportunities for peer learning and mentoring that support Mission Directors who have less PSE experience. Other Mission Directors focused on using Regional Mission platforms to support PSE efforts.

“We have been ambivalent about these regional platforms for decades, but they could provide a lot of assistance to bilateral Missions, like creating technical support hubs or managing regional incentive funds for promoting PSE. But there is no discussion, no space right now for articulating that, so it’s all left to people’s own devices. If we are going to get serious about implementing the PSE and J2SR policies, we have got to figure out how to make these changes more broadly.” —Mission Director

• **USAID taking a leadership role in PSE:** Some Mission Directors expressed hope that the Agency would take a stronger leadership role in promoting PSE among other government agencies and private-sector stakeholders. They noted that other U.S. government agencies often do not have buy-in to a PSE approach and suggested that USAID can provide leadership in making PSE a whole-of-government initiative. In addition, Mission Directors indicated that the Agency needs to take a leadership role with private-sector companies, fostering socially and environmentally responsible business models and highlighting the social benefits companies provide through their products and services.

“We are often coming at this as if the private sector is all good and we just need to learn to work with them better. But the private sector in most African countries is full of cartels run by the political elites of the country. We need clear thinking, leadership, and an Agency narrative at the headquarters level about how to work in these environments. What is our narrative? What kinds of things do private-sector actors need to change to work with us? If we are looking toward the future, it’s not just us that needs to change. The Agency needs to play that leadership role in helping people understand these changes in terms of getting the private sector to flourish, at least in African Countries.” —Mission Director

While Mission Directors highlighted the considerable work that still needs to be done, both at headquarters and in their Missions, to shift organizational culture and operations for more effective PSE, they also expressed enthusiasm for this new priority and for the PIVOT Cohort program’s contributions.

“The Agency, internally, under Administrator Green, is doing a tremendous job moving forward a private-sector engagement strategy and agenda that is actionable…In the past, where we’ve had challenges is in having a policy that doesn’t have programs like PIVOT in place. PIVOT is very action-oriented and supports Missions and staff in thinking and programming in new ways that look for PSE opportunities within our portfolios. We just need to keep at it, keep engaging the private sector over and over again. And if we keep supporting the champions and groups focused on engaging the private sector, I believe we will see tremendous benefits.” —Mission Director

2. **Country Contexts Inhibiting PSE:**

During interviews, PIVOT participants briefly discussed some of the contextual barriers affecting their new PSE efforts. These differed considerably across Missions, but the most commonly mentioned conditions included:

• **Corruption:** All Cohort members indicated that significant levels of corruption, cartels and monopolies, and unenforced regulations and laws are inhibiting PSE efforts. Participants recognized that they need strong due diligence processes and must be careful not to enable actors whose interests they don’t share.

• **Stagnant or volatile economies:** For some PIVOT Missions, national economies are stagnant or hitting a rough patch; growth has weakened and a number of sectors are experiencing strain. Caps on interest rates have impacted private lending and limited where private-sector actors want to invest. In others, significant currency volatility, high national interest rates, uncertainty caused by restructuring in financial/banking systems, and low capacities or limited access to finance discourage PSE opportunities.
• **Limited investors:** Some Cohort members indicated that few U.S. companies are investing in their countries. International investors may see their countries as commercially limited (e.g., low natural resources) or high risk (e.g., history of conflict or persistent political crises). Some mentioned an increasingly strong presence of Chinese investment that often counters USAID’s objectives and impacts their relevance to the private sector. In some countries, the prevalence of parastatal firms and government-controlled industries crowd out firm growth.

• **Local business community issues:** Participants mentioned a number of barriers to engaging with the local private sector. Some described young, informal, or fragmented local private sectors that lacked associations, had relatively small or nascent capital markets, or offered few reliable and reputable potential partners. Others discussed local private sectors that were used to grant support and unprepared for investors looking for commercial, risk-adjusted returns.

• **Difficulties doing business:** Some Mission contexts had very low rankings on the “ease of doing business” index (e.g., high shipping costs, poor roads, unreliable utilities), which limited international business interests. Participants also mentioned that bureaucratic permitting process for public-private partnerships created significant delays and barriers in formalizing these partnerships.

• **Resistance to change:** Cohort members also mentioned PSE barriers related to conservative mindsets among many key actors that resist change (e.g., national/cultural attitudes about natural resources).

• **Few multi-stakeholder policy dialogue forums:** Some Cohort members recognized that few platforms for inclusive dialogue among private-sector actors and government created barriers for improving market systems and business enabling environments.

While Change Team Leads and Mission Directors mentioned these national barriers as directly affecting their PSE efforts, they also highlighted PIVOT’s focus on staff capacity building and organizational change as essential first steps for effective PSE.

“**Before you consider external contexts or business environments, you have to make changes in the Missions. At USAID, we have to be very deliberate in our designs to ensure that spaces for PSE are created. If we don’t do that, then the opportunities won’t present themselves.**” —Cohort member
VI. Program Outcomes

This section summarizes results from a variety of Learning Review sources (e.g., survey, Outcome Harvesting activity, interviews, etc.) to examine program outcomes and discuss staff and organizational changes to which the PIVOT Cohort program may have contributed. Results are organized by individual, relational, and organizational levels of analysis.

OBJECTIVE 3: Collect and assess evidence that PIVOT’s capacity building and change management approach resulted in intended changes in participants and their Missions.

Overall, results from the Learning Review survey showed statistically significant increases in participants’ knowledge and skills around PSE, Agency policies, and CLA since the start of PIVOT. These, and increases in leadership skills, were corroborated by Outcome Harvesting, document analysis, and interview data as well. The survey also showed that PIVOT Cohort members rated their Change Teams significantly higher in trust, communication, collaboration, productivity, and innovation than the comparison group of non-PIVOT PSE POCs. In addition, PIVOT Cohort members rated USAID/Washington’s field support higher than the comparison group. In interviews, Cohort members and Mission Directors identified clear shifts in their Missions’ culture and operations since the start of the program, but usually qualified these changes as slower and nascent. Participants emphasized, however, that PIVOT’s focus on capacity building, change management, and PSE planning has been foundational, and more time is needed to see these kinds of results.

A. STAFF LEARNING: CHANGES IN PARTICIPANTS’ KNOWLEDGE, SKILLS, AND CONFIDENCE

Across sources, Learning Review data showed that program participants had significant increases in PSE, CLA, and leadership knowledge and skills, as well as increased understanding about how to operationalize the Agency’s PSE and Journey to Self-Reliance policies since the start of the PIVOT Cohort program.

1. PSE and Agency policies: In the analysis of Outcome Harvesting data—i.e., responses to open-ended questions asking participants to describe and rank changes or outcomes since the start of PIVOT—participants ranked changes in their own PSE knowledge, skills, and activities as well as new leadership abilities as the most significant outcomes of PIVOT (see Annex 9 for the full analysis and examples). These changes focused on: increased knowledge or understandings of PSE in general, and in their sector/area of work specifically; improved skills or abilities in talking with private-sector stakeholders (i.e., talking the talk); better understanding of private-sector actors’ points of view; and improved ability to discuss USAID’s PSE Policy and advantages of PSE for development work.
In the Learning Review survey’s pre- and post-test analysis, Cohort members (n=24) showed statistically significant gains in individual-level knowledge and skills related to PSE and to Agency policies since the start of the PIVOT program (see Annex 12 for additional information).\(^7\)

The following chart shows examples of changes in PSE knowledge and skills on a five-point scale.\(^8\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-Post Changes in Participants PSE Knowledge and Skills</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I understand and can describe the importance of inclusive market systems. (p=.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to make use of USAID’s full breadth of PSE approaches. (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to name industries and companies in them that would be a useful partner for USAID in my country/sector. (p=.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to describe my work in a way that will be compelling for private-sector stakeholders. (p=.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to listen for the interests of private-sector stakeholders. (p=.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the full spectrum of PSE modalities (financial and non-financial). (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with how to integrate private-sector perspectives and capabilities into strategy and design. (p&lt;.001)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples of changes in understanding of Agency policies include increases in:

- **Understanding the link between private-sector engagement and the Journey to Self-Reliance.** (p=.001)
- **Understanding how to operationalize the Journey to Self-Reliance.** (p=.003)

In addition to pre- and post-test analyses, the Learning Review also compared the PIVOT Cohort’s survey responses with those from field-based PSE POCs at non-PIVOT Missions.\(^9\) At the start of the PIVOT Cohort program, the PSE POCs were not considered appropriate for a matched comparison analysis. PIVOT Cohort participants included staff from a variety of technical and functional offices across their Missions, many of whom had little knowledge or experience with PSE prior to the program. In contrast, the field PSE POCs are usually selected based on considerable expertise and experience in PSE.

While there were no true baseline measures to compare these two groups at the start of the PIVOT program to test the assumption of nonequivalence, four items on the PIVOT baseline surveys (March 2019), overlapped with those on an Agency-wide PSE POC survey (June 2019). A preliminary analysis examined differences between the PIVOT Cohort’s baseline test and the PSE POCs’ responses to these items on the June survey (serving here as a pre-test). The results showed that, as might be expected, the PSE POCs group had significantly higher scores than

---

\(^7\) Please note that the survey reflects self-reported assessments rather than direct assessments and may suffer from validity issues. However, research literature suggests that such assessments are useful in evaluating professional development efficacy when substantiated by other data (Guskey, 2000).

\(^8\) The p-values at the end of each item indicate statistical significance, or the likelihood that the difference in scores between pre- and post-test (or, in later examples, between PIVOT and the PSE POC comparison group) was due to chance. For example, p<.05 indicates that we can be 95 percent confident that the difference in scores is NOT due to chance. By most standards, anything equal to or less than .05 is considered statistically significant.

\(^9\) Because the PSE POC group assignment was not randomized or controlled by reviewers, and there was no opportunity for a pre-test of this group, this comparison resembles a quasi-experimental, nonequivalent, posttest-only design.
PIVOT Cohort members on all four items. However, when the PIVOT Cohort and PSE POC groups were asked about the same four items on the Learning Review survey (serving here as a post-test), there were no significant differences in responses between groups (see Annex 12 for details). The following charts show changes in the average scores, on a five-point scale, for both PIVOT Cohort members (n=28) and the PSE POC comparison group (n=22) on those four items.

The limited number of questions and small sample sizes make it difficult to draw conclusions from this data. The analysis shows, however, that for these four questions at least, while PIVOT Cohort members may have started out as a non-matched group to PSE POCs, by the end of the PIVOT program, their gains in PSE knowledge and skills showed no significant difference from the PSE POCs. This supports other findings that indicate PIVOT Cohort members likely improved their PSE knowledge and skills as a result of their participation in the program.

This suggestion is further supported by the lack of significant differences between groups in their responses to all individual PSE skills and knowledge items, as well as 63 other items assessing individual and organizational readiness for PSE. In the Learning Review survey analysis, the only significant differences between the two groups were in the areas of CLA, PSE Working Groups, and Agency field support for PSE (discussed further below).
2. **CLA and Change Management**: In the Outcome Harvesting analysis, approximately 20 percent of responses elicited from participants fell within the CLA/change management category. They focused on internal or external collaboration, pause and reflect processes, flexibility or adaptability, and change management (e.g., *I am personally more aware of the importance of consensus-building and change management in creating buy-in for private-sector engagement partnerships*).

The comparative analysis of PSE plans submitted by PIVOT and non-PIVOT Africa Missions found that CLA principles and processes appear more frequently in PIVOT PSE plans than in non-PIVOT PSE plans. Although only directly mentioned in one PSE Plan (USAID/Madagascar), all of the PIVOT PSE plans incorporate principles associated with CLA to varying degrees much more frequently than non-PIVOT PSE plans (except for USAID/Senegal). However, in all PSE plans, the focus on CLA concepts was nascent, with only sporadic mention of knowledge management, learning, or collaborative approaches. Many PIVOT PSE plans articulated a general understanding of CLA principles (e.g., *making mistakes and changing course, but continuously learning*), but did not include intentional, systematic, or resourced approaches to CLA or identify how those concepts would be operationalized in PSE efforts (e.g., by learning from M&E data). In addition, the comparative analysis found no real differences in the inclusion of interpersonal skills between PIVOT and non-PIVOT Mission plans. Across all PSE plans, interpersonal skills such as active listening, relationship building, and elements of leadership were largely missing. USAID/Madagascar was the only Mission to mention leadership and change management skill development. This may relate to other findings indicating that participants face difficulties in applying these new skills (see discussion below) or it may suggest that the PSE plans don’t focus on this level of detail when discussing processes for implementing PSE.

In the Learning Review survey’s pre- and post-test analysis, Cohort participants showed statistically significant increases in participants’ CLA knowledge and skills. Examples include:

- **Understanding of how CLA can be integrated into their daily work**. *(p=.02)*
- **Familiarity with the CLA framework**. *(p=.03)*
- **Ability to identify CLA approaches, tools, and techniques to address their Change Team’s challenges and opportunities**. *(p<.001)*

Additionally, in the comparison between groups, PIVOT Cohort members scored significantly higher than non-PIVOT field PSE POCs on individual-level CLA items including:

- **Familiarity with the CLA framework**. *(p=.001)*
- **Understanding how CLA can be integrated into their daily work**. *(p=.02)*

For other individual-level PSE, CLA, and leadership skills, there were no significant differences between PIVOT Cohort members’ posttest scores and those from non-PIVOT PSE POCs. For example, in supporting knowledge sharing, both groups gave equally high ratings to the importance of: a) peer learning opportunities; b) structured knowledge transfer when staff rotate; and c) stronger technical/sector knowledge flow (in both directions) between Missions and USAID/Washington.

In the PIVOT Cohort pre- and post-test analysis, six of the 22 survey items measuring participants’ knowledge and skills did not show statistically significant increases (although all did show increases). Four of these six items focused on applying leadership skills within their work environments, one focused on applying CLA in their daily work, and one
focused on the ability to describe the importance of PSE within the local, national economy. While there may be a number of reasons for this result, it is interesting to note that all of these items focus on applying new skills and knowledge within their Mission and national contexts. This may relate to participants’ requests for more applied and contextualized training in the program (see Program Challenges section above) and/or to existing barriers within organizational cultures, structures, and operations (e.g., low opportunity or authority to apply these new skills) (see Organizational Barriers section above).

3. Leadership: Unlike the survey results, in the Outcome Harvesting analysis, participants ranked their new leadership skills (as well as PSE skills) as the most significant change since the start of the PIVOT program. In particular, responses referenced improved self-awareness, active listening, presentation and facilitation skills, giving and receiving feedback, mindfulness, new leadership responsibilities in their workplace, and recognition by others of their leadership efforts (e.g., My presentation skills have improved since, as a team and as individuals, we have to present to Mission leadership and the wider Mission often now).

During interviews, many program implementers, participants, and USAID/Washington leaders highlighted how PIVOT embraced and embodied USAID’s Leadership Philosophy by empowering leaders at all levels, fostering mindfulness and self-care, cultivating staff passions around a collective PSE vision, creating opportunities for coaching and mentoring, supporting risk-taking and continuous learning, and focusing on collaboration for innovation and accountability. They noted that engaging FSNs has been an important contribution of the program. For example, their knowledge about local landscapes and needs and consistent presence in Missions supports longer-term PSE implementation and institutional memory. All participants noted that PIVOT has helped increase their commitment to PSE and confidence in how to begin the work.

“PIVOT has created a paradigm shift that helped us realize we can go and talk with private-sector companies. It is not a hidden or forbidden world. PIVOT is breaking down those walls for us. We are learning to make a habit of engaging. I am empowered and ready to talk with businesses now.” —Cohort Member

“The Agency has a leadership philosophy which talks about leaders at every level. This program is the means to realize that. DC staff who come to our Mission are thrilled to hear the voices of FSNs at the center of this experience. I think one of the most significant changes is…inviting technical staff, giving them a mandate for Mission-wide change, including them on a team at a level that far exceeds what their PD says, giving them resources to do it, and watching them thrive.”

—Cohort Member

“What I have seen that is a really big change is that this group has gone from being in the position of, ‘we have so much to learn and we are still trying to get our heads around what this is’, to taking a leadership role…. Now we can explain why PSE is important, and we can coach and mentor others in our Mission. That has been a real change over the past few months.”

—Cohort Member

While PSE, CLA, and leadership skills have been discussed separately in this analysis of changes, the PIVOT Cohort approach to capacity building and staff development is integrated and holistic. This was reflected in the strong mix of categories that made up the Cohort’s “Top Ten” highest rated items across the Learning Review survey. When the average score for each survey item was ranked from highest to lowest, Cohort members’ top ten rated items (i.e., their strengths), show a mix of categories, including PSE (3), leadership (3), and CLA (2) knowledge and skills, Change Teams relationships (2), Mission-level support for PSE (1), and understandings of Agency policy (1). They also include a variety of individual-level, Change Team, and Mission-level items. In contrast, for the PSE POC group, eight of their “Top Ten” survey items focused on PSE knowledge and skills at the individual level. These differences highlight the effects of PIVOT’s multi-faceted approach to capacity building and change management.
B. RELATIONSHIP BUILDING: CHANGES IN PIVOT CHANGE TEAMS AND FIELD SUPPORT

PIVOT’s efforts to ground technical and interpersonal skills in practical, job-related experiences and opportunities for peer- and team-based learning also seemed to yield results for Change Teams and field support.

1. Change Teams: Throughout Learning Review interviews, Cohort members credited their supportive Change Team relationships, as well as new PSE-related knowledge and leadership skills, in helping them take leadership roles to advance PSE in their Missions (see Organizational Change section below for further discussion).

“PIVOT has elevated Change Team members’ knowledge and visibility around PSE, and given us both a platform and a mandate to champion change in our Missions.” —Cohort Member

“Watching our PIVOT team pick up the PSE mantle and lead…that’s what we’re doing and it’s what is needed. Seeing our efforts grow and start to catch fire…it’s gratifying.” —Cohort Member

In the Learning Review survey, Cohort members rated trust and collaboration within their Change Team as two of the ten highest scored items on the survey. In the comparison with the PSE POC group, PIVOT Cohort members rated their Change Teams significantly higher than PSE POCs rated their PSE working groups on a five-point scale across all dimensions, including: a) trust (p<.001); b) communication (p<.001); c) collaboration (p<.001); d) productivity (p=.034); and e) innovation (p=.044).¹⁰

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>PSE POCs</th>
<th>PIVOT Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productivity</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>4.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>4.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹⁰ For “innovation” the p-value provided is for the non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U-test, since it differed from the results of the independent, two-sample t-test. See Annex 12 for additional details.

Interviews provided some examples of PSE efforts that PIVOT Change Teams are currently working on, including:

- Completing a market analysis and opportunity mapping for Northern Ghana that will guide the Change Team’s TDY to that region. Results will inform their nascent opportunity matrix and relationship management system. (USAID/Ghana)
- Developing indicators and milestones to measure PSE progress within the Program Cycle, including PSE as a criteria in portfolio reviews. (USAID/Madagascar)
- Updating the PSE relationship management tracker/database to facilitate cross-office communication and coordination. (USAID/Madagascar)
• Developing PSE resource kits and messaging for three audiences: implementing partners, private-sector companies, and the Government of Rwanda. The team will help familiarize staff across the Mission with these resources. (USAID/Rwanda)

• Developing a database of successful private-sector partnerships in different sectors including case studies from bilateral Missions in the region that document activities where PSE was used to achieve development results. (USAID/Southern Africa)

2. USAID/Washington’s Field Support: Interviews with Cohort members and program implementers indicated that the sustained contact and collaboration between USAID/Washington and field staff in the PIVOT program had improved field support for private-sector engagement.

While there was no baseline data either for Changes Teams or PSE field support efforts (e.g., technical assistance, TDYs, knowledge resources, etc.), the Learning Review survey’s comparison group analysis found that, on a five-point scale, PIVOT Cohort members (n=28) rated USAID/Washington support significantly higher than the non-PIVOT PSE POCs group (n=22) in areas such as “helps connect Mission with U.S. or multinational companies;” “is sustained so work can build;” and “is tailored to fit needs.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsive Field Support</th>
<th>PSE POCs</th>
<th>PIVOT Cohort</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Helps connect Mission with U.S. or Multinational Companies (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is sustained so work can build (p=.004)</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is tailored to fit needs (p&lt;.001)</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>4.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interview data also suggested that PIVOT has been effective in addressing important issues raised in USAID’s Field Needs Survey (November 2018) for responsive support. For example, program implementers noted that the Cohort model and field support efforts strengthen institutional knowledge about Agency procedures and mechanisms at the same time as it fosters new ways of working with the private sector.

“Over the years, USAID has flipped the age and experience structure in Agency staffing. The magnitude of the challenge in building capacity to do things that were established protocols and procedures within Missions and programs, inter-agency, etc. is tremendous. So we are filling in those gaps for new staff at the same time as building capacities in new PSE processes and adaptations of old processes. It’s transferring institutional knowledge, capacity, or rules-of-the road.... For example, I can work very quickly with somebody from my own cohort...like, if [name removed] was sitting in a different Mission and I hadn’t talked to her in a year and a half—we could call up and have a very quick conversation. We share the same jargon and reference points, we can talk about things that are comparable to [specific examples omitted]...We are building those relationships and contexts now in PIVOT with people who will have long-term impact.... So, we are filling in this basic institutional knowledge about procedures and mechanisms at the same time as we’re pushing into new private sector work or expanding work we’ve been doing at a new level and degree of emphasis.” —Affinity Group Lead
C. ORGANIZATIONAL CHANGES: SHIFTS IN MISSIONS’ CULTURE AND OPERATIONS THAT SUPPORT PSE

While PIVOT participants often mentioned a wide range of overlapping changes in organizational culture and operations related to PSE, they also noted that these changes were slower to develop and less noticeable than individual and relational changes supported by PIVOT. For example, in the Outcome Harvesting analysis, Cohort members mentioned organizational level changes more often than changes in individual KSAs or relationships; however, they ranked them lower in significance. They may see these changes as less significant because many are still nascent. Alternatively, the prevalence of highly ranked individual-level changes may just reflect the salience of personal change over organizational shifts.

Learning Review survey results found significant increases in participants’ pre- and posttest ratings of their Mission’s organizational readiness for PSE and Mission staff’s understanding of Agency policies. Participants indicated that since the start of PIVOT, their Missions had changed significantly and positively. It should be noted, however, that while most survey items were rated on a five-point scale, these items were on a 10-point scale and average scores remained relatively low. This suggests that despite significant changes, there is still considerable work to do.

In addition, participants indicated that staff in their Missions had significantly improved attitudes and behaviors related to Agency policies. This included:

- **Mission staff are open to integrating Agency-wide policies and initiatives related to self-reliance into the Mission’s daily operations.** (p=.001)
- **Mission staff are able to effectively describe and implement Agency-wide policies and initiatives related to self-reliance into the Mission’s daily operations.** (p=.001)

In the comparison group analysis, PIVOT Cohort members had significantly higher scores than the PSE POC group in rating their Mission staff’s openness to integrating CLA into Mission operations (p=.05). They were significantly lower, however, in rating how much their Mission staff focus on developing more equal, co-created collaborations with private-sector stakeholders (p=.05). On all other organization-level survey items, the PIVOT Cohort showed no significant differences from the PSE POC group. This included:

1. **Mission support for PSE** (five items—e.g., flexible or dedicated time or funds for PSE; staff recognition or rewards for PSE);
2. Organizational culture supporting PSE (four items—e.g., openness to new ideas; opportunities for staff dialogue or reflection about PSE efforts);

3. PSE operations, practices, and outcomes (12 items—e.g., effective tools for outreach, due diligence, and relationship management; formalized processes for reporting PSE; mobilization of private-sector expertise and funds);

4. Evaluation of PSE efforts (four items—e.g., clear success metrics; M&E integrated into PSE); and

5. Relationships with other USG or donor organizations on PSE (two items).

The lack of significant differences between groups on organization-level PSE items may support suggestions that changes in PIVOT Missions’ cultures and operations related to PSE are still nascent and will take time to manifest.

For both groups, all 10 lowest scored survey items focused on organization-level conditions for PSE and six of them were the same for both groups. These highlight some specific areas for improvement within the Agency where efforts could focus on better supporting PSE. For example, both groups gave low ratings to items related to PSE metrics and evaluation; the availability of flexible or dedicated PSE funds; and time/opportunities for Mission staff to review, reflect, and dialogue on PSE efforts. These areas correspond to interview and focus group data where Cohort members reported challenges related to time, funding, and evaluation of PSE (see Program Challenges and Organizational Barriers sections above.)

Interviews with Cohort members and Mission Directors provided some insight into the kinds of organization-level changes that have begun since the start of PIVOT.

1. Increased Staff Awareness and Interest in PSE Across the Mission was the change mentioned most often since the start of PIVOT. Mission Directors, in particular, all discussed seeing increases in staff who are thinking and talking about PSE in more sophisticated ways, recognizing its importance, and focusing on developing new opportunities. Cohort members indicated that there is a growing recognition that PSE is everyone’s responsibility, and that this new focus is here to stay. Field staff and leaders indicated that Change Team presentations, report-outs and updates at office meetings, Mission town halls, and other meetings have contributed to these changes.

“PIVOT has led to big transformations in our Mission: More people understand what PSE is, speak a common PSE language, and know how to do it…People now realize that private-sector engagement is here to stay and we are integrating it into our daily work. The fire has been lit and it is beginning to burn. The key is to keep that momentum alive.” —Cohort Member

“For me, the biggest change since the start of PIVOT is more awareness about PSE—especially the ‘how’ of it—across Mission priorities and interests. The fact is that the Health folks, the Education folks, etc. are all starting to think about it and have been doing some private sector assessments. But the ‘how’ of engaging is what we are raising awareness about now. It mustn’t just be an add-on. It must be a central part of strategies. Getting the Front Office involved in those discussions has been a real accomplishment.” —Cohort Member

Participants indicated, however, that there was still much work to be done in helping staff throughout the Mission understand more clearly how to apply PSE to their own activities.

2. PSE Integrated into Mission Planning and Programming Across the Program Cycle: Participants also highlighted how instrumental PIVOT Change Teams have been in beginning to integrate PSE into Mission documents across the Program Cycle (e.g., CDCS, PADs, activity designs); adding it to staff position descriptions, work objectives, and performance review criteria; and creating both formal and informal processes for conducting PSE. All Change Teams helped develop their Mission’s PSE Plan and helped include PSE as a centerpiece in their new CDCSs. For example, in evaluations from the Uganda TDY, one of the largest changes reported was that the priorities of all technical and support offices are now reflected in the Mission’s approach to PSE. Across all Missions, Cohort members indicated that they have used collaborative planning processes modeled in PIVOT within their offices, which has increased staff buy-in for PSE efforts. Cohort members and Mission Directors indicated that Change Teams have helped integrate
PSE into planning and activities in each technical office and included PSE in operating processes (e.g., PSE updates built into internal meeting agendas and external Chief of Party meetings).

“PIVOT has provided a great opportunity to understand how PSE can be integrated into our Mission—for example, our PIVOT plan initiated conversations in the Missions across sectors and helped us build PSE into our CDCS. The Mission needed new staffing structures to do PSE and needed more people involved. PIVOT has helped expand staff skill-sets and integrate PSE into work objectives. The alignment and timing really pushed us to think—it has been very useful.” —Cohort member

3. Expanded Leadership Support for PSE: While Mission Director support was a precondition for participating in the PIVOT Cohort program and all Mission Directors in PIVOT Missions already placed a high priority on PSE and market-based development prior to the program, Cohort members indicated that the program had engaged a variety of other Mission leaders and enhanced senior leadership support for and attention to PSE efforts.

“I got an email from our Office Chief, who is new to the office, and she talked about the PSE strategy and how it was reported at the senior management group meeting by the program director (who wasn’t part of the PIVOT program). Hearing someone else who is not part of the Change Team be able to articulate the key objectives and hearing that it’s been discussed at senior management group meetings, without any of us there … That’s a change. She [Office Chief] is thinking about how to be at the front of this. She is asking me what the next steps should be so she can help lead. To me that shows that the Change Team is doing its job, because before, it was mostly just us talking about PSE.” —Cohort member

4. Improved Cross-Office Collaboration was mentioned by most Cohort members as an important change since the start of PIVOT. These efforts have fostered cross-sectoral learning and cross-fertilization of PSE efforts. For example, in one PIVOT Mission, a PIVOT TDY for PSE within the health sector resulted in a PSE landscape analysis and related action planning. That work provided a model for other technical offices that then conducted their own sector-specific landscape analyses. In a different Mission, one of the technical offices held a private-sector speakers series that brought in a variety of local and international companies. Strong, Mission-wide attendance motivated other offices to organize similar events.

“PIVOT has helped with coordination and integration of PSE across the Mission. Some technical offices had started PSE work prior to PIVOT, but it was stove-piped: Staff didn’t share information or work together. Our work in PIVOT has also helped develop a shared understanding of PSE.” —Cohort Member

“Change teams promote open and fluid communication across office … For example, if someone in our Programs Office needs help with an Education issue, she does not hesitate to pick up the phone and call a team member in the Education office now. This has provided an opportunity to understand different initiatives and identify ways of coordinating and collaborating … The structure is great!” —Cohort Member

5. Doing PSE Differently: Across interviews, participants emphasized that PIVOT was helping their offices work differently with private-sector stakeholders. These changes included:

- Shift Toward Proactive and Intentional PSE: Participants commented that operating units have usually been reactive and opportunistic about PSE. Through PIVOT support, participants have now led PSE opportunity mapping activities in their respective offices, are planning around identified needs, and are taking a more proactive approach to engaging private-sector entities. Cohort members in some Missions indicated that Mission staff are more strategic in implementing PSE and have criteria for who, when, and how to engage.

- Judicious Experimentation and Risk-Taking: Participants indicated that PIVOT has provided safe spaces for practicing and experimenting with PSE integrated with opportunities for reflection and learning. In at least one PIVOT Mission this has translated into a “Kiss Some Frogs” strategy where practice and fails in PSE have supported learning and refinement. While some efforts didn’t work out well, others proved very promising. Cohort members and Affinity Group Leads also mentioned that discussions of PSE risks and failures have created bonds
and useful learning opportunities. Participants raised questions, however, about how failure will be viewed by Mission supervisors and leaders who are not in PIVOT.

“We are building capacities, but PSE takes time to learn and to do effectively. If we engage a private-sector actor and it doesn’t result in a deal or work out, how will that be looked at? Internally, our team will reflect and learn from the experience. But at the end of the day, will leadership see that as a failure?”—Cohort Member

More systematic and intentional efforts to build equal, collaborative partnerships with private-sector companies. Participants noted that PIVOT’s curriculum provides focused skills and opportunities to help participants shift mindsets and partnerships away from transactional contracts toward longer-term, co-created activities.

Recognizing PSE as an approach rather than an objective: Participants also highlighted PIVOT’s efforts to help shift participant mindsets and behaviors away from PSE being an outcome toward recognizing PSE as an approach to achieving development impact.

“There are many priority initiatives right now, so we have shifted to look at how PSE can move those priorities forward, rather than PSE for its own sake. PSE is an approach not an objective, so we have aligned our efforts to fit into the shifting landscape of Mission priorities.”—Cohort Member

• Increased Private-Sector Stakeholder Consultations: Participants noted that PIVOT has supported them in increasing private-sector involvement throughout planning, implementation, and evaluation, including co-designing programs with private-sector partners and creating results frameworks relevant to all parties.

• Regional Missions Supporting the Use of PSE Approaches Across Bilateral Missions: At least one PIVOT Mission is focusing its PSE efforts on providing PSE support for bilateral Missions in its region through calls, roadshows, TDYs, and exchanges.

Changes at USAID/Washington: In addition to changes in Missions, program implementers also highlighted unexpected, organization-level changes within and between USAID/Washington operating units. Participants indicated that PIVOT has fostered PSE-related relationships across offices and Bureaus that spurred cross-fertilization and innovation. In addition, some noted that they have shifted how they provide PSE support to others (see Program Strengths section above).

D. CHANGES IN PSE ACTIVITIES

Approximately 10 percent of participants’ responses to the Outcome Harvesting activity identified new activities involving private-sector partners or platforms. Participants mentioned working with new kinds of private-sector entities, increased meetings with potential private-sector partners, and ensuring that a regional coordination platform engaged private-sector stakeholders in consultative meetings. In addition, interviews with Cohort members surfaced some examples of new activities. For example, the Education Office in USAID/Rwanda has developed a new private-sector partnership for publishing a textbook that places youth in publishing internship programs. This partnership supports workforce development in a new local industry where existing capacities are very low.

In addition, USAID/Kenya/East Africa is in the final steps of modifying an existing investment facilitation activity to make it a sector-agnostic investment facilitation platform.

“Originally focused on Feed the Future and Power Africa, this activity has now secured approval for buy-ins from Health and WASH, with a few other opportunities under discussion. Targets for these buy-ins are under discussion, and implementation has not yet begun, but the general approach is promising—creating cross-sectoral platforms that can support private-sector needs—be they for investment facilitation, SME strengthening, GDA-style partnerships, etc.—where the capacities required are relatively similar across sectors. These sorts of approaches, involving several streams of funding, could also be relevant when looking at
how to mobilize funding for enabling environment reforms that impact our earmarked sectors particularly, even when the benefits may also accrue to other non-priority sectors. DG funding, while also scarce, also seems very relevant to sector agnostic enabling environment reform. We have had some success building our DG office’s interest in this area in support of private-sector engagement, though they have not committed any funding to date.” —Cohort member

All Cohort members were quick to point out that these efforts are still new and that longer time frames are needed to see tangible results. Mission Directors, in particular, emphasized that they hoped to see concrete outcomes in the form of new partnerships or deals, capital mobilization, or innovative use of private-sector resources soon. They suggested that seeing PSE activities start in each of the technical offices was an important start and would help maintain enthusiasm. Almost all participants discussed the need for longer time frames to see results, but also expressed an urgency to start seeing results soon.

“Ultimately, initiatives like PIVOT live or die on their ability to meaningfully impact Mission priorities. We have a lot of things that we can claim the PIVOT team touched, some that we’ve owned and shaped, but none yet that have resulted in new movements of private capital. And although PSE is larger than partnerships and leverage, that is a very important outcome that people can look at and count. Success breeds success. Now we have to shift toward getting results.” —Cohort member

“We have to demonstrate value. If we don’t, there will be some questions around all of this effort. For now, we just need time to do the work—at least another year. Then come ask us about changes in PSE activities or Mission culture and operations.” —Cohort member

“Leadership underestimates the need for skill-building and the time required to do that effectively. It has to be an ongoing effort. If PIVOT fizzes because we didn’t transform the Agency in 12 months—then that’s a problem with overly ambitious expectations … PIVOT has been a very positive experience. It’s a good pilot. We have built a cohort of people who are more confident and comfortable talking and thinking about PSE. They see more opportunities within their own areas of work. Ultimately, having leadership buy-in and support is critical. In the best case, that means structural changes and resources. If the PSE policy is a real priority, there needs to be messaging and resources put towards that.” —Cohort member

Other Factors Contributing to Changes: While most Learning Review participants agreed that the PIVOT Cohort program had directly or indirectly contributed to the changes noted above, they also recognized that other factors and conditions contributed as well (see section on Enabling Conditions above.) For example, participants highlighted other PSE efforts at their Missions such as the presence of a private-sector unit, an investment team with a broad mandate to champion PSE, and Mission technical offices with existing private-sector relationships. They also mentioned the influence of existing CDCS priorities for PSE in their Missions, local market contexts that supported opportunities for PSE, and Mission leadership support for PSE and PIVOT’s change management approach as key factors contributing to changes.
Measures of success, both for the PIVOT Cohort program and for the Agency’s PSE efforts more generally, were not available or established at the outset of this Learning Review. In part, this is because PIVOT’s innovative, adaptive approach, which was evolving during its pilot year and operating within dynamic and emergent organizational contexts related to PSE, did not lend itself well to concrete, pre-set targets. In part, this also reflects larger unknowns in assessing staff and organizational capacities for PSE and underdeveloped success metrics for PSE. Nevertheless, from the beginning, PIVOT participants raised questions about what leaders’ expectations were for their change management and PSE efforts. Leaders also raised questions about how best to support staff and organizational readiness to engage the private sector.

To address these questions, the Review asked participants, implementing partners, and leaders in USAID/Washington and Missions what PIVOT and PSE “success looks like” for them. The following section briefly reviews the broad range of responses to this question and, where possible, summarizes relevant findings from the Learning Review that addresses them. This may help provide context for interpreting the outcomes or changes identified above and inform future learning efforts.

- **Participant engagement, commitment, and satisfaction** was a frequently mentioned indicator of success. USAID/Washington leaders noted that they were pleased to see strong Mission interest and competition to participate in the PIVOT initiative at its inception. During the program, Learning Review participants often commented on the high level of participation and enthusiasm among Cohort members and program implementers from across the Agency. They also commented on participants’ strong commitment to advancing PSE and noticeable increases in confidence about their roles as PSE champions and leaders in their Missions as the program progressed.

  “I think participants and Washington folks are voting with their most valued resources: time and money.”
  —USAID/Washington Leader

  “We have had great support from various USAID/Washington stakeholders as they work with the Cohort as Affinity Group leads, thought partners, facilitators/helpers, and providers of feedback and suggestions. These are very busy people, but they are really interested and engaged in PIVOT.”—Affinity Group Lead

Despite significant travel costs and demands on staff time, high attendance at in-person meetings and Cohort calls may also provide an indication of how much field staff and Mission leadership valued the PIVOT program. In addition,
two items on the Learning Review Survey assessed participants’ satisfaction. On a seven-point scale ranging from “Extremely Dissatisfied/Unlikely” to “Extremely Satisfied/Likely,” participants’ responses indicated high levels of satisfaction with the PIVOT program on both items.

![Participant Satisfaction with the PIVOT Cohort Program](image)

Overall, how would you rate your experience with the PIVOT Cohort program?

- Extremely Satisfied
- Very Satisfied
- Satisfied
- Neutral

![Recommending PIVOT to Colleagues](image)

How likely are you to recommend this program to a peer or colleague in another Mission?

- Extremely Likely
- Very Likely
- Likely

- **Addressing identified needs and goals**: Another typical measure of success mentioned was the program’s ability to help address the needs or problems identified at its inception. Early program materials highlighted that PIVOT was designed to respond to a variety of Mission needs (e.g., identified by USAID’s PSE Field Needs Study). The following chart highlights examples of Learning Review findings related to these identified needs:

### PIVOT CONTRIBUTED TO ADDRESSING MISSION NEEDS FOR:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need Area</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More clarity on J2SR</td>
<td>Survey results showed significant increases in participants’ understanding of: a) the link between PSE and the Journey to Self-Reliance; and b) how to operationalize the Journey to Self-Reliance in their daily work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More training and skill building on innovative finance and private-sector engagement</td>
<td>Survey results show significant increases in participants’ PSE knowledge and skills in almost all areas examined (e.g., understanding and ability to use full spectrum of PSE approaches; skills and abilities to integrate private-sector perspectives and capabilities into planning and designing approaches and implementation.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More opportunities for peer-to-peer learning and exchange</td>
<td>Individual and focus group interviews showed that participants highly valued the peer learning and collaborating opportunities in PIVOT (e.g., Change Teams within Missions; Cohort meetings and calls across Missions) and found them one of the most successful aspects of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved interpersonal and management skills</td>
<td>Individual and focus group interviews showed that participants highly valued the CLA and leadership skills they learned and practiced in the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to PSE resources</td>
<td>Survey results showed that Cohort members rated USAID/Washington support for PSE significantly higher than PSE POCs from non-PIVOT Missions in areas such as: a) connecting Missions with U.S. or multinational companies; b) receiving PSE support tailored to fit Mission needs; and c) receiving support that has continuity and is sustained so work can build cumulatively.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• **Changed staff behaviors and organizational operations**: Many participants’ reflections on what success looked like for PIVOT focused on seeing demonstrable increases in staff capacities to implement the PSE Policy and design and manage PSE programming, as well as set priorities and lead PSE efforts within their offices and Missions. Many comments focused on internal staff and organizational changes such as: integrating PSE throughout Mission planning and operations; improving collaboration across offices; designing multi-sectoral PSE efforts; changing staff behaviors; and ensuring PSE activities are aligned with Mission priorities and plans. Many Mission Directors also focused on expanding PSE knowledge and skills beyond the Cohort group (e.g., to other staff in the Mission or to other Missions in their region).

• **Changed relationships with private-sector stakeholders**: Other comments highlighted shifting relationships with private-sector stakeholders to focus less on transactional contracts and more on co-created partnerships and activities. A couple of Mission Directors discussed the importance of improved relationships with counterparts in other agencies as well. Finally, some Mission Directors indicated that successful PSE efforts at this time focused on creating more space for hearing private-sector perspectives; ground-truthing Mission assertions; and developing shared analyses of situations.

• **Concrete outcomes such as improved/increased partnerships, increased mobilization of private-sector resources, and improved business environments**: Many Mission Directors indicated that program metrics should include an upward trajectory of PSE activities in each technical office, increased resources leveraged, and clear value for investment of resources in the program. Others focused on metrics related to improved business environments such as improved governance, reduced corruption, increased foreign investment and international trade, and improvements on the “ease of doing business” index.

As mentioned above, Mission Directors indicated that PIVOT has had more impact internally than externally, such as on individual staff and organization-level changes, and has only recently begun focusing on external PSE efforts. They hoped that PIVOT’s approach and investment will soon yield improved, increased, and innovative private-sector partnerships to address development challenges in their country.

• **Expanded or replicated activities**: Almost all USAID/Washington leaders focused on how PIVOT’s Cohort and Change Team model could be adapted and applied in other Missions, other regions, and other policy initiatives. For example, some elements of the program that might be replicated in other contexts or integrated into other USAID capacity building efforts include integrating interpersonal skills into PSE trainings (e.g., for private-sector relationship building and management); offering opportunities for peer learning (both structured and open-space) across Missions and USAID/Washington Bureaus; shifting to more demand-driven and co-designed TDYs that build internal capacities; and supporting more cross-office, team-based, learning by doing activities focused on concrete Mission priorities.

USAID/Washington leaders also hoped that participants in the pilot program would help lead skill-building across other Cohorts and that lessons from the pilot program would inform other staff development and change management efforts. For example, some participants hoped that future USAID/E3 efforts would learn from, coordinate with, and support future PIVOT programs rather than duplicating them.

“I was at the [xx PIVOT] Mission recently and there was a lot of excitement about the PIVOT program there. They gave me a preview of their results framework and I got to see for myself that the staff who were participating in PIVOT were doing a really good job of ensuring that our strategy for [xx] country has a very proactive approach to private sector engagement. We need that everywhere. So now we have to figure out how to be more cost efficient and offer this broadly.”

—USAID/Washington Leader

• **Sustained activities**: A number of leaders suggested that an important indicator of success would be that the peer networks established in PIVOT continue beyond the program period and that participants help bring other staff into them.
• **More meaningful PSE metrics:** A consistent theme across interviews was the need for improved PSE metrics that facilitate learning about what works and what doesn’t in PSE. Headquarters staff hoped that PIVOT would support participating staff and Missions in developing their own measures of success, while field staff looked forward to guidance from Washington on more nuanced PSE indicators. Many emphasized that new metrics should move beyond quantitative measures and recognize PSE as a means rather than an end. They also cautioned against bureaucratizing PSE efforts with an over-emphasis on indicators and measurement.

> “We want to make sure that we don’t overburden staff and the bureaucracy doesn’t swallow the initiative.”
> —Mission Director

Some Mission Directors mentioned that they have created advisory boards of local private-sector stakeholders to advise on CDCS development and help shape PSE metrics. Directors raised questions about effective private-sector engagement such as:

- How do we know what the best opportunities are for reaching our objectives?
- How can we get more granular understandings about what is most effective in PSE?

In the comparison of PSE plans, one non-PIVOT Mission in particular, USAID/Senegal, had a robust learning-focused PSE approach with a more developed set of indicators, organized into three categories: 1) PSE across the Mission’s Program Cycle; 2) Mission culture for PSE; and 3) diversification of the Mission’s partner base. While the indicators are largely quantitative and do not capture the “intangible” aspects of PSE (e.g., nuances in relationships with private-sector groups, collective learning, etc.), they are the most comprehensive across the PSE plans reviewed in the comparative analysis (see Annex 10 for a full list of USAID/Senegal’s indicators).

Many participants recognized the difficulties of identifying meaningful PSE metrics. They indicated that focusing on changed staff attitudes and relationships seemed a bit soft, but that looking at changed business environments seemed too big—neither would be satisfying on its own. All pointed to the need for more examples of successful PSE.

> “We can clearly describe the end state. The difficulty is describing, with equal clarity, the steps in between. We need to come up with new and expanded sets of metrics. We would want to see more examples of successful PSE that are verifiable and can inform future efforts. We would want to see more innovation—not necessarily quantity of deals, but ways of doing partnerships better. We would want to start being more risk forward. In aggregate, there may be more failure along the way, but also, hopefully more successes. And if we learn lessons from the failures—for example, if we have ways of getting feedback through continuously engaging with the private sector and hearing when something isn’t working, then pivoting quickly to try something else - then that will be evidence that we are implementing our new strategies.” —USAID/Washington Leader

Change Teams had a variety of concrete responses to questions about what success looks for them at this time:

- Cross-sectoral PSE or investment platforms aligned with Mission priorities.
- Technical offices demonstrate support by contributing funds to a Mission-wide PSE pool.
- PSE Change Team/working group develops a pipeline of private-sector transactions to test and adapt approaches proposed in the action plans.
- Creating PSE tools and systems (e.g., a relationship management tracker) that actually gets used. Historically, many don’t.
- Identifying private-sector actors that catalyze change in their space along the value chain, have some spillover, and can serve as an example to others.

---

12 The literature on PSE also consistently recognizes that as development organizations increasingly prioritize knowledge generation about what works in PSE, how it works, and under what conditions different strategies might work best, they need clearer and more nuanced metrics of success as well as more robust MERL effort. See Annex 2 (the Learning Review’s Literature Review) for more information on this issue.
• Deliberate organizational change in Missions is the first step for PSE success.
• Designing USAID projects and activities differently so that the national governments have opportunities, platforms, and convening space to meet with private-sector actors.
• Designing activities that help build trust between the private sector and government and support locally-owned solutions.

“If we can provide a field-tested, streamlined PSE process that is tied to our Mission strategy, and can be picked up and used by non-experts across the Mission, then we will have hit a home run. Getting results and sustaining them would be a grand slam. But at this point we don’t have to drive funds. That comes next.” —Cohort Member

COHORT MEMBERS’ ADVICE TO COLLEAGUES AT OTHER MISSIONS WHO ARE INTERESTED IN PSE:

“Pick your PSE team carefully: members need to be passionate and committed so they have buy-in and output.”

“Create a PSE plan, but don’t over-plan. Make sure it’s flexible and be patient.”

“PSE is not rocket science. Talk to folks and look for mutual interests. Realize that most conversations give you information rather than turn into partnerships—and that is still valuable. And you can talk a lot without crossing any lines.”

“It’s essential to involve local private-sector companies and implementing partners early in PSE work. They know what is going on.”

“We have to be careful not to interfere in the market and create distortions because of how we are working. So, we will still do policy work, but the policy will be driven by the private sector and what they see as important, because they know the problems. Leveraging market-based solutions can ultimately move countries in this region beyond a reliance on foreign assistance.”

“It’s really about looking for shared value. Having a clear idea of what the challenge is that USAID is facing and where the private sector might have interest and something to contribute. PSE often gets into trouble when someone has a great conversation with a firm and then looks for a way to work with them, rather than identifying the challenge first, then seeking out great firms who can help address that.”

“The real opportunities are in engaging with the core business of firms. Look to partner with companies in a way that aligns with how they spend most of their time, energy, and money anyway. And that aligns with USAID’s development interests. That’s where the money is. And you see lots of those alignments.”

“A lesson from PIVOT for other Missions? IT IS POSSIBLE!! PSE is possible even without creating new positions and hiring new people. You can start with what you have. It is possible even within the current staffing structures and with the available staff who are not used to talking with the private sector. Especially with commitment, with some resources allocated, with a cross-cutting, cross-sectoral team, and with leadership support—it is possible.”
## Questions for Further Exploration

Participants identified numerous questions about PIVOT and PSE during the interviews, many of which are integrated into the analysis above. Additional questions that need further exploration to help advance PSE efforts in Missions included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>U/W: USAID/Washington leaders; MD: Mission Directors; I: program implementers; C: Cohort members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Learning more about PSE and CLA | **U/W** How do PSE and CLA cross-walk with each other?  
**U/W** How can PIVOT participants best influence organizational structures that will support significant changes in how USAID does business?  
**U/W** How did PIVOT help participants navigate or change organizational barriers?  
**U/W** What PSE strategies work best with different opportunities? How do we prioritize which approach to use?  
**I** How are issues of inclusion and local ownership being integrated into PIVOT’s PSE efforts?  
**I** Are participants seeing or internalizing the connection between CLA, leadership, and PSE?  
**C** How can participants’ experiences and learning in PIVOT help us adapt and improve current PSE and CLA resources? |
| Supporting staff in private-sector engagement | **MD** What motivates someone who is not used to doing PSE to start thinking differently about the private sector?  
**MD** How do we best reward and recognize effective PSE efforts?  
**MD** How can we manage all of the competing priorities from USAID/Washington and institutionalize PSE efforts?  
**MD** How do we keep people from being sucked into the bureaucracy?  
**I** How can PIVOT Change Teams sustain the integration of PSE within the Mission? How can they stay a coordinating body that shares responsibilities and strengthens capacities throughout the Mission rather than become siloed as the ‘PSE team’ for the Mission?  
**C** How do we create an environment that incentivizes staff to go out and speak more with the private sector? |
| Replicating and scaling the PIVOT approach | **MD** What happens next? How will it be funded?  
**U/W** What are the actual costs of PIVOT?  
**U/W** How do we trim the program without losing the best parts (e.g., continuity of responsive support, empowerment of FSNs)?  
**U/W** How do we scale up communities of practice to promote learning on PSE?  
**U/W** How do we keep the momentum going with the current group during the next iteration?  
**U/W** How can we save staff time and offer it to more people?  
**U/W** How do we build on what we learned from this pilot and roll it out more broadly? |
| Program impact | **MD** Will interactions with the private sector be different? Will the outcomes from meetings be different (e.g., are we taking better advantage of opportunities?) Will project designs actually look different?  
**MD** Are we achieving more?  
**I** Is the impact of PIVOT worth the effort?  
**U/W** Is there a difference in outcomes between PIVOT and other capacity building models?  
**U/W** When we look at the PIVOT participants and Missions six months from now, what will have endured and what will need to be further reinforced?  
**U/W** How effective is PIVOT, and PSE more generally, in moving the Agency along that path toward self-reliance? |
The PIVOT program took a holistic, people-centered approach to transformation that engaged and harnessed USAID staff’s passion and commitment for development work to build capacities and support organizational changes that advance private-sector engagement as a pathway to self-reliance. The Learning Review was designed to help PIVOT stakeholders learn from the efforts that go into making change happen, and to help increase the Agency’s capacity to evolve its mindsets, skillsets, and toolsets for innovation.

Overall, participants and implementers praised PIVOT’s design and implementation, highlighted new commitment, competence, and confidence in PSE gained through the program, and recommended that PIVOT continue, expand, and serve as a capacity building model for other Agency policies and priorities. Analyses from this review also found strong indications of program effectiveness in addressing identified staff and organizational needs, building staff capacities, and supporting initial organizational changes that strengthen the practical implementation of USAID’s PSE and Journey to Self-Reliance policies.

A number of diverse, and in some cases competing, concerns and suggestions also emerged from the analysis across Learning Review interviews. Some of these included:

**BALANCING TENSIONS IN THE PIVOT PROGRAM**

Findings from the PIVOT Learning Review, March 2020

- PIVOT’s organic, adaptive model is exciting and creative
- PIVOT’s intensive, “high-touch” approach
- USAID/W providing expertise and guidance to field staff
- PIVOT’s diverse participant group
- Increased participant engagement and empowerment
- Learning, experimenting, and innovating around PSE
- Keeping the community, intensity, and responsiveness of PIVOT

- PIVOT needs a “North Star” and Theory of Change to help guide participants
- Limited staff time
- Letting participants drive the process
- Tailored assistance and practical applications to staff jobs
- Limited opportunities and authority to engage and lead in their job contexts
- Expectations of concrete results & value-add
- Interest in scaling up the program to have broader impact
Most of these tensions reflect different interests and larger organizational dynamics that are unlikely to be fully resolved within or through the program. Further discussion among program stakeholders, however, may help provide more specific guidance on how best to balance or address these tensions.

Key Recommendations: The Learning Review’s analysis of program outcomes and areas for improvement surfaced a number of preliminary recommendations for future program planning. These were refined and supplemented by Cohort members, program implementing partners, and USAID/Washington leaders during the final, in-person PIVOT Cohort meeting using co-creation processes.13 Recommendations included:

- **Set a “North Star” for PIVOT**: Clarifying objectives, intended outcomes, and measures of success at the outset of the program could help build participants’ confidence that their efforts are on track, and could help clarify and manage expectations for other program stakeholders. Participants suggested using an inclusive, consultative process for each Mission at the beginning of the program that involves PIVOT implementing partners, program participants, and Mission leadership to establish clear expectations, goals, and concrete deliverables. These should be revisited and revised throughout the year as needed. Implementing this process may involve early, initial visits with each Mission that include needs assessments and baseline measures of existing knowledge, skills, and conditions.

- **Engage leadership intentionally**: Participants and implementing partners strongly recommended that the PIVOT program involve Mission leadership more often and more consistently to include their perspectives, ensure alignment with Mission priorities, and authorize support. Including Mission leaders in the program can also help PIVOT demonstrate how its capacity building efforts help staff do their jobs better, as well as secure input, buy-in, and assistance for PSE integration and change management efforts. Engaging leaders involves having regular communication and feedback loops with Mission teams, office leaders, and Front Office leaders. Participants also suggested that providing opportunities for PIVOT Mission leaders to meet with each other, with non-PIVOT Mission leaders, and with USAID/Washington leaders could help advance PSE efforts.

- **Select and work with participants strategically**: Participants noted the importance of including a PSE POC, contract officer, program officer, and a senior leader on PIVOT Change Teams/PSE working group. They also highlighted the importance of differentiating the needs of participants and their Missions, and developing programming to address these differences.

- **Make time for PIVOT and PSE**: Participants and implementing partners alike recognized staff’s limited time and competing job priorities as one of the biggest barriers to effective program implementation and PSE work. They made a variety of recommendations to help address this issue. Some emphasized the need to set clearer expectations about time commitments (or LOE) for the PIVOT program and accompanying PSE activities at the outset of the program, and get buy-in from managers to offset staff’s time and other work responsibilities. Others proposed building PIVOT/PSE-related competencies into work objectives, position descriptions, and performance evaluations and encouraging Missions to provide staff with flexible or allocated time for PSE work. Some participants recommended reducing the number of program calls and meetings or enhancing their efficiency by tightening the focus and tying them to specific PSE tasks or issues. Many also highlighted, however, that PIVOT’s “high-touch” approach created momentum and accountability that drove staff learning and organizational change.

- **Practice the “Art of PSE”**: Participants indicated that they need more opportunities to practice applying the new PSE knowledge and skills that they are learning. They requested more skill-building through real PSE case scenarios, interactions with private-sector stakeholders, and job-related tasks. They also asked for more sector- or function-specific mentoring (e.g., individualized work with Affinity Group Leads), and more open space or marketplace activities that allowed participants to drive the content.

---

13 These recommendations focus on the PIVOT Cohort program. Key take-aways and areas for improvement related to broader organizational issues can be found in the Final Report Summary Tables (especially Table III) in Annex 14.
• **Strengthen technical and contextualized learning:** For future PIVOT efforts, participants suggested providing more technical PSE content and introducing it earlier in the program. They also requested even stronger links between training and application that helped participants translate PSE theory into practice within their own job contexts, Mission dynamics and priorities, and national environment. They also recommended strengthening links to the PSE Policy by helping staff identify the roles, responsibilities, and steps they are taking in implementing the PSE Policy. In addition, they requested more training in facilitation skills to support their leadership roles in PSE share-outs and dialogue in their Missions, multi-sectoral initiatives and forums, south-to-south communities of practice, and other opportunities. Participants also recommended that PIVOT facilitation teams include a mix of people who have process expertise, subject matter expertise, and USAID organizational experience to address the variety of learning needs in the group.

• **Embed flexible M&E within PIVOT:** As USAID increasingly prioritizes knowledge generation about what works in PSE, how it works, and under what conditions different strategies might work best, it needs clearer and more nuanced metrics for success as well as more robust monitoring, evaluation, research, and learning (MERL) efforts. To effectively capture and use learning from PIVOT, the learning reviewers recommend embedding flexible M&E approaches within the program from the start. These efforts can develop and utilize collaborative, field-headquarters relationships that support ongoing data collection and analysis to facilitate the continuous learning and strategic thinking needed for adaptive management. Methods and measures should move beyond self-reports to include direct assessments, change logs, and assessments by peers, supervisors, mentors, and private-sector stakeholders that increase rigor and support learning. These efforts can model and encourage integration of MERL into Missions’ PSE efforts, and assist with the development of PSE indicators that matter to all parties and paint a fuller picture of what does and does not work.

• **Capture a range of program outcomes:** Participants indicated that PIVOT is contributing to a wide range of changes and that learning efforts should capture staff and organizational outcomes, including intangibles, cumulative learning, and transfer beyond direct participants. In addition, Learning Review participants recognized the need to collect and learn from examples of PSE innovations, successes, and failures that focus as much on the “how” as on the “what” of PSE efforts. They suggested including more deep dives into PSE examples and experiences that were happening “in real time” so peer assists could help staff grapple with issues as they came up and support adaptive management.

• **Plan longer time frames to see PIVOT results:** Most Cohort members emphasized that they are just beginning to implement their PSE plans now and that more time is needed to see measurable results in terms of organizational culture change, improved or innovative private-sector partnerships, and increased private-sector resource mobilization.
Guided by four broad objectives, this Learning Review addressed questions about what could be learned from the PIVOT Cohort program’s innovative capacity building and change management approach to help advance staff and organizational readiness for PSE. This report highlights a variety of PIVOT’s unique contributions to staff and organizational change, as well as a number of lessons that can help guide future PIVOT or PIVOT-like efforts. The Learning Review also recognized that the seeds of change planted in this pilot program will take time and continued effort to grow and bear fruit. It points to the tremendous work still to be done in answering the call for cultural and operational transformation to expand private-sector engagement Agency-wide as a pathway to Self-Reliance.

“A great deal has been done in PIVOT, but a lot more is needed. This is a long, long journey of corporate cultural change in the Agency, even among some of the PSE champions, experts, and teams, and forward thinking Missions like those in PIVOT that are on the leading edge of private-sector engagement for the Agency. Everyone still has a lot of work to do. It is positive that we are undertaking this process, but the length of the journey is sobering.” —USAID/Washington Leader
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ANNEX 1: THEORY OF CHANGE AND PIVOT ROADMAP DOCUMENTS

PIVOT’s Potential Changes Chart: Extended

The chart below summarizes potential changes or outcomes for the PIVOT Cohort program based on initial data collected from PIVOT participants and implementers. Where applicable, they have been cross-checked with research evidence and best practices identified in the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review’s literature review. The Learning Review will continue to refine, supplement, and verify these elicited changes or outcomes through additional research methods. This chart does not claim or provide evidence that PIVOT has achieved any of these potential changes.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Change/Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Internal to USAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Individuals** (PIVOT participants/USAID staff) | • **Competencies:** Staff develop competencies in technical and interpersonal skills needed for effective PSE, e.g.:  
  – Institutionalize PSE across the Program Cycle  
  – Identify areas of alignment between private-sector interests and USAID’s development priorities  
  – Design and implement multi-sectoral and multi-functional PSE action planning processes  
  – Convert PSE opportunities into strategic programmatic approaches  
  – Develop and manage relationships with private-sector contacts  
  • **Experience:** Staff practice and gain experience conducting PSE gained through OTJ learning and practice, e.g.:  
  – Recognize PSE relevance and opportunities within their jobs (e.g., work objectives, earmarked funds, etc.)  
  – Proactively and systematically develop new PSE activities based on identified needs and opportunities  
  – Know and use Agency’s resources, procedures, and mechanisms for PSE  
  • **Commitment:** Staff become engaged and empowered to help manage organizational change related to PSE (i.e., link individual and institutional capacity building), e.g.:  
  – Lead efforts within their offices to expand PSE (e.g., opportunity mapping)  
  – Help integrate PSE into Mission planning and activity documents  
  – Integrate CLA approaches into PSE planning and implementation across their Mission |
| **Relationships** (USAID internal teams, networks, and connections) | • **Within PIVOT Missions**  
  – Cross-sectoral, cross-functional PSE/PIVOT Teams within Missions have high levels of trust, communication, collaboration, and productivity.  
  – PSE/PIVOT Teams support increased PSE-related communication, coordination, and cross-fertilization across offices within Mission.  
  • **Within Cohort/across PIVOT Missions**  
  – Peer learning across Missions through Affinity Groups provides sector-specific PSE strategies and resources.  
  – Peer learning in Cohort meetings and calls strengthens PSE efforts.  
  – Cohort model creates shared context, connections, and capacities for future PSE work.  
  • **Between Headquarters and Field**  
  – Consistent contact and mentoring facilitates responsive support and technical assistance that builds cumulatively.  
  – Ongoing connections provide opportunities to field test new Agency PSE tools and products.  
  – Increased opportunities for connecting field staff with relevant U.S. companies and industries.  
  • **Across USAID/Washington Operation Units**  
  – Implementing PIVOT has increased PSE-related communication, coordination, and cross-fertilization across USAID/Washington OUs. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CHANGE/LEVEL OF ANALYSIS</th>
<th>INTERNAL TO USAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Organization** (Structures, operations, and organizational culture within USAID/Washington and Missions) | **Leadership support for PSE**  
- Clear signaling that PSE is a priority  
- PSE leaders at all levels—staff engaged and empowered to help manage change related to PSE (e.g., empower FSNs)  

**Staff incentives and support for PSE**  
- PSE integrated into work objectives, performance reviews, career development, etc.  
- Flexible/allocated staff time for PSE networking, relationship development, and relationship management  

**PSE integrated across the organization**  
- Increased staff awareness, interest, and involvement in PSE (e.g., high staff attendance at PSE events)  
- Increased communication and coordination among operating units about PSE  
- More staff engage private-sector stakeholders at all stages of the Program Cycle  
- PSE integrated into planning and activity documents (e.g., CDCSs, activity design, work objectives, solicitations)  
- All offices included in development and implementation of PSE and innovative finance  
- Coherence between USAID’s policy and practice  

**Organizational culture supports new ways of engaging private sector**  
- Openness to new ideas and new ways of engaging private sector stakeholders  
  - Support/opportunities for reflection, honest communication, and safe space for learning from mistakes and failures  
  - Structured opportunities for peer dialogue and learning among those working on similar issues  
  - New mindsets, behaviors, and ways of engaging private-sector stakeholders that support enterprise-driven development, healthy market systems, and the Journey to Self-Reliance  

**Organizational operations support PSE**  
- Clear structures for PSE (points of contact, division of labor, lines of communication, hub and spoke models, etc.)  
- Efficient PSE-related systems for outreach, due diligence, and relationship management  
- Flexible funding mechanisms and expedited procurement  
- Clear roadmaps and pathways for how to implement PSE  
- Responsive support for field staff (e.g., demand-driven, tailored)  
- Improved access to and utilization of PSE knowledge resources/expertise and tools  
- Clear success metrics for PSE that matter to all parties  
- Integrated MERL systems to track, adapt, and learn from PSE efforts  

**PIVOT Program replicated or scaled**  
- Expanded and/or extended PIVOT program  
- Replication of PIVOT-like programs in other OUs  
- PIVOT-like programs utilized to support other policy roll-outs |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CHANGE/LEVEL OF ANALYSIS</th>
<th>INTERNAL TO USAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>External PSE Efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Relationships                                   | • **New ways of engaging private sector entities**  
  - Shift toward systematic and proactive PSE based on identified needs, opportunities, and alignment  
  - Engage private sector early for input/perspectives on challenges, interests, recommendations, etc.  
  - Initial discussions with potential business partners are exploratory rather than targeted to identify alignment, additionality, shared value opportunities, etc.  
  - USAID staff play a more facilitative role in enterprise-driven development as a pathway to self-reliance  
  - Diversify private-sector partnerships and partnership models  
  - Focus partnerships on measurable outcomes that matter to all parties  
  • **Stronger relationships with private sector entities**  
  - Focus on identifying alignment and building trust in relationships with private-sector entities  
  - Develop more equal, co-created collaborations over longer time frames rather than short-term, transactional partnerships or contracts  
  - Co-design programs with business partners to address development challenges  
  - Support local private sector as change agents  
  • **Improved communication and coordination with other USG agencies around PSE efforts**  
  • **Improved communication and coordination with other donor organization around PSE efforts** |
| PSE outcomes/success indicators                 | • **Improved PSE** (Need more meaningful and nuanced metrics for learning “what works” and measuring success in PSE)  
  (Use USAID’s PSE Indicator Framework here when it is developed)  
  For example:  
  - Increased opportunities to engage directly with private-sector entities  
  - Increased information sharing and strategic alignment with private-sector stakeholders  
  - Increased use of private sector expertise and innovation in addressing development and humanitarian challenges  
  - Increased mobilization of private-sector resources and action for development objectives  
  - Increased innovative and blended finance to address development challenges  
  - Improved business enabling environments  
  - Improved health of market systems (e.g., inclusive business practices, resilience, etc.)  
  • **Improved development results and self-reliance**  
  - Greater sustainability and scale of development results  
  - Strengthened local institutions  
  - Assistance used to catalyze wider change that supports self-reliance |
THE PIVOT ROADMAP

INCREASED SELF-RELIANCE

INCREASED PRIVATE SECTOR RESOURCES LEVERAGED FOR DEVELOPMENT OUTCOMES

STRONGER RELATIONSHIPS AND MORE OPPORTUNITIES WITH PRIVATE SECTOR GROUPS

STRENGTHEN CAPACITIES FOR PSE, LEADERSHIP, AND CLA

FACILITATE LEARNING BY DOING

BUILD MEANINGFUL COMMUNITY

PRACTICAL, INNOVATIVE ON-THE-JOB TRAINING

SPONSORED BY:
USAID/AFR/SD/EEA

NOVEMBER 2019

* PSE = PRIVATE SECTOR ENGAGEMENT; * CLA = COLLABORATING, LEARNING, AND ADAPTING
ANNEX 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Executive Summary

The Practical Innovative On-the-Job Training (PIVOT) Cohort program, launched by USAID’s Africa Bureau Division for Economic Growth, Environment, and Agriculture (EGEA) in March 2019, works with field staff in six Missions in Africa to build internal capacity, commitment, and community that advance private-sector engagement (PSE) as a pathway to self-reliance. Designed to capture learning from both the implementation and outcomes of the PIVOT Cohort program, as well as contribute evidence related to questions on the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda (SRLA), the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review conducted this literature review during its preparatory phase. The literature review briefly examines research, evidence, and best practices in PSE-related capacity building, organizational change, enabling environments, and evaluation to help provide context for the PIVOT Cohort program approach and inform the Learning Review’s methods and findings. While not a comprehensive or systematic review of relevant literature, this document highlights a broad range of existing evidence and current thinking within the Learning Review’s targeted areas of investigation. Some of the key findings discussed in the literature review are summarized below.

This literature review focuses on the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review’s areas of investigation including:
1. PIVOT’s design and implementation;
2. Organizational enabling conditions for PSE;
3. National and local enabling environments for PSE;
4. Relationship qualities that influence PSE success;
5. The use of influence, knowledge, and convening power in PSE that support self-reliance; and

The PIVOT Cohort program’s design and implementation: The first half of the literature review examines a wide range of research evidence on PSE capacity building, experiential/on-the-job training, peer- and team-based learning, and change management relevant to the PIVOT Cohort program. The review found that best practices encourage an integrated approach to PSE capacity building that:

1) Combines technical PSE knowledge and skills with interpersonal skills, such as effective communication, cooperative planning and problem-solving, and adaptive management. For example, the literature recognizes that good relationships and relationship management are critical to PSE success and that “soft skills” play an essential role in uncovering alignment, building trust, and treating partnerships as relationships rather than transactional contracts (OECD, 2016; Rubin & Nordehn, 2015; Hervey & Gilboy, 2014).

2) Includes a variety of learning modalities beyond traditional training, such as mentoring, peer learning, and exchanges. Studies have found that structured, workplace/on-the-job learning increases efficiency and overall impact of learning, and lowers costs in competency development (Liu & Bat, 2005; Keenan, 2004). Participating in concrete experiences or tasks already required by the job, in an environment that encourages active experimentation, accepts mistakes, and fosters reflection on learning, is considered one of the most effective approaches to building practical competencies. Research also suggests that organizations that encourage honest discourse and debate, and provide an open and safe space for communication, tend to perform better and be more innovative. In addition to learning by doing, studies show that staff learn best from each other (Jennings, 2015; Matey & Fickell, 2014; Rubin & Nordehn, 2015; Englehardt & Simmons, 2002). Research indicates that staff usually turn to colleagues first in seeking knowledge needed to do their jobs. Increasingly, organizations are encouraging peer learning opportunities and communities of

---

14 The PSE literature often refers to these non-technical skills as “soft skills.” When directly summarizing from sources, this literature review will adopt the authors’ phrasing. In more general discussions, however, these skills will be referred to as “interpersonal skills,” in keeping with the phrasing used by the PIVOT Cohort program.
practice (CoPs) as vehicles to generate learning and enhance organizational performance. Facilitated CoPs have proven effective in improving knowledge creation and sharing by focusing on interactive, people-centered learning processes and fostering trust (Moreno, 2001; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999).

3) Engages, empowers, and connects staff as change agents to help link individual and institutional capacity building. A growing body of evidence from both private and public sector organizations recognizes employee engagement as critical to successful organizational performance and indicates that employee and team empowerment helps improve job satisfaction, commitment, innovativeness, and organizational performance. Having the ability to share and apply learning to effect change increases perceived autonomy, which is associated with higher job satisfaction, greater commitment to the organization, and lower employee turnover. Studies have similarly found that developing champions who understand how to initiate, facilitate, and implement needed change is an effective model for managing change within an organization (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013; Dizgah, et al., 2011; Ugboro & Obeng, 2002).

Organizational Contexts that Support PSE: The PSE literature recognizes that development organizations are making a number of critical shifts in their culture, structures, and staffing capacities as they prepare for more strategic and systematic engagement of the private sector to achieve development objectives. Leadership support is among the most widely recognized factors needed to create an organizational enabling environment for PSE. Best practices recognize the importance of PSE buy-in by leaders and ownership by front line implementers within the organization. Beyond this, studies highlight the importance of integrating staff incentive structures into organizations, including linking employee reward systems with PSE performance. They also suggest allocating staff time for building relationships with private-sector actors and for managing the complexities of multi-stakeholder partnerships. They highlight the need for efficient, PSE-related management systems for outreach, due diligence, and relationship management, as well as the creation/use of flexible funding mechanisms and expedited procurement processes. Studies further suggest that creating cross-functional and cross-sectoral teams helps improve communication and coordination among operating units. They reveal that field staff need demand-driven, tailored support that is responsive to their needs and readily available when requested. Finally, a growing body of evidence indicates that aid agencies are most successful when they are able to operate flexibly and manage adaptively (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; OECD-DAC, n.d.)

National and Local Contexts that Support PSE: The literature on PSE recognizes the need for better understanding of how business-enabling environments affect PSE and enterprise-driven development (PSE Evidence and Learning Plan, 2018). Identifying lessons has been difficult because enabling conditions are sector- and industry-specific, rely on analyses of different local systems and political economies, and are continually changing. Beyond macro-level analyses of political, economic, social, and technological environments, other factors that may influence the shape and development of PSE efforts include the maturity of local business communities; the prevalence of corporate social responsibility within core business practices; and the availability of multi-stakeholder dialogue forums. Research on healthy market sector systems offers some guidance on principles for business enabling environments that support development impact. These include having robust regulatory and institutional architectures that support rule-based interactions for businesses, fight corruption, and promote a level playing field for competitive innovation. They also focus on engaging local private-sector actors as change agents who support and own efforts to integrate into global value chains and pursue legal or regulatory reforms. Donor coordination, inclusive business practices, diversified PSE efforts that build market resilience, and multi-dimensional PSE in fragile or conflict-affected areas are also important business-enabling conditions for sustainable and inclusive development (FTF, 2018; OECD, 2016).

Private-sector relationship qualities that influence results: The research literature on PSE consistently identifies a need to shift how donor organizations relate to private-sector stakeholders. Studies suggest that effective PSE moves away from short-term, transactional partnerships, such as one-off contracts or co-funding opportunities, to more equal, co-created collaborations with longer time frames. They recommend that development organization staff focus on relationship building with clearer expectations, alignment, and trust before partnering on specific initiatives that address development goals and market challenges. This requires early discussions to be more exploratory than targeted. Research also found
that market-oriented partnerships designed around core business opportunities of partners, and relationships that created market linkages were most effective. It indicated that capacity building only endured when conducted in conjunction with other pathways to sustainability, and that PSE efforts achieving policy change were better able to sustain and scale without additional funding (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; Ingram et al. 2016).

**Using influence, knowledge, and convening power to complement projectized support in PSE and foster self-reliance:** The PSE literature recommends that bilateral donors draw upon a full spectrum of activities and approaches for working with and through the private sector to achieve development impact. PSE efforts focused on knowledge sharing and relationship building (e.g., roundtables, matchmaking events), and policy dialogues, highlight development organizations’ non-financial additionality that can foster self-reliance. Using influence, knowledge, and convening power in PSE efforts also draws upon staff’s interpersonal skills in effective communication, facilitation, and relationship building. Using a variety of PSE strategies can help staff better leverage assets beyond projectized support to achieve sustainable development outcomes. Many questions remain, however, about the conditions under which different PSE efforts may be most effective (DCED, 2019).

**Identifying meaningful PSE outcomes and measures of success:** As development organizations increasingly prioritize knowledge generation about what works in PSE, how it works, and under what conditions different strategies might work best, they need clearer and more nuanced metrics for success as well as more robust monitoring, evaluation, and learning efforts. For example, the evaluation literature on PSE recognizes that success metrics are underdeveloped: too often they rely on quantifiable, tangible outcomes such as “funds leveraged” or “number of partnerships” and miss meaningful indicators that could paint a fuller picture about what does and does not work in private-sector engagement for development impact. Recommendations for improving PSE evaluations emphasize the need to establish clear metrics for success that matter to all partners. They also suggest developing and using a common PSE assessment framework to facilitate comparison and aggregation of results, and articulate a broader results narrative that enhances learning, accountability, and effectiveness. A common assessment framework should complement, rather than replace, program- and context-specific metrics. The literature also highlights a need to compare enterprise-driven development efforts with more traditional mechanisms to capture the unique contributions of PSE. Finally, evaluators recommend embedding resources for monitoring and evaluation within PSE efforts to encourage continuous learning and adapting (USAID, 2018; OECD, 2016).

I. Literature Review

I. Context and Scope of the Literature Review

In December 2018, the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) introduced its new Private-Sector Engagement (PSE) Policy.

"**USAID is undertaking a major cultural and operational transformation to expand Private-Sector Engagement Agency-wide. Through its new Private-Sector Engagement Policy, USAID is issuing an Agency-wide call to action and mandate to work hand-in-hand with the private sector to design and deliver our development and humanitarian programs in all sectors. This policy signals an intentional shift towards enterprise-driven development as a more sustainable way to empower people, communities and countries on their journey to self-reliance.**" (USAID, PSE Policy Executive Summary, 2018, p.1)

Responding to this Agency-wide call, in March 2019, USAID’s Africa Bureau Division for Economic Growth, Environment and Agriculture (EGEA) launched the Practical Innovative On-the-Job Training (PIVOT) Cohort program. This pilot program aims to address the demands from Missions for clarity about the PSE and Journey to Self-Reliance policy expectations, opportunities for peer-to-peer learning and exchange, and training and skill-building on PSE and innovative finance. The PIVOT program works with field-based staff in six Missions in Africa: Ghana, Kenya/East Africa, Madagascar, Rwanda, Southern Africa, and Uganda. This year-long, innovative capacity building and change management program is designed to enhance staff capacity, commitment, and community around PSE and help advance USAID’s cultural and operational shift towards private-sector engagement as a pathway to self-reliance.
The PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review, commissioned by the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda (SRLA) initiative at the midpoint of the PIVOT program, recognized the need to capture learning from both the implementation and outcomes of the PIVOT program, as well as the opportunities that learning can offer in addressing SRLA questions. This literature review, conducted as part of the preparatory phase of the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review, briefly examines research evidence and documented learning about private-sector engagement and organizational change to help provide context for the PIVOT Cohort program approach and inform the Learning Review’s methods and findings. It reviews the evidence base and identified best practices related to the Learning Review’s areas of investigation including:

1) Elements of the PIVOT Cohort program’s design and implementation
2) Organizational and country-level enabling conditions for PSE
3) Relationship qualities that influence PSE success
4) The use of influence, knowledge, and convening power in PSE that support self-reliance
5) Meaningful PSE outcomes and measures of success

While this literature review offers context and current thinking on PSE from research and grey literature in the Learning Review’s areas of investigation, it does not provide a comprehensive or systematic review of existing literature. This is, in part, because reviewers had limited access to academic research and private-sector studies, are not technical experts on PSE, and had limited time for compiling and reviewing sources. Instead, this document aims to summarize research findings and documented learning relevant to the PIVOT Cohort program that can help inform the Learning Review’s methods and findings and help it better contribute to USAID’s growing evidence base on effective PSE.

II. Literature Related to the PIVOT Cohort Program’s Design and Implementation

The PIVOT Cohort program builds field staff capacities in technical PSE knowledge and skills, as well as interpersonal skills related to collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) and leadership. It does so through a combination of traditional training methods, on-the-job training and practice (learning by doing), mentoring, and peer learning approaches. The program is structured around cross-sectoral Change Teams within Missions that foster team-based learning, as well as regular, in-person Cohort meetings and cross-Mission Affinity Groups that encourage peer learning and collaborating. The program is managed through frequent individual, Change Team, and Cohort calls to provide feedback loops that facilitate continuous learning and adapting, and to strengthen connections between USAID/Washington and the field for more integrated, timely, and responsive support. Beyond that, the program is facilitated with intentional fun and safe-space activities to build trust and community among participants who support each other in driving organizational change and advancing PSE efforts in their Missions. The following section examines the research literature on PSE capacity building, experiential/on-the-job learning, peer- and team-based learning, and change management to review the evidence base for the PIVOT Cohort program’s design and implementation approach.

A. An Integrated Approach to Building Staff Capacities for PSE:

The literature on PSE capacity building emphasizes that in addition to recruiting new staff with corporate experience, aid agencies should invest significantly in internal PSE capacity building and staff development opportunities to effectively shift organizational culture and operations around PSE (ACYFA, 2019; Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; OECD,
Documented peer learning from German, Swedish, Dutch, and American aid agencies indicates that many of the skills needed for PSE may not yet exist in-house and suggest that staff capacity building requires both technical and “soft skills” (OECD-DAC, 2016). They recognize the challenge in ensuring that organizational capacities are appropriate, and suggest that too often PSE training and technical assistance efforts focus only on technical knowledge and skills, neglecting the complementary soft skills of leadership, planning, and management that are crucial to effective engagement (ibid).

Effective PSE capacity building, experts argue, requires a more comprehensive, multi-dimensional approach that builds networks of skilled PSE champions across policy, planning, and operational levels who can advocate for and implement organizational change.

The literature on PSE also suggests that best practices move beyond traditional training approaches to include a variety of learning modalities such as: mentoring and coaching, experiential/on-the-job training and practice, and staff exchanges, all of which should integrate “do-reflect-apply” methods for learning (OECD, 2016; Rubin & Nordehn, 2015; Hervey & Gilboy, 2014; Dunbar, 2013). USAID’s 2018 survey of field staff needs indicated that staff want more interactive training approaches (e.g. case studies or simulations) and opportunities for peer-to-peer experience sharing. The survey also recognizes the need to expand capacity building beyond the economic growth and agriculture offices into non-traditional sectors (USAID, 2018; OECD, 2016).

Research on PSE and capacity building further highlights the importance of differentiating between human and institutional capacity development. Often these dimensions are conflated, assuming that providing training to increase staff knowledge and tools for engaging private-sector actors will automatically lead to strengthened institutional capacities (Rubin & Nordehn, 2015; Hervey & Gilboy, 2014). Effective PSE capacity building, experts argue, requires a more comprehensive, multi-dimensional approach that builds networks of skilled PSE champions across policy, planning, and operational levels who can advocate for and implement organizational change (Rubin & Nordehn, 2015). Training in interpersonal skills, such as change management, adaptive leadership, action planning, and cooperative problem-solving, when practiced and applied on the job, can help link individual and institutional capacity building by engaging and empowering staff to help lead change within their operating units (Hervy & Gilboy, 2014).

Finally, the literature recognizes that private-sector engagement is an iterative process that requires ongoing learning, reflection, and review of institutional operations and capacities. Staff rotation and churn, especially within development and aid organizations, requires that PSE capacity building also be iterative and ongoing, including a focus on field staff, such as Foreign Service Nationals, who have local knowledge and less rotation (ACDFA, 2019; OECD, 2016).

I. Building Technical PSE, CLA, and Leadership Competencies Together

As USAID staff are asked to expand the use of Agency approaches and tools to unlock the potential of the private sector in achieving development objectives, they need new knowledge, skills, mindsets, and ways of relating. The USAID PSE Field Needs Study indicated that staff want support in gaining an adequate range and depth of private-sector knowledge and experience, and in using new approaches to meet the growing demand for PSE (USAID, 2018). It, and other research on staff capacity building for PSE (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; OECD, 2016), have identified a number of critical knowledge and skill areas for engaging the private sector, including:

- Identifying opportunities for enterprise-driven development impact
- Understanding and effectively using the full spectrum of PSE approaches
- Identifying and attracting potential business partners
- Learning business interests and incentives
- Communicating own assets effectively
- Recognizing aligned interests and additionality (both financial and non-financial) from all involved
- Assessing and managing risks
- Knowing what tools are available for partnership
- Identifying needs and opportunities for innovation
- Designing the partnership
- Negotiating rights to intellectual property
- Navigating contracts and legal considerations (including leveraging existing authorities)
- Managing relationships and partnering effectively

Most of these areas require specific technical knowledge and skills for PSE, as well as complementary interpersonal skills, such as effective communication, cooperative action planning, collaborative problem-solving, interest-based negotiation, and adaptive management (OECD-DAC, 2016). Studies suggest that effective PSE also requires skills in flexibility, adaptability, communication, and resourcefulness. For example, they indicate that good relationships and relationship management are critical in PSE, and these soft skills play an essential role in helping staff shift mindsets to treat partnerships as relationships rather than just contracts (ibid).

Integrating training in PSE and adaptive leadership—including skills related to active listening, giving and receiving feedback, understanding and navigating power dynamics, and mindfulness and self-awareness—provides an example of how complementary interpersonal and technical skills can help link individual and institutional capacity building for navigating change. The 2016 BEAM report on adaptive management in development organizations found broad agreement that flexible and adaptive management, throughout the program cycle and in the financial and operational management of implementation, is essential for program effectiveness (Byrne, Sparkman, & Fowler, 2016). They suggest that leaders who foster adaptive programming have the following qualities: they insist on substantive engagement by staff across functional and sectoral offices so they have a stake in making changes; openly embrace learning from failure; create incentives for internal reciprocity and integration; celebrate staff who are willing to be honest about results when speaking with leadership; and maintain an overriding curiosity about and enthusiasm for the task of managing adaptively that inspires imitation (ibid).

Leaders are central to defining organizational culture, and the leadership literature discusses how organizations that encourage honest discourse and debate, and provide an open and safe space for communication, tend to perform better and be more innovative (Schein, 1992). For example, researchers suggest that Southwest Airlines, Netflix, and other leading companies have been successful because their leaders created a culture that was conducive to collaboration, learning, accountability, and adaptability (Hailey & James, 2002). These studies also indicate that one of the most important characteristics of a leader is an ability to understand and work within a changing and complex environment (Hailey & James, 2002; Hovland, 2003).

In addition, studies show that emotional intelligence is a strong predictor of leadership effectiveness (Kerr, 2006; Rosete & Ciarrochi, 2005). Emotional intelligence, as defined by the Mayer-Salovey Emotional Intelligence Test (MSCEIT), is comprised of a series of capabilities related to self-awareness, understanding emotions and their causes, reading others’ emotions based on feedback, and being able to predict how others will emotionally react. According to the literature, leaders who score highly on these abilities are more likely to be effective in their management of teams.

Leaders are central to defining organizational culture. Studies show that emotional intelligence is a strong predictor of leadership effectiveness.

---

15 The Mayer-Salovey Caruso Emotional Intelligence Test, or MSCEIT, is among the few available and the most widespread measure of EI as an ability.
2. Experiential, On-The-Job Learning: Learning by Doing


Much of the literature on organizational learning focuses on the positive impacts of experiential and informal learning from others, “learning in situ”, and learning by doing (Jennings, 2015; Matey & Fickell, 2014). Many authors note that experimentation is a fundamental and powerful part of learning by doing and should be supported in an environment that accepts mistakes (Rubin & Nordenh, 2015; Englehardt & Simmons, 2002).

David Kolb's experiential learning framework, still one of the most prominent in business management training programs, asserts that effective learning requires four components: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation. He suggested that learning must involve full and open engagement, without bias, in new experiences, plus reflection on and observation of the learning experience from different perspectives (Kolb, 1984 in Matey & Fickell, 2014). Although assessment of experiential learning remains challenging, significant empirical evidence concludes that this learning framework constitutes one of the most effective approaches to developing practical competencies (Rodriguez & Morant, 2019).

Many authors note that experimentation is a fundamental and powerful part of learning by doing and should be supported in an environment that accepts mistakes.

In addition, the 70/20/10 learning and development model provides a proportional breakdown of how people learn most effectively: 70 percent from challenging assignments; 20 percent from relationships; and 10 percent from coursework and training (Lombardo & Eichinger, 1996). While more recent replication studies have produced different numbers and stress that 70/20/10 is not a rule of fixed percentages, but rather a proportional model, they also conclude that workplace, or structured, on-the-job learning helps change mindsets, increases efficiency and lowers costs in competency development, and improves overall impact of learning (Jennings, 2015; Liu & Bat, 2005). Research concludes that, “over the past 40 years or more... workplace learning is not only the most important way that high performers develop their capabilities but also that it is increasingly pervasive and central to organisational learning and performance generally.” (Ibid. p.1)

Reflective Practice: The literature discusses the importance of reflecting often both individually and in groups and adapting as needed to improve outcomes (Hilden & Tikkamaki, 2013; Andrews, 2012). The adage “experience is the best teacher” is not entirely true. Researchers have found that it is reflection on experience that teaches the most (Di Stefano, 2015). Reflective practice requires the development stakeholders to reflect on development processes; challenge previous assumptions and instill dynamism in discourses; include multiple voices through a critical view of power relations; facilitate the creation and actualization of multiple approaches at the local level; and create opportunities for these local imaginings to be synthesized at regional and global level to enable a better understanding of global issues and advocate for the transformation of global regimes (Jakimov, 2008). The literature found that organizations and projects are much more likely to be successful if they adopt such reflective practices and can increase their agility.

Employee Engagement and Empowerment: A growing body of evidence from both private and public sector organizations recognizes employee engagement as critical to successful organizational performance (GAO, 2015; OPM, 2016). The literature also indicates that employee and team empowerment helps improve job satisfaction, commitment, innovativeness, and organizational performance (Fernandez & Moldogaziev, 2013; Dizgah, et al., 2011; Ugboro & Obeng, 2002; Kirkman & Rosen, 1999). A 2016 report published by Deloitte stated that “learning opportunities are among the largest drivers of employee engagement and strong workplace culture” (Deloitte University Press, 2016). As such, learning-driven behavior change extends beyond technical and systems knowledge. Studies show that this practice can facilitate a radical shift in approach and vision by molding organizations' culture.
Having the ability to share and apply learning to effect change leads to greater autonomy, which is associated with greater job satisfaction, greater commitment to the organization, and lower employee turnover (Galletta, Portoghese, & Battistelli, 2011; Spector, 1986). Empirical studies indicate that aid agencies with more autonomous work environments have more satisfied staff (Honig, 2015). For example, a quantitative study that tested the relationship between World Bank “task team leaders” and project outcomes found that qualities of team leaders, such as empowerment and engagement, were more strongly and significantly correlated with project outcomes than features of the environment or project itself. This finding further emphasizes the relationship between employee empowerment and outcomes (Denizer, Kaufmann, & Kraay, 2013). Empowered and engaged employees are also more productive (Towers, 2012).

3. Peer Learning, Team-Based Learning, and Communities of Practice

USAID’s field staff needs survey (2018) recommends that the Agency “offer more Mission-to-Mission, in-person, experience-sharing opportunities (like PSEF) during which there is space and time for brainstorming and thinking and exchanging lessons learned,” and “facilitate increased opportunity for peer-to-peer learning, mentoring, and networking across Agency operating units.”

“Staff learn best from experience and from each other… Staff prefer to use their colleagues as the first point of call for the knowledge they need to do their jobs. They also prefer to exchange what they know through dialogue (ACAI, p. 15).

Peer Learning: Evidence is accumulating that peer learning plays an essential role in capacity building, creating greater confidence and independence in learning, deeper understanding, and improved performance (Keenan, 2004). For example, a 2014 report on How DFID Learns, conducted by the Independent Commission for Aid Impact (ACAI), asking where DFID staff go first to access knowledge found: “Staff learn best from experience and from each other. Sharing knowledge and know-how between individuals and groups is key to DFID learning effectively … Staff prefer to use their colleagues as the first point of call for the knowledge they need to do their jobs. They also prefer to exchange what they know through dialogue” (p. 15). In addition, a survey of 2,000 staff from 481 companies in 47 countries provided similar evidence about sources of staff learning (Towards Maturity, 2013). When asked how staff are learning what they need for their job, the responses were as follows:

- 86 percent from working in collaboration with others
- 70 percent Google or other search engines
- 64 percent classroom courses
- 55 percent job aids and checklists
- 51 percent online courses

Much of the literature on peer learning tends to focus on the benefits of individuals interacting with one another and transmitting knowledge (Kelly & Schaefer, 2014; Phelps, et al., 2012; De Meuse, et al., 2009). The processes that facilitate peer learning are rooted in psychological and sociological literature that discuss the role of memory, perception, and cognition when processing information with others. One example of this is the ability of teams of peers to develop “transactive (or shared) memory systems,” which facilitate group goal performance, or the ability of groups to “sensemake” within an organization (Kanawattanachai & Yoo, 2007; Lewis, 2004; Austin, 2003).

According to the literature, to share and create knowledge, peers must intentionally set aside time to learn from one another, a procedure that may be integrated into existing meetings and processes. Research has shown that knowledge sharing is positively related to reductions in production costs, faster completion of new product development projects, team performance, firm innovation capabilities, and firm performance, including sales growth and revenue from new products and services (for example, Mesmer-Magnus & DeChurch, 2009; Hansen, 2002; Lin, 2007; Collins & Smith, 2006). While many organizations have invested considerable resources in
knowledge management systems, at least $31.5 billion has been lost per year by Fortune 500 companies because of the failure to effectively share knowledge (Babcock, 2004). Studies indicate that one important reason for this failure is a lack of consideration for how organizational and interpersonal characteristics influence knowledge sharing (Carter & Scarbrough, 2001; Voelpel, et al., 2005).

Among the factors that aid knowledge sharing, researchers emphasized trust, which also emerged as an important factor in creating a culture conducive to learning and adapting. They found that higher levels of trust among colleagues led to higher levels of knowledge sharing. Studies have found that, “It is critical to establish a trustful and caring environment for knowledge sharing, since individuals that feel safe and trusted are more likely to share knowledge” (Kharabsheh et al., 2016, p. 5). The literature reviewed also found a positive correlation between knowledge sharing and job satisfaction, indicating that knowledge sharing contributes to improved team performance by increasing job satisfaction (Kianto, 2016; Kasemsap, 2014).

**Team-Based Learning:** Much of the literature on team-based learning comes from the field of psychology. Organizational behavioral scientist Amy Edmondson quantitatively measured the connection between “team psychological safety,” learning behavior, and team performance. She found that team psychological safety is positively linked to learning behavior, which in turn affects team performance. Examples of learning behavior include seeking feedback, sharing information, asking for help, talking about errors, and experimenting. Teams with high levels of psychological safety are more likely to participate in risk-taking learning behavior and, by extension, proactive learning-oriented action, because they trust that the team will not embarrass, reject, or punish someone for speaking up (Edmondson, 1999).

The importance of team psychological safety and trust is further supported by the research conducted by Google’s Project Aristotle. Researchers there found that the highest performing groups were those that had the following characteristics: psychological safety, dependability, structure and clarity, meaning of work, and impact of work. The study also found that psychological safety and emotional behavior were related; as such, conversational turn-taking and showing sensitivity to feelings and needs established productive team norms that promote psychological safety and contributed to improved performance (Duhigg, 2016). This outcome aligns with what other studies have found across sectors—that high-trusting teams are generally also high-performing (Hakanen & Soudunsaari, 2012; Costa, 2003; Erdem, et al., 2003). This is, in part, because trust is associated with the release of oxytocin in our brains, meaning that the more we trust, the higher satisfaction levels we experience, which relates to an improved propensity to collaborate and perform well on teams (Zak, 2017). Other drivers of trust include organizational stability, empowered employees, and aspects of human resources operations, such as the fairness of performance appraisals, career development opportunities, and perceived autonomy (Cho & Poister, 2012; O’Toole & Meier, 2003).

Research conducted in the business sector has found that components of successful teamwork include external orientation; continuous learning; “straight talk” (honest, direct communication); and team orientation (De Meuse, et al., 2009; Hackman, 2002; LaFasto & Larson, 2001; Lencioni, 2002). Effective teams are built on applying outstanding functional skills to address complex challenges or opportunities and leveraging strong, trusting relationships to deliver innovation and results.

**Communities of Practice:** Organizations are increasingly turning to communities of practice (CoPs) as vehicles to generate learning and enhance organizational performance. CoPs are defined as groups of individuals who share a concern, a set of problems, or a passion about a topic and who strengthen their knowledge and expertise by interacting on a consistent basis (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999).

The literature found that CoPs are more effective as tools for reflection and learning when they form organically. However, the literature also notes that leaders need to facilitate these organically formed learning groups, bringing them out of silos, supporting them, and disseminating their knowledge across the rest of their own and other organizations (Moreno, 2001; Wesley & Buysse, 2001; Wenger, 1998). This includes resources such as time and administrative support and recognition such as rewards.
Communities of Practice offer a space for dialogue among those working on similar issues and can result in more rapid organizational learning, more effective decision-making, better use of lessons learned, and more efficient and effective problem solving.

CoPs are one way to bridge the gap between cognitive and behavioral learning because they facilitate the creation of knowledge by encouraging interaction between individuals. Cognitive learning, which is unobservable, is based on the understanding of knowledge as an object that can be passed from person-to-person; behavioral learning, which is observable, is based on the understanding of knowledge as something that is created in the interaction between people. The literature notes a tendency to reduce learning down to observable behaviors precipitated by new systems and requirements, but less focus appears to be made in the literature on knowledge being created (Huber, 1991; Chen & Edgington, 2005; King & McGrath, 2003). The literature recommends that for learning to take place, interactions should be emphasized and all individuals should learn from each other.

According to the literature, development organizations have difficulty moving from cognitive information management to people-centered learning processes. CoPs are one technique development organizations have used to facilitate people-centered learning processes. In the development sector, however, the procedures set up to promote organizational learning often consider knowledge more as an object that can be transferred from one person to another rather than something that is created in interactions. A study of NGOs concludes that the “widespread and tangible outputs of knowledge and learning work tend, thus far, to be based on improved information systems, rather than improved processes or changed behaviors,” and that, as a consequence, their learning structures are “more supply-led than demand-driven” (Ramalingam, 2005, p. 14). A tendency was noted among these organizations to “point to information systems as the “end product” rather than specific processes for knowledge and learning” (Ramalingam, 2005, p. 15). An example of a people-centered process is the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) Bank Networks (CoPs) that emerged organically around different themes and sectors. These groups are self-organized, set their own objectives, and their membership is largely voluntary and self-selected. They offer a space for dialogue among those working on similar issues and result in more rapid organizational learning, more effective decision-making, better use of lessons learned, and more efficient and effective problem solving (Moreno, 2001).

Under the right conditions, CoPs can be an effective model for facilitating knowledge sharing and learning. One study empirically examined a model of organizational CoP effectiveness that included constructs such as leadership, empowerment, the structure of tasks, and CoP relevance to organizational effectiveness. Using data from 32 CoPs in a U.S.-based multinational mining and minerals processing firm, the study found that external community leaders play an important role in enhancing CoP empowerment, particularly to the extent that task interdependence is high. Empowerment, in turn, was positively related to CoP effectiveness. Researchers also found that CoPs designated as “core” by the organization (e.g., working on critical issues) were more effective than those that were noncore. Task interdependence also was positively related to CoP effectiveness (Kirkman & Rosen, 1999).

B. A Strategic Approach to Change Management

Advanced technology, a changing workforce, competitive pressures, and globalization are just a few of the forces that prompt organizations to engage in and attempt to manage planned change (Burnes, 2004b; By, 2005; Kotter, 1996). It is often not a question of whether organizations should change but of how and in what direction they must change. In recent years, there has been a substantial growth in the amount of research conducted on change management and in the number of change management models as organizations grapple with these challenges.

Drawing from a large body of literature that spans several disciplines, seven change management models have emerged as distinctive and consistently cited. They range from highly prescriptive models like Lewin’s Three-Phase Process (1948) to more fluid models like the Appreciative Inquiry Model (1987) and the ADKAR Model (2006). Taken together, these seven models show considerable overlap, particularly in the processes or practices they advocate.
Change management researchers have identified a few key, common steps across the models that are supported by empirical research (Stouten, 2018):

1. **Assess the opportunity, need, or problem motivating the change:** Several models advise an initial diagnosis that involves gathering information to understand the specific problem(s) or change opportunity (Kanter et al., 1992; Judson, 1991; Beer, 1980). Research on problem solving, decision-making, and change management highlight the importance of having deliberate and well-conducted diagnosis to effectively manage planned change (Astor, et al., 2016; Armenakis & Harris, 2009).

2. **Select and support a guiding change coalition:** A key feature these models share is the role a guiding coalition of organization members can play in overseeing the change process. This coalition is advised to maintain supportive relationships and ongoing communication with top management (Kotter, 2012; Kanter, 1999). There is little scientific study of the tasks performed by the guiding coalition and their role in change success. However, researchers note that building a coalition of powerful and influential employees or other leaders can help signal consensus regarding a change message (Bies, 2013; Kellogg, 2012).

3. **Develop and promote change-related knowledge and ability:** Effective change typically involves learning new skills and knowledge. Of the seven approaches, however, only Hiatt (2006) specifies a change step for learning and knowledge. In Hiatt’s framework, using new skills and knowledge is facilitated by removing barriers to their application. Hiatt calls attention to potential “psychological blocks” employees may face when the new knowledge is not compatible with their existing roles. Researchers highlight two important elements to this process: psychological safety and time. The environment should be psychologically safe to make mistakes and learn from them and employees should be given sufficient time to develop new skills and knowledge (Hiatt, 2006).

One model that stands out as relevant to the PIVOT Cohort program’s theory of change is the Champion Model. According to the literature, change champions are individuals within an organization that volunteer or are selected to facilitate change. The champion is an active member within the change management project during all of its stages (Thompson, et al., 2004). Champions can be from any level within the organization and it is often encouraged to have champions from multiple levels; they do not need to be from the management level (Warrick, 2009). Champions are key to a successful outcome of organizational change (Porter Lynch, 2012). According to a literature review about the predictors of effective change management, empowering employees as champions of the change management process is critical for its success (Makumbe, 2016). Warrick (2009) similarly finds that developing champions who understand how to initiate, facilitate, and implement needed change is an effective model for managing change within an organization.

### III. Research Related to Enabling Environments for PSE

The PIVOT Cohort program seeks to help advance USAID’s cultural and operational shift toward private-sector engagement as a pathway to self-reliance. The following section reviews the research and programmatic literature on enabling environments for private-sector engagements both within organizational and country contexts.

#### A. Organizational Contexts that Support PSE

Studies show development organizations making a number of critical shifts in their culture, structures, and staffing capacities as they prepare for more strategic and systematic approaches to engaging the private sector in achieving development objectives (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017). USAID is working toward effectively institutionalizing and incentivizing PSE within the Agency by integrating PSE at every stage of strategic planning, design, and execution, and continuously adapting to new evidence, opportunities, or circumstances (USAID PSE Policy, 2018). The literature describes a number of key organizational change areas that create an effective enabling environment for PSE as a pathway to self-reliance.
Leadership Support for PSE: Studies show that executive level support for PSE plays a catalytic role in integrating PSE policies and related organizational change processes into operations. (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; OECD, 2016). Senior leadership lends authority and credibility through internal communication of PSE as a priority and changes mindsets by being responsive to knowledge needs and concerns. USAID’s Field Needs Study recognized the need for Mission leadership and supervisors to clearly signal PSE is a priority (USAID, 2018). Leaders can also help reassure sceptics by developing and communicating due diligence criteria and processes. Best practices in the PSE literature highlight the importance of PSE buy-in by leadership of operating units and ownership by front line implementers within the organization (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017).

Staff Incentives: Incentive structures for staff that link employee reward systems with PSE performance and recognize PSE expertise and experience as criteria for upward mobility were also highlighted as best practices in the literature (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; ACVFA, 2019). Research and recommendations specific to USAID suggest that the Agency recognize and reward leading actors within the organization (ACVFA, 2019) and build PSE into performance standards and job descriptions (USAID, 2018). In addition, studies of PSE suggest that allocating flexible staff time and funding for PSE efforts can help promote increased interest and activity (OECD, 2016b).

More Staff Time for Building and Managing Relationships: The literature on PSE recognizes that relationship building with potential business partners takes time, both to identify aligned interests and to build trust. In addition, multi-stakeholder partnerships add complexity to project design and implementation, placing higher demands on staff time (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; OECD 2016). They recommend allocating time for technical staff to host and/or attend networking events and initiate dialogues. Studies have found that active networking efforts were the most effective way of developing new relationships and partnerships with private-sector actors (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; OECD 2016). USAID’s Field Needs Study suggested that relationship management needs to be better resourced, more responsive, and more proactive in providing leads to field staff (USAID, 2018).

Efficient PSE-Related Management Systems: Time-saving processes and systems for outreach, due diligence, and relationship management are critical to assist staff in initiating and managing private-sector partnerships, communicating and collaborating across the Agency, and improving institutional memory (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017). For example, in terms of outreach, some research suggests that proactive approaches to identifying private-sector actors who meet specific program and policy objectives (e.g., Germany’s corporate cooperation scouts) have been more effective than passive approaches (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; OECD, 2016a). USAID’s Field Needs Study indicated that field staff need more flexible staffing practices—including short-term access to key PSE expertise and rotations—along with more time to engage directly with the private sector and peer learning exchanges. It also suggested that guidelines on PSE, including due diligence and communicating with the private sector, should be codified in ADS 200 and 300 Series. Finally, field staff also indicated that they need more awareness of and access to existing PSE knowledge resources and tools, ideally through a centralized, one-stop-shop within the Agency (USAID, 2018).

Flexible Funding Mechanisms and Expedited Procurement: Studies highlight best practices that create and use flexible funding mechanisms and procedures outside of existing programmatic frameworks, both at headquarters and field offices. This may include innovation funds that support early-stage or higher-risk ventures, or other flexible, non-grant financial mechanisms open to a variety of sectors and stakeholders (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; DCED, 2019). Documented experience and expertise from development organizations who practice PSE in Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and the United States also recognize the importance of aligning finance mechanisms with country needs and contexts. They indicate that in more challenging business environments and frontier markets, financial mechanisms tend to be fairly simple, while stronger enabling environments and emerging markets offer wider opportunities for innovative finance (OECD, 2016a, 2016b, 2016c, 2016d).
USAID’s Field Needs Study identified the need for expedited processes of forming partnerships as well as flexibility to operate with private-sector norms in mind. Field staff requested help in navigating contracts and legal considerations for PSE, including how to fully leverage existing authorities. The study concluded that the Agency did not necessarily need more funds, but required more unrestricted funds for convening, pursuing new opportunities, etc. Similarly, the study suggested the need to explore new ways to use existing authorities, rather than creating new authorities, and focused on the need for innovative programming, rather than new procurement instruments (USAID, 2018).

**Cross-functional Staff Teams and Operating Units:** The DCED’s study of development organizations’ work on PSE noted a number of best practices around staffing structures and roles (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017). For example, it recognized the need for improved communication and clearer division of responsibilities between headquarters and field around PSE. It also highlighted the best practice of creating cross-functional teams involving staff with different expertise and roles (e.g., contracting officers, technical staff, legal advisors, etc.) to help develop and manage private sector partnerships. They also recommended creating focal points for in-house and external PSE inquiries, and dedicated staff for relationship management (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; ACVFA, 2019). The USAID Field Needs Study identified the need for improved communication and coordination across pillar/regional Bureaus and “central” Washington support teams to provide a clearer sense of where portfolios of pillar and regional Bureaus overlap with “central” PSE support and to facilitate responsive support.

**Responsive Support:** USAID’s Field Needs Study indicated that field staff want demand-driven, tailored support, responsive to their needs and readily available when requested.

> “Go to the Missions to listen to and learn from the people in the field. Each country and context are different. You have to hear about the challenges and possible solutions first hand, you have to analyze them and incorporate them into the design of the field support services. Invite key people from the field, including contract officers and comptrollers, to sit for a few days and work toward design. If you design something with a great idea, but you don’t get input from the field, OAA, or comptrollers, then these sources could be sources of bumps down the road.”

The study further identified a number of ways headquarters could better support field staff efforts, including providing technical expertise that complements Missions’ local knowledge; making connections and supporting relationships with U.S. and multinational companies; brainstorming with and serving as a sounding board for Mission staff; providing PSE-related analytical services; creating a one-stop-shop for PSE related knowledge resources and tools; and help designing and implementing specific partnerships and PSE initiatives. It also suggested that additional efforts were needed to create clear entry points for field staff to ask for advice and ensure effective coordination with USAID/Washington staff (USAID, 2018).

**B. National and Local Contexts that Support PSE**

While recognized as a critical element for effective PSE, the literature reviewed only briefly discussed the contexts and conditions that could lead to successful enterprise-driven development. In part, this may be because enabling conditions are sector and industry-specific, rely on analyses of different local systems and political economies, and are continually changing (FTF, 2018). Nevertheless, a better understanding of how common elements of business enabling environments affect PSE can help improve PSE efforts for development impact (PSE Evidence and Learning Plan, 2018). The following section reviews literature related to Question #2 in the PSE Evidence and Learning Plan (also a subquestion of SRLA Q4), what context-specific factors drive effective engagement with the private sector?

PEST or PESTLE analyses of macro-level political, economic, social, technological, legal, and environmental contexts are a commonly used tool to identify opportunities and challenges in a national or local business environment (Thiele, 2018; Aguilar, 1967). These factors in the enabling environment—such as growth rates, cost of finance, reliable/affordable electricity, communication, travel, corruption, etc.—influence business investments and operations in local contexts and can impact PSE opportunities for programs like PIVOT.
Other business environment factors from the literature (e.g., Global Partnerships, 2018) that may influence the shape and development of PSE efforts, like those in the PIVOT Cohort program, include:

- **Maturity of business community**: including ease of procedures to start and run a business; percentage of local large companies vs. SMEs and MSMEs; prevalence of informal sector; maturity of business associations across sectors and representation of MSMEs.

- **Maturity of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)**: including degree to which CSR is pervasive, systematic, regulated, integrated into core business practices, in line with development objectives, etc.

- **Maturity of multi-stakeholder policy dialogue forums**: including meetings throughout policy cycle, inclusivity (e.g., SMEs and MSME are viewed as partners rather than beneficiaries; explicit efforts to work with women, poor, ethnic minorities, youth, smallholder farmers, remote populations), diversity of sectors represented, dialogue platforms/ opportunities at national, district and local levels.

- **Maturity of social dialogues**: 1) Among business interests (e.g., trade unions and employer associations on key issues like minimum wage; collective bargaining capacities); 2) cross-sectoral dialogues (including civil society) to build trust; and 3) among donor organizations (e.g., to coordinate around PSE).

- **Maturity of PSE efforts**: including diverse partners and range of budgets; full spectrum of PSE modalities; inclusive of social sectors (beyond finance, energy, and agriculture sectors); PSE mapped to development priorities and known challenges in business enabling environment; monitoring and evaluation (M&E) integrated into projects to identify key factors that support success; and institutional focal points to help coordinate across sectors and identify potential partnership opportunities, etc.

Further research is needed to identify what contextual factors most influence PSE success and how they make a difference.

Building on earlier frameworks for inclusive market systems development (Campbell, 2016), Feed the Future’s work on healthy market systems offers some useful guidance in this regard. Its recent review of 65 pieces of literature (FTF, 2018), and documented learning from its conference in South Africa involving 130 leading practitioners and donors involved in market systems (Marketlinks, 2018) identified a number of principles for business-enabling environments that support development objectives. Some of these include:

**Robust regulatory and institutional architectures** that support rule-based interactions for businesses, fight corruption, and promote a level playing field for competitive innovation are critical (OECD, 2016c). The literature recognizes that development agencies can play an important role in convening and influencing relevant government, private sector, and civil society stakeholders to improve regulatory, infrastructure, legal, or institutional environments that affect PSE.

*A well-functioning, properly enforced system of sound rules creates an enabling environment for the business of agriculture, reducing the risks and lowering the cost of transacting vertically and horizontally within value chains. Both the lower risk and higher profits associated with a good, well-enforced legal system can lead to poverty reduction, food security, economic growth, employment, and systemic resilience. The enabling environment, which includes both formal rules (i.e., policies, laws, regulations, and standards) and informal rules (i.e., societal norms and traditions), directly impacts the performance of all segments in a market system. This means fewer efficiency losses throughout a value chain and more money available to invest in higher returns.* (FTF, 2018)

**Local private sector as primary change agents**: Engaging local private-sector stakeholders in needs analyses and co-creation processes, and supporting their efforts to integrate into global value chains, helps develop healthy market systems (Marketlinks, 2018; OECD, 2016b). Local business and civil society ownership of proposed legal or regulatory reform can improve the sustainability of business-enabling conditions and ensure broader public benefits (rather favoring specific interest groups), though precautions against creating non-tariff barriers to trade are needed (FTF, 2018).
Donor coordination to capitalize on mutually beneficial programs and recognize that policy initiatives build on each other was another principle for supporting business-enabling environments. For example, “Any donor working on agricultural financing should collaborate closely with a legal systems reform program that improves contracts enforcement or a new credit reporting system, as these interventions have a direct link to the risk premium for accessing finance.” (FTF, 2018; OECD, 2016).

Inclusive business practices that engage and benefit a range of actors including women, youth, ethnic minorities and/or other marginalized groups who are often excluded, or even exploited, by traditional market systems are essential in creating enabling environments that support development objectives.

Inclusive business practices that engage and benefit a range of actors including women, youth, ethnic minorities, and/or other marginalized groups who are often excluded, or even exploited, by traditional market systems are essential in creating enabling environments that support development objectives. The literature suggests that increased inclusivity in business practices can help these actors acquire access to the opportunities, skills, and resources to upgrade, and the capabilities to engage with and influence market systems to reap the benefits that arise from the upgrading process (USAID/LEO, 2016).

Diversification of PSE to support market resilience, or the ability of households and communities to manage change, shocks, and stressors without compromising long-term prospects (DFID, 2019), is another important focus, given the increased uncertainties and need to protect investments in development contexts. This represents a shift in defining sustainability, from market stabilization to a broader concept that includes market resilience (FTF, 2018). Research suggests that supporting resilient enabling environments for PSE requires innovative program and investment approaches, as well as longer time frames to market system development that focus on diversified production and income to help mitigate risk for different types of shocks and stressors (Mercy Corps, 2015).

Multi-dimensional PSE in fragile and conflict-affected areas: OECD studies also recognized that weak institutions in fragile and conflict-affected areas can make it challenging for businesses to operate effectively and carry high risks that discourage investors (OECD, 2016). Yet the needs of people living in these areas can only be met if private enterprises are able to grow, create employment, provide the goods and services people need to improve their lives, and generate the tax revenue that allows governments to provide essential services (WBG, 2018, p. 18). Grounded in conflict analyses, private-sector partnerships and innovative financing are an important part of multi-dimensional approaches to build capable, legitimate institutions that ensure citizen security, address injustice, and create employment. PSE activities that contribute to market development and crowd-in investments can help address the drivers of conflict, support the most vulnerable populations, and help break cycles of violence (WBG, 2018; OECD, 2016c).

IV. Research Related to SLRA Questions

This section briefly examines the literature and evidence related to two questions on the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda that are relevant to the PIVOT Cohort program’s efforts to advance PSE and help guide the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review. These questions focus on: 1) relationship qualities with private-sector stakeholders that may influence the success of partnerships in achieving development impacts; and 2) the effective use of USAID’s non-financial value propositions, including influence, knowledge, and convening power in PSE efforts, to foster self-reliance.

A. What private-sector relationship qualities influence results?

The research literature on PSE consistently identifies a shift needed in how donor organizations relate to private sector stakeholders (Hienrich-Fernandes, 2017). For example, a survey of USAID corporate partners revealed that while they value USAID’s expertise, they are “frustrated by small, one-off projects that don’t contribute to a more strategic
approach to development and market challenges. Mostly, they want a more equal relationship, with USAID engaging them earlier in” (Ingram, et al., 2016, p.3). The following section briefly reviews best practices for developing successful relationships with private-sector actors identified in the PSE programmatic and research literature.

Studies suggest that effective PSE moves away from short-term, transactional partnerships, such as one-off contracts or co-funding opportunities, to more equal, co-created collaborations with longer time frames.

Stronger, long-term partnerships: Studies suggest that effective PSE moves away from short-term, transactional partnerships, such as one-off contracts or co-funding opportunities, to more equal, co-created collaborations with longer time frames. Best practices suggest that development organization staff focus on relationship building with clearer expectations, alignment, and trust before partnering on specific initiatives that address development goals and market challenges (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; Ingram et al., 2016).

Early, exploratory discussions with potential partners: The literature notes that the changing nature of partnerships often requires early discussions to be more exploratory that targeted. Authors advise that, in initial meetings, participants focus on listening rather than planning; understanding a company's interests and assets; presenting Agency interests and assets in a way that is relevant to businesses; identifying common interests; staying flexible; establishing clear timelines and timely follow-ups; and keeping paperwork light (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017; Askin, n.d.).

Healthy partnerships require alignment and trust: USAID research on private-sector relationships indicated that healthy relationships with business partners improved performance (Oullette, 2016). Early stage partnerships need alignment and commitment, while implementation requires trust. Strategic partnerships—or alliances focused on improving societal or environmental conditions in which businesses and development organizations operate—rely on trust. Shared value partnerships—or intentional investments into societal issues that strengthen a company’s competitive advantage and potential for profit as well as supporting development objectives—rely on alignment. The study found that establishing clear norms and proactive communication was key to relationship health. Constructively addressing partnership pain points was also critical to success (Oullette, 2016).

Relationship qualities for sustainable and scalable results: An analysis of 40 USAID private-sector partnerships resulted in a framework for partnership assessment focusing on relationship qualities that led to sustainable and scalable projects (Private Sector Partnership: Achieving Enduring Results, 2016). Examining the nature of partnership activities, pathways to sustain results, private-sector assets, and platforms to scale, the study found that:

1) Market-oriented partnerships endured more than non-market oriented partnerships, especially when designed around a core business opportunity for business partners.

2) Private sector assets that were additive play a critical role in partnerships that sustained and scaled. Relationships were most additive when they created market linkages. The framework identifies five categories of business assets, including investment capital, brand value, specialized capabilities, relationships, and proprietary information or innovation.

3) Capacity building only endured when conducted in conjunction with other pathways to sustainability.

4) Partnerships that achieved policy change were more likely to sustain and scale without additional funding.

B. In fostering self-reliance, how can we use influence, knowledge, and convening power to complement projectized support in PSE?

According to the literature on Innovative Finance, international investors recognize the significant expertise and influence that government donors have in development contexts, and often have more demand for their networks and experience working in emerging markets than their capital (Loveridge, 2016). Bilateral donors can draw upon a full spectrum of activities and approaches for working with and through the private sector to achieve development impact and foster self-reliance. Many of these approaches complement projectized support by drawing upon Agency influence,
knowledge, and convening power. For example, aid agencies can play powerful convening and brokering functions based on their knowledge of both international and local private-sector actors; share their deep understandings of country political and regulatory environments; and provide influence in supporting broader policy reform with business partners (Heinrich-Fernandes, 2017). An OECD study of experience and expertise about PSE from U.S. development organizations highlights this:

**Government initiatives signal to the private sector which issue areas are priorities (e.g. the launch of the Power Africa initiative signaled a U.S. government focus on energy). They can also signal to other stakeholders that a company has been vetted as a credible partner. In their role as convener, governments bring together a range of partners (e.g., donors, the private sector, civil society organizations, universities, etc.) and facilitate networking and connections. This role creates opportunities to reduce transaction costs by enabling the private sector to tap into the expertise of government and other stakeholders and mitigates risk by facilitating the co-ordination of initiatives across sectors.** (OECD, 2016d)

A number of PSE typologies have been proposed to describe the range of approaches, as well as stages, depth, and mechanisms for engaging the private sector (e.g., DCED, 2019; OECD, 2016; ECDPM, 2016; ODI, 2013; and ICAI, 2015). For example, USAID’s Private-Sector Engagement Policy (USAID, 2018, p.19) outlines different “Ways We Engage,” objectives for each approach, and illustrative examples of relevant USAID PSE activities (see copy of chart on next page). As with other PSE typologies, categories of engagement approaches are rarely discrete, and often mix objectives (such as knowledge sharing), activities (such as policy dialogue), and inputs (such as technical assistance). In addition, experts note that different approaches can be used to achieve the same results (DCED, 2019). Many of these PSE efforts (e.g., roundtables, matchmaking events, policy dialogues, etc.) focus on development organizations’ non-financial additionality and staff’s interpersonal skills such as facilitation, effective communication, and relationship building to strengthen enterprise driven development as a pathway to self-reliance. In addition, some of these PSE activities can reach and support existing processes of collaboration among local actors. These efforts complement more traditional forms of projectized support involving private-sector stakeholders.

Like USAID’s framework below, some recent PSE frameworks make useful distinctions between Private-Sector Engagement, Innovative Finance, Market Systems Development, and Business Environment development in terms of who donors engage (e.g., international businesses, private investors/financial institutions, national or local businesses, and national or local business associations) and how they engage (e.g., see DCED, 2019). Differentiating these strategies can help aid staff refine their value proposition for specific private-sector actors and better leverage assets beyond projectized support to achieve sustainable development outcomes. For example, USAID’s research on private-sector partnerships found that PSE efforts that resulted in policy change demonstrated strong potential to both sustain and scale, without requiring additional funding (USAID/ISP, 2016). Many questions remain, however, about the conditions under which different PSE efforts can be most effective.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WAYS WE ENGAGE</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information-Sharing and Strategic Alignment:</strong> Engagement that aims to identify shared interests, respective capabilities, and experiences. It does not necessarily entail investment of financial resources.</td>
<td>• Better understand challenges at hand; • Align and coordinate respective strategies and efforts for achieving outcomes of shared interest; • Identify resources and potential solutions; and • Enable private-sector actors to support development objectives.</td>
<td><strong>Convening for Aligned Investment in Brazil:</strong> Under Mais Unidos, or “More Together;” USAID worked with more than 100 American companies operating in Brazil to shape the development impact of their investments in the Amazon region. The alliance established a social investment fund worth more than $500,000; supported Ministries in the Brazilian federal government to extend English-language learning opportunities; and funded educational activities that promote the preservation of the Amazon region’s biodiversity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advancing Learning and Market Research:</strong> Engagement that advances shared market research, good practices for PSE, and joint strategic planning and project design within the USAID Program Cycle.</td>
<td>• Identify and implement solutions to development challenges; • Address information asymmetries; and • Build evidence for what works in PSE.</td>
<td><strong>Healthy Markets Vietnam:</strong> The Government of Vietnam recognizes a more sustainable response to the HIV epidemic is necessary to ensure access to pharmaceuticals, supplies, and services for all affected populations. USAID’s Healthy Markets Initiative, under the President’s Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), segments populations based on their need and ability to pay. This approach enables the Government to prioritize finite public resources for the most-vulnerable, and supports growth of a commercial market for those with the ability to pay. By filling gaps in market information, the Initiative attracted the private sector to invest, which allowed USAID to phase out its funding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Harnessing Private-Sector Expertise and Innovation:</strong> Engagement that harnesses innovation, technology, research and development, industry expertise, and/or entrepreneurial skills to achieve development outcomes.</td>
<td>• Deploy private-sector expertise, technology, and other capabilities to address development and humanitarian challenges; and • Enable private-sector actors to engage effectively in development (e.g., through the application of market-based approaches or support for the design of projects).</td>
<td><strong>Tapping Private-Sector Manufacturing Expertise for Maternal Child Health:</strong> In Nepal, one in 28 children dies before his or her fifth birthday. Many newborns die from preventable infections of their umbilical cords. Working with local manufacturers and the Nepalese Government, USAID funded the introduction and scale up of a life-saving intervention: chlorhexidine antiseptic gel. When the gel is applied within 24 hours of birth in high-risk settings, neonatal deaths drop, on average by 23 percent. Producing chlorhexidine locally through private-sector partners built in-country capacities that support Nepal’s Journey to Self-Reliance. A local manufacturer has also supplied the life-saving gel to other countries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Catalyzing Private-Sector Resources:</strong> Engagement that mobilizes private-sector resources and action—including philanthropy and CSR assets—to address a specific issue and/or objective.</td>
<td>• Mobilize more resources (financial and non-financial) to address development and humanitarian challenges; • Focus stakeholders’ efforts on specific issues and/or approaches; and • Use philanthropic or concessional funds to attract more commercially-oriented businesses and investors, and unlock further resources.</td>
<td><strong>Coffee Farmer Resilience Initiative:</strong> In Central America, USAID worked with Root Capital, Keurig Green Mountain, Cooperative Coffees, and Equal Exchange to help 40,000+ smallholder farmers combat coffee rust, a disease that threatened their harvests. USAID provided Root Capital with a $15 million DCA credit enhancement to cover the risks of lending to cooperatives. Keurig Green Mountain is covering the Fund’s first $400,000 in potential losses. By mitigating risk and acting as first movers, USAID and Keurig have attracted new investors, and an additional $8 million.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unlocking Private Investment:</strong> Engagement that addresses constraints to a transaction or broader investment. The emphasis is on activities that can be replicated or brought to scale, inclusive of efforts to “crowd in” and shape investment. (See box entitled, “Mobilizing Private Investment for Development.”)</td>
<td>• Mobilize greater financial resources and expertise to address development challenges; • Support the expansion of more and better businesses with a development impact (focused on unlocking investments that would not occur without USAID support); and • Finance new models and solutions to development challenges.</td>
<td><strong>Attracting Investment in Ghana’s Agricultural Value-Chain:</strong> The transaction costs associated with learning new markets are high for potential investors in Ghana. To unlock capital, USAID developed a milestone-based payment program, FinGAP, which deploys local advisors to scout promising businesses and develop investment requests. This reduces risk for investors, and makes investments more attractive. Advisors receive compensation only when businesses receive financing. Investors also compete for grants that USAID disburse only once they make investments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengthening the Enabling Environment:</strong> Engagement on issues of importance to multiple U.S. and local private-sector actors, such as regulatory reforms, policy, compliance with standards, and government capacity building.</td>
<td>• Develop policy agendas and frameworks at the international, national, and local levels that reflect all parties’ interests; and • Improve the capacities of host country government to create strong business-enabling environments, and to engage private-sector partners to support their Journey to Self-Reliance.</td>
<td><strong>Power Africa in Sénégal:</strong> USAID worked with Sénégal’s Ministry of Energy and the national utility company, Senlec, to develop a master plan for generation and transmission that enhances the Government’s ability to make investment decisions in the sector. USAID built Sénégal’s capacity to integrate and manage more than 400 megawatts of grid-connected solar power. By addressing key constraints and capacity gaps in the power sector, Power Africa is helping Sénégal open the doors to future investment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V. Identifying meaningful PSE outcomes and measures of success

As development organizations increasingly prioritize knowledge generation about what works in PSE, how it works, and under what conditions different strategies might work best, they need clearer and more nuanced metrics for success as well as more robust monitoring, evaluation, research, and learning efforts. This section briefly summarizes common challenges in measuring PSE results, highlights recommendations for improvement, and examines outcome measures from the literature that may be relevant to PIVOT.

A. Current Challenges

Identifying meaningful success metrics: The evaluation literature on PSE recognizes that success metrics are underdeveloped: too often they rely on quantifiable, tangible outcomes such as “funds leveraged” or “number of partnerships” and miss meaningful indicators that could paint a fuller picture about what does and does not work in private-sector engagement for development impact (USAID, PSE Evidence and Learning Plan, DCED, 2019).

The evaluation literature on PSE recognizes that success metrics are underdeveloped: too often they rely on quantifiable, tangible outcomes such as “funds leveraged” or “number of partnerships” and miss meaningful indicators that could paint a fuller picture about what does and does not work in private sector engagement for development impact.

Evaluators note that few organizations are disciplined or adept at identifying measures of success at the outset of their PSE efforts (Parskey, 2017). Pinpointing what changes to measure to facilitate better understanding and assessment of progress toward broader goals, and including criteria that are most meaningful to different stakeholders, has proven quite difficult. As a result, assessment criteria for PSE efforts remain limited, vague, and idiosyncratic (USAID PSE Policy; Marketlinks, 2018). The diverse evaluation criteria and methods for assessing PSE effects and effectiveness also prevent meaningful comparisons and aggregation across engagement efforts, making it difficult to generate broader lessons and cumulative learning (Mansell et al. 2019; DCED, 2019). “Leverage is so abused in our measurement, we leave it to people who have incentives to inflate them. There’s no guidance on what to count/not to count. We count incorrectly. If we get rigor to this process, it’ll raise the value of partnerships because they’ve been devalued by these faux partnerships.” (USAID, 2018)

Data and measurement issues: Evaluators also recognize that data about PSE effectiveness, especially intangibles like different forms of additionality, can be difficult to collect (DCED, 2019). In addition, there is often a mismatch between expectations to provide data on results, and both the ability and incentives to measure them (DCED, 2019; Parskey, 2017; Loveridge, 2016). Because of this, a preponderance of PSE evaluation efforts focus on outputs rather than outcomes, and rely too heavily on self-reports of partners involved (BEAM, 2016; USAID PSE Policy, 2018).

Integrating M&E into management of PSE efforts: In addition, most PSE efforts have not embedded results measurement into management practices for all partners to help create feedback loops that support continual learning and adapting (Loveridge, 2016). Often PSE monitoring and evaluation are not integrated into the design or budgets of an effort, but are sponsored and conducted instead by a third party, with end-point reporting that does not contribute to real-time learning and adaptation (ibid). In addition, as PSE managers and evaluators change during the life of a partnership, replacements often do not revisit initial measures or move the “finish line,” limiting the usefulness of data already collected (Parskey, 2017). These issues affect the quality of assessments and their usefulness for improving programs.

Assessing plausible contribution: Finally, PSE evaluations also suffer from well-documented difficulties in assessing attribution, or even specific program contributions, in complex, dynamic, and uncertain environments (OECD, 2018; FTF, 2018). Evaluators recognized that multiple factors and other interventions influence outcomes; results often take a longer time frame or have time lags that are not captured in short-term M&E efforts; and meaningful intangibles that are difficult to capture and communicate often get dropped from assessment efforts (Parskey, 2017; OECD, 2018).
B. Proposed Improvements:

The evaluation literature makes a number of recommendations for strengthening efforts to understand and assess the success of PSE efforts.

1) **Establish transparent results frameworks and clear metrics for success that matter to all partners** (e.g., private-sector partners as well as USAID), including both development impact and financial returns (ACVFA, 2019; Global Partnerships, 2018). PSE evaluators recognize that measuring results works best when it has clear business value; however, they also suggest that companies identify results information that can be useful to broader business operations and interests (e.g., relevance, efficiency, sustainability) beyond financial impact reporting to investors (Loveridge, 2016). USAID’s PSE Field Needs Study found that PSE points of contact and technical staff wanted clearer definitions of success for their own performance and recommended letting field staff help drive the thinking on new indicators for PSE (USAID, 2018).

2) **Develop and use a common PSE assessment framework** with a few core performance indicators for all sectors and a few key, sector-specific performance indicators. This framework can be used as a complement to more program and context-specific assessment efforts, to facilitate comparison and aggregation of results and articulate a broader results narrative that enhances learning, accountability, and effectiveness (OECD, 2018). For example, Germany’s GIZ reported that its PSE assessment framework has helped reduce the administrative burden on partners and streamlined internal assessment and reporting processes (OECD, 2016a). Further, the literature suggests that conducting thematic evaluations can be useful for identifying best practices and learning across an institution, while portfolio evaluations offer an opportunity to assess impacts and inform future investments (OECD, 2018).

3) The evaluation literature also recommends developing **more long-term and systems-oriented indicators** (FTF, 2018). Evaluators recommend that assessment criteria look beyond targeted beneficiaries to include broader behavioral changes such as adoption, imitation, adaptation, and innovation, as well as changes in intangibles such as more inclusive networks, increased trust, improved information and financial flows, lower churn rates, etc. (Marketlinks, 2018; FTF, 2018; Loveridge, 2016).

For example, the literature on market system development and business-enabling environments suggests that PSE efforts include assessments of change in three domains, including:

- **Outcomes and impacts** based on results frameworks for development objectives. This would include examining evidence of success along results chains as well assessing broader contributions to market systems and enabling environments that facilitate countries’ self-reliance;

- **Inclusion** of marginalized groups such as women, youth, smallholder farmers, ethnic minorities, remote communities, etc. and expanded networks, connections, and relationships; and

- **Governance and enabling environments**, including formal rules, laws, and procedures that guide business behaviors as well as informal norms and rules that support enterprise-driven development (Marketlinks, 2018; FTF, 2018).

4) **Find new ways to capture and communicate intangible results of PSE** that recognize the full range of impacts and benefits of working with the private sector. For example, it would be useful to assess the contributions of co-creation processes and policy dialogue that may not yield financial disbursements but may lead to significant changes in business models, enabling environments, and future PSE approaches (OECD, 2016c). They also indicate the need for assessments that compare enterprise driven development to more traditional mechanisms to capture the unique contributions of PSE efforts (PSE Evidence and Learning Plan, n.d.; OECD, 2018).

5) **Embed resources for monitoring and evaluation within PSE efforts to encourage continuous learning and adapting** (Global Partnerships, 2018). This may include incentivizing the development and use of feedback loops and regular reporting on progress towards goals for sustainability and scale. The evaluation literature also recommends developing post-partnership metrics and review processes and setting expectations for ex-post reporting (Oullette, 2016).
Improving success metrics for PSE is considered a priority in much of the literature on PSE. This is critical to build and act on the evidence of what works, and what does not, in PSE to support self-reliance (USAID PSE Policy, 2018).

VI. Conclusion

This literature review examines a broad range of empirical research and programmatic studies to highlight some of the current evidence related to the PIVOT Cohort program’s design and implementation, as well as the broader questions surrounding PSE as a pathway to self-reliance that guide the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review. The evidence, best practices, and lessons learned described in this document can help inform the Learning Review’s methods and help situate discussions of its findings.
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Cohort Summaries

I. Learning Review Context

The PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review, launched in September 2019, is designed to help capture promising practices, lessons learned, and evidence of change from the Practical, Innovative, On-the-Job Training (PIVOT) Cohort Program to address a variety of learning needs related to advancing private-sector engagement (PSE) as a pathway toward self-reliance, including:

• What works, what needs improvement, and what other questions need to be explored to help improve the PIVOT program’s design and implementation, shape future PIVOT iterations, and inform other change management, PSE, and SR efforts;

• Key factors or conditions that support and inhibit the effectiveness of the PIVOT program, including those influencing the shape and development of PIVOT Missions’ journey toward self-reliance;

• Evidence about how and to what extent PIVOT’s integrative capacity building and change management approach contributes to intended changes; and

• Evidence from the PIVOT program that can help address questions in the Agency-wide PSE Evidence and Learning Plan and the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda.

As part of the PIVOT program’s Second In-Person Cohort Meeting in Baltimore, Maryland, September 3–6, 2019, the Learning Review conducted an initial round of data collection, designed to provide preliminary information for ongoing program improvement, PIVOT 2.0 design discussions, and future Learning Review efforts.

Section II provides a brief overview of findings from PIVOT’s Cohort members, implementing partners, and Affinity Group Leads (N=32) collected during the Learning Review session at the PIVOT Cohort meeting in Baltimore on September 5th, 2019. Section III includes a more in-depth analysis of PIVOT Cohort members’ (n=23) responses to open-ended questions on the Individual Reflection Sheets and the Focus Group Interviews. Information from this informal summary will be combined with other data collected during the Learning Review (e.g., from key informant interviews, document reviews, and case study analyses) as part of a final report.

Reviewers invite all Cohort members to make comments and corrections to this internal document. For those who were not able to attend the Baltimore meeting in particular, reviewers solicit your reflections and input on the issues discussed here. Feedback and comments will be included in an aggregated analysis for the final report with all person-identifiable information removed. Please use pages at the end of the report to make anonymous comments, additions, or suggestions, or email Ilana Shapiro, Learning Review Lead, directly at ilanasemail@gmail.com.

II. Overview of Findings

Cohort members, implementing partners (IPs), and Affinity Group Leads (AGLs) showed considerable agreement in their responses to questions on the Individual Reflection Sheets and Focus Group Interviews. This brief overview of findings highlights the key themes for each question within and across groups.

1) What is working well?

Cohort members have found the PIVOT program’s design, especially the cross-sectoral Change Teams within Missions and the cross-Mission interactions, to be very helpful in fostering peer learning, collaboration, and support for their PSE efforts. They also highlighted the effectiveness of PIVOT’s demand-driven capacity building,
which integrates the “power skills” of leadership and Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) with more technical PSE knowledge and tools. The PIVOT change plans have been an important focal point for team-building and applying new learning (i.e., learning by doing) in the first half of the program. Cohort members also commented on the value of “high touch” facilitation through regular calls and meetings for keeping everyone engaged and accountable.

IPs and AGLs echoed these assessments about what is working well. They added that Cohort members show high levels of participation in, enthusiasm for, and commitment to advancing PSE. They also indicated that the PIVOT program is building a PSE community not only within and across participating Missions, but across USAID/Washington offices and Bureaus involved in the program as well. They suggested that PIVOT has helped connect USAID/Washington policies with Mission operations around PSE and has been successful in garnering leadership support.

2) What should be changed?

Cohort members focused on the need to shift from making plans to taking action at this mid-point of the program. They also expressed an interest in receiving more technical PSE knowledge and skills training as they begin to implement their change plans. Those new to PSE requested more individual consultations and guidance in navigating the private-sector landscape. Many Cohort members also recognized the need for additional funding and a longer time frame for implementing PIVOT, and suggested streamlining program calls to help manage the time constraints of current staff.

IPs and AGLs also recognized Cohort members’ need for additional technical PSE support as they begin implementing their PSE plans. In addition, they raised a variety of issues related to designing the next iteration of PIVOT, such as refining participant selection criteria, resourcing and institutionalizing the program, and enhancing communication with Mission and USAID/Washington leadership.

3) What are key enabling conditions for and barriers to PIVOT implementation?

**Enablers:** Cohort members, IPs, and AGLs were unanimous in highlighting leadership support as the key enabling factor for the PIVOT program. Many also discussed PIVOT’s alignment with Agency PSE policies and priorities, program cycle requirements (e.g., a PSE Plan, CDCS development), and other PSE activities and actors at USAID. Other enabling factors included existing PSE expertise within the Agency and interest in PIVOT’s integrative change management approach.

**Barriers:** The primary barrier noted by all participants was limited staff time and bandwidth due to competing priorities and responsibilities. Other barriers included limited or inflexible funding, organizational structures and regulations that slowed PSE efforts, and unclear PSE objectives and measures of success.

4) What are the biggest changes in PSE since the start of PIVOT?

Cohort members, IPs, and AGLs agreed that a growing awareness, interest, and knowledge about PSE within PIVOT Missions has been the biggest change so far. In addition, all mentioned Cohort members’ improved leadership, CLA, and PSE capacities and increased cross-sectoral and cross-Mission learning and collaboration around PSE. Cohort members have seen and supported more integration of PSE into Mission planning documents such as CDCSs, PADs, and PSE plans, and reported new PSE activities in offices across their Missions.

Participants believed that PIVOT contributed directly to these changes through dedicated staff time and new technical, CLA, and leadership capacities around PSE within Missions. They also recognized that the Agency’s new PSE policy and priorities, and other PSE activities, have facilitated the change as well.
5) How can we best know and show PIVOT’s success?

Cohort members, IPs, and AGLs all suggested that measures of PIVOT’s success should focus on stronger integration of PSE into Mission documents and increased PSE activities in their Missions. They also mentioned seeing increases in participants’ PSE, CLA, and leadership capacities, sustained cross-sectoral relationships, increased private-sector partnerships and funds leveraged, and changes in organizational processes, resources, and culture related to CLA and PSE integration.

Many participants recognized that measuring PIVOT’s outcomes and demonstrating success in advancing PSE will require a time frame longer than one year and will vary by Mission and country context.

6) What do they want to learn from this Learning Review?

Participants expressed a wide variety of interests related to the Learning Review. They were particularly interested in learning more about other Missions’ approaches to PSE and seeing comparisons, both long- and short-term, of PSE implementation and outcomes between PIVOT and non-PIVOT Missions. Participants hoped that the Learning Review would provide a collective body of knowledge and evidence from PIVOT about what works and what doesn’t, challenges and how to overcome them, where to focus energies, and case studies of effective PSE. They also hoped the Learning Review would capture PIVOT’s contribution to changes in participants’ technical, CLA, and leadership capacities, as well as related changes in Missions’ processes and efforts to advance PSE as a pathway toward self-reliance.

III. PIVOT Cohort Data Summary

This section synthesizes and briefly discusses information from PIVOT Cohort members by question using a summary chart and quotes from both Individual Reflection Sheets and the Focus Group Interview notes to illustrate main points. The summary chart identifies categories that emerged from open coding of responses to the open-ended questions and includes the number of participants/percentage of respondents who offered comments related to each category. Response categories are often not discrete, having overlap and relationships to each other and to those in other questions.

Participants: The information in this summary was provided by PIVOT Cohort members from all six PIVOT Missions including:

• 96 percent of the PIVOT Cohort who attended the Baltimore Meeting (23/24 participants), representing
• 66 percent of the total PIVOT Cohort (23/35 participants)

A. PIVOT design and implementation: Questions in this section explored issues related to what is working well, what should be changed, and external factors that support or inhibit program implementation.
1) Based on your experience, what is working well in the PIVOT program so far?^{6}

**Change Teams:** Participants mentioned the cross-sectoral Change Teams in Missions most often as working well in the PIVOT program. They commented that this team approach was very useful in supporting inter-office communication, cross-sectoral collaboration, and in transferring or integrating knowledge about PSE throughout the Mission. They described Change Teams as providing opportunities for ongoing peer learning, feedback, support, motivation, and accountability, and as an important vehicle for advancing PSE planning and action in their Missions.

“**PIVOT as it’s designed—it’s brilliant. Especially at the Mission level, where we have people from different technical offices—all the technical offices—and the contracts office working together on PSE. It’s a whole Mission approach, I like that about the program.**”

“**The change team model is good. I like having a team to bounce ideas and challenges off of, and it keeps me accountable.**”

Participants commented that relationships built in the Change Teams have improved inter-office communication beyond PSE as well.

“**Change teams promote open and fluid communication….For example, if someone in our Programs Office needs help with an education issue, she/he does not hesitate to pick up the phone and call a team member in the Ed office. It has provided an opportunity to understand different initiatives and identify ways of coordinating and collaborating … the structure is great!”**

**Capacity building:** Participants appreciated the very intentional and demand-driven design of PIVOT programming and highlighted its usefulness both directly for their PSE efforts and indirectly for other aspects of their jobs. Some highlighted the “soft skills” of leadership and CLA, while others focused more on technical PSE tools and resources provided. Many commented on the value of combining different types of learning (e.g., presentations, skills training, learning by doing, peer learning, etc.) in PIVOT as well.

“**PIVOT is providing both capacity building on PSE related skills needed and confidence to lead others comfortably.”**

“**Knowing the kind of language, how to approach, how to engage, and how to motivate people in the private sector has been very useful.”**

---

^{6} The charts in this data summary capture responses to open-ended questions. The horizontal axis presents response categories that emerged from the analysis of participants’ comments. The vertical axis identifies the number of participants whose responses fell within each category. Since the total number of participants who responded to each question varied, the percentages at the top of each bar represent the percent of respondents in each category.
“It is practical training and is making us start thinking outside the box and knowing that PSE is not just an EG thing.”

- Special shout-outs included: PEPSE TA/resource mechanisms (2); CLA skills (2); Enneagram (2); ISP’s decision tree; Carlijn Nouwen’s PowerPoint presentation on PSE opportunities in different sectors (2); communication skills, and leadership skills.

Cross-Mission learning and collaborating was also mentioned by many participants as working well. PIVOT’s design and activities (e.g., Affinity Groups and Cohort meetings) are creating cross-Mission learning networks and new peer relationships that allow participants to learn from each other and share experiences, contacts, and tools for advancing PSE. Participants emphasized how helpful it has been to hear about other Missions’ progress, frustrations, and successes.

“I would say the cohort networks are working really well—having the contacts that we can now reach out to. The learning that we get from their different experiences—like in the affinity groups—stuff that we adopt from each other. For example, with the Kenya team … I was able to say, ‘if you guys won that proposal, how can we do that?’ I was able to work directly with [name removed] on some consultations. It’s difficult to quantify these ancillary conversations. It’s a discussion over lunch or over tea or waiting for a session to start.”

“Saving Change Plans on Google Drive and allowing others to compare, contrast, and comment on them have allowed for cross-Mission learning and integration of idea … We had good peer feedback with Rwanda about their change plan—that’s something I encourage others to do and seek out—to hear what their approach was and how they deal with different issues and provide mutual feedback.”

PIVOT Change Management Plans were highlighted by participants as a very practical and useful way to integrate different kinds of learning from PIVOT, build an effective team, and develop actionable steps for advancing PSE tailored to their specific Mission and country contexts.

“I think just having the change management plan as a focus for the group works really well because it outlines concrete action for you to do within your mission. We’re not just training five people in the mission on PSE, it’s training them to have a plan to get the rest of the Mission on board.”

“Structuring learning around the Change Management plan has been helpful in understanding how I engage with our PSE plan. I have learnt a lot. I understand myself better and I am a better teammate.”

In-person Cohort meetings and regular calls were both mentioned as effective in supporting learning, enthusiasm, momentum, and accountability. Participants commented that in-person Cohort meetings added depth to peer learning and “cross-pollination” of ideas about what works and what doesn’t in PSE. In addition, the regular check-in calls with Change Teams and monthly Cohort calls provided important opportunities to discuss issues and keep participants on track.

“The Cohort meetings have been really good. They’re productive weeks, and coming out of the May one, we had a lot of momentum. I expect we will from this one too. It’s also strengthened cross-office communication. I’m not sure we ever really talked or worked together before PIVOT.”

“The regular calls help keep everyone awake and on their toes.”

USAID/Washington Support was also mentioned as working well in PIVOT. Backstops, implementing partners, and Affinity Group Leads were praised for making the program demand-driven; listening and supporting field teams well; and keeping everyone on track.

“People in Washington listen to Change Team members; they take feedback and address it directly.”

“I feel very supported by people in DC. Communication has been consistent and reliable. DC team is very proactive and responsive to the needs of Change Team members.”
Please Note:Participant responses related to Leadership Support and Alignment with Policy and Program Cycle are discussed below under Enabling Conditions. Participant responses related to PSE and Change Plans are discussed below under Outcomes.

2) If you could change one thing about the way that PIVOT is designed or implemented, what would that be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What Should Be Changed</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More Action-Oriented</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Technical Training</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More Individual Coaching</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longer Time-Frame</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ensure Adequate Resources</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce/Streamline Calls</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participant responses showed somewhat less agreement about what should be changed than what is working well regarding PIVOT’s design and implementation. Almost everyone listed more than one thing that they would change, but there was a lot of variability about their suggestions.

More action-oriented: Participants’ most frequent request was to shift from planning to action at this point in the program. Many commented that they wanted less talking about and planning for PSE and more implementation of action steps and “learning by doing” activities.

“It’s not enough to develop plans and change strategies, there is a real need to move beyond and begin engaging the private sector now.”

“The first meeting was a lot about planning and laying the foundation. At some point we need to pivot (pun intended) into practicing PSE, so we can go back to our Mission leadership and provide concrete examples and guidance. We are the change agents across the Mission so we need to be able to add value there.”

“Less process and planning. After months of planning around the CDCS, PADs, Change Plans, action plans, PSE Plan—I am planned out! I am feeling overwhelmed by process and want to focus now on PSE skills building and action, not more planning to make a plan to … engage the private sector.”

“I tend to be results-oriented and would like to see us further along with private sector engagement. I understand the importance of process in change management but perhaps require less of it (or have less patience for it) than most. I want action!”

More practical and technical training was a related request from several participants. As they begin to implement their change plans, participants mentioned wanting practical skills and concrete experiences to help guide them and lead others in PSE at their Missions.

“Moving forward, I hope we will focus more on practical tools for implementing PSE in Missions. Everyone should be learning how to do PSE landscape assessments, for example.”
“I wish we could have gotten started sooner with technical skills. I think that there should be a heavier focus on them. I personally have less patience for soft/leadership skills. For example, I would rather have had the chance to attend all three break-out PSE technical sessions at this meeting than do sessions on soft skills.”

More one-on-one consultation was a suggestion offered by many as a way to get practical, individualized guidance on PSE. Participants requested more dyad time, peer-to-peer learning opportunities, individual consultations or mentoring, and interactive exercises to help those new to PSE navigate the private-sector landscape.

A longer time frame: Recognizing that start-up, team building, and planning processes take some time, even when managed efficiently, some participants suggested extending the time frame for the PIVOT program. They commented that two years was a more realistic timeline for achieving measurable advances in PSE. These comments also relate to the primary barrier identified to PSE work: lack of time due to other demands of their job (see findings for question #4, “Barriers” below).

“The time frame for the PIVOT program is too short given the competing demands for Mission staff. We are currently developing our CDCS and that seems to be taking all of our attention.”

“Change the time frame for PIVOT—one year is just not enough. It should be closer to two years. PIVOT took some time to get off the ground, even to properly understand the direction it would take and how we could work together. Action Plans have only recently started to move forward, and there are only six months left.”

Ensure adequate resources: Some participants focused on the need for additional human and financial resources at Missions to ensure PSE effectiveness (also discussed in question #4 “Barriers). They also suggested that the PIVOT program include funding for Cohort members to attend the four; in-person PIVOT Cohort meetings.

“There needs to be discussion on how this [attending in-person Cohort meetings] is done realistically given the locations and budgets. When it’s time to travel, we are met with people saying there’s no money.”

Reduce/streamline calls: While many participants highlighted PIVOT meetings and calls as working well, some also suggested that program calls should be reduced or streamlined. This suggestion aligned with responses to question #4 which identified “Mission staff time constraints” as a primary barrier to effective program implementation.

“The different monthly calls (cohort call, backstop calls, webinars, affinity group etc.)—that’s a lot of calls and they are time consuming.

“The calls/VTC are intense—it’s a heavy lift”

“We agreed to dedicate a couple of hours a week to PIVOT in the application, but it’s a lot more than that when you look at the meetings and calls. It would be helpful to get a calendar of tasks and deliverables to manage our work and pick and choose trade-offs for what is most important to our Mission. We’re all in different spaces. In some instances, it might make 100% sense for us to join a phone call, and in others it might not. That kind of overview is very important so we can strategically choose what works for us and what doesn’t.”

Additional suggestions for changing PIVOT program design and implementation included:

- More PIVOT engagement with Mission leadership to solidify support and provide “big picture” (e.g., calls with Washington leadership [AFR DAA Ramsey Day], include Mission Directors in the last in-person Cohort meeting)
- Clearer program objectives and metrics for success (for participants and their supervisors)
- Recruitment/inclusion of participants who may be resistant to PSE/change
- Differentiate levels of expertise (e.g., introductory vs. advanced) for technical assistance
- More participant input into agenda development and programming
- Make sure future Cohort participants are aware, at the outset, of the intensity of work for Change Team members
- Institutionalize PSE where possible (e.g., include in ADS, provide guidance, standards, and templates that allow for variations in contexts/conditions; recognize in performance reviews)
- More inter-agency and regional cooperation in PSE approaches
3. What do you see as some of the key factors or conditions in your Operating Unit that have supported the implementation of PIVOT?

![Enabling Conditions](image)

**Leadership support:** Participants were unanimous in pointing to leadership support as a key factor enabling the implementation of the PIVOT program. While most responses mentioned senior leadership support in general, some specified buy-in from the Mission Director (23 percent); Front Office (23 percent); and Office Directors or middle management (18 percent). Participants indicated that senior leadership support has paved the way for support and interest from Office Directors and other Mission staff, facilitated the procurement of human and financial resources for the program, and created an environment conducive to integrating PSE into Mission activities. Several participants suggested that PIVOT USAID/Washington leadership engage Mission leaders occasionally in PIVOT to maintain or enhance their support.

> “Any time the MD has time to talk to people, she highlights the issue of PSE and this makes the Mission talk about PSE. Today it’s standard that technical offices talk about PSE in activity design - even DRG staff talk about PSE.”

**Alignment with Agency policies and Program Cycle requirements** was mentioned often as an enabling condition for the PIVOT program as well. Participants emphasized the relevance of PIVOT to new Agency PSE priorities in the Policy Framework and Prosper Africa. They also discussed how Program Cycle planning helped prioritize and facilitate PIVOT efforts to integrate PSE into Missions’ work.

> “One good thing is that the vision for PIVOT remains quite relevant, especially with Prosper Africa, and the other Agency PSE Policies. Sometimes you design a program and the whole point of it goes away and it’s not relevant right away.”

> “Due to the Mission’s current priorities—design of CDCS, PADS, and PSE plan—the PIVOT program is being highly prioritized.”

> “I think that PIVOT is really timely. We’re working on our CDCS and the discussions in PIVOT are helping in the exercise of doing a CDCS. We are now talking about integrating PSE as a big pillar of our CDCS. We want to see our PIVOT change plan integrated there.”

**Other PSE activities and actors** at Missions were also mentioned as supporting the momentum of PIVOT. Participants commented that PIVOT activities have been enhanced where Missions have staff already focused on PSE (e.g., PSE unit, private-sector advisor); previous successful experiences with private-sector partners; or explicit PSE goals already in their work plans and Program Cycle documents.
Mission culture and context, including openness and readiness to change, as well as general interest in PIVOT’s change management approach or PSE, was mentioned by some participants as supporting PIVOT implementation. In addition, a few participants indicated that a thriving private sector in their country helped foster Mission interest in PSE and supported PIVOT efforts.

4) What do you see as some of the biggest barriers to implementing PIVOT?

Limited staff time and “bandwidth” were mentioned as barriers to PIVOT implementation by over half of the respondents. Participants emphasized the difficulty of managing the competing demands and priorities of their jobs. This response related to several suggestions about program changes, such as extending the program time frame, streamlining calls, and providing PIVOT calendars or activity trackers to help staff schedule and prioritize their participation.

“Everyone is really busy with their normal jobs and roles. It’s difficult, with all of the competing priorities we have, to find time to focus on this.”

Organizational structures and regulations were also mentioned by several participants as creating challenges for implementing PIVOT. For example, some mentioned the departure/rotation of FSOs from Missions as interrupting program momentum. Others highlighted the lack of Agency regulations and institutionalization backing PIVOT’s integrated approaches (e.g., cross-sector and cross-Mission work) and PSE more generally. They commented that there were few structures that allowed staff to make strategic trade-offs in their time or to document/get recognition for less tangible aspects of PSE.

“Our inability to integrate it into the program design Mission Order to give PSE the Mission authority it needed has been a real barrier.”

“We need to have job descriptions to reflect clear objectives and tasks related to PSE.”

“My only challenge is how do I make sure that my boss understands that [we have made important but intangible progress on PSE] in my appraisal?”

Funding limitations and inflexibility were frequently mentioned barriers as well. Funding earmarks and inflexibility made it difficult for Missions to co-fund member participation in Cohort meetings. Funding constraints also make it difficult for participants to implement new PSE activities.
Unclear PSE objectives, measures of success, and ways to operationalize PSE also inhibited program implementation. Participants pointed to a general lack of clarity around the Mission about whether PSE was a strategy or an objective, how it related to existing development objectives/priorities, what to do to advance PSE, and how “progress” would be measured or “success” demonstrated.

Other barriers discussed by participants included:
- Limited PSE opportunities in countries because of a nascent private sector or conflict zones (2)
- Lack of support or communication with Mission leadership (3)
- Changing or competing Mission priorities, including uncertainties about continued Agency focus on PSE following elections (2)
- Mission culture that is resistant to change or to PSE (1)

B. PIVOT-Related Changes/Early Outcomes

Only six months into the pilot year of the PIVOT program, progress toward intended outcomes is expected to be modest. Reviewers focused on this area to help capture tangible and intangible steps toward broader program goals and check for evidence along the program’s results chains. Responses about early outcomes can help establish benchmarks for future programs and clarify (and manage) expectations about outcomes at the end of the first year. Reviewers recognize that additional methods are needed to verify (and measure?) the self-reported changes in Missions that participants identified below.

5) What are some of the biggest changes, related to private sector engagement, that you have seen in your Mission since the PIVOT program began?

Increased Mission staff awareness about PSE was the change most often noted by participants. They discussed a growing interest in and “buzz” around PSE at Missions. In particular, participants saw more cross-office discussions about PSE, more leadership buy-in, and more Mission-wide acceptance and recognition that PSE is an important new pathway toward self-reliance for USAID. Participants indicated that their presentations, report-outs, and updates at office meetings, Mission town halls, and other meetings have contributed to that change.

“Many more people at our Mission are talking about the private sector now, and thinking about how to work with companies, as opposed to before when it was the responsibility of just a few people.”

“For me, the biggest change since the start of PIVOT is more awareness about PSE—especially the ‘how’ of it—across Mission priorities and interests. The fact is that the EG folks, the education folks, etc. are all starting to think about it
and have been doing some private sector assessments. But the ‘how’ of engaging is what we are raising awareness about now. It mustn’t just be an add-on. It must be a central part of strategies, and getting the Front Office involved in those discussions has been a real accomplishment.

“I got an email from our office chief, who is new to the office, and she talked about the PSE strategy and how it was reported at the senior management group meeting by the program director (who wasn’t part of the PIVOT program). So, hearing someone else who is not part of the Change Team be able to articulate the key objectives and hearing that it’s been discussed at senior management group meetings, without any of us there … that’s a change. She [office chief] is thinking about how to be at the front of this, she’s asking me what the next steps should be, so she can help lead. To me that shows that the Change Team is doing its job, because before it was mostly just us talking about PSE.”

“Comprehension of PSE among staff has increased, along with participation and buy-in from other offices.”

More integration of PSE into Mission documents was another area of change since the beginning of PIVOT. Participants mentioned helping to include PSE in their Missions’ next CDCS (and RDCS), providing targeted assistance in completing Mission PSE plans, updating Mission Orders (project and activity design) to reflect PSE elements, including PSE as part of Portfolio Review processes, and establishing ongoing PSE working groups.

Change Team leadership on PSE across offices was mentioned often as well. Participants credited their supportive, new Change Team relationships, as well as new PSE-related knowledge and leadership skills, as helping them take leadership roles in advancing PSE in their Missions.

“PIVOT has elevated change team members’ knowledge and visibility around PSE and given us both a platform and a mandate to champion change in Missions.”

“Watching our PIVOT team pick up the PSE mantle and lead…that’s what we’re doing and it’s what is needed. Seeing our efforts grow and start to catch fire … it is gratifying.”

New PSE activities were also discussed by some participants, though many commented that they were just starting to implement their PSE action plans at this point. New activities included leading private sector assessments in their office; getting PIVOT Change Plans supported by their Mission leaders; developing the Mission’s PSE plan; and an agreement to resource a new PSE-dedicated position.

While most participants (90 percent) agreed that the PIVOT program had directly or indirectly contributed to these changes in PSE, they also recognized other contributions as well. These included:

- **Other PSE efforts at their Missions** such as the presence of a private sector unit, an investment team with a broad mandate to champion PSE, and Mission technical offices with existing private sector relationships.
- **Existing CDCS priorities for PSE** within their Missions.
- **New Agency policies** focusing on PSE as a pathway toward self-reliance including the Private-Sector Engagement Policy, Prosper Africa, and Journey to Self-Reliance.
- **Market contexts in their countries** greatly influenced opportunities for PSE. For some, thriving private sectors offer promising opportunities for public-private partnerships and other PSE activities. For others, nascent or fragile private sectors provided much fewer opportunities.
- **Mission leadership support for integrative change or PSE policies** also contributed to recent changes at Missions. Participants mentioned Front Office support for cross-office collaboration, and leadership interest in changing Missions’ way of doing business as factors, beyond the PIVOT program, that contributed to PSE-related changes.
6) How can we best know and show PIVOT’s success?

Many participants indicated that metrics for success in PIVOT, and in PSE more generally, were still unclear. They suggested both specific benchmarks and indicators that might be appropriate measures of program effectiveness as well as processes for identifying and measuring those changes.

**Stronger integration of PSE into Mission documents** was mentioned most often by participants as a measure of success for PIVOT. Responses mostly focused on PSE integrated into the CDCS, though participants also mentioned integration into PADs, PSE Plans, and broader Program Cycle processes and guidance (e.g., ADS.)

**Increased private sector engagement activities** was also considered an important success metric by many. Most comments were fairly general such as, “**Increased private sector investment in our work,**” or “**More deals with the private sector,**” but a couple of participants suggested specific benchmarks such as, “**If every office in the Mission has at least one private sector partner.**”

“**Success can’t just be that we all prepared plans. We’ll need to show a private sector partner or some sort of commitment. If it came down from Ramsey that we had some specific partnerships, that would be amazing.**”

“**Having sat in on the blended finance session, I realized that we have a long way to go, not just a long way to go to show results. But that’s where we should be going. Expose us to a lot of ways that the private sector can be brought into our fold. I realized that this is bigger than even we are thinking.**”

**Changes in PIVOT participants’ capacities,** including differences in pre- and post-program testing on related knowledge and skills was another measure mentioned.

“**When we got home from the first PIVOT meeting we did a baseline assessment. It was a snapshot of where the Mission was and where the understanding of PSE was. We used that and what we thought we knew to formulate our change plan. We can use that and then check where we are at the end to show effectiveness.**”

**More private sector funds leveraged** was highlighted by some as a metric often used to assess changes in PSE. Participants suggested that increases in dollars leveraged and return on investment analyses might be particularly convincing for Agency leadership.

**Changes in Missions** that support PSE and PIVOT’s integrated change management approach was also considered important by many. These changes included Mission awareness about, and plans focused on, PSE as well as transfer of PSE knowledge and skills to staff beyond the PIVOT Cohort. While most responses focused on changes in PSE, some also mentioned broader changes related to collaborating, learning, and adapting (e.g., CLA Framework).
“We should look at new Mission processes, partnerships, programs, plans or structures that would enhance USAID’s ability to generate greater results, through improved partnerships and engagement of the private sector.”

“Within the mission, if we begin to see technical offices design activities that include PSE, that’s clearly demonstrating effectiveness to some level. We also want to know at what point—in the instance where we see PSE—will demonstrate success.”

“PIVOT is beyond PSE, it’s about developing these CLA and leadership skills too. It’s about adaptive management and integrating that in the Mission as well. For example, four of our Change Team members are on the CDCS team. A lot of these skills we take from PIVOT are being applied in the CDCS development team now. We need to share that back with the Mission as well.”

Processes for determining what success means: Participants discussed the importance of asking program and Agency leadership about what they think success looks like for PIVOT; including Missions in voicing their expectations, tracking success, and integrating accountability mechanisms; and recognizing that program expectations and outcomes will change along the way as program adaptations are made and contexts change.

“It would be good for Amy to re- pose this question to Ramsey: what does success look like? What would it take for you to call us a success and fight for us to get additional time and money?”

“Definitions of success will be different for each team—South Africa’s success will be different from Madagascar’s, which will be different from Kenya’s. We need to create definitions of success that take into account Mission and country contexts and other underlying factors.”

“Related to all of this is resetting PIVOT to what we want. It seems like that has shifted a bit from what it was originally. We need to reset our expectations. We’re at a point now where we can look and say, “ok, what is it that PIVOT Washington (Amy and others) expect from us? What is it that we want and need in our Missions?” I think we need to have conversations again—not at a group level—to ensure we’re meeting expectations. People are going to be asking us why are you still going to this thing? How do we show them that this effort is enough for them?”

Additional suggestions for understanding PIVOT success included:

- Include Mission case studies, testimonials, and videos showcasing how PIVOT is working
- Find out how LEARN and other IPs show effectiveness and include those indicators
- Include metrics for self-reliance when looking at PIVOT outcomes
- Develop context-specific measures of success for each Mission
- Track progress on PIVOT change plans for each team
- Compare PIVOT results with the results of other one-year initiatives
- Compare PIVOT results with previous Mission attempts to increase PSE

“It’s got to be a rack up. It’s a bit of marketing thing. We have to be able to say, ‘because of PIVOT, PSE is better integrated and responsible for these tangible outcomes—e.g. partnerships, reallocation of resources, structure, etc.—as well as these intangibles—x, y, and z.’ By the end of the PIVOT program, what did we produce?”
7) What would you most like to learn from this Learning Review of PIVOT that could help you with other change management, PSE, or self-reliance efforts?

Learning from and comparing PIVOT with other Missions: Participants were interested in learning more about how PSE is working in PSE-strong Missions. They also wanted to see comparisons, both short- and long-term, of PSE implementation and outcomes between PIVOT Missions and non-PIVOT Missions.

“It would be interesting to see in 1–2 years if the Missions involved in PIVOT engaged the private sector more than Missions that weren’t involved.”

“We need to have some comparisons. When the team leads met yesterday, we were worried about demonstrating results by December. But so many USAID processes don’t produce any results in nine months, and we’ve done great things in six. So, benchmarking ourselves against other efforts: What did other initiatives do in a year? We’ve done X times that … Because this is so vague, and it’s not clearly tied to any one presidential initiative—there’s a question of: how does it relate?”

Collective learning from PIVOT: Participants also hoped that the Learning Review could provide a collective body of knowledge and evidence from PIVOT about what works and what doesn’t, challenges and how to overcome them, where to focus energies, and case studies of effective PSE. They were also interested in highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of PIVOT relative to other change management approaches.

Changes in PSE capacities: Participants also hoped that the Learning Review could help show PIVOT’s contribution to changes in participants’ knowledge and skills as well as shifts in Mission culture, processes, and staff behaviors relevant to CLA and PSE.

Other interests mentioned included:
- Examining private sector motivation and expectations around engaging with governments/USAID
- Understanding how the “Clear Choice” strategy applies to PSE
- Providing more clarity on what “success” means for this program
- Setting up processes to track long-term changes related to PIVOT’s change management approach and PSE
Additional Material

Interesting Discussion

Addressing differences among Missions: There was no consensus among participants about how PIVOT should address the differing needs and levels of PSE at Missions. For example, participants discussed whether PIVOT programming should try to balance skill levels and provide templates for advancing PSE within and across Mission, or whether it should focus on more targeted assistance to address the diverse needs and contexts.

“**We don’t have one single PSE plan, we have different plans across all missions. So, we might have plans that are pointing toward very different ways to do PSE. There’s no one concerted way to do PSE. So, if we’re going to ask for a common way to do this, to bring it into the way that the Mission operates, it won’t be the same all across. We’ll do it differently across Missions.**”

“PIVOT should be designed to come up with one uniform to fit all of us, so we can all go toward that way, rather than lead us to have our own ways.”

“The country contexts are all different. So we can’t say we should all be doing the same thing. Once we provide parameters, countries can figure out how to do PSE from there.”

“Mission profiles are different, but there’s something similar about conducting PSE across the Agency—so clarify that standard set. What needs to be in place, what are best practices for infusing PSE into the Program Cycle? And then, understanding what the standard things are, know there will be differences and that’s okay.”

“I agree with this whole thing about plans being different. But having a template so they all have the same structure more or less is helpful. I get that we’re the tip of the spear here, so no one has had time to put anything in the ADS yet, so we’re guinea pigs. But in PIVOT 2.0, the Africa Bureau or LEARN or whatever mechanism is leading it, should develop a template to get guidance into the ADS and then have a template or have a framework for everyone to all work with. So as FSOs move around Missions, the PSE plan looks familiar wherever they go and they can work with it.”

8) What are the most pressing questions or concerns related to your efforts in PIVOT that you or your team face at this time?

![Pressing Questions & Concerns](image.png)

Not surprisingly, responses overlapped with those related responses to #2 “What should be Changed.” See #4 “Barriers to Implementing PIVOT” (see those sections for related information.)
Working with the private sector: Participants most frequently raised questions about strategies and action steps to identify and engage the private sector. Many requested more in-depth technical assistance on issues such as USAID mechanisms for, and examples of blended finance, or sector-specific PSE opportunities and action steps. Some also raised concerns about how to ensure ethical private-sector engagement (e.g., reduce corruption, promote transparency, and inclusivity).

“How do we identify new PSE opportunities and learn how to align private-sector interests or requests with what we already know about both local development needs and our own objectives, operations, resources, etc?”

“We need a better understanding of how to attract US business investments in health, agriculture, and financial services.”

“How do we help strengthen competition and transparency in the private sector, build stronger, more inclusive private-sector associations, and fight corruption?”

Having adequate, flexible resources: Responses echoed those for other questions in highlighting concerns about limited or inflexible funding for PSE efforts (4) as well as participation in PIVOT meetings (2).

“What specific resources and contractual mechanisms are available and flexible enough to respond efficiently to private sector partnership opportunities?”

Beyond PIVOT: Participants are already thinking beyond the current time frame and scope of PIVOT, wondering about the next steps and sustainability of the program, expansion beyond current participants and participating Missions, and cooperation with other PSE efforts outside of USAID.

“PSE needs to be more than PIVOT. It will continue beyond PIVOT. How do we ensure that momentum is maintained after PIVOT ends?”

“What are the plans around building from this pilot? Will there be regulations to support PIVOT?”

“Ultimately, I don’t just want Mission buy-in, but buy-in from [my country’s] government as well—it’s a complete mindset change for them.”

Sustaining and expanding PSE capacity and commitment: Participants expressed concerns about implementing their action plans, including how to sustain commitment and a multi-sectoral focus, as well as how to deal with resistance within their Missions. Institutionalizing PSE through inclusion in Mission documents (CDCS, PADs), Agency regulations and guidance (e.g., ADS), dedicated human and financial resources, and performance monitoring were recurring suggestions in responses to this and other questions.

“How do we sustain willingness and concrete commitment to work on multi-sectoral issues related to PSE?”

“How do we really institutionalize PSE and make others in the Mission understand its importance? How do we support others to feel comfortable engaging with the private sector?”

Time: In addition, Participants expressed concerns about finding time in their own and others Mission staff’s busy schedules to do PIVOT or PSE-related work.

Implementing Partners

This Data Summary synthesizes information from implementing partners collected in the Individual Reflection Sheets and the Focus Groups interviews during the Learning Review session at the PIVOT Cohort meeting in Baltimore, Maryland on September 5th, 2019. The information is summarized and briefly discussed by question using quotes from both Individual Reflection Sheets and the Focus Group Interview notes to illustrate main points. Response categories emerged from an analysis of responses to each open-ended question and are often not discrete, having overlap and relationships to each other and to those in other questions.
This Summary includes responses from five implementing partners (IPs); however, some participants did not identify their Operating Unit, so it is unclear whether all of PIVOT’s IPs are represented here.

1) Based on your experience, what is working well in the PIVOT program so far?

   • **Participant engagement and commitment:** The IPs all mentioned Cohort members’ high level of participation and enthusiasm about the PIVOT program. They also commented on participants’ strong commitment to PSE and a growing sense of confidence about their roles as PSE champions and leaders in their Missions.

   • **Demand-driven capacity building:** IPs indicated that they are designing their TDYs and capacity building efforts in response to specific requests from participants and Missions. “80 percent of our work for this program is demand-driven. Participants are showing real interest and excitement about our TDYs.”

   • **Integrative program design:** IPs commented that PIVOT’s cross-sectoral, cross-Mission, interactive approach has helped build strong relationships among Cohort participants. They indicated that Cohort participants seem to appreciate the combination of technical PSE knowledge, personal development, CLA, and leadership skills in the program.

   • **USAID/Washington support for PIVOT:** IPs were impressed by the support that PIVOT has received from USAID/Washington staff, Bureaus, and leadership.

      “Amy has done a great job making connections for PIVOT within the Agency, and this seems to be growing over time as well. This has helped raise PIVOT’s profile and gotten leadership attention on the value of this change management approach.

      “We have had great support from various USAID/W stakeholders as they work with the Cohort as Affinity Group leads, thought partners, facilitators/Helpers, and providers of feedback and suggestions.”

      “I think participants and Washington folks are voting with their most valued resources: time and money.”

2) If you could change one thing about the way that PIVOT is designed or implemented, what would that be?

   • **More resources and institutionalization for PIVOT and PIVOT-like programs:** IPs suggested that securing additional funding (e.g., for travel, for additional implementing staff) is important for the program’s success. Some suggested that institutionalizing PIVOT-like programs could assist with longer-term efforts. “The Cohort approach needs to be institutionalized and intentionally funded and resourced—perhaps through the Agency training budget.”

   • **More external communications:** IPs suggested starting an outward-facing communications plan, including a one-page UA Summary for FFP/GT/OAPA, and regular take-aways.

   • **PIVOT 2.0 design considerations** from IPs included holding off on implementation until PIVOT’s next iteration is thoroughly planned; streamlining the program to focus more on Affinity Groups and remove dyads and the Whole Life Challenge; and building in participant feedback loops to Cohort supervisors, office directors, and Mission Directors to facilitate adaptive management.

3) What do you see as some of the key factors or conditions in your Operating Unit that have supported the implementation of PIVOT?

   • **Funding:** IPs all mentioned flexible funding from AFR/SD as a key factor enabling PIVOT’s innovative design and implementation. “No one was paying attention to what we did or didn’t do with those Ag/Eg/Env funds so it was easy to innovate.”

   • **Leadership support:** IPs also all mentioned leadership support, including access to and partnerships with decision-makers, as an important enabling condition for PIVOT.
• **Existing expertise and experience:** Some IPs mentioned that PIVOT has drawn upon and been strengthened by strong, pre-existing expertise, relationships, and related initiatives within the Agency. “Our team [name removed] has the benefit of drawing on expertise and resources to support implementation, including graphic design, connections to related USAID efforts, pre-existing relationships with PIVOT Missions, contextual insight, and general moral support.”

4) **What do you see as some of the biggest barriers to implementing PIVOT?**

- **Limited time:** IPs indicated that limitations on their own and Mission staff time was one of the biggest barriers to program implementation.

  “Mission staff already feel they have too much to do, so adding more calls, meetings and asks creates challenges.”

  “Some Mission staff feel that the commitment required by PIVOT is larger than they expected.”

  In addition, some IPs noted that adaptively managing PIVOT to respond to feedback and learning during its pilot year, and to address the different needs and levels across Missions, has been time-consuming for implementing staff.

  “The PIVOT program was launched before it was fully designed, so there has been the need to make ongoing adjustments and corrections to deal with unforeseen and/or emergent issues. Dealing with these types of issues has been time-consuming and inefficient, but it has allowed us to keep tailoring the program to meet shifting needs and priorities.”

- **Limited funding** was also mentioned as a barrier, both for implementing PSE at Missions and for implementing future PIVOT programming.

- **Lack of direct leadership involvement:** IPs commented that lack of direct leadership involvement in the program, along with limitations on staff time, sometimes led participants to shift responsibilities onto others rather than to volunteer or take a leadership role themselves. “We must clear a path for participants with more support from direct supervisors and office directors.”

- **Variability across Missions** in terms of financial resources, leadership support, and level of staff capacities, was also mentioned as a challenge for program implementation. Some IPs suggested the need for further discussion about Mission and staff selection processes and criteria in future iterations of PIVOT.

5) **What are some of the biggest changes, related to private sector engagement, that you have seen in your Mission since the PIVOT program began?**

- **Increased awareness about PSE in Missions** was mentioned by IPs as the biggest change since the start of PIVOT. They indicated that Change Teams have helped integrate new PSE knowledge and awareness throughout their Missions. “More Mission folks are more knowledgeable about PSE policy and process. PIVOT continues to build on Mission knowledge about PSE.”

- **More cross-sectoral collaboration and teamwork** for advancing PSE was also mentioned. “Teams have gotten clearer about how to work together and what they want to do as a collective.”

- **Increased PSE capacities at Missions:** IPs noted that Change Teams have increased capacities related to PSE, as well as clearer understandings about what else they need to learn and where to go for additional capacity. “Change Teams are taking more ownership and responsibility for PSE at their Missions. They have a better sense of what they know and what they don’t know.”

  IPs indicated that they believe PIVOT has contributed to these changes by bringing dedicated staff time and increased capacities to the PSE work that Mission are already doing.

  “More than anything, PIVOT has provided the time and resource space for Missions to move their thinking about PSE forward, creating vision and collaboration.”
“I hope that the PIVOT program’s support to Missions in terms of dedicated time to work on their plans, TA from PEPSE, INVEST, and ISP, access to Agency experts (i.e., through Affinity Groups and in-person meetings), and added motivation to make progress has had an impact.”

They also recognized that the Agency’s new PSE Policy and priorities have facilitated the changes as well.

“The PSE policy came out so Missions would have made a PSE plan one way or another. However, the sophistication and the buy-in would have been much lower.”

“The Agency has pushed out a lot of PSE-related guidance at the same time that PIVOT has been up and running. There is a much stronger focus on PSE in general across USAID, which means that leadership and other colleagues are engaged and have internalized the need to make progress on this front.”

6) How can we best know and show PIVOT’s success?

IPs offered many suggestions for indicators and measures of PIVOT’s success including:

- Seeing PIVOT participants begin to lead their own teams in building leadership, communication, and CLA skills.
- More Mission staff feeling comfortable engaging the private sector at all stages of the program cycle.
- PSE efforts expanded beyond EG offices.
- Movement toward PSE plan goals and actions.
- Hearing stories of successful private sector engagements/deals in PIVOT countries that were not in the works, or were embryonic, prior to the advent of the PIVOT program.
- Ongoing funding of the program from USAID/Washington and/or Missions.
- Expanded PIVOT efforts such as a PIVOT office with a larger implementing team that can run multiple cohorts at once.
- Replication of PIVOT-like programs in other operating units (not just the technical side, but the CLA and leadership component as well) that emphasize cross-sector and cross-Mission learning.
- Quantitative results such as number of new partnerships or number of dollars leveraged.
- Comparisons between PIVOT and non-PIVOT Missions’ PSE Plans in terms of sophistication and collaborative efforts.

Most of the IPs also recognized that measuring outcomes and demonstrating success for PIVOT will require a longer time frame.

“The PIVOT approach is promising, but should not be under pressure to show results in one year. Give room for incremental change over time.”

“PSE is a longer-term endeavor, because it is riskier work. Having a longer time horizon for success to happen is important.”

7) What would you most like to learn from this Learning Review of PIVOT that could help you with other change management, PSE, or self-reliance efforts?

- Gain clarity about what success means.
- Understand whether and/or how integrating leadership and CLA helps advance PSE.
- Identify which elements of the program have been most and least useful, as well as changes that should be made moving forward.
- Examine the impact of collaborating across Missions over a longer period of time.
- Determine the ideal size of a cohort.
- Explore ways to manage variability between staff and Missions (e.g., divide based on existing capacities or mix different levels.)
Affinity Group Leads

This Data Summary synthesizes information from Affinity Group Leads collected in the Individual Reflection Sheets and the Focus Group interviews during the Learning Review session at the PIVOT Cohort meeting in Baltimore, Maryland on September 5th, 2019. Information is organized by question, and summarized in categories that emerged from an analysis of responses to each open-ended question. Response categories are often not discrete, having overlap and relationships to each other and to those in other questions. Only four out of the eight (50 percent) Affinity Group Leads provided information for this summary. In addition, notes from the Focus Group Interviews were very general. Because of these data limitations, relatively few quotes were available to illustrate points.

1) Based on your experience, what is working well in the PIVOT program so far?

- **Participant engagement and commitment:** The Affinity Group Leads all commented on the high level of participation in, enthusiasm for, and commitment to advancing PSE among PIVOT participants. They credited the Program’s integrative approach and interactive facilitation with making the program fun and useful for participants.

- **Building a PSE community across USAID/Washington offices and Bureaus:** They also highlighted PIVOT’s success in fostering a PSE community not just within and across Missions, but across USAID/Washington offices and Bureaus as well. This sense of community facilitates peer learning and collaboration on issues related to PSE.

  “We don’t really do other multi-Bureau programs so this brings us together in unique ways.”

  “As PSE lead in [sector name removed], I have felt isolated, and PIVOT has been helpful in bringing me into a community.”

  “There is a gap in DC … how does [Bureau name removed] connect to PSE. PIVOT is taking the change process home to our Bureau and making PSE a sphere for engagement.”

- **Connecting USAID/Washington with field/policy and operations:** Affinity Group Leads also discussed PIVOT as timely and well-designed, connecting USAID/Washington’s policy level interests in PSE with Missions’ operational level interests.

  “It is helping participants do something their boss already asked them to do, as well as connecting the dots to senior leadership in Washington.”

- **Increased capacities and knowledge uptake:** They also discussed the effectiveness of practical, “on-the-job” learning in PIVOT as helping participants digest and apply a range of new knowledge and skills.

2) If you could change one thing about the way that PIVOT is designed or implemented, what would that be?

- **Provide implementation support:** Affinity Group Leads reported back the need for additional support for Cohort members with implementing PSE plans. They indicated that new skills are currently underutilized due to time and resource shortages.

- **More skill-building and technical sessions:** Affinity Group Leads echoed Cohort members in suggesting a stronger emphasis on practical skill-building and earlier introduction of technical sessions.

- **Strengthen USAID/Washington participation:** Affinity Group Leads mentioned strengthening USAID/Washington participation and involving more senior leadership.

- **Align with Mission priorities:** Affinity Group Leads also suggested recycling the survey about Mission priorities to ensure the program stays aligned with Mission needs and focus.

- **More time for Affinity Groups** at Cohort meetings was mentioned by some Affinity Group Leads. Some group leads indicated that they were so busy facilitating, they did not have enough time to connect well with their groups.
• **Strategize participant selection and limit the scope of PIVOT 2.0:** Affinity Group Leads emphasized the importance of recruitment and selection for PIVOT 2.0, suggesting the inclusion of desk officers on Change Teams, and continued leadership of some from the pilot cohort. They suggested a rigorous application process with written commitments from supervisors and Mission Directors. They also encouraged program leaders to identify both what can and cannot be done in PIVOT 2.0

• **Expand and replicate the program** into other regional Bureaus, into other like-minded Missions, and as part of the PSE rollout were all suggested by Affinity Group Leads.

3) What do you see as some of the key factors or conditions in your Operating Unit that have supported the implementation of PIVOT?

• Agency leadership support for PSE: Because PIVOT coincided with the Administrator’s PSE priorities, senior leadership support has created an enabling environment for the program.

  “**Leaders see PIVOT as a vehicle to implement PSE policies and connect with Mission staff on PSE.”**

• Affinity Group Leads also mentioned that this provides the PIVOT program with the opportunity to influence how PSE is planned, implemented, and assessed.

• Interest in PIVOT’s change management approach: Affinity Group Leads mentioned that PIVOT’s integrated capacity building and change management approach (e.g., cross-sectoral teams, cross-Mission cohort, learning by doing) addresses a number of management issues and resonates with many across the Agency.

  “**This addresses a change management need that led me to allocate more time to PIVOT.”**

• Technical experience and expertise in Bureaus provide rich resources to support PSE at PIVOT Missions.

4) What do you see as some of the biggest barriers to implementing PIVOT?

• **Limited staff, time, and bandwidth:** Affinity Group Leads mentioned staff shortages and competing priorities and demands on staff time as the biggest barriers to implementing PIVOT.

• USAID’s culture: They also mentioned that USAID’s organizational culture, procedures, and processes, “**work against widespread adoption of PSE in practice**”.

• Lack of understanding or agreement with a PSE approach to SR was another barrier. Affinity Group Leads indicated that some at USAID are not clear about what PSE is and is not, while others, “**see the private sector as evil, ‘just another forced task’, or ‘same initiative, new name’.””

5) What are some of the biggest changes, related to private-sector engagement, that you have seen in your Mission since the PIVOT program began?

• **New relationships and teamwork** was the answer for most Affinity Group Leads in this review. They mentioned the successful formation of cross-Mission relationships and cohesive teams that can champion PSE with their Missions.

• **Expanding PSE beyond EG offices:** They noted that multiple offices are now seeking to engage the private sector, where before it was largely an economic growth focus.

6) How can we best know and show PIVOT’s success?

• **More effective Mission PSE plans:** Affinity Group Leads discussed the design and implementation of Mission PSE plans as a possible measure of success. They suggested that PIVOT Missions might have a faster PSE cycle time, that plans might be implemented with more ease and support, and might yield more private sector partnerships and investments than at non-PIVOT Missions.
• **Sustained cross-sectoral and cross-Mission relationships** beyond the PIVOT program might indicate the usefulness of the networks.

• **Evidence of new staff capacities**

• **Evidence of Agency change** including easier mechanisms for PSE

• **Evidence of PSE improving development outcomes**

• **More examples of PSE coming out of PIVOT Missions**

7) What would you most like to learn from this Learning Review of PIVOT that could help you with other change management, PSE, or self-reliance efforts?

• How PIVOT advances PSE in specific sectors (e.g., education);

• How PSE-strong Missions have dealt with the competing priorities for limited staff time and resources; and

• How PIVOT’s integrated change management approach could work with other roll-out processes? In other regions?

8) What are the most pressing questions or concerns related to your efforts in PIVOT that you or your team face at this time?

• **Finding ways to scale up** with limited staff to make it to the next level; limited buy-in from some at the middle management level; and differing contexts/levels across countries and Missions.

• **Clarifying the problem we seek to solve**, and the “market” that drives or constrains solving the problem;

• **Integrating conflict sensitivity** into PSE for “do no harm” concerns;

• **Adapting to evolving concerns**: Concerns change over time, so frequent engagement is needed to promote communication, problem-solving, co-creation, and collaboration.

• **Accelerating PSE processes** and mechanisms within the Agency so that staff can engage the private sector with the speed and agility needed.
ANNEX 5: SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWS WITH THE PIVOT COHORT PROGRAM’S IMPLEMENTING PARTNERS, AFFINITY GROUP LEADS, AND BACKSTOPS

Overview

This summary is based on a preliminary thematic analysis of 14 semi-structured, one-hour interviews with PIVOT’s Implementing Partners (IPs), Affinity Group Leads (AGLs), and Backstops conducted in October 2019. Data collection and analysis for the Learning Review is ongoing, so this interim, internal summary is shared only to support learning and adaptation during program implementation. Additional data may support, elaborate on, or contradict this preliminary analysis.

Clearer and more collaborative roles: PIVOT IPs, AGLs, and Backstops roles have been evolving to become clearer and more collaborative. A subset of IPs are working together to refine, sequence, and, where relevant, integrate specific PSE, leadership, and CLA competencies based on the expressed needs of field staff. Backstops are providing coaching in CLA and leadership skills to promote behavior change, as well as facilitating uptake of Agency PSE resources. Affinity Groups are still in a formative stage with considerable variation across groups (e.g., number of meetings, group vs. individualized support, scheduled vs. ad hoc meetings, etc.) AGLs are providing sector- or issue-specific technical assistance and promoting peer learning with Cohort participants across Missions.

Program strengths and challenges: Throughout the interviews, participants praised PIVOT’s innovative design, adaptive implementation, and inspiring leadership. They highlighted new organizational capacities and connections for advancing PSE that have been built through the program. They also discussed the challenges of managing this dynamic program, especially given the diversity of participants’ perspectives and needs, and their geographic dispersion. Almost all participants also discussed how time limitations and competing priorities make full participation in the program a stretch. Despite these noted challenges, participants remained excited about the program’s design, implementation, and early outcomes. They also all planned to continue participating actively in PIVOT.

“I have learned a ton [through my work in PIVOT]. As hard as it has been to manage all of the changes, it has been a terrific experience. I’m really just excited that I get to be part of it. I’d like to see the program continue, because I think that people really want this.”

UNIQUE CONTRIBUTIONS OF PIVOT’S APPROACH

Participants indicated that PIVOT has contributed to advancing PSE at USAID by helping to:

- **Support Proactive Engagement with the Private Sector:** PIVOT has helped participants shift from reactive, opportunistic engagement with private sector entities to more proactive and collaborative partnerships based on identified needs and alignment.

- **Build Cohesive PSE Capacities:** The cohort model strengthens staff’s institutional knowledge about PSE resources, procedures, and mechanisms, and creates a shared context for future work.

- **Sustain Collaboration between Headquarters & Field Staff:** Consistent contact and mentoring has facilitated responsive support and TA that builds cumulatively. It has also connected field staff with relevant U.S. companies and industries.

- **Foster PSE-Related Relationships:** PIVOT has helped foster PSE-related relationships across USAID/W operating units as well as within and across Missions which has spurred cross-fertilization and innovation.

- **Integrate PSE Into Their Work:** PIVOT has helped participants recognize how PSE is relevant within their job descriptions, development objectives, and earmarked funds. This has strengthened the coherence of policy and practice.

- **Field Test New PSE Tools:** PIVOT has provided opportunities to field test new, Agency PSE tools and products (e.g., screening tool from BFS; indicator framework from CTP).
LEARNING FROM PIVOT

Based on their experiences so far, IPs, AGLs, and backstops discuss both their learnings from and recommendations for the program.

- **Set a ‘North Star’ for PIVOT:** Clarifying program objectives and intended outcomes could help build participants’ confidence that their efforts are on track.

- **Practice the ‘Art of PSE’:** IPs have recognized that participants need practice applying new PSE knowledge and skills to integrate their learning. They have shifted toward providing practical, interactive opportunities for skills practice within contexts that are safe for experimentation, reflection, and learning.

- **Engage Leadership in PIVOT:** Participants suggested that the program should engage leadership more often to include their perspective, inform them about activities and outcomes, help set vision, and authorize support.

- **Select & Work with Participants Strategically:** Participants noted the importance of including PSE POCs and Contract Officers on Mission Change Teams and differentiating the needs of participants and Missions.

- **Capture a Range of Program Outcomes:** Participants indicated that PIVOT is contributing to a wide range of changes. Staff and organizational outcomes should include intangibles, collective learning, cumulative learning, and transfer beyond direct participants.

- **Plan Longer Time Frames to See PIVOT Results:** Participants emphasized that Cohort members need time to implement their PSE plans before measuring possible PSE-related outcomes.

Analysis Across Interviews of PIVOT

Implementing Partners, Affinity Group Leads, and Backstops

This summary is based on a thematic analysis of semi-structured interviews with PIVOT’s Implementing Partners (IPs), Affinity Group Leads (AGLs), and Backstops conducted in October 2019. The data was gathered from 14, one-hour phone interviews with 20 key informants representing four Implementing Partners, eight Affinity Group Leads, and two Backstops. Interviews were recorded to enhance accuracy of notes and analysis, but were not transcribed. All but one participant granted verbal permission to record interviews and all gave permission to include their names in an Annex to the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review Final Report. The thematic analysis was conducted manually using an inductive, grounded theory approach. This analysis is provided as a draft, internal, interim summary for PIVOT. Quotes have not yet been member-checked.

1) **Clearer and more collaborative roles:** IP, AGL, and Backstop roles have been evolving. Participants suggested that initially, the project leader brought great people into PIVOT and let them organize their role as they thought best (one participant called it a “choose your own adventure” model.) This resulted in innovative, but sometimes uneven implementation. Meetings among those in a similar role (e.g., meetings of Affinity Group Leads) have been a catalyst for clarification and change. For example, backstops are making a shift into a coaching and connecting role. People often mentioned the benefit of dual or co-leads (e.g., CLA and PSE combination for backstops; co-leaders for Affinity Groups) to share responsibility and provide complementary support.

- **Affinity Groups** are still new and in a formative stage. Many leaders see their role as providing technical assistance and making connections to Agency resources. Most groups have met just two or three times. Implementation is still uneven. Variations include: group focused vs. individualized support; scheduled vs. ad hoc meetings; and pro-active support vs. responsive to requests. Non-technical groups (i.e., leadership, program office, and contracts) are still trying to figure out how they fit in—or what they can provide that is most needed or relevant. Most AGLs are engaged and interested, but not all believe the Affinity Groups have been useful yet. They indicate that PIVOT provides other forums for peer learning and technical assistance and Cohort members are not sure where to prioritize their time.

AGL meetings have helped: 1) synthesize and share what is working; 2) promote learning about respective technical areas; and 3) build relationships and connections across USAID/Washington. Some AGLs mentioned that
continued, active participation in PIVOT is an indicator that the program is valued. For example, one commented, “Affinity Group leads and Cohort members keep showing up and spending time. Everyone is incredibly busy, so that is big.”

A few AGLs noted the need to clarify their role, share promising practices, and bring in those who still aren’t sure how they can contribute.

Implementing partners: IPs see that they have distinct but complementary knowledge and skills. A subset are working closely together as peers to plan and problem-solve: the cross-over is helping to blend process and content, inform their respective work, and validate ideas. Participants mentioned that getting the balance right (e.g., type and level of PSE, CLA, and leadership content) has been challenging and required an iterative approach. All commented that they enjoy the chance to get to know and learn from each other. Many have, “gone above and beyond expectations.” However, everyone is busy and it is a big group; it is hard to stay connected and maintain communication.

2) Building competencies (what we know we know/building conscious competence):

a. Overall Objective: (Is there agreement on this?) “Participants don’t need to be experts. They need practical knowledge and skills for how to plan and implement PSE related to their work areas, plus knowledge about where to connect in USAID and beyond for more in-depth assistance/resources.”

b. PIVOT Competencies: (Draw from documents on competencies for each IP (separate and integrated):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEARN</th>
<th>PEPSE</th>
<th>INVEST</th>
<th>ISP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• CLA</td>
<td>• General PSE KSAs</td>
<td>• Basics of financing</td>
<td>• Identifying opportunities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adaptive Leadership</td>
<td>• Action planning</td>
<td>• How to structure partnerships</td>
<td>• Spectrum of PSE activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Relationship Mgmt.</td>
<td>• Opportunity mapping</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Working creatively with contract office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Meetings with private sector</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Innovative procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Relationship building</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Programmatic approaches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c. Sequencing: IPs reflected on how the PSE content has been evolving and is now being sequenced.
   • (from PEPSE): Initial trainings provided general information to questions such as: what is PSE? Why is it important? How does it contribute to the Journey to Self-Reliance? etc. Following that, PSE content focused on assisting Change Teams cooperatively plan PSE actions most relevant to their Mission needs and country contexts. Missions differ considerably in their PSE efforts, but an area that many participants asked for assistance with next was market-sector mapping and identifying PSE opportunities. That work is ongoing. Participants are also requesting help with preparing for meetings with private sector entities, including how to present USAID’s value proposition, explore alignment and shared value, due diligence processes, etc. Relationship building and management has been a large area of interest, including a range of technical information about USAID partnership and finance mechanisms available and how to implement them. Next efforts will focus on how to turn relationship building into a programmatic approach. PSE technical content is being integrated into an applied, “how to” skill-building approach. Leadership and CLA skills are woven into many aspects of this work.

The skill-building progression is: General knowledge about PSE --> action planning --> opportunity mapping --> meeting with private sector actors --> relationship building --> turn it into a programmatic approach.
   • (from INVEST): Participants want to know about PSE writ large first and have been focused on a lot of the skill areas that PEPSE is offering. They want information about innovative and blended finance from INVEST a bit later in the program. The needs and levels of Missions are very different in this regard. For example, USAID/Kenya/East Africa has their own resources for financing, so their questions and needs for INVEST are different.
d. Mid-program pivots in competency development:

- IPs began identifying, focusing on, and measuring specific PIVOT competencies;
- IPs began identifying areas of overlap and potential integration of competencies (e.g., between CLA and PSE; CLA and Leadership) as well as clarifying discrete focus areas;
- LEARN shifts to more explicitly highlighting CLA and leadership principles, skills, and methods that have been embedded in and modeled throughout the program to facilitate conscious learning. They also begin more explicitly articulating the relevance and use of CLA and leadership skills to Change Teams’ efforts;
- PEPSE dropped its pre-planned curriculum of basic PSE knowledge (e.g., PowerPoint presentations) and shifted to more practical, interactive, skills-based content and methods that apply PSE within the context of participants’ work;
- Change Teams express interest in developing more sustained mentorships with IPs and AGLs. Questions remain about how best to build on new relationships formed in PIVOT to do this.

3) Affinity Group meeting topics: AGLs indicated that participants brought the following topics, challenges, and questions to their respective affinity group meetings:

- **Time management**, prioritization, and “how do I say no?”
- **Sector specific PSE strategies**: Participants want to learn sector-specific PSE strategies and mechanisms, technical information and tools, existing knowledge resources, and connections to relevant companies.
- **Sector specific issues**: a) Most technical offices (other than Economic Growth) are used to working with civil society groups, which is a very different orientation. Participants have to learn private sector perspectives, language, and additionality; b) EG offices need help focusing beyond contractual relationships; c) DG offices often don’t see the relevance of PSE to their role, but it is connected with J2SR and different PSE modalities. That needs to be made more explicit; and d) Contracts offices and officers have very idiosyncratic approaches and they deal in specifics so it’s hard to make generalizations. Questions remain about how PIVOT can inform and be informed by AGLs’ prep for new PSE/OAA training module.
- **Operationalizing policy**: Cohort members are requesting AGL assistance in interpreting how the PSE Policy and Policy Framework fit within their country contexts, job descriptions, specific development objectives, and earmarked funds. They indicated that efforts to integrate PSE into their CDCS’ has helped operationalize policy.
- **Clearer roadmaps and options**: Participants want roadmaps or pathways with clear steps and decision points that focus on the “what” of options available and the “how” to do it. For example, members of one Affinity Group requested a blended finance roadmap including types of investors. In addition, AGLs suggest that the Agency needs clearer pathways for structuring partnerships and utilizing mechanisms. One AGL commented,

  “There are a lot of new mechanisms, but few clear pathways on how to use them. Who can help with that? the Lab? OAA? Participants need to know the nuts and bolts of how you actually implement and use these mechanisms. Companies say that when they talk to Missions they often hit a brick wall. Are these missed opportunities where we are just not taking advantage of new mechanisms, or do they not really apply to certain sectors (e.g., education or health)? We have to learn these things ourselves and also help our colleagues in Missions—especially in non-EG technical offices—learn how to use new partnership mechanisms.”

- **Examples of what didn’t work** were very useful in creating a supportive environment and learning moments for some Affinity Groups.
- **Tools**: Participants have expressed needs for some specific tools such as a PSE screening tools; prioritization tools; a relationship management tool; and adaptive M&E tools.
4) Unique contribution of PIVOT Cohort model. Participants indicated that PIVOT has contributed to advancing PSE at USAID by helping to:

- **Shift toward proactive and intentional PSE:** Participants commented that OUs are usually reactive and opportunistic. PIVOT participants are planning around identified needs and taking a proactive approach to engaging private sector entities.

- **Focus on the “how” of PSE:** This includes practical skill-building in areas such as how to conduct a landscape assessment and use it to make programming decisions; how to find alignment and shared value with private sector entities. PIVOT is helping to improve integration of PSE content and processes, but there is still more work needed on this.

- **Engage FSNs:** Their knowledge about local landscapes and needs, and their consistent presence in Missions supports longer-term PSE implementation and institutional memory.

- **Make PSE relevant:** Participants emphasized that PIVOT is providing dedicated space and assistance to helping field staff translate how PSE can help them with their jobs.

- **Field tests new tools:** PIVOT provides headquarters with opportunities to field test and get feedback on new PSE tools and products (e.g., screening tool from USAID/BFS; indicator framework from CTP).

- **Provide a vehicle for connection:** Many participants noted that PIVOT is playing a vital role in building connections and relationships among peers within USAID (within and across Missions; across USAID/Washington OUs). It also helps connect field staff with U.S. companies and industries, as well as Agency resources. These connections, embedded in PIVOT’s design, support cross-fertilization and innovation.

- **Create a fun and safe environment for building staff capacities:** Throughout the interviews, participants praised PIVOT’s innovative design, fun and adaptive implementation, and inspiring leadership.

> “I have learned a ton [through my work in PIVOT]. As hard as it has been to manage all of the changes, it has been a terrific experience. I’m really just excited that I get to be part of it. I’d like to see the program continue, because I think that people really want this.”

> “Working on PIVOT has been creative and fun. Amy saw an opportunity where she could align resources with a need she saw for capacity building … the program really found a sweet spot between the PSE policy roll-out and the latitude to invent and reinvent itself. The collaboration with Amy has been great!”

- **Support sustained collaboration between headquarters and field staff:** Consistent contact and mentoring between headquarters and field staff helps: a) USAID/Washington staff have a better understanding of field staff’s priorities, needs, constraints, etc.; b) shift mindsets and practices toward more demand-driven and co-designed support; c) field staff receive more targeted TA that builds cumulatively; and d) strengthen coherence of policy and practice including how to operationalize PSE Policy within Mission documents and plans.

> “There is no substitute for face-to-face interactions. People love it. USAID/Washington staff want the ongoing interaction and engagement. They get to be a resource and be helpful. And it helps them do their work better. They get a window into what is happening in the field.”

> “PIVOT is actually more sustainable than the usual way we do training … Having a consistent person allows for work to build. Field staff don’t have to tell someone all over again what they know and need. PIVOT supports relationships and knowledge creation in an informal way that promotes continued connection even after the program is over.”

- **Strategic and cohesive capacity building:** The cohort model strengthens institutional knowledge about Agency procedures and mechanisms and creates a shared context for future work.

> “Over the years, USAID has flipped the age and experience structure in agency staffing. The magnitude of the challenge in building capacity to do things that were established protocols and procedures within Missions and programs, inter-agency, etc. is tremendous. So we are filling in those gaps for new staff at the same time as building capacities in new PSE processes and adaptations of old processes. It’s transferring institutional knowledge, capacity, or rules-of-the-road …
For example, I can work very quickly with somebody from my own cohort … like, if Amy was sitting in a different Mission and I hadn’t talked to her in a year and a half—we could call up and have a very quick conversation. We share the same jargon and reference points, we can talk about things that are comparable to xxx, … We are building those relationships and contexts now in PIVOT with people who will have long-term impact … So we’re filling in this basic institutional knowledge about procedures and mechanisms at the same time as we’re pushing into new private sector work or expanding work we’ve been doing at a new level and degree of emphasis.”

5) PIVOT’s objectives and outcomes: Although interview questions did not focus directly on PIVOT’s objectives, success measures, or causal model, a number of participants raised questions and made suggestions in these areas. These included:

- **Set a ‘North Star’ for PIVOT:** Participants asked a number of questions about What PIVOT’s objectives and intended outcomes are as well as what ‘success’ for the program means at individual and organizational levels. Some suggested the need for broad objectives to help know if the program is on track.

  “Is this adaptive management? Seems adaptive, but sometimes it’s more like we are asking Missions what they want and just going with that. There is no real North Star for what we are trying to accomplish. PIVOT is going to have to deal with this. At some point there is going to be a reckoning if we don’t develop an approach that allows for adaptation but also identifies what constitutes success and that we have moved along that path. If we can’t do that, it just won’t be funded. The key to that is probably in the adaptive M&E. We need to bring that in.”

  “Having measurable outcomes would build confidence for participants. Missions are often metrics driven. The old saying is relevant here, “you can’t manage what you don’t measure.” You can’t know whether or not you are successful unless success is defined and tracked.”

- **Capturing the range of PIVOT outcomes:** Participants noted that PIVOT may be having a wide range of results and highlighted the importance of capturing intangibles, collective learning, and cumulative learning:

  “A lot of changes are internal to participants—changes in how teams are working together or thinking about working with private sector entities, changes in the culture of a Mission … They are intangible but important—how do we capture them?”

  “My gut concern is that people will remember back to all the great things they learned in PIVOT—and it changed the way that they individually did the work that they did—but it won’t be captured and won’t be celebrated because it’s very difficult to put your finger on what the change was. And there won’t be a legacy of collective learning and change. We need to gather up all the learning in this group before it becomes atomized into individual learning.”

  “I just wonder how all of the different things we are doing in PIVOT are adding up.”

- **Explicitly articulating PIVOT’s causal model:** Participants suggested that PIVOT keep making the causal model explicit and sharing it out. That could help participants identify and internalize it. Tying elements of the program directly into that model and objectives can clarify relevance and increase incentives to participate.

  “We need a Theory of Change so in the future, when people ask, ‘what is PIVOT all about?’ you can say, ‘here is our Theory of Change.’ And people will be able to look at it and say, ‘That totally aligns me with the PSE Policy and the J2SR. It is what people in Missions have been asking for, and frankly, it aligns with what I’ve been saying my whole career.”

  “Transfer beyond PIVOT participants: Participants also suggested that a causal model should include how PIVOT contributes to change beyond direct participants. This has implications for whether future iterations of PIVOT will focus on replication in other Missions or on building upon the current Cohort. For example, one participant asked how success in the six current PIVOT Missions could be leveraged to impact other Missions (e.g., regional Missions supporting bilateral Missions).

Examples of transfer also surfaced during the interviews. One implementing partner indicated that their experiences in PIVOT are changing how they work with other requests for PSE technical assistance. They are designing to fit requests more now, sharing insights from their work in PIVOT in discussions with others, and using examples from
PIVOT to illustrate points. PIVOT is also informing the work of leaders by providing more in-depth information about field contexts including roadblocks and challenges that Missions face.

- **Longer time frames are needed to see results:** Participants emphasized that Cohort members need time to implement their PSE plans before measuring possible PSE-related outcomes. They need time to do this work and reflect on it before asking, ‘what is changing? What is most valuable?’ IPs, AGLs, and backstops agreed that they don’t have enough interaction with field staff at this point to really know about changes or outcomes related to PIVOT.

6) **Challenges:** Participants across the interviews noted a number of similar challenges including:

- **Managing the program:** It has been a real challenge to manage, organize, and structure PIVOT so that all of the pieces fit together as a whole (metaphors used included jigsaw puzzle, mosaic, weaving threads together.) Implementers are chronically understaffed. Participants’ needs and the program design keeps changing and growing over time, making it hard to keep up. PIVOT includes a large, diverse group; there are a lot of people with different perspectives, interests, and levels of PSE exposure. It’s hard to address all of the needs and keep everyone on the same page. Everyone is busy and geographically dispersed, making it hard to manage communication and stay on track.

- **Time and bandwidth:** Almost all participants also discussed how time limitations and competing priorities make full participation in the program a stretch. The time demands are particularly difficult for those who don’t have PSE in their job descriptions. IPs, AGLs, and backstops suggested that continued effort is needed to connect PIVOT capacity building to practical applications in their jobs. Leaders can help signal that PSE is a priority by allocating staff time and providing recognition for staff efforts in PIVOT. Some participants noted that assisting with PIVOT has been a big lift. A couple suggested that having a shorter time frame (e.g., six months) might better allow for this sort of intensity. Despite these noted challenges, however, all participants remained excited about the program and planned to continue participating actively in all dimensions of the program.

“So many meetings! Participants need a Sherpa to navigate all of them. And there is already so much we are all doing. No one realized the magnitude of this program and it’s hard to participate fully. Participants need incentives, like for leaders or supervisors to build in job-time and reward accomplishments. There are hierarchy issues and questions around roles and responsibilities too: are the right people in the room? Are they empowered to make change?”

- **Notably missing in discussions:** Beyond these challenges raised by participants, a number of issues related to the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review areas of investigation were notably missing from discussions in these interviews, even when questions about them were asked directly. These included:

- **Connections between PIVOT and the Journey to Self-Reliance (J2SR):** When asked about the connection between PIVOT and J2SR, participants most often discussed it in terms of PIVOT helping Missions and Mission staff become more self-reliant so they can lead PSE efforts within their Missions. Participants did not explicitly make the link between PIVOT’s internal (to USAID) focus on capacity building and change management and J2SR’s external focus on countries’ capacity and commitment to becoming more self-reliant.

- **The spectrum of PSE modalities:** Discussions of PSE focused primarily on project and financial partnerships with private sector entities. Only a couple of times were non-financial PSE modalities like matchmaking events, policy dialogue affecting business enabling environments, knowledge sharing events, etc. mentioned.

- **The relationship of PSE to inclusive development and local ownership:** Most discussions of PSE in the interviews also did not focus on issues of inclusive development and local ownership. One participant noted:

“Where are the implementers and beneficiaries (e.g., local associations) in these discussions? Right now the conversations [in PIVOT] are very internal to USAID. But if we are really doing this stuff, those groups need to be integrated in ways they are not involved right now.”
7) **Recommendations:** Throughout the interviews, participants offered a number of suggestions for program improvement both for the next few months and for future iterations of the program. Those recommendations that were mentioned in at least two interviews are included below.

- **Engage leadership in PIVOT:** To be more impactful, the program should have more connection with higher levels of leadership (e.g., Center for Transformational Partnership; Mission Front Office; OU leaders). Participants indicated that including leaders in some aspects of the program could help set vision, keep everyone updated, and ensure continued and additional support (e.g., time allocations). One participant suggested, “**PIVOT needs people who can look across portfolios, across continents, and across the agency. This could help participants see themselves and this capacity-building model in context.**”

- **Capitalize on cooperative learning opportunities:** Draw on the respective strengths and specialties at each Mission (and among Affinity Group leaders) to foster peer learning opportunities. For example, participants mentioned that Ghana could be a case study for building institutional capacity or in how to integrate PSE into the DG office; and Uganda could hold a session on Leadership.

- **Leverage regional-bilateral Mission relationships:** Work with regional Missions on effective ways to communicate out and support bilateral Mission PSE efforts (e.g., USAID/Southern Africa → Madagascar; USAID/Kenya/East Africa → Uganda).

- **Distinguish different strategies for PSE work:** Participants indicated that it may be important to explicitly distinguish and highlight relative advantages and disadvantages of different PSE approaches. For example, some efforts focus on advancing USAID development objectives through PSE (i.e., looking for private sector partners to help reach USAID objectives through projectized support). Others focus on growing current relationships where parties are interested in solving aligned concerns. They ask companies why they aren’t succeeding, what they need to succeed, and what (and how big) their incentives are for solving the shared concern. These different strategies impact how staff approach relationships with private sector entities.

- **Keep Cohort calls snappy and highlight the relevance of topics:** Participants offered feedback on Cohort calls and meetings to help accelerate the learning curve as well. They encouraged implementing partners to provide frequent, explicit connections between call topics and staff tasks or program objectives to highlight relevance. They also recommended showing empathy and awareness with short staffing and time challenges. For example, headquarters should explicitly acknowledge constraints of particular Missions when appropriate.

- **Secure funding for staff participation:** Some participants mentioned the need for help securing funding for Mission and USAID/Washington staff that don’t have travel budgets.

- **Practice the ‘art of PSE’:** IPs have recognized that participants need to practice applying new PSE knowledge and skills to integrate their learning. They can learn this through observing mentors in action; practically applying skills to their work tasks (i.e., learning by doing); experimenting and reflecting, etc. Some participants suggested that TDYs should include simulations with built-in observers and feedback.

- **Be more strategic in selecting and working with participants:** PIVOT implementers are learning a lot about participant selection through this pilot. For example, they indicated that Change Teams should include PSE POCs, contracts officer, and leadership. OU leads should also be consulted in selecting participants for the program. It may also be useful to differentiate work with FSNs and FSOs. New FSNs may have excellent PSE experience and local knowledge, but may have a large learning curve related to USAID processes and mechanism. FSOs face a different set of challenges and needs.

8) **Tensions:** A number of tensions or competing concerns and suggestions emerged from the analysis across interviews. Some of these included:

- PIVOT’s organic, adaptive model is exciting and creative vs. PIVOT needs a ‘North Star’ to guide the project and know/show success
• PIVOT’s comprehensive, intensive approach vs. limited staff time
• USAID/Washington providing knowledge and guidance to field staff vs. letting participants drive the process

9) Questions (what we know we don’t know): Participants identified numerous questions about PIVOT and PSE during the interviews, many of which are integrated into the analysis above. Additional questions that participants think need further exploration to help advance PSE efforts in Missions included:

• Are Cohort members shifting to focus on deeper, long-term relationships or are they still focusing on the old ways of doing things (i.e., developing new contracts)?
• How are participants internalizing the leadership and CLA skills? Are they seeing the connection with PSE?
• Are participants familiar with the range of PSE modalities?
• How are issues of inclusion and local ownership being integrated into PIVOT’s PSE efforts?
• Leaders signed off at the beginning, but there have been shifts in PIVOT. Are Mission leaders still on board? Can they provide support by allocating more staff time? What role should the Front Office play to sustain PIVOT?
• Is the impact of PIVOT worth the effort?
• How can PIVOT Change Teams sustain the integration of PSE within the Mission? How can they stay a coordinating body that shares responsibilities and strengthens capacities throughout the Mission rather than become siloed as the ‘PSE team’ for the Mission?
ANNEX 6: SUMMARY OF LEADERSHIP INTERVIEW, INCLUDING MISSION DIRECTORS AND USAID/WASHINGTON LEADERS

Mission Directors

This summary provides a preliminary analysis of the 30-minute interviews with five of the six PIVOT Mission Directors conducted in January, 2020. Overall, Mission Directors comments were very consistent with those offered by PIVOT Change Teams members; however, they focused much more often on their Mission’s broader PSE goals and organizational changes needed to support them.

I. What Mission Directors like about PIVOT

Directors all emphasized that they are strong proponents of PSE and have made it a priority at their Missions even before the start of PIVOT. They all noted that they have received positive feedback about the program from their participating staff and believe the program is both timely and needed.

“Our Mission generally has a very positive attitude toward and experience with the private sector. PIVOT has expanded and deepened that engagement. Over the past several months, PIVOT has really built skills across sectors in the Mission. It’s not just the Private Sector Officer on the EG team who is advocating for private-sector engagement. It is now the education team looking for opportunities, our Health team and Democracy and Governance teams too. Even our Contracts Office is deeply involved. I see that our strategy is positively impacted because all of these PIVOT members are also members of the CDCS design team. The program has created leadership. It has also offered a learning by doing opportunity for staff who wouldn’t otherwise be focused on this work. I’m very happy with what has come out of this effort.”

In particular, Directors said they liked that PIVOT has:

- **Brought together a cross-sectoral, cross-functional PSE team.** PIVOT has strong facilitation of group dynamics and team-building so the teams work well together in completing tasks. In most Missions, these teams have become or formed a core part of the Mission’s PSE working group.
- **Created dedicated space and time to support staff in PSE planning and activities.** The learning-by-doing/ on-the-job emphasis in PIVOT supported staff in fulfilling PSE-related requirements like creating PSE plans, integrating PSE into the new CDCSs, and developing new PSE activities.
- **Integrated PSE into technical areas that haven’t traditionally focused on PSE such as health, education, and democracy and governance.** Mission Directors indicated that before it was just the EG office. Staff, across offices, now see more PSE opportunities in their sectors and jobs.
- **Expanded awareness and interest in PSE across the Mission.** Mission Directors have noticed considerable increases in staff who are thinking and talking about PSE in more sophisticated ways, recognizing its importance, and focusing on developing new opportunities.
- **Fostered staff leadership and empowerment.** PIVOT Change Teams have energized the Mission around PSE as a priority, generating both enthusiasm and innovative ideas.
- **Shifted staff mindsets and behaviors in working with the private sector,** particularly in developing new relationships with private sector companies.

“Effective PSE requires changing our mentality to recognize that relationships matter, and they don’t always have to be predicated on funding. This is a key point that PIVOT has helped staff understand. For example, it has helped improve our relationships with our government counterparts. Staff are meeting and working more closely with industries and civil...”

---

17 This summary will be revised to include information from the sixth Mission Director once that interview has been conducted at the end of January.
society organizations too—just talking, sharing information, and seeing what’s out there. And out of these conversations, all of these additional opportunities that nobody ever saw are coming to the fore.”

In general, Mission Directors were supportive of the PIVOT program as a model for field staff capacity building.

“This model of building a team of interested people from across offices—to learn technical and leadership skills, and have dedicated time and space to think and plan around a priority issue for the Agency, to meet and learn from other, similar teams from other Missions, and access support from across the Agency—that’s an important new model. Then they come back and share their learning and their plans with the Mission. They engage Mission management regularly in their planning and implementation and share their work out with the whole Mission. It has been very well received here. So I think this is a good model for anything that is really important to the Agency. I wish they would do something like that for women’s empowerment!”

2. Concerns or questions about PIVOT

While most Mission Directors hoped that PIVOT will continue and be expanded, they consistently raised concerns around program demands on staff time and travel funding for participation in Cohort meetings. In addition, some had suggestions for improving PIVOT training design and content.

• **Staff time constraints:** Mission Directors expressed concerns about the high demands of PIVOT on staff time. Particularly in smaller Missions, Directors indicated that the number of staff, traveling for multiple PIVOT meetings over the year and missing other work had created a noticeable burden for the Mission. Some suggested integrating more long-distance learning opportunities into PIVOT. Others discussed hiring needs that could offset program demands and meet more general needs for effective PSE at the Mission.

• **Funding needs:** Directors mentioned needing more flexible funding to send staff to PIVOT meetings. Funding for PSE, in general, was one of the most often mentioned concerns and needs.

• **No concrete results yet:** All Directors pointed out that PIVOT has not yet demonstrated results in fostering new private sector partnerships, mobilizing capital, or influencing larger business environments. Most recognized that more time is needed to see these kinds of results and that PIVOT’s focus on staff capacity building and PSE planning is foundational.

• **Program design and content:** Some Mission directors offered suggestions for improving PIVOT’s design and content. These included:
  - **Clarifying who the program is most appropriate for.** Based on feedback from staff, some Directors suggested that program organizers clarify who the target participants are (e.g., PSE novices or experts, junior or senior staff, etc.) or establish different roles, expectations, and training levels for the range of participants.
  - **Ground PSE learning in organizational contexts to better promote behavior change.** Some Directors suggested staff behavior change could be accelerated by having more in-house implementers to help connect and contextualize PSE knowledge and skills within: a) USAID’s organizational policies and procedures; b) Mission processes and dynamics; and c) country contexts.
  - **Strengthening connections between information and application.** Directors also suggested creating tighter links between new knowledge and its practical application in staff’s daily jobs. They recommended more consistently connecting “classroom” learning with job-related learning-by-doing.
  - **Improving the balance between interpersonal and technical skills.** Some Directors indicated that there was too much “process work” and soft skills. They would have preferred to see more targeted PSE technical training and guidance on multi-sectoral approaches to PSE structured around concrete challenges and issues.
  - **More efficient design.** Some Directors suggested that trimming the number of program implementers, particularly contractors, would provide a more cost-effective design.
  - **Improved guidance on action-planning.** Some Directors recommended adapting the action-planning process to provide more guidance and walk teams through the design of specific PSE activities from a multi-sector perspective. This could help move beyond integrating PSE into different technical offices and support more
collaborative, multi-sectoral activities. They also suggested helping staff learn design processes that linked directly to the Program Cycle and questions asked at each phase.

- **Multi-level approach to change management.** While PIVOT currently focuses on staff competencies and Change Team dynamics, some Mission Directors requested that PIVOT’s change management strategies take a more explicit, multi-level approach to also address changes within offices, organizational structures and processes, and larger environments that enable or inhibit effective PSE.

**What Mission Directors would like to learn from the PIVOT effort:**

- How do we best reward and recognize effective PSE efforts?
- What motivates someone who is not used to doing PSE to start thinking differently about the private sector?
- How do we keep people from being sucked into the bureaucracy?
- How can we manage all of the competing priorities from Washington and institutionalize PSE efforts?
- What happens next. How will it be funded?

3. **What success looks like for PIVOT**

Directors provided a wide range of answers to questions about what success of the PIVOT program would look like for them. Many of their responses linked more closely to their Mission’s broader PSE goals than to PIVOT’s focus and objectives. In some cases, there was a noticeable disconnect between Directors’ expectations and the program’s approach. This suggests a need for improved communication, collaboration, and expectation setting between PIVOT and Mission leadership.

- **Changed staff behaviors and organizational operations.** Many comments focused on internal, staff, and organizational changes such as integrating PSE throughout Mission planning and operations, improving collaboration across offices, designing multi-sectoral PSE efforts, changing staff behaviors, and ensuring PSE activities are aligned with Mission priorities and plans. Many Directors also focused on expanding PSE knowledge and skills beyond the Cohort group (e.g., to other staff in the Mission or to other Missions in their region).
- **Changed relationships with private sector stakeholders:** Other comments highlighted shifting relationships with private-sector stakeholders to focus less on transactional partnerships and more on co-created activities. A couple of Directors discussed the importance of improved relationships with counterparts in other agencies.
- **Increased mobilization of private-sector capital and improved business environments.** Some Mission Directors indicated that program metrics should include an upward trajectory of PSE activities in each technical office, increased resources leveraged, and clear value for investment of resources in the program. Others focused on metrics related to improved business environments such as improved governance, reduced corruption, increased foreign investment and international trade, and improvements on the “ease of doing business” index.

As mentioned above, Directors indicated that PIVOT has had more impact internally on individual staff and organizational level changes and has only recently begun focusing more on external PSE efforts. They hoped that PIVOT’s approach and investment will soon yield improved, increased, and innovative private-sector partnerships to address development challenges in their country. Most also recognized, however, that longer time frames are needed to realize these kinds of results; many of the factors influencing them are complex and outside staff/Missions’ spheres of control; and that changes in staff capacities and organizational readiness are prerequisites for improving longer-term financial and development outcomes.

**More meaningful PSE metrics.** All Mission Directors indicated that more work was needed to develop metrics and measures that facilitated learning about what works and what doesn’t in PSE. At the same time, some expressed caution about bureaucratizing PSE efforts with an over-emphasis on indicators and measurement. “We want to make sure that we don’t overburden staff and the bureaucracy doesn’t swallow the initiative.” They looked forward to guidance from USAID/Washington on more nuanced PSE indicators and were also in the process of developing contextualized
and customized metrics related to their Mission strategies and activities. Some Mission Directors mentioned that they have created advisory boards of local private sector stakeholders to advise on CDCS development and help shape PSE metrics. Directors raised questions about effective PSE such as:

- How do we know what the best opportunities are for reaching our objectives?
- How can we get more granular understandings about what is most effective in PSE?

4. Organizational shifts needed to support PSE readiness:

Beyond their assessments of the PIVOT program, Mission Directors’ comments often highlighted more general needs for sustaining and improving their Missions’ PSE efforts.

“The environment is changing faster than the Agency is able to respond. PIVOT is a great start for making shifts at the individual, relationship, and activity levels. We also need other, complimentary activities and changes in the organization to effectively implement the PSE policy.”

Their suggestions focused on broader changes at headquarters that would create an enabling environment for effective PSE in the field including:

- **More collaborative, individualized technical support processes.** Mission Directors highlighted the need for more PIVOT-like technical support. This included Missions’ early input and co-design of support so that assistance is context-sensitive and clearly aligns with Mission strategies and needs.

- **Flexible funding for innovation:** Flexible funding pools and procedures were among the needs mentioned most often by Mission Directors. These included innovation funds that support PSE exploration, experimentation, and Mission-led proposals; more fungible resources with longer expiration dates; and more “friendly” funding processes that allow for quick deployment of capital and allow for innovative (rather than procurement-driven) partnerships.

  “If PIVOT and PSE is important to the Agency, there should be a pot of money to allow for Mission-led proposals. There needs to be an opportunity for Missions to bring forward these initiatives rather than Washington dictating what activities should be done in these countries.”

- **Workforce planning for PSE:** Mission Directors emphasized that the Agency can’t effectuate cultural change without strong in-house capacities for PSE. “Currently, people with the right technical skills and background in PSE are more the exception than the rule. In terms of workforce planning, Missions need to bring in more people with strong private equity backgrounds to complement PIVOT’s efforts to build that capacity with existing staff. This will alleviate major time constraints affecting staff PSE efforts.”

- **A PSE change management strategy for USAID/Washington:** Inspired by PIVOT’s approach within Missions, some Directors suggested that USAID/Washington also needs a change management strategy and process with clear metrics to support new ways of doing business. A change management strategy should focus on improving:
  - **PSE coordination across Bureaus:** Mission Directors noted that PSE across the Agency is very uneven and unclear, which can be confusing to Mission staff. They highlighted the need for improved coordination and increased accountability around PSE.

  “For example, humanitarian assistance doesn’t have clear options or tools for PSE. There needs to be a stronger nexus between the humanitarian and resilience processes. If one is not really on board with PSE, it makes it difficult to manage transitions along the continuum from relief to development. That’s a problem. Bureaus are not coordinating and there is no accountability. Lack of coordination means Missions are left to figure things out for themselves. What we have is Bureaus carrying out their own activities in the country without any serious discussion about the effectiveness of those activities and whether they are aligned at all with private-sector engagement. They are beyond accountability with respect toward pivoting toward PSE. People observe these counter-narratives going on inside the Agency right now.”
- **Guidance, requirements, and incentives for PSE:** Some Directors discussed the need for PSE requirements and incentives to make changes structural rather than optional and reward PSE efforts.

- **Connecting private sector companies with Missions:** Some Directors suggested that USAID/Washington should become more proactive in building relationships between U.S. companies and Missions.

> One of the big challenges that HQ needs to address is engaging the U.S. private sector in a much more robust way and building bridges of engagement with Missions, at least on the African continent. We have all of these international alliances with private sector companies, big deals with HQ and big name companies, but we don’t see people trying to pull those relationships down into the countries where we are working. So it all becomes very ethereal and not very practical. There are a lot of things, systemically, out of HQ that are left to the Missions to figure out on their own. Headquarters could be a lot more proactive in driving these initiatives and bringing Missions into relationships with regional and global private sector networks.”

- **Models for scaling up PSE capacity building:** While PIVOT offers an intensive, cohort approach to staff PSE capacity building within certain Missions, some Directors discussed the need for models that scale-up these efforts. They mentioned that PSE should be a strong focus at the Mission Directors’ conference with long-term opportunities for peer learning and mentoring that support Directors who have less PSE experience. Other Directors focused on using Regional Mission platforms to support PSE efforts.

> We have been ambivalent about these regional platforms for decades, but they could provide a lot of assistance to bilateral Missions, like creating technical support hubs or managing regional incentive funds for promoting PSE. But there is no discussion, no space right now for articulating that, so it's all left to people’s own devices. If we are going to get serious about implementing the PSE and J2SR policies, we have got to figure out how to make these changes more broadly.”

- **USAID taking a leadership role in PSE:** Some Directors emphasized a need for the Agency to take a stronger leadership role in promoting PSE among other government agencies and private-sector stakeholders. They noted that other U.S. Government agencies often do not have buy-in to a PSE approach and suggested that USAID can provide leadership in making PSE a whole-of-government initiative. In addition, Directors indicated that the Agency needs to take a leadership role with private-sector companies, fostering socially and environmentally responsible business models and highlighting the social benefits companies provide through their products and services.

> We are often coming at this as if the private sector is all good and we just need to learn to work with them better. But the private sector in most African countries is full of cartels run by the political elites of the country. We need clear thinking, leadership, and an Agency narrative at the headquarters level about how to work in these environments. What is our narrative? What kinds of things do private-sector actors need to change to work with us. It’s not just us that needs to change and become more user-friendly. Some companies are more enlightened while others are harder to crack. If we are looking towards the future, everybody needs to do some changing, not just USAID. The Agency needs to play that leadership role in helping people understand these changes in terms of getting the private sector to flourish, at least in African countries.”

While Mission Directors highlighted the considerable work that still needs to be done, both at headquarters and in their Missions, to shift organizational culture and operations for more effective PSE, they also expressed enthusiasm for this new priority and for the PIVOT Cohort program’s contributions.

> The Agency, internally, under Administrator Green, is doing a tremendous job moving forward a private-sector engagement strategy and agenda that is actionable … In the past, where we’ve had challenges is in having a policy that doesn’t have programs like PIVOT in place. PIVOT is very action-oriented and supports Missions and staff in thinking and programming in new ways that look for PSE opportunities within our portfolios. We just need to keep at it, keep engaging the private sector over and over again. And if we keep supporting the champions and groups focused on engaging the private sector, I believe we will see tremendous benefits.”
USAID/Washington Leaders

The brief summary highlights the main reflections and responses of six participants in the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review’s interviews with USAID/Washington leaders.

1. What USAID/Washington leaders like about PIVOT

USAID/Washington leaders had many positive reflections on the PIVOT Cohort program. All praised the program’s concept, design, and boldness as a model for changing staff mindsets, organizational culture, and ways of doing business. Comments focused on the following areas:

- **Capacity building and staff development model:** Participants liked the program’s multi-component approach to capacity building and staff development. They emphasized PIVOT’s approach to learning by doing within participants’ job contexts such as developing required PSE plans; integrating PSE into their new CDCS; and proactive, sector-specific applications. They also liked the peer learning and team-building across offices, sectors, and Missions.

Some participants appreciated how PIVOT embraced and embodied USAID’s leadership philosophy by empowering leaders at all levels, fostering mindfulness and self-care, cultivating staff passions around a collective PSE vision, creating opportunities for coaching and mentoring, supporting risk-taking and continuous learning, and focusing on collaboration for innovation and accountability. Others highlighted the program’s focus on building commitment, competencies, and confidence for PSE among field staff.

- **Responsive support model:** Leaders also highlighted PIVOT’s demand-driven support model that focused on sustained engagement and co-design of trainings and TDYs. Several mentioned that PIVOT had done an excellent job recruiting support from across the Agency.

- **Change management model:** Most of the participants focused on the change management aspects of PIVOT and appreciated its explicit focus on changing organizational culture and operations in ways directly tied to the PSE and J2SR policies. For example, some pointed to the selection of Change Team participants from across Mission offices and highlighted the program’s whole-of-Mission approach to organizational change.

Leaders also noted the timeliness of the program and were pleased to see strong Mission interest and competition to participate in the initiative. Several discussed PIVOT as a useful model for other policy roll-outs. For example, they noted that J2SR is a change effort and could benefit from the PIVOT approach.

- **Focus on new ways of working with the private sector:** Several leaders highlighted PIVOT’s focus on developing new staff skills in intentional and proactive approaches to PSE. In addition, a few leaders praised PIVOT’s efforts to include direct interactions with international businesses, especially those working in PIVOT Mission countries or specifically requested by participants, as part of program meetings and activities. They liked that PIVOT provided a unique opportunity for field staff to hear a range of private sector perspectives, and refine presentation and relationship building skills with guidance from mentors.

“The PSE policy calls for a major cultural and operational shift in the way we do business. I think that the PIVOT program—in the way it was launched, in the way it was designed, and in the way that it pulls from across the Agency to support certain Missions and these Change Teams—is probably the best pilot we could possibly have for a deliberate attempt at changing the way we do business in the Agency to enable greater engagement and collaboration with the private sector.”

2. Concerns or questions about PIVOT

USAID/Washington leaders had various levels of knowledge and experience with the PIVOT program; however, a number of common concerns and questions emerged across interviews.
• **Replication and scaling of the model:** All participants saw strong potential for continuing, expanding, and replicating the PIVOT Cohort program model. Several raised questions about how future iterations of the program could be more efficient in replicating and scaling-up the program without losing the intensive work. They asked: How can we save staff time and offer it to more people? How do we build on what we learned from this pilot and roll it out more broadly?

• **Funding:** USAID/Washington leaders were focused on developing a sustainable funding model and buy-in across the agencies for the program. Some suggested finding ways for Missions to buy in for longer-term support. Others recommended focusing on partnering with Pillar Bureaus that have much bigger budgets than the Regional Bureaus. They also recognized that as program investment expands, so too would various agendas and obligations. They expressed concern about a possible loss of program flexibility and freedom.

• **Leadership support:** Participants emphasized the importance of structuring Mission leadership involvement in the PIVOT model. They also stressed the need for better communication with Mission and USAID/Washington leadership.

• **Program management and content:** Several participants mentioned the need for PIVOT to have a more systematic and cohesive plan for external communication. They also discussed adjusting the balance of soft and technical skills, better integrating CLA and leadership skills with PSE content and TDYs, and making better use of what CLA resources can offer the change management process.

• **Time:** Almost all participants recognized that more time is needed for the seeds of change that PIVOT has planted and cultivated to thrive and bear fruit.

> “This program was designed to take place over a year, which is longer than most, but still only a year. We all know that any cultural shift takes time. PSE readiness and the cultural shifts that need to happen to improve that readiness across a Mission—not just among individuals or a team—needs much longer. Maybe a three-year period would be optimal. This one-year pilot really forced the program into action, though—rather than getting stuck in a design mode—and there are positive points to that.”

3. **What success looks like for PIVOT**

Participants offered a wide range of responses for what success looks like for the PIVOT program including:

• **PSE integrated into Mission culture and operations:** Some suggested that, at PIVOT Missions, we should be able to see PSE integrated into all planning and strategy documents, represented in activity designs, and reflected in strong PSE plans.

• **Staff PSE skills and leadership:** Some discussed being able to see demonstrable increases in staff capacities to implement the PSE Policy, design and manage PSE programming, and set priorities and lead PSE efforts within their offices and Missions.

• **Expanded or replicated activities:** Almost all leaders focused on how PIVOT’s Cohort and Change Team model could be adapted and applied in other Missions, other regions, and other policy initiatives. They also hoped that participants in the pilot program would help lead skill-building across other Cohorts. They also hoped that lessons from the pilot program would inform other staff development and change management efforts. For example, two participants hoped that future USAID/E3 efforts would learn from, coordinate with, and support future PIVOT efforts rather than duplicating them.

• **Sustained activities:** A number of leaders suggested that an important indicator of success would be that the peer networks established in PIVOT continue beyond the program period and that participants helped bring other staff into them.

• **Better metrics for PSE and examples of success:** A consistent theme across interviews was the need for improved PSE metrics. Some hoped that PIVOT would support participating staff and Missions in developing their own meaningful measures of success. All noted that this was an area where there was a lot more work to do, even
among experts. Some emphasized that new metrics should move beyond quantitative measures and recognize PSE as a means rather than an end. Others pointed to the need for more examples of successful PSE.

“We can clearly describe the end state. The difficulty is describing, with equal clarity, the steps in between. We need to come up with new and expanded sets of metrics. We would want to see more examples of successful PSE that are verifiable and can inform future efforts. We would want to see more innovation—not necessarily quantity of deals, but ways of doing partnerships better. We would want to start being more risk forward. In aggregate, there may be more failure along the way, but also, hopefully more successes. And if we learn lessons from the failures—for example, if we have ways of getting feedback through continuously engaging with the private sector and hearing when something isn’t working, then pivoting quickly to try something else—then that will be evidence that we are implementing our new strategies.”

4. What participants would like to learn from PIVOT

• Efficient design for scaling up: What are the actual costs of PIVOT? How do we trim the program without losing the best parts (e.g., continuity of responsive support, empowerment of FSNs)? How do we scale up Communities of Practice to promote learning on PSE? How do we keep the momentum going with the current group during the next iteration?

“I was at the [xx PIVOT] Mission recently and there was a lot of excitement about the PIVOT program there. They gave me a preview of their results framework and I got to see for myself that the staff who were participating in PIVOT were doing a really good job of ensuring that our strategy for [xx country] has a very proactive approach to private sector engagement. We need that everywhere. So now we have to figure out how to be more cost efficient and offer this broadly.”

• Program improvement: What worked and what didn’t? What did we learn about behavior change so we can improve future efforts? How can we do better next time?

• Program impact: What changes did PIVOT contribute to? Is there a difference in outcomes between PIVOT and other capacity building models? When we look at the PIVOT participants and Missions six months from now, what will have endured and what will need to be further reinforced? How effective is PIVOT and PSE more generally in moving the Agency along that path toward self-reliance?

• Triangulate perspectives on the program: What do participants think of the experience? What do they need more of? What do Mission Directors and USAID/Washington leaders think of the program? What do private sector companies who participated in PIVOT think of their experience? What is their perspective on PIVOT?

• Collective learning about change management and PSE:
  – How do PSE and CLA cross-walk with each other? How can participants’ experiences and learning in PIVOT help us adapt and improve current PSE and CLA resources?
  – How can we map out and measure PSE competencies?
  – What strategies work best with different PSE opportunities? How do we prioritize which approach to use?
  – How did organizational culture, processes, and resources support or inhibit participants’ PSE efforts? How did PIVOT help participants navigate or change organizational barriers?
  – What would PIVOT Cohort members advise their colleagues in other Missions to do?

Overall, the interviews with USAID/Washington leaders revealed strong support for the PIVOT Cohort program and an interest in learning from and expanding upon this pilot.

“A great deal has been done in PIVOT, but a lot more is needed. This is a long, long journey of corporate cultural change in the Agency, even among some of the PSE champions, experts and teams, and forward thinking Missions like those in PIVOT that are on the leading edge of private sector engagement for the Agency. Everyone still has a lot of work to do. It is positive that we are undertaking this process, but the length of the journey is sobering.”
ANNEX 7: CHANGE SUMMARY CHARTS FOR GHANA, EAST AFRICA/KENYA, MADAGASCAR, RWANDA, SOUTHERN AFRICA, AND UGANDA

PIVOT Summary Information Chart: USAID/Ghana

“The structure of PIVOT is outstanding! The value of the program is that it creates the focus, the structure, and the space to approach PSE. Before PIVOT, we didn’t have that. There is no substitute for creating this structure. So, when I say the time aspects of the program can be demanding—well, PSE itself is demanding, at least doing it in an engaged, sustainable, scalable way is an enormous task. But it’s needed. And what we’ve gained in PIVOT is irreplaceable: it is really worth it.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID/Ghana</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE: Explore how to encourage sustainable SME sector growth in Ghana that drives job creation, competitiveness, and wealth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIVOT: Build capacity and practical experience in PSE for a core group of people who can spark interest and change throughout the Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes Since the Start of PIVOT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Interest, knowledge, and commitment regarding PSE has increased across the Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Planning has been collaborative, so there is a lot of buy-in.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six members (EG, DG, ED, AA, Health, Program Office); Team Lead is PSE POC; number of FSNs, FSOs, other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Team Selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection Criteria: 1) Diversity of representation from Mission Offices; 2) Expressed interest in PSE; 3) Some experience with the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Dynamics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyone is excited to participate and they are engaged as a team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biggest internal shifts</strong>: Everyone understands what PSE is and how to do it; everyone now has ideas for PSE efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong>: Diversity of experience and representation; significant knowledge of local economic development sector; strong relationships with private sector and Government of Ghana; experience with DCAs and GDAs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong>: Time constraints; previous efforts were unable to create sustainable and scalable SME financial solutions; Mission staff concerns that the private sector is an unreliable partner; enormity of task compared to availability of staff time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Focus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team: 1) They are completing a market analysis and opportunity mapping for Northern Ghana that will inform the team’s TDY to that region. They will engage 10-30 private-sector entities there in a variety of formats. Results will inform their nascent opportunity matrix and relationship management system. 2) They are implementing a Mission-wide effort to create an innovative, integrated, new CDCS based on changing the behaviors of key private-sector actors and stakeholders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals: Two members are interested in access to finance; one member is exploring a partnership with a large multinational company; one member wants to play the point role with the acquisitions office; a new Health TDY will look at PSE opportunities across the health portfolio.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What will endure beyond PIVOT? The Ghana Mission Change Team has branded itself the PSE Team for work well beyond the PIVOT pilot. They will continue aligning team activities with the Mission strategy and sharing out team learning with the whole Mission. They recognize PSE efforts and learning are iterative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>USAID/Ghana</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes in Mission’s Culture</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More time is needed to see cultural changes. So far, changes include:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased receptivity to PSE among Mission staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strong Mission-wide attendance at PSE events and meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• PSE integrated into Mission planning documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We have to demonstrate value first. If we don’t, there will be some questions around all of this effort. For now, we just need time to do the work—at least another year. Then come ask us about changes in Mission culture and operations.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **What Does Success Look Like?** |
| “If we can provide a field-tested, streamlined PSE process that is tied to our Mission strategy, and can be picked up and used by non-experts across the Mission, then we will have hit a home run. Getting results and sustaining them would be a grand slam. But at this point we don’t have to drive funds. That comes next.” |
| • Creating PSE tools and systems (e.g., a relationship management tracker) that actually gets used. Historically, many don’t. |
| • Identifying private sector actors that catalyze change in their space along the value chain, have some spillover, and can serve as an example to others. |

| **National Context: Barriers** |
| • Significant level of corruption and lack of enforcement of regulations and laws already on the books in Ghana. |
| • Fragmentation of private sector entities, including lack of associations and difficulties identifying reliable and reputable potential partners. |
| • Cartels and monopolies in certain industries. |
| • Conservative mindsets by many key actors in Ghana that resist change. |
| • Difficulties financing SMEs: high rates set by the Bank of Ghana; significant currency volatility; uncertainty because of restructuring in financial/banking systems. |
| • National/cultural attitudes about natural resources. |

| **National Context: Enablers** |
| • Wide agreement that the SME sector must be improved, e.g., Ministry for Private Sector Development focusing on improving the SME sector. |
| • Commercial banks are interested in diversifying their loan portfolios and exploring innovative financing solutions. |
| • Youthful Ghanaian population has proven to be ready, in agriculture and other sectors, to learn new skills to improve their standard of living. |
| • Ghana is considered a stable democracy and the Government of Ghana is committed to encouraging private-sector investment as a core strategy for self-reliance. |
| • Many multinational companies consider Ghana a regional hub for business. |

| **Learning** |
| “We have been learning about the depth and complexity of PSE as well as the difference between PSE and private sector development. It’s a puzzle that many people are working on in concert.” |

| **Advice** |
| Create a PSE plan, but don’t over-plan. Make sure it’s flexible and be patient. |

| **Questions** |
| • What is the Agency’s follow-on plan to the release of the PSE policy? |
| • What has the Agency learned through its attempts to conduct PSE in the past year? |
PIVOT Summary Information Chart: USAID/Kenya/East Africa

“Leadership underestimates the need for skill-building and the time required to do that effectively. It has to be an ongoing effort. If PIVOT fizzles because we didn’t transform the Agency in 12 months—that may be a problem with overly ambitious expectations … PIVOT has been a very positive experience. It’s a good pilot. We have built a cohort of people who are more confident and comfortable talking and thinking about PSE. They see more opportunities within their own areas of work. Ultimately, having leadership buy-in and support is critical. In the best case, that means structural changes and resources. If the PSE policy is a real priority, there needs to be messaging and resources put towards that.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID/KENYA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSE</strong>: Partner more strategically and effectively with private sector firms as a convener, advocate, co-creator, investment catalyst, and, to a lesser extent, as a funder. Deploy USAID resources to leverage substantially larger pools of private Kenyan, East African, and U.S. capital to support Kenya and East Africa’s development goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PIVOT</strong>: Develop a whole-of-Mission approach that encourages Mission-level conversations about PSE and breaks down existing silos between offices. Shift towards looking at the private sector as partners rather than beneficiaries.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Changes Since the Start of PIVOT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased awareness, interest, and communication about PSE across offices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increased staff confidence and competence talking about PSE and seeing opportunities for engagement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Team</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight members: all offices (EG, DG, Youth &amp; ED, Program Office, Contracts Office, Front Office) Team Lead is PSE POC; number of FSNs, FSOs, and others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Change Team Selection</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Mission Director prioritized PIVOT and asked the Deputy Mission Director to participate in the Change Team. Office chiefs selected people from their offices. Having more time prior to team selection to gain internal clarity about objectives would have been useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Team Dynamics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team meets every two weeks to discuss current PSE efforts, set objectives, and assign tasks for the next period.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Biggest internal shifts</strong>: Health office member left Agency and hasn’t been replaced yet. They have built strong, new relationships and function well as a dynamic unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong>: Strong representation from all offices in the Mission. Excellent access to and communication with leadership. Members have good interagency relationships. They have developed excellent products. Each member brings their personal and office perspectives into the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenges</strong>: Time constraints/increased volume of work in the last quarter has resulted in less time for PIVOT. Uneven participation, though everyone contributes to key deliverables. Historically, USAID/Kenya/East Africa hasn’t had clear targets, resource allocation, outreach strategies, or selection criteria for PSE. Staff views differ regarding what forms of PSE are a good use of USAID resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Current Focus**

“There are many priority initiatives right now, so we have shifted to look at how PSE can move those priorities forward, rather than PSE for its own sake. PSE is an approach not an objective, so we have aligned our efforts to fit into the shifting landscape of Mission priorities.”

- Strengthen PSE awareness and knowledge management in the Mission.
- Advise on incorporating PSE into the new CDCS.
- Test PSE approaches through partnership development. Staff are seeking information and input from private sector firms and associations on opportunities for co-creation, co-funding, and co-implementation. They are also testing existing mechanisms for needed modifications e.g., the Health office is looking to buy in to an economic growth and investment facilitation platform. “That is hugely positive. We wouldn’t have seen that coming a year ago.”

**Next Steps**

1) Transition Change Team into permanent PSE working group with continued front office participation, access, and support.

2) Build Mission-wide capacities: leverage training and leadership skills from PIVOT to become trainers and advocates of others in the Mission.

3) Support the operationalization of the PSE Plan internally: advocate for institutional changes to sustain this initiative (see below).

4) Focus on generating results: shift toward implementing PSE plans and developing new partnerships.

“Ultimately, initiatives like PIVOT live or die on their ability to meaningfully impact Mission priorities. We have a lot of things that we can claim the PIVOT team touched, some that we’ve owned and shaped, but none yet that have resulted in new movements of private capital. And although PSE is larger than partnerships and leverage, that is a very important outcome that people can look at and count. Success breeds success. Now we have to shift towards getting results.”

**Institutional Changes/Support Needed**

- Awards and recognition for superior PSE efforts, e.g., PSE as a part of the award ceremony. “It would raise the profile so people would know that if they do PSE work, even if it’s not traditional aid work, they are still being recognized for it.”

- Time allocations for PSE in technical offices. “Right now PSE is encouraged by leadership and something many staff want to do, but they still have 100 percent of their LOE allocated to other things.”

- PSE plans and programs that align with particular Mission priorities and are resourced at the inter-office level.

- Integration of PSE within contracts, legal, and financial management offices. “Having those staff engaged, and seeing themselves in this work is important. They may engage differently, but there has to be a sense of how they fit in and that this contributes to their goals too.”

- Expedited and flexible USAID administrative procedures and processes.

**What Does Success Look Like?**

- Cross-sectoral PSE or investment platforms aligned with Mission priorities.

- Technical offices demonstrate support by contributing funds to a Mission-wide PSE pool.

- PSE Change Team/working group develops a pipeline of private sector transactions to test and adapt approaches proposed in the action plan.
### National Context: Barriers and Enablers

Three contextual issues impacting them right now:

- Kenya has a large and diverse economy—lots of opportunities for PSE. Challenges and questions around what they should do, with whom, and why?
- Corruption in Kenya is hitting an inflection point. They must be careful not to enable actors whose interests they don’t share. They need a strong due diligence process.
- The economy is hitting a rough patch: growth is weakening and a number of sectors are experiencing strain. Cap on interest rates has impacted private lending. This limits where private sector actors want to invest.

“The best PSE approaches within the business environment vary a lot from sector to sector. Policy work is ultimately the best case: putting in place better policies helps create a level playing field and better environment for all businesses, not just the few we can impact directly. But it tends to be very challenging to achieve because of dynamics within government, slow pace of change, forces resistant to it ... So, we would love policy reform to go forward, but where we can’t do that, second best is support to firms and associations of firms. We are looking more at how to support business associations so they can be more effective advocates with governments and other actors. There are still needs for firm-level capacity building and strengthening. In Kenya we are looking to support competition and increase innovation.”

### Learning

- Building strong relations across units that don’t usually work together is critical and a very positive outcome of PIVOT.
- Focusing on one or two challenges that impacts multiple offices helps focus efforts and keeps the momentum going.
- More time is needed to see results.

“One year to start this process, build a team, and deliver results that we originally targeted is proving challenging. And I think we started from a fairly advanced spot. I think by the end of PIVOT we can do a rack-up of things that are meaningful, but there won’t be capital mobilization. It takes more time to see that.”

### Advice

- For people who don’t usually do PSE: “PSE is not rocket science. Talk to folks and look for mutual interests. Realize that most conversations give you information rather than turn into partnerships—and that is still valuable. And you can talk a lot without crossing any lines.”
- For people who do PSE, but are trying to improve effectiveness: “It’s really about looking for shared value. Having a clear idea of what the challenge is that USAID is facing and where the private sector might have interest and something to contribute. PSE often gets into trouble when someone has a great conversation with a firm and then looks for a way to work with them, rather than identifying the challenge first, then seeking out great firms who can help address that.”
- “The real opportunities are in engaging with the core business of firms. Look to partner with companies in a way that aligns with how they spend most of their time, energy, and money anyway. And that aligns with USAID’s development interests. That’s where the money is. And you see lots of those alignments.”

### Questions

- What do new Agency structures like the PSE Hub and Development Innovation Ventures mean for Missions? Should they be staffing differently?
- How can PIVOT participants best influence organizational structures that will support significant changes in how USAID does business?

### PSE Examples:

USAID/Kenya/East Africa is in the final steps of modifying an existing investment facilitation activity to make it a sector-agnostic investment facilitation platform. Originally focused on Feed the Future and Power Africa, this activity has now
secured approval for buy-ins from Health and WASH, with a few other opportunities under discussion. Targets for those buy-ins are under discussion, and implementation has not yet begun, but the general approach is promising—creating cross-sectoral platforms that can support private sector needs—be they for investment facilitation, SME strengthening, GDA-style partnerships, etc.—where the capacities required are relatively similar across sectors.

These sorts of approaches—involving several streams of funding—could also be relevant when looking at how to mobilize funding for enabling environment reforms that impact our earmarked sectors particularly, even when the benefits may also accrue to other non-priority sectors.

DG funding—while also scarce—also seems very relevant to sector agnostic enabling environment reform. We have had some success building our DG office’s interest in this area in support of private sector engagement, though they have not committed any funding to date.

PIVOT Summary Information Chart: USAID/Madagascar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID/MADAGASCAR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Goals** | PSE: USAID/Madagascar will use market-based approaches, improve the enabling business environment, and partner with the private sector to solve development challenges more sustainably and at scale. Priority areas for PSE include poverty reduction, biodiversity and habitat protections, health, and food security.  
PIVOT: Build capacity of Mission staff to use innovative and cutting-edge PSE approaches across the Mission’s portfolio. Expand staff understandings of PSE beyond limited, funding-based approaches. |
| **Changes Since the Start of PIVOT** | “PIVOT has helped with coordination and integration of PSE across the Mission. All technical offices had started PSE work prior to PIVOT, but it was stove-piped: Staff didn’t share information or work together. Our work in PIVOT has also helped develop a shared understanding of PSE.”  
• They have developed a new Mission-wide PSE vision. |
| **Change Team** | Six members (PSE POC, AG, ENV, Health, and Program Office). Three are FSNs. Three are FSOs. |
| **Change Team Selection** | Selection Criteria: 1) Experience working with private sector; 2) Existing private sector relationships and networks; 3) Strong inter-agency collaboration. |
| **Team Dynamics** | • The team meets as needed to discuss issues and assign roles and tasks. Most work is completed independently. This approach works well for them. They tried regularly scheduled meetings but this approach works better for them.  
• Biggest internal shifts: Initial PSE coordinator, based in the Program Office, left. Mission plans to hire two new PSE coordinators (one USPSC and one FSN) in the environmental and economic development office to sustain this work. Health team member became Acting Office Director, so has more time constraints now.  
• Strengths: The team is effective in getting tasks completed.  
• Challenges: Increased time constraints have limited meeting times. Staff are busy working on CDCS and PSE Plan. |
## USAID/MADAGASCAR

### Current Focus

1. Socializing and implementing approved PSE Plan. They used an inclusive, collaborative approach to develop the plan that included input and feedback from the Front Office and all offices.
2. Developing indicators and milestones to measure PSE progress within the Program Cycle.
3. Integrating PSE into CDCS design and in portfolio reviews.
4. Focusing on leadership development aspects of PIVOT to support their career development after the program (one member oversees leadership development at Mission).
5. Continuing ongoing work to improve Madagascar’s business environment through their Fiscal Transparency Program (FTP) that supports reform of government’s budgeting and cash management functions and a new DRG program.

### Next Steps

- Preparing for two new PSE coordinators.
- Formalize a standing PSE working group including all Change Team members, representatives from support offices, contracts office, and U.S. State Department’s Economy Section.
- Update the PSE relationship management tracker/database to facilitate cross-office communication and coordination as needed.
- Schedule USAID’s PSE 101 course available for all interested Mission staff to take place in Madagascar.

### National Context: Barriers

- Madagascar is ranked 164/189 for ease of doing business (high shipping costs, poor roads, increased spoilage compared to other countries).
- High levels of corruption and weak business enabling environment reduces private sector investment.
- Bureaucratic permitting process for public-private partnerships creates significant delays and barriers in formalizing PPPs.
- Few U.S. companies are investing in the country.
- Persistent, cyclical political crises have resulted in stagnant economic growth.

### National Context: Enablers

- New government is focused on attracting foreign investment and responsible corporate actors to help foster self-reliance.
- Mission has good relationships and a new DG initiative to address corruption and improve transparency. This may help improve the business enabling environment.

### Learning

- “It’s essential to involve local private sector companies and implementing partners early in PSE work. They know what is going on.”
- Creating a Mission-wide vision for PSE has really helped signal that PSE is a priority that is here to stay and has supported staff buy-in.
- Including U.S. State Department staff in meetings with the private sector—and supporting inter-agency communication & coordination more generally—has been really useful.

### Advice

Involve the Mission Director in the PSE planning from the beginning so s/he can help advocate for the plans.
**PIVOT Summary Information Chart: USAID/Rwanda**

“*PIVOT has created a paradigm shift that helped us realize we can go and talk with private sector companies. It is not a hidden or forbidden world. PIVOT is breaking down those walls for us. We are learning to make a habit of engaging. I am empowered and ready to talk with businesses now.*”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID/RWANDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PSE: Work with private sector actors and the Government of Rwanda (GOR) to improve access to finance and new blended and innovative finance options.  
PIVOT: Build capacity for PSE throughout the Mission and change mindsets toward doing business differently. |
| **Changes Since the Start of PIVOT** |
| 
| • Staff interests and skills in PSE have expanded across offices.  
• PSE integrated into Mission documents (e.g., new CDCS).  
• More systematic and intentional PSE efforts focus on building equal, collaborative partnerships. |
| **Change Team** |
| 
| Five members (EG, AG, Youth & ED, Health, Program Office) Team lead is PSE POC, number of FSNs, FSOs, others? |
| **Change Team Selection** |
| 
| Selection Criteria: 1) Experience at the Mission; 2) Experience working with private sector entities; 3) PSE included in their work objectives. Understaffing prevented DG and Program Design staff from participating. |
| **Team Dynamics** |
| 
| • **Biggest internal shifts:** FSO team lead rotated out a few months after PIVOT started, but the transition to a new team lead has been smooth.  
• **Strengths:** The team works really well together: They communicate well, hold each other accountable, and are very productive in completing tasks.  
• **Challenges:** Time constraints limit participation, particularly for those who don’t have PSE integrated into work objectives. Most staff lack PSE and finance expertise and experience. Participation and learning has been unequal across the team. They need more time to implement their PSE action plans. |
| **Current Focus** |
| 
| • The team assisted in completing Phase 2 of the CDCS process by intentionally integrating PSE as a cornerstone of their CDCS results framework.  
• Every technical office is conducting an analysis of PSE opportunities.  
• Some offices are organizing private sector roundtables and networking events based on the opportunity mapping.  
• TDYs are scheduled  
• Examples: 1) EG Office is using GDA and USAID mechanisms in a holistic approach involving companies in different sub-sectors; 2) Education Office needed a private sector partner for publishing a textbook. Local capacity was low; it is a new industry. They are now able to connect with workforce development and place youth in publishing internship programs. |
<p>| <strong>Next Steps</strong> |
|
| The Change Team is planning to develop PSE resource kits and messaging for three audiences: implementing partners, private sector companies, and the GOR. They will help familiarize staff across the Mission with these resources. The Mission will be coordinating their market-sector work and policy work, shifting away from their role as foreign assistance provider toward facilitator and broker of development. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID/RWANDA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Context: Barriers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• International investors often see Rwanda as commercially limited (land-locked; low natural resources; complicated history).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Private sector is relatively small/nascent capital market.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Many parastatal firms and government-controlled industries crowd-out business growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local private sector companies are used to grants and unprepared for investors looking for commercial, risk-adjusted returns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Government wants evidence-based information with numbers and projections that are not readily available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Context: Enablers</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Staff have excellent relationships with government counterparts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Mission’s past experience with private sector companies is very positive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GOR is supportive of enterprise-driven development and committed to tapping into global markets to fund sustainable growth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GOR has prioritized new forms of financing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“PIVOT has provided a great opportunity to understand how PSE can be integrated into our Mission—for example, our PIVOT plan initiated conversations in the Missions across sectors and helped us build PSE into our CDCS. The Mission needed new staffing structures to do PSE and needed more people involved. PIVOT has helped expand staff skill-sets and integrate PSE into work objectives. The alignment and timing really pushed us to think—it has been very useful.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Learning about the enneagram and focusing on mindfulness has been formative for many of us and very useful. Working as a team and doing PSE action planning has been great too! The Cohort calls and calls with backstops have been excellent for improving communication and accountability. We are good at PSE planning, procedures, and paperwork now and are focusing on the practice of implementing PSE.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Advice</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“A lesson from PIVOT for other Missions? IT IS POSSIBLE!! PSE is possible even without creating new positions and hiring new people. You can start with what you have. It is possible even within the current staffing structures and with the available staff who are not used to talking with the private sector. Especially with commitment, with some resources allocated, with a cross-cutting, cross-sectoral team, and with leadership support—it is possible.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Questions</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do we create an environment that incentivizes staff to go out and speak more with the private sector?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PIVOT Summary Information Chart: USAID/Southern Africa

“Before you consider external contexts or business environments, you have to make change in the Missions. At USAID, we have to be very deliberate in our designs to ensure that spaces for PSE are created. If we don’t do that, then the opportunities won’t present themselves.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>USAID/SOUTHERN AFRICA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goals</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| PSE: South Africa has long been recognized as the gateway to Africa, with the most diversified economy in the region and a thriving private sector. The importance of leveraging its advanced private sector, financial systems, and corporate governance to increase regional integration and growth in southern Africa cannot be overstated.

PIVOT: Develop capacities of technical teams in the Mission to better integrate PSE into their plans and activities for more efficient and innovative ways to address development challenges and promote self-reliance. |
| **Changes Since the Start of PIVOT** |
| • Improved cross-office communication and coordination so they are all “pulling in the same direction.”  
• Gaining a wider set of tools for designing PSE and innovative finance. |
| **Change Team** |
| Six members (EG, PSE POC, health, Energy, Project Development (x2)). Number of FSNs, FSOs, other? |
| **Change Team Selection** |
| Criteria: 1) Expressed interest in PSE; 2) Diversity of representation from Mission offices; 3) Considerable PSE experience and expertise. |
| **Team Dynamics** |
| • Everyone is very committed to PSE, but has significant time constraints.  
• **Biggest internal shifts:** Initially they struggled to figure out their roles and how to work together as a team—they all had different priorities and styles of working. Now they work together really well.  
• **Strengths:** Staff experience and expertise with PSE can provide guidance to bilateral Missions in the region.  
• **Challenges:** Time constraints; most projects have already been awarded and are being implemented; stretched budgets cannot support innovative ideas; some offices do not have time to actively participate. |
| **Current Focus** |
| 1) They are developing a database of successful private-sector partnerships in different sectors including case studies from Missions that document activities where PSE was used to achieve development results.  
2) They are increasing awareness about and supporting the use of PSE approaches across OUs and bilateral Missions through calls, roadshows, and TDY exchanges. |
| **Next Steps** |
| They are developing a private sector-centric CDCS through PSE stakeholder consultations and creating results frameworks relevant to all parties. |
| **Changes in Mission’s Culture** |
| • Changed principles, procedures, and resources within the Mission related to how they engage private-sector stakeholders. |
What Does Success Look Like?

- Deliberate organizational change in Missions is the first step for PSE success.
- Designing USAID projects and activities differently so that the national governments have opportunities, platforms, and convening space to meet with private sector actors.
- Designing activities that help build trust between the private sector and government and support locally-owned solutions.

“We have to be careful not to interfere in the market and create distortions because of how we are working. So, we will still do policy work, but the policy will be driven by the private sector and what they see as important, because they know the problems. Leveraging market-based solutions can ultimately move countries in this region beyond a reliance on foreign assistance.”

Learning

“The interpersonal skills have been really valuable. Some people dismiss them as nonsense. Being mindful, knowing ourselves as individuals, learning how to deal with difficult conversations and conflict—they are key. People like to joke about them, but I have found them to be very helpful in my PSE work.”

Advice

- Pick your PSE team carefully: members need to be passionate and committed so they have buy-in and output.
- Recognizing and valuing that output is really important! People want a good PPR. If it’s not in the performance review, it may not get done.

PIVOT Summary Information Chart: USAID/Uganda

“PIVOT has led to big transformations in our Mission: more people understand what PSE is, speak a common PSE language, and know how to do it … People now realize that private-sector engagement is here to stay and we are integrating it into our daily work. The fire has been lit and it is beginning to burn. The key is to keep that momentum alive.”

PIVOT-USAID/UGANDA

Goals

PSE: Identify private-sector interests and engagement opportunities in nature-based tourism, youth employment and child protection activities, and health commodity supply chains, WASH, and ICT. Better understand the private sector’s role in accountability and reducing corruption in service delivery.

PIVOT: Develop a Mission-wide approach for doing PSE differently. Build capacity and institutionalize PSE across offices to foster stronger private-sector relationships and achieve greater development impacts.

Changes Since the Start of PIVOT

- Interest, knowledge, and commitment regarding PSE has expanded across the Mission.
- PSE is integrated into Mission planning documents and activities in every office.
- Mission staff are more strategic in implementing PSE and have criteria for who, when, and how to engage.

Change Team

Five core members (Ed/ Youth, Biodiversity, Program Office, Health, OAA) working closely through an expanded working group of PSE champions (from EG PSE Unit and PPD).

Change Team Selection

Senior management chose a team in consultation with office directors—focused on having representation across offices.
Team Dynamics

- **Biggest internal shifts:** Initial PIVOT team lead with PSE background left the Mission. Two people from OAA have joined the group. PIVOT now rebranded as an ongoing, extended PSE working group to improve information sharing and coordinating implementation of Mission action plan. Team weekly meetings have shifted to become more structured and systematic. In addition, we have instituted a monthly PSE working group to meet with the Front Office.

- **Strengths:** Team reflection and adaptability in solving problems; strong relationships with PSE POC, EG office, and network of PSE champions across Mission to link priorities and “communicate with one voice.” Staff have strong relationships with Government of Uganda counterparts. Lots of humor keeps us sane!

- **Challenges:** Early staffing changes on the team pushed them to become more intentional and strategic about the structure, staffing, responsibilities, lines of communication, etc. PSE has been a big learning curve for some members. Difficulty in PIVOT being ground up in implementation and less attention to Missions being centralized in leadership and therefore, prioritization.

Current Focus

1) Increasing PIVOT Change Team capacities such as active listening, making pitches that resonate with private sector companies, identifying alignment, learning USAID’s PSE mechanisms, being seen as PSE leaders in the Mission.

2) Increasing Mission-wide PSE capacities and promoting cross-fertilization across offices, e.g., Health TDY, resulted in a PSE landscape analysis and related action planning that provided a model for other offices; PPD office held an event (speaker series) that brought private-sector entities. Strong Mission-wide attendance has motivated other offices to organize similar events.

3) Exploring PSE opportunities has resulted in a “Kiss Some Frogs” strategy where practice and fails in PSE has supported learning and refinement. While some efforts didn’t work out well, others have proven very promising.

Next Steps

- They are balancing internal capacity building for PSE to keep the current momentum alive with careful, strategic planning for engaging with Uganda’s vibrant private sector.

- The Change Team will morph into a broader PSE working group that will extend beyond PIVOT.

Change in Mission’s Culture

- Increased interest, conversations, and general openness regarding PSE among staff.

- PSE integration into daily activities, e.g., PSE built into meeting agendas such as upcoming Chief of Party meeting and internal office meeting agendas.

- Mission documents like the CDCS and PSE Plan provide space, direction, and resource commitment for PSE.

- PSE champions are active within offices across the Mission.

National Context: Barriers

- Corruption hinders private sector growth and Uganda’s Journey to Self-Reliance.

- Increasingly strong presence of Chinese investment often counters USAID/Uganda’s objectives and impacts their relevance to the private sector.

- Young domestic business community (many MSMEs) that operates mostly in the informal sector.

- Low capacity and limited access to finance.

- Few platforms for inclusive dialogue among private-sector actors and government.

- Nearly 80 percent of Uganda’s population is youth under age 30.
### USAID/UGANDA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>National Context: Enablers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Political environment supports private sector development, PSE and self-reliance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Government of Uganda has a national development plan and investment policy where the private sector plays a key role in helping reach development objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Growing involvement and advocacy of the private sector is improving services and accountability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“We initially underestimated the LOE and need for leadership support in this effort, especially given all the competing priorities. Once supervisors and the Front Office give their blessings and allocate some time, the work is much easier.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Change Team has really learned to work adaptively to ensure broad, ongoing participation and support for change management and PSE efforts across the Mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• How will failures be viewed and handled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“We are building capacities, but PSE takes time to learn and to do effectively. If we engage a private-sector actor and it doesn’t result in a deal or work out, how will that be looked at? Internally, our team will reflect and learn from the experience. But at the end of the day, will leadership see that as a failure?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**ANNEX 8: PIVOT’S POTENTIAL CHANGES CHART: SUMMARY**

## PIVOT’s Potential Changes Chart: Summary

This chart summarizes potential changes or outcomes for the PIVOT Cohort program based on initial data collected from PIVOT participants and implementers. Where applicable, they have been cross-checked with research evidence and best practices identified in the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review’s literature review. The Learning Review will continue to refine, supplement, and verify these elicited outcomes through additional research methods. This chart does not claim or provide evidence that PIVOT has achieved any of these potential changes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CHANGE</th>
<th>INTERNAL TO USAID</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individuals (PIVOT participants/USAID staff)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Competencies</strong>: Strong staff competencies in technical and interpersonal skills needed for effective PSE (see LEARN/EGEA competency document).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Experience</strong>: Staff apply PSE competencies in their jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Commitment</strong>: Staff are engaged and empowered in integrating PSE throughout Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (USAID internal teams, networks, and connections)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Within PIVOT Missions</strong>: Increased communication and coordination across offices helps integrate PSE throughout Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Within Cohort/across PIVOT Missions</strong>: Peer learning and connections help advance PSE efforts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Between headquarters and field</strong>: Responsive support improves technical assistance and resources needed to advance PSE.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Across USAID/Washington operating units (OUs)</strong>: Increased connections across OUs inspires coordination and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization (USAID/Washington and Missions)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Senior Leadership support for PSE.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Staff incentives, structures, work objectives, and time linked to PSE.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Increased staff understanding and involvement in PSE across offices.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>PSE integrated into documents across the Program Cycle.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Organizational culture supports new ways of engaging the private sector</strong> (e.g., increased communication/coordination across OUs, proactive, systematic engagement; equal partnerships; facilitative role; integrated CLA processes).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Organizational operations support PSE</strong>: (e.g., flexible funding and expedited procurement; responsive support; streamlined roadmaps for PSE; efficient systems for outreach, due diligence, and relationship management; clear success metrics, and integrated MERL).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• PIVOT Program replicated, extended, or scaled.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE OF CHANGE</th>
<th>EXTERNAL PSE EFFORTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Relationships (USAID relationships with private-sector stakeholders)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>New ways of engaging private-sector entities</strong> (e.g., proactive, strategic engagement; co-designed collaborations, USAID plays facilitative role to support self-reliance).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Stronger relationships with private-sector entities</strong> (e.g., increased alignment, trust, and clear additionality; local private sector supported as change agents).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Improved donor and inter-agency coordination for PSE.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Improved PSE</strong>: Changes related to USAID’s PSE Indicator Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• <strong>Improved development results and self-reliance</strong>: Increased sustainability and scale of development results and improved self-reliance.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 9: OUTCOME HARVESTING DATA

At the 3rd PIVOT Cohort meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, December 2–6, 2019, PIVOT Cohort members participated in a short Outcome Harvesting activity for the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review. In the activity, participants were asked to brainstorm a list of changes that they had noticed since the start of PIVOT and rank the top three changes they believed were most significant. Suggested domains of change included:

- **Individual** — Changes in me, my abilities, and/or how I do my job
- **Relationships** — Changes in my relationships or networks
- **Organizational** — Changes in my operating unit, Mission, or Agency
- **PSE Activities** — Changes in the way that I or my organization engage(s) with private-sector stakeholders
- **Negative** — Changes that created or revealed a problem we need to learn from (i.e., negative changes)
- **Other** — Any other changes

The responses elicited in this activity were coded deductively by level of analysis (i.e., categories of change listed above) as well as by PIVOT’s capacity building areas of private-sector engagement (PSE), leadership, and collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) and change management (CM). Within each level of analysis category, responses were further coded inductively into subcategories that emerged from the data. Where responses fell into more than one category, they were included in each category that applied. The following analysis summarizes the results of this activity.

- 72 percent of PIVOT’s Cohort members (26/36 people) participated in this activity
- 103 changes were brainstormed in their responses
- 55 percent of brainstormed changes were ranked

Overall, participants identified slightly more organizational changes than individual changes. Only 15 percent of changes reported focused on PSE activities and new/improved relationships. No negative or “other” changes were noted. Participants ranked individual level changes somewhat higher than other changes.

Across all levels of analysis, changes related to PSE were noted most often, followed by changes related to CLA and CM combined, and leadership.19

---

18 Six of the participants (23 percent) did not rank their list of changes. One indicated that all had equal significance. No explanations were given by the others. Responses from these six participants were treated as “unranked” in the analysis.

19 Because LEARN’s CLA framework includes elements of leadership and change management within it, there was considerable overlap between Leadership and CLA and CM categories. PIVOT’s training/curricula materials provided guidance on where some distinctions might fall, but where responses clearly overlapped they were included in both categories.
In general, despite phrasing their responses somewhat differently, participants’ open-ended responses had high consistency in their meaning within each category. In addition, there were no noticeable differences in the meanings between responses that were ranked and those that were unranked.

**Individual Level Changes**: Participants identified most changes in their own PSE knowledge and skills and ranked their PSE and leadership skills as most significant.

- **Changes in PSE skills, knowledge, and activities** included responses that focused on increased knowledge or understandings of PSE in general and in their sector/area of work specifically; improved skills or abilities in talking with private-sector stakeholders (i.e., talk the talk); better understandings of private sector actors’ points of view; and improved ability to discuss USAID’s PSE Policy and advantages of PSE for development work. Examples of individual level changes included:
  - I have a better understanding of what PSE is all about and that it can be done in all our programs.
  - PIVOT increased my knowledge in PSE.
  - I am more aware of what the private sector can bring to the development work we do.

- **Changes in leadership capacity** included participants’ references to improved mindfulness, self-awareness, active listening, giving and receiving feedback, presentation and facilitation skills, new leadership responsibilities in their workplace, and recognition by others of their leadership efforts. Examples included:
  - My leadership skills have improved, e.g., engagement.
Increased self-awareness and enhanced mindfulness.

My presentation skills have improved since as a team and as individuals, we have to present to Mission leadership and the wider Mission.

- **Changes in CLA and CM** included responses that focused on internal or external collaboration, pause and reflect processes, flexibility or adaptability, and change management. Examples included:
  - I am personally more aware of the importance of consensus-building and change management in creating buy-in for private-sector engagement partnerships.
  - I am more flexible and less rigid.
  - I have better communication and collaboration with colleagues both in my office and in the Mission.

**Organizational Level Changes:** Participant responses identified a wide range of overlapping changes in organizational culture and operations. The changes mentioned most often focused on increased staff interest and awareness of PSE across the Mission, as well as various forms of PSE institutionalization and integration. Organizational changes fell most often within the lower ranked and unranked categories.

- **PSE institutionalization** included responses that highlighted integrating PSE into Mission documents across the Program Cycle (e.g., CDCSs, PADs, activity design); adding it to staff position descriptions, work objectives, and performance review criteria; and creating both formal and informal processes for conducting PSE. Examples included:
Focus on private sector as part of portfolio review.

My Mission and operating unit have accepted that there is room for PSE in new design of awards and plans to institutionalize it.

Acceptance within the Mission that PSE will form a significant part of our new CDCS culture shift.

- Increased staff interest, awareness, knowledge, discussion, and acceptance of PSE was also a strong theme among participant responses. Examples included:
  - Increased awareness of PSE in the Mission.
  - Knowledge the Mission has in PSE has grown tremendously.
  - XXX Mission is much more aware of PSE as a tool for J2SR.

- Leadership support was a highly ranked change focusing on increases in senior leadership buy-in and prioritization of PSE. Examples included:
  - My Mission has embraced PSE and we have leadership buy-in to do PSE.
  - Senior leadership buy-in critical to the success of PSE.
  - PSE is a clear priority for Mission Director.

- Working groups included responses that highlighted the transformation and leadership of the PIVOT Change Teams as ongoing, cross-sectoral, PSE working groups. Examples included:
  - PSE working group formed (or forming!) that includes representation from technical and support offices.
  - PSE working group is created and actually action oriented.
  - The working group is a platform beyond technical offices spotlighting skills in collaboration across offices, strategic vision for PSE, and Mission-level recognition of leadership capacity.

- Cross-office collaboration focused on changes in cooperative learning, planning, and activities across offices. Examples included:
  - The XXX Mission has moved a notch higher in terms of different offices collaborating around private-sector engagement.
  - Closer, more open and trusting relations between technical staff from different offices on designing private-sector engagement activities/strategies.
  - Cross-office thinking on PSE.

- PSE action planning included responses that focused on increased PSE action planning in their Mission. Examples included:
  - Identified concrete opportunities to explore with the private sector across technical offices.
  - Planned PSE related activity in the next months to use USAID mechanisms and identify new PSE opportunities and document them.
  - PSE is integral to an XXX assessment being planned.

Changes in PSE Activities and Approaches: While relatively less frequent, approximately 10 percent of participants’ responses focused on changes in the way individual participants or their Missions engaged with the private sector. This included increased activities and interactions with private-sector stakeholders, new ways of doing business with the private sector (e.g., co-creating activities with private sector actors), and working with new kinds of private-sector entities. Examples included:

- PIVOT increased my personal and my team’s direct engagement with the private sector.
- Ensure that regional coordination platforms in XX country engage with the private sector through consultative meetings.
- Expanding private sector players to include new/smaller businesses and help them organize themselves.

Changes in Relationships: Finally, approximately five percent of responses underscored PIVOT’s contribution to improved relationships or expanded networks. Examples included:

- My networks have increased: both PIVOT-wise and Mission wide acquaintances. This improves my ability to know where to go for assistance.
- Expanded network, as over the last couple of months I have gotten to know people from the other five Missions and have gotten closer to the ones from my Mission as we travel and work together.
ANNEX 10: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PSE PLANS

Purpose and Methods

The purpose of this analysis was to look for key differences and similarities across the Private-Sector Engagement (PSE) Plans for USAID Missions in Africa involved in the PIVOT program and not involved in the PIVOT program. This analysis is by no means comprehensive. It does, however, provide an additional perspective on the integration of PSE knowledge and skills across Missions in Africa.

Five PIVOT Mission PSE Plans (all but USAID/Rwanda, which has not yet submitted its PSE Plan for review) and four non-PIVOT Mission PSE Plans were included in the review.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PIVOT MISSIONS</th>
<th>NON-PIVOT MISSIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Africa</td>
<td>Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Senegal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Malawi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The researcher reviewed each of the PSE Plans and took notes according to the following five criteria:

1. Does the plan directly or indirectly mention integrating collaborating, learning, and/or adapting principles, processes, activities, or behaviors? (Note: anything related to subcomponents counts.)

2. Does the Mission have a cross-sectoral, cross-functional PSE working group?

3. How specific is the PSE Plan (dates, clear action items, rationale for why they are taking certain actions, etc.)?

4. Does the plan take a Mission-wide (or whole-of-Mission/holistic) approach to PSE? Does the plan promote (directly or indirectly) changes in staff mindsets or organizational culture and operations that foster doing business differently with private-sector stakeholders (e.g., proactive PSE, co-creation, relationship management, etc.)?
   a. Does the PSE Plan focus on competencies and incentives for staff to take up PSE practices?
   b. Does the PSE Plan mention any of the behaviors associated with the 5 key PIVOT competencies?

5. How learning-focused is the plan? Do they mention how they will monitor and track their PSE efforts? Do they mention how they will learn and adapt and adjust their PSE strategy/work as they go?
   a. Does the plan advance PSE metrics beyond number of deals, funds leveraged, capital mobilized, etc.? If so, what are they tracking?

High-Level Themes:

1. Collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) principles appear more frequently in PIVOT PSE Plans than in non-PIVOT PSE Plans.

   Although only directly mentioned in one PSE Plan (USAID/Madagascar), all of the PIVOT PSE Plans incorporate principles associated with CLA to varying degrees. Almost all of the non-PIVOT PSE Plans reviewed here do not focus on concepts related to collaborating, learning, and adapting (except for USAID/Senegal).

---

20 Promote personal and team readiness to engage in a change management process around PSE; identify areas of alignment between private sector and USAID interests; design and implement multi-sectoral and multi-functional PSE action planning processes; convert PSE opportunities into strategic programmatic approaches; develop and manage relationships with private sector contacts.
However, in the PIVOT PSE Plans, the focus on CLA concepts was nascent. Across the plans, there was often a sporadic mention of knowledge management, learning, or collaboration approaches. There did not appear to be an intentional, systematic, and resourced approach to CLA in the PIVOT PSE Plans. For example, many of the PSE Plans articulate a general understanding of the CLA mindset (“making mistakes and changing course, but continuously learning”) but often did not clearly outline how they will operationalize those concepts in their day-to-day work related to PSE (for example, by establishing processes for learning, resourcing effective adaptation, etc.) One thing to note is that most, if not all, of the PIVOT and non-PIVOT PSE Plans mention that the plan is a working document and will be reviewed and updated periodically.

**EXEMPLARY:** One PIVOT Mission, USAID/Madagascar, included CLA concepts throughout their PSE Plan. Notably, they integrated a focus on CLA-related process milestones for the Mission, such as quarterly pause and reflect sessions to examine what PSE milestones have been met or not met and why, the number of after action reviews with principal stakeholders held following major events, or the number of leadership development opportunities in which staff have been able to participate.

2. **Building soft skills required for PSE (active listening, making the pitch, relationship building, leadership) was largely missing from non-PIVOT and PIVOT PSE Plans.**

   Across both the PIVOT and non-PIVOT PSE Plans, soft skill development needed for effective PSE was scarcely mentioned. Of the PIVOT Missions, USAID/Madagascar was the only Mission to mention a focus on soft skill development.

   **EXEMPLAR:** USAID/Madagascar’s plan outlines how the Mission will use CLA methods to develop and manage its PSE efforts. They write, “these methods will create opportunities for staff to develop and exercise leadership skills (e.g., active listening, critical thinking) at various levels in the Mission.” However, the Mission’s plan for soft skill development is only mentioned in broad terms in the plan.

3. **There was more of a stated focus on requirements for PSE in non-PIVOT Mission PSE Plans than in PIVOT PSE Plans.**

   Most of the non-PIVOT PSE Plans only focused on what the Mission was required to do for PSE. For example, several of the plans wrote about what was required and how the Mission planned to execute those requirements. They used language like, “the Mission is required to do the following” or “the Mission is expected to” and noted that incentives for PSE uptake at the Mission were linked to accountability.

   However, PIVOT PSE plans did not focus on the fact that some PSE activities are required by USAID. Several PIVOT PSE Plans also went beyond what was strictly required in terms of PSE activities they planned at their Missions.

4. **The most common incentive for PSE is recognition in the form of annual awards given out by the Mission Director.**

   Awards for exemplary PSE work were included in both PSE and non-PSE Plans.

5. **Market-based approaches were included more in PIVOT PSE Plans than in non-PIVOT PSE Plans.**

   Almost all PIVOT PSE Plans mention the need for co-creation and market-based solutions. However, two Missions in particular, USAID/Senegal and USAID/Southern Africa, went into great detail about how they were going to institutionalize the use of market-based solutions for PSE at their Missions. Other non-PIVOT PSE Plans sparingly mentioned the need for market-based solutions.

   **EXEMPLAR:** Every time an activity is designed, USAID/Senegal and USAID/Southern Africa plan to institutionalize the mandate to ask a series of questions about PSE and market-based approaches. For example, the Missions formalized how they would ask questions from the Agency-level PSE Plan in the Program Cycle:
1. Can the private sector solve this problem by itself?
2. Could there be a market-based approach to addressing this challenge?
3. What are the roles and interests of the private sector in addressing this challenge?
4. Are there factors constraining the private sector from involvement and investment?
5. Is there a role for USAID to help alleviate or eliminate these constraints?

**EXEMPLARY:** In addition, at USAID/Senegal, when a Statement of Work (SOW), Performance Work Statement (PWS), Statement of Objectives (SOO), or Program Description does not include a proposed private-sector partnership or a market-based approach, a justification memo, explaining why, prepared by the PSE advisor should be attached to the SOW, PWS, SOO or Program Description when routed for clearance.

6. Plans for learning from PSE activities are limited across non-PIVOT and PIVOT Missions.

Only a handful of PIVOT and non-PIVOT Missions explained how they plan to learn from their PSE efforts in their PSE Plans. Even when it was written about, the plan for learning from PSE activities was not specific. Across PIVOT and non-PIVOT Missions, the most common learning activity was hosting PSE trainings but not much detail was given beyond that.

**EXEMPLARY:** USAID/Kenya has a planning matrix in their PSE plan to guide technical teams at the Mission in the PSE partner selection process. The planning matrix has several learning-focused questions such as “why engage the private sector?” and “what are partners looking for?” It also outlines different ways to collaborate and has a section for next steps and actions the Mission will take. This is an example of one way USAID/Kenya is integrating learning and adapting into its PSE Plan.

7. Indicators of successful PSE were scarce across non-PIVOT and PIVOT PSE Plans.

Beyond the number of deals, private capital mobilized, and funds leveraged, the majority of PIVOT and non-PIVOT Missions did not include indicators they were tracking to measure and learn from their PSE efforts.

**EXEMPLARY:** Notably, USAID/Senegal has a robust, learning-focused PSE Plan with a set of comprehensive indicators. The indicators are organized into three categories: PSE across the Mission’s Program Cycle, Mission culture for PSE, and diversification of the Mission’s partner base. The indicators are listed below.

**Potential indicators for PSE across the Mission’s Program Cycle**
- Number of new USAID activities designed that incorporate PSE
- Total private-sector resources leveraged

**Potential indicators for the Mission’s culture for PSE**
- Number of individuals who complete PSE training
- Number of private-sector services (such as assistance with due diligence, MOUs, risk assessments) provided by the PSE Team to Mission
- Number of Interagency Teams formed
- Number of brown bag presentations held on specific PSE tools

**Potential indicators for diversification of Mission’s partner base**
- Number of private-sector opportunities explored
- Number of private-sector partnerships executed that leverage at least 1:1 in resources
- Number of private-sector engagement events
- Number of private enterprises invited to PSE events
- Number of private-sector partners recorded in CRM tool
ANNEX II: PIVOT VIDEOS MOST SIGNIFICANT CHANGE ANALYSIS

Purpose and Methods

The purpose of this analysis was to look across the interviews captured on video with PIVOT participants (Cohort members, implementing partners, etc.) to analyze responses about the most significant changes that have occurred as a result of the PIVOT Cohort program. Fourteen interview videos were analyzed. The researcher took verbatim notes of the sections of the interviews when most significant changes were mentioned and conducted a thematic analysis across the interview data. Key themes and direct quotes from interviewees are listed below. One important thing to note is that interviewees were asked these questions in group settings and for social and political reasons may have given responses that skewed more positively. Most questions focused on job-related skills and knowledge as well as organizational conditions within their Missions, which may have prompted participants to respond in a manner where they and their Missions would be viewed favorably by others (i.e., over-reporting of desired behaviors and conditions and under-reporting of undesired ones.)

High-Level Themes

When asked what has been the most significant change since the start of the PIVOT Cohort program, interviewees shared thoughts about five key themes:

1. An increased understanding of what PSE is.
2. A mindset shift away from thinking that PSE is just one person’s job to PSE being everyone’s job.
3. Increased levels of self-awareness and leadership skills.
4. An increased understanding of how to manage relationships effectively, both within Missions and with private-sector partners.
5. The development of trusting, open relationships.

The five key themes that emerged from the analysis are listed in greater detail below:

1. **Interviewees involved in PIVOT report that there has been an increased understanding of what PSE is as a result of the program.** Interviewees explain that one of the most significant changes they’ve observed since the start of PIVOT is the awareness the program has created in Missions about PSE. Mission staff spoke about how PSE is being integrated across their Mission’s technical work and culture. Implementing partners also note that they have observed a big change in the PIVOT Change Teams from watching them go from being in a position of learning about PSE to being able to coach, mentor, and teach others within their Missions about why PSE is important.
   a. “At the Mission, there has been an increased awareness of what PSE is and how we might apply it. Both at the CDCS and PAD levels.”
   b. “One significant change I have seen is the awareness we have created in the Mission. For me, I work with the health team. For the health team to be able to do PSE, the health team is quite structured—we have earmarks, etc. but now the health team is thinking about integrating PSE into health project designs. The health office director has invited me to other platforms to talk about PSE for other projects. It’s amazing how the offices are starting to do PSE.”
   c. “We got the Mission excited about PSE. For our CDCS, we have a whole development objective related to PSE.”
   d. “What I have seen that is a really big change is that this group has gone from being the position of we have so much to learn and we are still trying to get our hands on what this is and then see them shift into a leadership role, we are teaching other people, we can explain why PSE is important, and we can coach and mentor others in our Mission. That has been a real change over the past few months.”
e. “I think with PIVOT we’ve moved towards a process to integrate PSE into our culture. Change is a slow process. We haven’t transformed the Mission in a few months, but we see people engaging more thoughtful and open-endedly with how do we increase our development impact through partnership with the private sector.”

2. Interviewees report a mindset shift away from thinking that PSE is just one person’s job to PSE being everyone’s job. In addition to increased awareness about what PSE is, interviewees also note that there has been a mindset shift away from Mission staff thinking that PSE is just one person’s job to thinking about PSE as everyone in the Mission’s job. In addition, Mission staff spoke about how PSE is not an “add on” but rather a different way of doing work.
   a. “Everyone is thinking the same—not just one person. It’s a concept and way of work that is starting to be integrated into the way people do their work.”
   b. “Before PIVOT, the feeling in the Mission was that we had a PSE advisor and everything was his work. It was his thing. It was an individual task. Now it is everyone’s task.”
   c. “The most significant change that I have seen come as a result of the PIVOT program. After the PEPSE TDY—the acceptability of PSE across the Mission. Started to understand that PSE is part of their day to day work, not in addition to their work.”

3. Interviewees involved in PIVOT report increased levels of self-awareness and leadership skills. Interviewees shared about how PIVOT has increased their levels of self-awareness, such as by understanding their enneagram type and what that means for how they show up and manage tension in the workplace. They also spoke about how PIVOT has strengthened their leadership skills. Interviewees observe that they themselves have and have seen others take on more leadership opportunities, such as briefing the Mission Director about the importance of PSE.
   a. “The program has impacted my leadership skillset in a pretty important way. To bring in the soft skill side into everything I do. It’s definitely much more at the forefront of my mind now I’m trying to work in a different way. To do things—we are all very busy—but thinking more holistically about people. Taking the time to pause and ask how people are doing.”
   b. “For me, my leadership skills have been so much impacted. I had the opportunity to brief the MD and to review our PS landscape assessment and brief the whole Mission.”
   c. “The Agency has a leadership philosophy which talks about leadership at every level. This program is the means to realize that. People who come are so thrilled (visitors from Washington) to see the voices of FSN leadership is at the center of this experience and I think one of the most significant changes is inviting staff who are not office directors—this is lower than office director staff, so technical staff—giving them a mandate for Mission-wide change and inviting them to work at a level that far exceeds what their PD says on a team and giving them the resources to do it and watching them thrive.”

4. Interviewees report an increased understanding of how to manage relationships effectively, both within Missions and with private-sector partners. Interviewees spoke about how the PIVOT program has helped them understand themselves better. By creating an open environment for sharing, interviewees note that PIVOT has enabled the development of more holistic relationships with their colleagues. In addition, interviewees spoke about the value of learning how to effectively manage relationships with private-sector businesses.
   a. “When I think about the best moments of PIVOT it’s been the discussions about how we work together, our personalities, how we don’t work together sometimes, conflict that can arise in Missions. We talk about deep personal issues that we would normally never have the time to talk about in a Mission—even—one would be talking about deep psychological issues. Yet it’s so much part of why we struggle in our day to day work. We have conflict and we don’t want to work with someone. How do we deal with that? The enneagram and leadership skills development has been critical for moving the teams forward and building that solidarity and helping the team bond and work better together.”
   b. “You have to have in mind at the very beginning what type of partnership you want to have. With the tool, we are able to understand that it is a process and we are learning from the process.”
c. “The most important technical skills that people are building through PIVOT are relationship management (identifying areas of alignment with private sector businesses and development goals) and then starting a relationship, making it a productive meeting, next steps you take, etc.”

5. Interviewees report that there has been a development of trusting, open relationships as a result of PIVOT. Interviewees spoke about how one of the most significant changes they have observed since the beginning of the PIVOT program is the development of holistic relationships in which people feel safe and comfortable to share what is happening in their personal lives and how they are feeling at work. Several interviewees spoke about how unique these types of open and trusting conversations and relationships are in the broader context of USAID.

a. “There is no one hiding anything; any question you ask, everyone is ready to answer. And for me this has really been a very good way of learning, by sharing and also doing. What we are doing at the Mission and also sharing and getting comments from other people. It is really a community of true believers who really want to make private-sector engagement work for the Agency.”

b. “I think being able to come together and see people put themselves in situations when they might be vulnerable just creates a bond and a relationship with people that you can’t gain through doing TDYs at Missions. It’s a unique environment. It helps establish relationships and also get a broader perspective of what people are doing, what they are facing in their jobs, and what challenges and opportunities they see. I’ve never seen an opportunity to gain that in any other setting.”
ANNEX 12: LEARNING REVIEW SURVEY ANALYSIS

Purpose of Learning Review Survey

The Learning Review Survey was developed and administered at the end of the review period to help identify individual and organizational changes related to PSE, CLA, leadership, and change management to which the PIVOT Cohort program may have contributed. It addresses the following sub-questions in Objective 3 of the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review work plan:

- **What evidence is there that PIVOT contributed to improving staff competencies and organizational capacities to engage private-sector actors and foster self-reliance?**
- **What evidence is there that program participants contributed to advancing PSE at their Missions?**

The survey included:

1) **A re-test of PIVOT’s baseline survey**: PIVOT’s baseline survey was initially given to PIVOT Cohort members at the start of the program in March 2019 to assess individual knowledge and skills as well as organizational readiness for PSE at the beginning of the PIVOT Cohort program. This survey provided an endline assessment to help identify staff learning and organizational changes since the start of the program.

2) **A comparison of the PIVOT Cohort group with PSE POCs in Missions across the Agency**: This comparison group analysis was designed to identify potential similarities and differences in individual knowledge and skills as well as organizational conditions between PIVOT Cohort members and non-PIVOT PSE POCs.

3) **An analysis of strengths and challenge areas**: The analysis ranked mean scores across all survey items to identify the Cohort’s “Top Ten” highest scored items and the “Bottom Ten” lowest scored items. It did the same with PSE POC scores and compared highest and lowest scored items across groups. This provided some indication of group strengths and areas for improvement that could help guide future planning efforts.

The survey results can shed light on program contributions to individual and organizational changes, help shape future PIVOT iterations and other Agency capacity building efforts, and inform work on the PSE Evidence and Learning Plan and Self-Reliance Learning Agenda (SRLA). They can also serve as a baseline for measuring future changes in PIVOT Cohort staff and Missions, as well as PSE readiness in Missions more generally.

Survey Design

The Learning Review survey consisted of 77 items with Likert-type response options and an item for open-ended comments.21

- 35 items were from the PIVOT baseline surveys (22 from the individual baseline; 13 from the change team baseline) initially administered to PIVOT Cohort members in March 2019.
- Nine items were from the PSE POC survey initially administered to all PSE POCs in June/July 2019
- 31 items were new, assessing individual and organizational changes aligned with promising practices identified both by PIVOT participants and the PIVOT-SRLA Literature Review
- Two items assessed participant satisfaction with the PIVOT Cohort program

A separate survey for PSE POCs at non-PIVOT Missions was developed with similar items. The PSE POC version of the survey differed in that it omitted five items specifically related to PIVOT activities and program satisfaction.

---

21 The LR Survey’s coding matrix, including a list of questions, categories, and response scales is provided in Annex B.
The survey was administered online through Google Forms. Data was collected from PIVOT Cohort members and field PSE POCs December 27, 2019 to January 13, 2020. Emails were sent by the Program Lead to the 36 PIVOT participants and 68 non-PIVOT, field-based PSE POCs requesting their participation in the Learning Review survey. Reminder requests for participation were also sent the day before the survey closed.

Survey data was downloaded from Google Forms into Excel, where it was combined and cleaned for analyses in Stata (statistical software tool). Pre- and post-test data for Cohort members were assessed using paired t-tests. Comparisons between PIVOT Cohort participants and non-PIVOT PSE POCs were assessed using independent, two sample t-tests.

Participants:

PIVOT Cohort participants: N=28

- 78 percent of PIVOT Cohort members participated in the survey (28 out of 36)
- 71 percent of PIVOT Cohort members were included in the pre-post survey analysis (24 out of 34)

Cohort members from all six PIVOT Missions participated in the survey (five from USAID/Ghana; six from USAID/Kenya/East Africa; five from USAID/Madagascar; four from USAID/Rwanda; three from USAID/Southern Africa; and five from USAID/Uganda.)

Non-PIVOT PSE POC participants: N=22

- 32 percent of field-based PSE POCs contacted participated in the survey (22 out of 68).

Of these, eight were from non-PIVOT Missions in Africa; seven from Asia Missions; three from Europe and Eurasia Missions; two from Latin America and the Caribbean Missions; and two from Middle East Missions.

Results:

Pre- and Post-Test Changes in the PIVOT Cohort Participants and Missions:

Changes in PIVOT Cohort Members

Overall, Cohort members showed significant gains in individual-level knowledge and skills, especially those related to PSE, Agency policy, and CLA since the start of the PIVOT program. Participants showed significant increases on eight of the nine items focused on PSE knowledge and skills and significant increases on all three items assessing knowledge and implementation of Agency policies. In addition, participants indicated significant gains in three of the five items assessing CLA knowledge and skills.

Table 1.1 presents the results of individual-level changes including the item, pre- and post-test mean scores, percent change in scores, t-test values, and significance levels/p-values. The rows are ordered by percent change. Items in blue showed statistically significant changes between pre- and post-test and their significance levels are noted in red.

For example, in the table’s first item, 24 Cohort members (n=24) participated in both PIVOT’s baseline survey and endline survey. They used a five-point scale to rate their agreement (Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree) with the statement: I know how to make use of USAID’s full breadth of PSE approaches for working with the private sector. Their average (mean) score for baseline survey (or pre-test) at the beginning of the program was 1.708 and their average score

---

22 Non-parametric analyses were conducted on data as well (Wilcoxon signed ranks test for repeated measures, and Mann-Whitney U-tests for independent samples) as they are generally considered more appropriate for ordinal data and small sample sizes. However, the data had relatively normal distributions and, except in a couple of instances, parametric and non-parametric tests yielded similar results. This document reports results from the parametric tests since they are considered more robust measures and notes instances where non-parametric tests offered different results.
in the endline Learning Review survey (or post-test) at the end of the program was 2.667. This represents a 56.1 percent increase in the mean score for the group. The paired t-test value of 6.255 represents the statistically calculated size of the difference relative to the variation in the sample data. The significance level or p-value identifies exactly how likely it is that the differences between the pre- and post-mean scores happened by chance. For example, a p-value of .05 indicates that we can be 95 percent confident that the difference in scores is NOT due to chance. Anything equal to or below .05 is considered statistically significant and is printed in red in the table. In the first line of Table 1.1, the item had a p-value of 0.000 (usually reported in studies as p<.001) which indicates a higher than 99.9 percent chance that this difference in scores was due to chance. The far right column in the table shows the category that the item belongs to—in this case, PSE.

Table 1.1 – Results for PIVOT Cohort Individual-Level Pre- and Post- Surveys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean (n=24)</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean (n=24)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Paired t-test t(23)</th>
<th>Significance p value (≤.05)</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know how to make use of USAID’s full breadth of PSE approaches for working with the private sector.</td>
<td>1.708</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>56.10%</td>
<td>6.255</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand the full spectrum of PSE modalities (financial and non-financial).</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>3.708</td>
<td>43.55%</td>
<td>5.122</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with how to integrate private-sector perspectives and capabilities into strategy and design.</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>32.43%</td>
<td>4.290</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand and can describe the importance of inclusive market systems.</td>
<td>2.042</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I meet someone who works for the private sector, I know how to listen for their interests.</td>
<td>2.708</td>
<td>3.375</td>
<td>24.62%</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I clearly understand how to operationalize the Journey to Self-Reliance.</td>
<td>3.125</td>
<td>3.833</td>
<td>22.67%</td>
<td>3.331</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can identify CLA approaches/tools/techniques to address my Change Team’s challenge/opportunity.</td>
<td>3.458</td>
<td>4.167</td>
<td>20.48%</td>
<td>4.623</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I meet someone who works for the private sector, I know how to describe my work in a way that will be compelling for them.</td>
<td>2.583</td>
<td>3.083</td>
<td>19.35%</td>
<td>3.140</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how CLA can be integrated into my daily work.</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>4.125</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
<td>2.498</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

T-tests are the statistically calculated difference represented in units of standard error. The greater the magnitude of T, the greater the evidence against the null hypothesis (i.e., no difference).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean (n=24)</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean (n=24)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Paired t-test t(23)</th>
<th>Significance p value (≤0.05)</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am able to name industries and private-sector entities in them that would be a useful/beneficial partner for USAID in my country/sector.</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>2.229</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I clearly understand the link between private-sector engagement and the Journey to Self-Reliance.</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>4.625</td>
<td>13.27%</td>
<td>3.680</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) framework.</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>11.34%</td>
<td>2.298</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have systematically and intentionally integrated CLA into my daily work.</td>
<td>3.250</td>
<td>3.583</td>
<td>10.26%</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of how PSE can leverage market-based approaches to achieving outcomes across sectors.</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>9.38%</td>
<td>1.519</td>
<td>0.142* 0.019</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel up-to-date on Agency policies related to self-reliance.</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>6.67%</td>
<td>1.446</td>
<td>0.162* 0.008</td>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand and can describe the importance of private investment in the local national economy.</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>2.958</td>
<td>4.41%</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.543</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I work in an environment that is open to hearing alternative perspectives.</td>
<td>3.917</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2.13%</td>
<td>0.569</td>
<td>0.575</td>
<td>Org. Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I give and receive feedback effectively.</td>
<td>2.458</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use active listening in my work environment.</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>0.327</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to navigate interpersonal conflict in a work environment.</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>4.083</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I practice mindfulness in my work environment</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>2.292</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLA has been a useful approach for addressing my Change Team’s challenge/opportunity.</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>4.042</td>
<td>−7.62%</td>
<td>−1.621</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Wilcoxon signed rank z-scores and p-values are included in blue where they differed from paired t-tests.

In the PIVOT Cohort pre-and post-test analysis, six of the 22 survey items (approximately 30 percent) did not reach the level of statistical significance. Four of these items focused on applying leadership skills within their work environments, one focused on applying CLA in their daily work, and one focused on the ability to describe the importance of PSE within the local national economy. While there may be a number of reasons for this result, it is interesting to note that all of these items focus on applying new skills within their Mission and national contexts. This may relate to participant requests for more applied and contextualized training in the program (see the Learning Review’s Final Report: Program Challenges...
Finding no significant changes between pre- and post-test survey items for leadership skills, in particular, was surprising in light of considerable interview and Outcome Harvesting data highlighting that many participants valued the leadership aspects of PIVOT’s curriculum highly. In addition, when the mean scores of all Learning Review survey items were ranked from highest to lowest, three of the ten highest rated survey items for the Cohort focused on leadership skills. Perhaps responses on the survey did not change significantly because these items focused on the application of such skills in their work environment. This explanation may be supported by the slight decrease (non-significant) in participants’ pre- and post-test ratings for Mission-level openness to and effective practice of leadership skills among other staff. Participants may not have the opportunity or authority to apply new leadership skills within their work contexts. An alternative explanation for some of these items, however, may relate to the measurement scales. For example, while most survey items had a five-point rating scale (e.g., strongly agree to strongly disagree) the scale for three of the four non-significant leadership items only had a three-point scale (rarely, sometimes, very often). The limited response options may not have been adequate or sensitive enough to capture changes in these areas.

**PIVOT Mission-Level Changes**

Overall, the Learning Review survey results showed significant increases in participants’ pre- and post-test ratings of their Mission’s organizational readiness for PSE and Mission staff’s understanding of Agency policies. Participants indicated significant increases in how often their Missions consulted private-sector stakeholders in developing strategies, designs, and solicitations; integrated PSE into staff performance evaluations and activity evaluations; and had formalized processes for reporting PSE. In addition, participants’ estimates of how many staff are open to and can effectively implement Agency-wide policies and initiatives related to self-reliance increased significantly.

**Table 1.2 – Results for PIVOT Mission-Level Changes from Pre- and Post-Test Surveys**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean (n=24)</th>
<th>Post-Test Mean (n=24)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
<th>Paired t-test t(23)</th>
<th>Significance p value (≤.05)</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s annual evaluations have work objectives that include private-sector engagement as a core part of performance evaluation?</td>
<td>1.042</td>
<td>4.958</td>
<td>376.00%</td>
<td>7.146</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s strategy, designs, and solicitations integrate PSE as an evaluation criterion?</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>6.000</td>
<td>148.28%</td>
<td>6.701</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Mission consistently and strategically consults and engages the private sector in approaching development and/or humanitarian issues.</td>
<td>1.375</td>
<td>3.292</td>
<td>139.39%</td>
<td>8.860</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s strategy, designs, and solicitations integrate market-based approaches and promote engaging the private sector directly to increase development impact?</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>112.50%</td>
<td>5.504</td>
<td><strong>0.000</strong></td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Pre-Test Mean (n=24)</td>
<td>Post-Test Mean (n=24)</td>
<td>% Change</td>
<td>Paired t-test t(23)</td>
<td>Significance p value (≤.05)</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does your Mission/office have a formalized processes for reporting PSE (e.g., through a Mission Order, relationship management approach, etc.) which is linked to Mission/office development objectives?</td>
<td>3.053</td>
<td>4.842</td>
<td>58.62%</td>
<td>2.277</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission can effectively describe and implement Agency-wide policies and initiatives related to self-reliance in the Mission’s daily operations?</td>
<td>5.042</td>
<td>6.333</td>
<td>25.62%</td>
<td>4.021</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission are open to integrating Agency-wide policies and initiatives related to self-reliance into the Mission’s daily operations?</td>
<td>6.250</td>
<td>7.417</td>
<td>18.67%</td>
<td>4.264</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission are effectively implementing CLA as a holistic management approach into the daily operations of the Mission?</td>
<td>5.875</td>
<td>6.792</td>
<td>15.60%</td>
<td>1.920</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission are open to engaging with the private sector and understand the implications of PSE for the Mission’s operations or programming?</td>
<td>5.667</td>
<td>6.250</td>
<td>10.29%</td>
<td>1.834</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission know what tools and approaches are available to them for engaging with the private sector and are able to use them effectively?</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>4.917</td>
<td>5.36%</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission are open to integrating Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) as a holistic management approach and into how the Mission operates?</td>
<td>7.542</td>
<td>7.667</td>
<td>1.66%</td>
<td>0.421</td>
<td>0.678</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission effectively demonstrate and practice leadership skills in their daily jobs?</td>
<td>6.909</td>
<td>6.636</td>
<td>–3.95%</td>
<td>–1.240</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission see leadership skills as a core component of staff development?</td>
<td>8.833</td>
<td>8.458</td>
<td>–4.25%</td>
<td>–1.619</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Items that did not show significant changes during the program focused on participants’ estimates of the extent to which staff in their Missions were open or able to effectively integrate PSE, CLA, and leadership tools and approaches into their work. These results, for PSE in particular, were surprising in light of strong and consistent interview data from Cohort members and Mission Directors suggesting that staff in PIVOT Missions had increased awareness and openness to PSE.
This may be due, in part, to suggestions that changes in Missions’ culture and operations were still nascent. It should be noted however, that data collection methods may have affected results as well. Program implementers collected baseline data for these particular items through a group discussion process, where Change Teams considered these items and then agreed on a single score to estimate staff openness and abilities related to PSE, CLA, and leadership. The Learning Review was not able to replicate these conditions. In the Learning Review survey, individual Change Team members (paired) rated these same questions individually. The analysis compared mean scores by Change Team to the baseline scores. The dynamics of group discussion and decision-making in the baseline, however, may have impacted results differently than individual ratings in the endline, making the comparison of pre- and post-tests difficult to interpret.

Comparing PIVOT Cohort group with Non-PIVOT PSE POCs

In addition to pre- and post-test analyses, the Learning Review also compared the PIVOT Cohort survey responses with those from field-based PSE POCs at non-PIVOT Missions. Because the PSE POC group assignment was not controlled by investigators and there was no opportunity for a pre-test of this group, this comparison resembles a quasi-experimental nonequivalent group, post-test only design.

At the start of the PIVOT Cohort program, the PSE POCs were not considered appropriate for a matched comparison analysis. PIVOT Cohort participants included staff from a variety of technical and functional offices across their Missions, many of whom had little knowledge or experience with private-sector engagement prior to the program. In contrast, the field PSE POCs are usually selected based on considerable expertise and experience in PSE.

No true baseline measures were available to test the assumption of nonequivalence for most survey items. However, four items on the PIVOT baseline surveys (administered to PIVOT Cohort members in March 2019), overlapped with those on an Agency-wide PSE POC survey (administered in June 2019). These included:

1. I understand USAID’s full spectrum of PSE approaches, including financial and non-financial modalities.

2. I have the experience and skills to integrate private-sector perspectives and capabilities into planning, designing approaches, and implementation.

3. I clearly understand the link between private-sector engagement and the Journey to Self-Reliance.

4. My Mission consistently and strategically consults and engages the private sector in approaching development and/or humanitarian issues.

A preliminary analysis in Stata examined differences among the PIVOT Cohort members (n=33) and PSE POCs from non-PIVOT Missions (n=35) (serving here as a pre-test). The results showed that, as might be expected, the PSE POCs group had significantly higher scores than PIVOT Cohort members on all four items. However, when the PIVOT Cohort and PSE POC groups were asked the same four items on the Learning Review Survey (serving as a post-test here), there were no significant differences in responses between groups. Tables 2.1 and 2.2 show the data comparing responses on these four items at pre- and post-test periods.

---

24 In the PSE POC survey, three PSE POCs were from PIVOT Missions (Ghana; Kenya/East Africa; Southern Africa). These participants were removed from the PSE POC group for the purposes of this analysis. Because these individuals participated in the PIVOT Cohort individual and change team baseline surveys, their responses are included in that group.
The results of these limited pre- and post-tests between groups indicate that the PSE POC group showed no significant changes between the pre-and post-test on these four items, whereas the PIVOT Cohort group showed significant increases. The limited number of questions and small sample sizes make it difficult to draw conclusions from this data. The analysis suggests, however, that for these four overlapping questions at least, while PIVOT participants’ ratings at the beginning of the program were significantly lower than the PSE POCs, by the end of the program, their gains in PSE knowledge and skills show no significant differences from the PSE POCs. This provides some support to claims that PIVOT was effective in contributing to increased staff and organizational changes.

In the Learning Review survey, the only significant differences between the two groups were in the areas of CLA, PSE Working Groups, and Agency field support for PSE. In these areas, PIVOT Cohort members had significantly higher scores than the PSE POCs group. Table 2.3 identifies those items on the survey that showed significant differences between groups, including group means, t-scores, and significance levels.

---

25 While only eight participants from the original PSE POC group (pre-tests group, n=35) participated in the Learning Review Survey (post-test group, n=22), an independent, two-sample t-test between groups on 10 overlapping questions revealed no significant differences in responses between PSE POC groups. In addition, a repeated measures test among the eight PSE POC participants who took both surveys also yielded no significant differences.
Table 2.3 – Comparison of PIVOT Cohort and Non-PIVOT Field PSE POCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Pre-Test Mean (n=22)</th>
<th>Cohort Mean (n=28)</th>
<th>% Difference</th>
<th>Independent two-sample t-test t(48)</th>
<th>Significance p value</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) framework.</td>
<td>3.818</td>
<td>4.536</td>
<td>17.89%</td>
<td>3.407</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand how CLA can be integrated into my daily work.</td>
<td>3.727</td>
<td>4.214</td>
<td>12.27%</td>
<td>2.365</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission are open to integrating Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) as a holistic management approach and into how the Mission operates?</td>
<td>6.409</td>
<td>7.357</td>
<td>13.77%</td>
<td>2.009</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your PSE working group in terms of levels of: a. Trust</td>
<td>3.705</td>
<td>4.607</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>6.016</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>PSE Working Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Communication</td>
<td>3.411</td>
<td>4.286</td>
<td>22.74%</td>
<td>-4.414</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Collaboration</td>
<td>3.470</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>22.66%</td>
<td>4.632</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Productivity</td>
<td>3.588</td>
<td>4.036</td>
<td>11.75%</td>
<td>2.185</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Innovation</td>
<td>3.412</td>
<td>3.821</td>
<td>14.30%</td>
<td>1.853*</td>
<td>0.070*</td>
<td>&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The PSE support that staff at my Mission receive from USAID/Washington is tailored to fit our needs.  
3.318 4.071 20.38% 3.851 0.000 USAID/W Support

The PSE support that staff at my Mission receives from USAID/Washington has continuity and is sustained so that work can build cumulatively over time.  
3.182 3.893 20.09% 3.059 0.004 USAID/W Support

USAID/Washington has helped staff at my Mission connect with relevant U.S. or multinational companies.  
2.618 3.500 28.83% 4.081 0.000 USAID/W Support

Mission staff focus on developing more equal, co-created collaborations with private-sector stakeholders.  
3.272 2.857 –13.54% –1.989 0.052 PSE

Cohort members’ significantly higher scores on CLA items suggest that PIVOT was effective in familiarizing participants with CLA processes and approaches. In addition, differences between groups along all dimensions of PSE Working Groups/Change Teams demonstrate PIVOT’s effectiveness in team-building and team-based learning. Finally, Cohort members’ significantly higher rating of USAID/Washington support suggests that PIVOT’s responsive field support model was successful in addressing needs identified in USAID’s PSE Field Needs Study (November 2018).
In the comparison group analysis, PIVOT Cohort members had significantly higher scores than the PSE POC group in rating their Mission staff’s openness to integrating CLA into Mission operations. They were significantly lower, however, in rating how much their Mission staff focus on developing more equal, co-created collaborations with private-sector stakeholders. The PIVOT Cohort showed no significant differences from PSE POC group along all other organization-level survey items examined. This included:

1. Mission support for PSE (five items, e.g., flexible or dedicated time or funds for PSE; staff recognition or rewards for PSE);
2. Organizational culture supporting PSE (five items, e.g., openness to new ideas; opportunities for staff dialogue or reflection about PSE efforts);
3. PSE operations, practices, and outcomes (nine items, e.g., effective tools for outreach, due diligence, and relationship management; formalized processes for reporting PSE);
4. PSE outcomes (three items, e.g., mobilization of private-sector expertise and funds);
5. Evaluation of PSE efforts (four items, e.g., clear success metrics; M&E integrated into PSE); and
6. Cooperation with other USG or donor organizations on PSE (two items).

The lack of significant differences between groups on organization-level PSE items may support suggestions that changes in PIVOT Missions’ cultures and operations related to PSE are still nascent and will take time to manifest. However, in key informant interviews, both Cohort members and Mission Directors highlighted several changes in their Missions’ culture and operations, including:

- Increased staff awareness and interest in PSE across the Mission;
- PSE integrated into Mission planning and programming across the Program Cycle;
- Expanded leadership support for PSE;
- Improved cross-office collaboration; and
- Doing PSE Differently (e.g., more proactive and intentional PSE; increased private-sector stakeholder consultations, etc.)

Their comments provide additional context for interpreting survey results and suggest areas to focus attention during the next round of data collection.

**Highest and Lowest Scored Survey Items**

The final analysis of survey data ranked the average score for each survey item from highest to lowest and created a “Top Ten” list of highest rated items (i.e., strengths) and “Bottom Ten” list of lowest rated items (i.e., areas for improvement). Tables 3.1 shows items that overlapped between both groups’ highest and lowest rated items.

Four of the six highest scored items for both groups were the same. All of these focused on individual level knowledge and skills for PSE, leadership, and Agency policy. Among the lowest scored items, six out of ten for both groups, were the same. These highlight some specific areas for improvement within the Agency where efforts could be focused to better support PSE. For example, both groups gave low ratings to items related to PSE metrics and evaluation, the availability of flexible or dedicated PSE funds, and opportunities to review and reflect on PSE efforts.

---

26 See Annex 1 for a full list of these items and group means
Table 3.1: Highest Rated Items for Both Cohort Members and PSE POCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cohort Mean</th>
<th>PSE POC Mean</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I clearly understand the link between private-sector engagement and the journey to Self-Reliance.</td>
<td>4.679</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I meet someone who works for the private sector, I know how to listen for their interests.</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of how PSE can leverage market-based approaches to achieving outcomes across sectors.</td>
<td>4.393</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use active listening in my work environment.</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>4.545</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: Lowest Rated Items for Cohort Members and PSE POCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Cohort Mean</th>
<th>PSE POC Mean</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission know what tools and approaches are available to them for engaging with the private sector and are able to use them effectively?</td>
<td>2.607</td>
<td>2.682</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Mission has developed clear success metrics for PSE</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does your Mission/office have a formalized processes for reporting (e.g., through a Mission Order, relationship management approach, etc.) which is linked to Mission/office development objectives?</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>2.682</td>
<td>Mission Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s annual evaluations have work objectives that include private-sector engagement as a core part of performance evaluation?</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td>Mission Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite the workload, people in my Mission find time to review and reflect on how PSE efforts are going.</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>Org. Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are flexible or dedicated funds available at my Mission for pursuing innovative PSE opportunities.</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>Mission Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 3 provides additional tables showing the ten highest and lowest scored items for the PIVOT Cohort members and PSE POCs. Interestingly, PIVOT Cohort members’ top ten items show a variety of categories (e.g., PSE, CLA, leadership, Change Teams, Mission support, Agency policy) as well as a mix of individual, team, and Mission-level items. This seems to reflect the PIVOT program’s multi-component curriculum and highlights both the capacity building and change management aspects of the program. In contrast, for the PSE POC group, eight of their top ten survey items focused on PSE and all items were focused on individual-level skills and knowledge.

In terms of lowest rated items, for both groups all ten focused on organization-level issues. For the PSE POC group, four of the lowest ten items focused on Mission and USAID/Washington support for PSE work. In contrast to the PIVOT Cohort group, some of the lowest scored items PSE POCs focused on were their Mission staff’s implementation of both CLA and leadership skills.
Participant Satisfaction with the PIVOT Cohort Program

Two items on the survey assessed participant satisfaction. On a seven-point scale ranging from Extremely Dissatisfied/Unlikely to Extremely Satisfied/Likely, participant responses indicated high levels of satisfaction with the PIVOT program on both items.

Open-Ended Comments:

The survey elicited 15 comments from Cohort members and three from PSE POCs. Of these, all three from the PSE POCs emphasized their Missions’ strong commitment to PSE strategies, but also indicated that organization-level changes were still in the early stages. One noted that limited PSE opportunities within the country context affected Mission efforts and that responses should be interpreted through that lens. Four of the Cohort members’ comments echoed similar themes. As one participant wrote,

“While it appears through my responses that we didn’t move the needle much on Mission-wide PSE efforts, our PIVOT experience has enabled us to put a framework and workplan in place that will drive this shift over the next year. The plan has FO and Office Director buy-in and direct engagement/leadership from the Deputy Mission Director. From where the Mission started I believe significant progress has been made regarding PSE.” —Cohort member

Three of the comments praised PIVOT’s structure and the opportunities it provided to practice PSE.

“This is a super structured learning program which gives hands-on practical experience compared to one off training. This should not be stopped.” —Cohort member

The remaining eight comments provided suggestions for program improvement such as more leadership engagement, more assistance pulling Missions into existing USAID/Washington’s private-sector partnerships, more learning-by-doing opportunities and help applying new skills (e.g., leadership) within work contexts. A few comments included design recommendations such as fewer calls, a shorter program to allow staff to get back to other work demands, introducing TDYs earlier, and a more targeted approach to selecting participants.
“For a junior staff person—which I am not—the PIVOT program is a great introduction to PSE and the skills necessary for successfully engaging the private sector. For more experienced staff, it was the Kenya meeting where the level of information shared and the actual PSE made the meeting worthwhile. In future design and marketing of this program, the organizers will need to decide WHO the PIVOT training program is for, keeping in mind that in many Missions, junior people often aren’t invited into meetings with the private sector.” —Cohort member

The results of the Learning Review survey provide a snapshot of participants’ experiences and learning in the PIVOT program. They suggest that, overall, Cohort members believe they have significantly increased their knowledge and skills about PSE, CLA, and Agency policy. In comparison to non-PIVOT PSE POCs, they show no significant differences on PSE-related items and significantly higher ratings in CLA and PSE working group trust, communication, collaboration, productivity, and innovation. In addition, after their experiences in PIVOT, they rate USAID/Washington’s support significantly higher than the PSE POCs who did not receive similar support. The survey did not find any difference in ratings of Mission-level conditions supporting PSE between groups. Open-ended comments provide some insight: participants from both groups indicate that organizational changes to support staff’s PSE efforts are still in the early stages and do not reflect Missions’ interest in or commitment to PSE as a pathway to self-reliance. The survey analysis of highest and lowest rated items highlights some of the strengths of PIVOT’s multifaceted approach to PSE showing that, in contrast to PSE POCs who were strongest on individual-level PSE knowledge and skills, Cohort members reported confidence in a variety of categories at individual, team, and Mission-level. In the survey, responses from both groups also pointed to some specific areas for improvement to support organizational readiness to PSE, including improved PSE metrics and evaluation efforts, increased availability of flexible or dedicated PSE funds, and more structured opportunities for staff to review and reflect on their PSE efforts.

Survey Limitations: The survey had a number of limitations, including:

- **Self-reported data:** The survey reflects self-reported assessments rather than direct assessments (e.g., knowledge checks) and may suffer from validity issues. While this limits conclusions that can be drawn from the data, the research literature indicates that self-reported assessments are useful in evaluating professional development efficacy when substantiated by other data.27

- **Potential social desirability and acquiescence biases in responses.** To match responses on repeated measures and examine pre- and post-test changes, participants named were included on their survey forms. Most items focused on job-related skills and knowledge as well as organizational conditions within their Missions, which may have prompted participants to respond in a manner where they and their Missions would be viewed favorably by others (i.e., over-reporting of desired behaviors and conditions and under-reporting of undesired ones.) To help mitigate this bias, participants were assured that individual responses would remain confidential and only reported in aggregated form. In addition, many items on this survey asked participants to rate their agreement with statements using Likert-type responses (i.e., five options ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree) which may be subject to acquiescence biases. Survey respondents may have exhibited tendencies to agree with statements when in doubt, to be polite, or to speed up the survey-taking process. Investigators were unable to use some of the typical methods for countering such biases such as reversing items or providing an N/A or “I don’t know” option because: a) previous baselines had not used these methods and introducing it in the re-test could create problems with response comparisons; b) Google Forms did not allow for an effective “I don’t know” option format (pilot tests indicated that including that option in the allowable formats created confusion). These and other response biases typical of self-reports must be considered in assessing the quality and interpretation of data.

- **Non-equivalent comparison groups:** The comparison of PIVOT Cohort members with PSE POCs in non-PIVOT Missions raises many questions about group equivalencies. For example, the analysis is subject to internal validity threats of selection since group assignment was not random (e.g., self-selected PSE POC participation in survey). Prior

differences in these groups may have affected outcomes. The PSE POCs also do not represent a real control group because their positions and PSE expertise was considerably different from the diverse group of PIVOT Cohort members, most of whom had little if any previous PSE experience. Future Learning Review efforts should, if possible, include a better matched control group and assess pre- and post- changes in both groups.

- **Instrument design:** There were a number of issues with the survey instrument design that may have affected results. For example, the Learning Review survey inherited more than two-thirds of its questions from other surveys. These surveys had varying scales which made comparisons across items more difficult (i.e., required conversion to standardized scores). In addition, some of the original items had three- or four-option scales, which did not appear sensitive enough to capture the variation or changes in responses. In addition, for the Cohort’s baseline assessments of Mission-level readiness for PSE, the methods of data collection (i.e., group discussion) were considerably different than the online survey methods of the Learning Review. As mentioned earlier (see p. 6 of this analysis), the dynamics of group discussion and decision-making in the baseline, may have impacted results differently than individual ratings in the Learning Review survey, making the comparison of pre- and post-tests difficult to interpret.

- **Timing and response rates:** The survey was given approximately six weeks before the end of the Cohort period. Because of this, Cohort responses may not have captured important learning that took place in the last part of the program. In addition, during the period when the survey was administered, PSE plans had just been submitted and the third PIVOT Cohort meeting had just finished. Participants may have been more fatigued than at other points in the program, which may have affected responses (i.e., they may have been more positive if the survey had been given during the final Cohort gathering). In addition, the survey was introduced at the end of December, just before the winter holidays, and while it remained open through January 13, it is possible that this timing lowered the response rate as well. The survey response rates were relatively low for both groups (i.e., 71 percent of Cohort members for pre- and post-test; 78 percent of Cohort members, and 32 percent of PSE POCs for comparison group analyses). The relatively small numbers in each group, especially when combined with self-selection issues, may skew the data and affect the validity of findings.

**Conclusion**

While there are considerable limitations to the Learning Review Survey, a number of fairly clear results emerged from the analysis. These include:

1) The Learning Review survey showed significant increases in participants’ knowledge and skills related to PSE, CLA, and Agency policy since the start of the program. In addition, participants’ highest scored items suggest that PIVOT’s multi-faceted approach built strengths in PSE, CLA, and leadership skills at individual, team, and Mission levels.

2) Results of the survey indicate that, at the end of the PIVOT program, Cohort members showed no difference from PSE POCs on items related to PSE knowledge and skills (on items where pre-and post-tests were available for both groups, results showed that while Cohort members began the program with significantly lower scores on PSE items, by the end of the program there were no significant differences between groups on those items.)

3) The survey also showed that PIVOT Cohort members rated their CLA knowledge and skills, their PSE working group dynamics, and the assistance they received from USAID/Washington significantly higher than non-PIVOT PSE POCs.

4) Findings from the survey analysis showed no significant differences between groups on their assessments of Mission-level conditions supporting PSE (e.g., available funding, allocated staff time or incentives for PSE work, time-saving tools for outreach, due diligence, or relationship management, etc.). Open-ended comments on the survey (and Learning Review interview data) suggest this may be because organization-level changes are still nascent and slower to take hold than individual-level changes.
This analysis of the Learning Review survey provides some insights and useful information about staff and organizational changes to which the PIVOT Cohort program may have contributed. The results, however, are best understood within the context of other information and analyses (e.g., from interviews, document review, etc.) that are part of the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review effort.

Survey Analysis Annexes

Annex A

Table: Organization-Level Items with No Significant Difference between Cohort and PSE POCs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Organization-Level Items with No Significant Differences between Groups</th>
<th>Cohort Mean</th>
<th>PSE POC Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mission support for PSE (5 items)</td>
<td>Senior leaders in my Mission clearly signal that PSE is a priority.</td>
<td>4.536</td>
<td>4.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff PSE efforts are recognized and rewarded at my Mission.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff have flexible or dedicated time for PSE networking, relationship development, and/or relationship management.</td>
<td>3.143</td>
<td>3.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There are flexible or dedicated funds available at my Mission for pursuing innovative PSE opportunities.</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>2.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s annual evaluations have work objectives that include private-sector engagement as a core part of performance evaluation?</td>
<td>5.036</td>
<td>4.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture (5 items)</td>
<td>The organizational culture in my Mission values new ideas and is open to new ways of doing things.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Despite the workload, people in my Mission find time to review and reflect on how PSE efforts are going.</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my Mission, most staff are eager to share their experiences about what does and does not work in PSE.</td>
<td>3.179</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my Mission, staff have structured opportunities for peer dialogue and learning about PSE.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In my Mission, staff communicate and coordinate around PSE across offices.</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Organization-Level Items with No Significant Differences between Groups</td>
<td>Cohort Mean</td>
<td>PSE POC Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organizational Operations &amp; Practices (9 items)</strong></td>
<td>My Mission assesses and actively pursues market-based approaches to achieve objectives and results.</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Mission consistently considers a wide range of private-sector perspectives, resources, and capabilities in its planning and programming across the Program Cycle.</td>
<td>3.429</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Mission consistently and strategically consults and engages the private sector in approaching development and/or humanitarian issues.</td>
<td>3.321</td>
<td>3.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Mission is integrating PSE approaches across the Program Cycle.</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Mission is expanding its use of PSE approaches and tools (financial and non-financial) that unlock the potential of the private sector in achieving outcomes.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Mission has effective tools and systems for PSE in these areas: a. outreach; b. due diligence; c. relationship management.</td>
<td>3.14/3.56/3.54</td>
<td>3.17/3.17/3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does your Mission/office have formalized processes for reporting (e.g., through a Mission Order, relationship management approach, etc.) that are linked to Mission/office development objectives?</td>
<td>4.786</td>
<td>4.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s strategy, designs, and solicitations integrate market-based approaches and promote engaging the private sector directly to increase development impact?</td>
<td>5.893</td>
<td>5.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does your Mission have opportunities to engage directly with private-sector entities?</td>
<td>6.893</td>
<td>6.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes (3 items)</strong></td>
<td>My Mission’s PSE efforts help support local private-sector actors as change agents.</td>
<td>3.071</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does your Mission mobilize private-sector expertise and innovation to address development and humanitarian challenges?</td>
<td>5.929</td>
<td>5.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent does your Mission mobilize private-sector financial resources to address development and humanitarian challenges?</td>
<td>5.571</td>
<td>5.583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PSE Evaluation (4 items)</strong></td>
<td>My Mission has developed clear success metrics for PSE.</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>2.917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Mission integrates monitoring and evaluation systems to track, adapt, and learn from PSE efforts into our activities.</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Mission works to build and act on the evidence of what works, and what does not, in private-sector engagement.</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>3.417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s strategy, designs, and solicitations integrate PSE as an evaluation criterion?</td>
<td>6.143</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work with Other USG &amp; Donors (2 items)</strong></td>
<td>My Mission communicates and coordinates with other USG agencies around PSE efforts.</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>My Mission communicates and coordinates with other donor organizations around PSE efforts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Annex B: Learning Review Survey Coding Matrix**

For access to the Learning Review Survey Coding Matrix, please contact Ilana Shapiro at ilanasemail@gmail.com.
### Annex C: Highest and Lowest Scored Items for PIVOT Cohort Members and PSE POCs

#### Table 3.2: PIVOT Cohort’s Ten Highest Scored Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I clearly understand the link between private-sector engagement and the Journey to Self-Reliance.</td>
<td>4.679</td>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take a leadership role in expanding PSE efforts within my OU or Mission.</td>
<td>4.607</td>
<td>PSE/Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your PSE working group in terms of levels of: a. Trust</td>
<td>4.607</td>
<td>Change Teams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with the collaborating, learning, and adapting (CLA) framework.</td>
<td>4.536</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior leaders in my Mission clearly signal that PSE is a priority.</td>
<td>4.536</td>
<td>Mission Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I meet someone who works for the private sector, I know how to listen for their interests.</td>
<td>4.429</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of how PSE can leverage market-based approaches to achieving outcomes across sectors.</td>
<td>4.393</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission see leadership skills as a core component of staff development?</td>
<td>4.393</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use active listening in my work environment.</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please rate your PSE working group in terms of levels of: c. Collaboration</td>
<td>4.357</td>
<td>Change Teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table 3.3: PIVOT Cohort’s Ten Lowest Scored Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission know what tools and approaches are available to them for engaging with the private sector and are able to use them effectively?</td>
<td>2.607</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Mission has developed clear success metrics for PSE.</td>
<td>2.679</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does your Mission/office have a formalized processes for reporting (e.g., through a Mission Order, relationship management approach, etc.) that is linked to Mission/office development objectives?</td>
<td>2.714</td>
<td>PSE Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s annual evaluations have work objectives that include private-sector engagement as a core part of performance evaluation?</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>Mission Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite the workload, people in my Mission find time to review and reflect on how PSE efforts are going.</td>
<td>2.786</td>
<td>Org. Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Mission integrates monitoring and evaluation systems to track, adapt, and learn from PSE efforts into our activities.</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission staff focus on developing more equal, co-created collaborations with private-sector stakeholders.</td>
<td>2.857</td>
<td>PS Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are flexible or dedicated funds available at my Mission for pursuing innovative PSE opportunities.</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>Mission Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Mission communicates and coordinates with other donor organizations around PSE efforts.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Donor Relationships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In my Mission, staff have structured opportunities for peer dialogue and learning about PSE.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Org. Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 3.4: PSE POC Group’s Ten Highest Scored Items</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have the knowledge and skills to develop and manage relationships with private-sector contacts.</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know how to identify areas of alignment between private-sector interests and USAID’s development priorities.</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take a leadership role in expanding PSE efforts within my OU or Mission.</td>
<td>4.667</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I clearly understand the link between private-sector engagement and the Journey to Self-Reliance.</td>
<td>4.583</td>
<td>Agency Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use active listening in my work environment.</td>
<td>4.545</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am familiar with how to integrate private sector perspectives and capabilities into strategy and design.</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I meet someone who works for the private sector, I know how to describe my work in a way that will be compelling for them.</td>
<td>4.455</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am aware of how PSE can leverage market-based approaches to achieving outcomes across sectors.</td>
<td>4.417</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand and can describe the importance of private investment in the local national economy.</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I meet someone who works for the private sector, I know how to listen for their interests.</td>
<td>4.409</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.5: PSE POC Group’s Ten Lowest Scored Items</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are flexible or dedicated funds available at my Mission for pursuing innovative PSE opportunities.</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>Mission Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID/Washington has helped staff at my Mission connect with relevant U.S. or multinational companies.</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>USAID/W Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent do your Mission’s annual evaluations have work objectives that include private-sector engagement as a core part of performance evaluation?</td>
<td>2.636</td>
<td>Mission Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission know what tools and approaches are available to them for engaging with the private sector and are able to use them effectively?</td>
<td>2.682</td>
<td>PSE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To what extent does your Mission/office have a formalized processes for reporting (e.g., through a Mission Order, relationship management approach, etc.) that is linked to Mission/office development objectives?</td>
<td>2.682</td>
<td>Mission Operations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PSE support that staff at my Mission receives from USAID/Washington has continuity and is sustained so that work can build cumulatively over time.</td>
<td>2.833</td>
<td>USAID/W Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission are effectively implementing CLA as a holistic management approach into the daily operations of the Mission?</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>CLA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In your estimation, how many staff in your Mission effectively demonstrate and practice leadership skills in their daily jobs?</td>
<td>2.909</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Despite the workload, people in my Mission find time to review and reflect on how PSE efforts are going.</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>Org. Culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My Mission has developed clear success metrics for PSE.</td>
<td>2.917</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANNEX 13: LEARNING REVIEW METHODS SECTION

The following objectives, areas of investigation, and key questions guided this Learning Review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AREA OF INVESTIGATION</th>
<th>KEY QUESTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **OBJECTIVE 1:** Identify what works, what needs improvement, and what other questions need to be explored to help improve PIVOT’s design and implementation, shape future iterations, and inform other change management, PSE, and self-reliance (SR) efforts. | • What worked well in the PIVOT program?  
  • What changes are needed to improve the program?  
  • What additional questions should be explored to improve the program? |
| Program Design & Implementation                |                                                                              |
| **OBJECTIVE 2:** Highlight key factors or conditions that support and inhibit the effectiveness of the PIVOT program including those influencing the shape and development of PIVOT at participating Missions. | • What key factors and conditions supported the effectiveness of PIVOT in advancing PSE?  
  • What key factors and conditions inhibited the effectiveness of PIVOT in advancing PSE? |
| Enablers and Barriers to Advancing PSE through PIVOT |                                                                              |
| **OBJECTIVE 3:** Collect and assess evidence that PIVOT’s capacity building and change management approach resulted in intended changes in participants and their Missions. | • What evidence is there that PIVOT contributed to improving staff competencies and organizational capacities to engage private-sector actors and foster self-reliance?  
  • What evidence is there that program participants contributed to advancing PSE at their Missions? |
| Program’s Contribution to Outcomes              |                                                                              |
| **OBJECTIVE 4:** Examine how evidence from the PIVOT program can help address questions in the Agency-wide PSE Evidence and Learning Plan and the Self-Reliance Learning Agenda. | • Q4: How can PSE support countries in advancing on the Journey to Self-Reliance?  
  • Q13: How did USAID’s organizational structures and staffing, policies, guidance, technical assistance, and capacity building enable PIVOT to foster self-reliance? |
| Implications for SRLA Questions                 |                                                                              |

Learning Review Design

To address these objectives, the Learning Review examined the PIVOT Cohort program through an embedded case study design (Scholtz & Tietje, 2002) that provided both a holistic understanding of the PIVOT program’s design, implementation, and enabling conditions, as well as an assessment of program outcomes related to sub-units of analysis such as individual participants, Change Teams, and Missions. The review utilized iterative, mixed (qualitative and quantitative) methods for data collection and analysis to explore self-reported learning among participants, assessments by Mission Directors and implementing partners, as well as other metrics of change in advancing PSE identified in PSE literature (e.g., organizational conditions supporting PSE readiness). The review examined pre- and post-program changes in participants, Change Teams, and their respective Missions’ culture and operations. Finally, the review also conducted a comparative analysis of PIVOT and non-PIVOT Mission PSE Plans, and provided a nonequivalent posttest only comparison of PIVOT Cohort participants with non-PIVOT, field-based PSE points of contact (POCs) on individual and organizational readiness for PSE.
Data Collection and Analysis

The Learning Review initially envisioned using Theory of Change (ToC) methods to map out the PIVOT Cohort program's underlying assumptions and causal links explaining how and why implementing the program would lead to more effective PSE and self-reliance. Early discussions with the program lead and implementing partners resulted in a draft ToC chart and a co-created PIVOT Roadmap (see Annex 1). These efforts revealed, however, that PIVOT’s innovative, adaptive, and complex pilot did not lend itself well to a ToC evaluation or more traditional, model-testing approaches. While an explicitly articulated ToC might result from PIVOT’s inaugural year to be tested and refined in subsequent iterations, the program’s initial dynamic, responsive design suggested that a modified evaluation approach would be more appropriate and useful. This review remained focused on addressing the learning objectives and key questions; however, it also provided ongoing data summaries and feedback to program implementers and participants to help capture ongoing learning and support program development and improvement. Data collection and summaries included (see Annex xx for details):

**Literature Review:** Conducted during the Learning Review’s preparatory phase, the literature review examined research, evidence, and best practices in PSE-related capacity building, organizational change, enabling environments for PSE, and meaningful measures of success. While not a comprehensive or systematic review of relevant literature, this document highlighted a broad range of existing evidence and current thinking within the Learning Review’s targeted areas of investigation. This summary of research findings and documented learning aimed to provide context for the PIVOT Cohort program’s approach and inform the Learning Review’s methods and findings (see Annex 2).

**Key Informant Interviews:** Learning reviewers conducted 32 key informant interviews with 38 program stakeholders (see Annex xx for a list of KII participants). Thematic analyses were conducted for each participant group using an inductive, grounded theory approach and summary analyses were provided for respondent validation. Key informant interview groups included:

- **Implementing Partners, Affinity Group Leads, and Backstops:** 14 one-hour, semi-structured phone interviews with 20 key informants representing PIVOT’s four implementing partners (IPs), eight Affinity Group Leads (AGLs), and two backstops. Participants provided descriptive information about their roles and activities in PIVOT as well as assessments of what was working well, challenges and areas for improvement, new learning from the program, changes or outcomes to which PIVOT may have contributed, and questions needing further exploration (see Interview Summary in Annex 4).

- **PIVOT Change Teams:** Six one-hour, semi-structured phone interviews with PIVOT Change Team Leads. Participants provided descriptive information about their Change Team’s development and activities, organizational and local contexts affecting their PSE efforts, new learning, changes or outcomes to which PIVOT may have contributed, PSE-related advice to colleagues in other Missions, and questions needing further exploration. Information from these interviews was combined with data collected from other Change Team members and Mission Directors to develop Change Team Charts for each PIVOT Mission: Ghana, Kenya, Madagascar, Rwanda, Southern Africa, Uganda (see Change Team Charts in Annex 7).

- **Mission Directors from PIVOT Missions:** Six 30-minute phone interviews with Mission Directors focused on their assessments of what was working well in the PIVOT program, challenges and areas for improvement, changes or outcomes to which PIVOT may have contributed, what program success would look like from their perspective, and what they would like to learn from PIVOT (see Interview Summary in Annex 6).

- **USAID/Washington Leaders:** Six 30-minute phone interviews with a variety of program-related, PSE, and policy leaders from across the Agency focused on their assessments of what they liked about the PIVOT program approach, concerns or questions they had about it, what program success would look like from their perspective, and what they would like to learn from PIVOT (see Interview Summary in Annex 6).

---

28 All interviews were recorded to enhance accuracy of notes and analysis but were not transcribed.
Focus Group Interviews and Individual Reflection Sheets: The Learning Review’s launch coincided with the midpoint of the PIVOT Cohort program and PIVOT’s second in-person Cohort meeting in Baltimore, September 2–5, 2019. The Learning Review session at the Baltimore meeting provided an important opportunity for data collection from the 35 PIVOT Cohort members, IPs, and AGLs who attended. Participants completed an Individual Reflection Sheet consisting of ten open-ended questions, then discussed their answers to those and other questions in six facilitated focus groups. Questions focused on the Learning Review objectives, including what was working well in the program, areas for improvement, factors or conditions that supported and inhibited their PSE efforts, most significant changes to which the PIVOT program may have contributed, best ways to know and show program success, and what they would most like to learn from the program. Notes from the focus groups were transcribed and a thematic analysis was conducted by group (i.e., Cohort members, IPs, and AGLs) across focus groups and individual reflection sheets. The summary analyses were provided to all participants for respondent validation (see Summary Analyses in Annex 4).

Outcome Harvesting and Most Significant Change Activities: At PIVOT’s third in-person Cohort meeting in Nairobi, Kenya, December 2–6, 2019, 26 PIVOT Cohort members participated in a brief Outcome Harvesting activity for the Learning Review where they brainstormed a list of changes that they had noticed since the start of PIVOT and then ranked the top three changes they believed were most significant. In addition, 14 Cohort members participated in video interviews where they were asked to provide examples of significant changes to which they believed PIVOT had contributed. While these short activities did not reflect a true application of Outcome Harvesting and Most Significant Change methods, they provided participatory opportunities to elicit outcomes across levels of analysis and collect examples or stories of PIVOT- and PSE-related changes. Thematic analyses were conducted separately for each activity and findings were used to supplement and provide comparisons to other data sources and methods in the Learning Review (see Summary Analyses in Annexes 9 and 11).

Comparative Analysis of PSE Plans: Because PSE Plans for all Missions were submitted during the PIVOT-SRLA Learning Review period, the review conducted a brief, informal analysis of PSE Plans across five PIVOT Missions and six non-PIVOT, AFR Missions. The analysis focused on key similarities and differences of plans related to five criteria, including: 1) integration of CLA processes and principles; 2) focus on cross-sectoral and cross-functional approaches to PSE; 3) clarity and specificity of plans; 4) inclusion of staff incentives and competencies for PSE; and 5) integration of monitoring, evaluation, research, and learning (MERL) opportunities and innovations in PSE metrics (see summary in Annex 10).

Learning Review Survey: The Learning Review Survey was developed and administered at the end of the review period to help identify individual changes related to PSE, CLA, leadership knowledge and skills, and organizational changes to which the PIVOT Cohort program may have contributed. The survey consisted of 77 items with Likert-type response options, including 35 from the PIVOT baseline survey; nine from the Agency’s June 2019 PSE POC survey; 31 new items examining promising practices identified by PIVOT participants and in the PSE literature (see potential Change Charts in Annex 7); and two items assessing participant satisfaction. An item for open-ended comments was included as well.

The survey was administered online through Google Forms and data was collected during the period December 27, 2019 to January 13, 2020. Emails were sent by the Program Lead inviting the 36 PIVOT participants to take the survey. In addition, 68 non-PIVOT, field-based PSE POCs were invited to take a slightly modified version of the Learning Review Survey as a comparison group. Reminder requests for participation were sent the day before the survey closed as well. A total of 50 field-based staff (PIVOT Cohort n=28; PSE POCs n=22) participated in the survey representing a total of 28 Missions. Data from the surveys were analyzed using Stata statistical software package (see Summary Results in Annex 12). The survey analysis included:

- A re-test of PIVOT’s baseline survey, initially given to PIVOT Cohort members at the start of the program in March 2019, included 35 items that assessed individual learning and organizational changes since the beginning of the PIVOT Cohort program. Twenty-four Cohort members, representing 71 percent of the total Cohort (24 out of 34),
participated in both tests. Differences in pre- and post-test responses for Cohort members were analyzed in Stata using both paired t-tests and non-parametric, Wilcoxon signed ranks tests.

- **A comparison of the PIVOT Cohort group with PSE POCs** in Missions across the Agency examined similarities and differences in individual knowledge and skills as well as organizational conditions that support PSE. Because the PSE POC group assignment was not controlled by investigators and there was no opportunity for a pre-test of this group, this comparison resembles a non-equivalent, posttest-only design. A separate survey for PSE POCs at non-PIVOT Missions was developed with similar items except for the omission of five items specifically related to PIVOT activities and program satisfaction. Twenty-two non-PIVOT, field-based PSE POCs, representing 32 percent of the field-based PSE POCs contacted (22 out of 68) participated in the Learning Review Survey. Comparisons between PIVOT Cohort participants’ (n=28) and non-PIVOT PSE POCs’ (n=22) responses to 75 items were analyzed in Stata using independent, two sample t-tests and non-parametric, Mann-Whitney U-tests. In addition, the analysis compared each group’s ten highest and ten lowest scored items.

To increase rigor, the Learning Review focused on the triangulation and the transparent synthesis of data from a variety of information sources. To promote knowledge integration, the review drew upon multiple methods of data collection and analysis, shared and validated data analyses with implementing partners and PIVOT Cohort members throughout the Learning Review period, and conducted some data internalization and co-creation of recommendations processes. The goal of these knowledge integration efforts was to inform decision-making and to improve action around current and future PIVOT-related programming, as well as advance and support the use of evidence relevant to the complex, contextualized issues of PSE as a pathway toward self-reliance.

**Verification**

This Learning Review used a mixed methods design, triangulation of data sources and analytical frameworks, and respondent validation to enhance the reliability and validity of findings. Triangulating findings from multiple data sources (e.g., program participants, program leaders, Mission and USAID/Washington leadership, Mission PSE Plans, existing PSE research literature, etc.) helped verify claims and mitigate self-reporting biases. In addition, the use of multiple data analysis methods (e.g., qualitative thematic analyses of interviews and documents, and quantitative pre-post test and comparison group analyses) and respondent validation of findings helped support the trustworthiness of evidence. Mixing qualitative and quantitative methods also helped generate more complete data, corroborated findings, and enhanced insights gained from one method with those from a complementary method. Iterative data collection and analysis also provided opportunities to capture and assess adaptations made during program implementation.

**Limitations**

This Learning Review faced several limitations.

**Limited Time-Frame for the Learning Review**: Due to administrative constraints, the Learning Review did not begin until the mid-point of the PIVOT Cohort program and ended approximately six weeks before the program itself. Because it was not part of initial program planning and early implementation, data collection opportunities and methods were not strategically integrated into program design. Reviewers also relied on Cohort baseline measures and methods designed by implementing partners that did not necessarily reflect the scope of issues investigated in this Learning Review. Reviewers were able to offset some missing baseline information through data collection and analysis of a comparison group.

In addition, the early end-date of the Learning Review did not allow for data collection beyond mid-January. This meant that the review missed important opportunities to learn from the implementation and outcomes of four TDYs, the final Cohort meeting, and participants’ PSE efforts during the last six weeks of the program. Further, the restricted time-frame
prevented reviewers from collecting more detailed, context-specific examples or stories of PSE success, failure, and innovation from Cohort members.

While these missed opportunities don’t detract from the findings in this review, best practices suggest that: a) future Learning Review or MERL efforts develop timelines that are better aligned with program implementation; and b) implementing partners (or another designated person) find opportunities to capture this new information during the final program period to supplement the Learning Review’s Final Report.

Finally, the one-year time frame of the pilot program and the six-month duration of this Learning Review significantly limited the ability to assess longer-term outcomes, possible time-lags in individual and organizational changes, or transfer beyond program participants. For example, this review was not able to examine how PSE contributed to meaningful changes in development outcomes or provide evidence to address broader questions about the relationship between PSE and self-reliance. However, the review may have helped establish some baseline information for PIVOT participants and Missions that can be explored further in longer-term investigations of these topics.

Limited Access to Field Data: Because the Learning Review had no travel budget or designated field staff for data collection, reviewers had limited access to information from Cohort members. For example, there were no opportunities for field observation or in-depth interviewing of participants. Cohort members and Mission Directors were extremely busy; however, most were incredibly gracious about participating in Learning Review interviews, focus groups, surveys, and activities, and generous with their time in sharing their thoughts and experiences related to PIVOT and PSE more generally. The review gathered sufficient data to identify and verify broad learning themes across the Cohort and participating Missions. However, additional in-depth, Mission- or context-specific information (e.g., mini case studies or other idiographic data) would have added important dimension and nuance to this review. Future PIVOT learning efforts should embed field data collection within the program design. For example, the program could develop “insider-outsider” partnerships where some Change Team members act as local learning reviewers (“insiders”) and work in partnership with a USAID/Washington Learning Review team (“outsiders”) to design, collect data, interpret analyses, and support knowledge integration of PIVOT/PSE-related learning.

Limited Access to Data Beyond Self-Reports: Learning Reviewers were able to collect data and triangulate findings about the program from Cohort members’ and program implementers’ self-reports, Mission and USAID/Washington leaders’ reflections on the program, PSE Plans, and other PIVOT-related document review, and a review of existing research literature. However, learning from PIVOT would have benefited from additional perspectives, such as assessments by private-sector companies that participated in Cohort meetings or partner regularly with Missions, and Cohort members’ supervisors and non-PIVOT peers. In addition, learning from objective performance measures (e.g., examining changes in participants’ competencies/observable behaviors on PSE-related job tasks; knowledge checks; etc.), would have been useful supplements to more subjective self-reports and peer assessments. While the Learning Review recommends including some objective measures in future PIVOT learning efforts, it also recognizes their limitations (e.g., superficiality) and the importance of maintaining a fun and safe learning environment that encourages experimentation and judicious risk-taking, and accepts failures as part of the learning process.

Limited Comparisons and Counterfactuals: First, the review focused on the PIVOT program as an embedded case study and provided only limited comparisons with other PSE, change management, or self-reliance efforts within USAID. It also had limited access to possible counterfactuals—e.g., African Missions that were not part of the PIVOT program. Second, as mentioned above, pre- and post-tests comparison data for PIVOT participants and Missions were initiated before the Learning Review and did not necessarily reflect the scope of issues investigated in this Learning Review. Third, the review could not control for missing or thin data, gaps in evidence from Missions, or for inconsistencies in evidence between Missions. Data limitations affected the reviewers’ ability to address some of the key questions guiding this review and may have impacted the interpretation and broader application of findings.
Ethical Considerations

To protect participants in this Learning Review and ensure informed consent, prior to all interviews and surveys the reviewers: a) explained the general purpose and procedures of this Learning Review; b) explained the voluntary and confidential nature of participation in it; c) reviewed the expectation that no costs, foreseeable risks, or discomforts were associated with participation in this review; and d) obtained verbal consent for participation. Results from primary data collection in this review are reported only in aggregated form that is limited to identifying the operating units of participants. No individual names are included in any reports and all person-identifiable information has been removed from shared materials.

The lead reviewer for this Learning Review disclosed that she is an independent consultant contracted through the LEARN mechanism and SLRA budget. Because LEARN is an implementing partner for the PIVOT program, she acknowledged a potential conflict of interest. To mitigate potential biases in the design, conduct, and reporting of findings from this Learning Review, the lead reviewer reported to LEARN’s MERL team lead and USAID/PPL’s SRLA lead rather than LEARN staff involved in the implementation of PIVOT.
ANNEX 14: LEARNING REVIEW SUMMARY TABLES

These Summary Tables provide a summary of key take-aways from each section of the report.

I. Promising Practices

II. Lessons Learned

III. SRLA Q13: Organizational Enablers and Barriers

IV. SRLA Q4: Context-Specific Factors Affecting PSE (PSE Evidence and Learning Plan subquestion)

V. Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHAT WORKED WELL – PIVOT’S PROMISING PRACTICES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Cohort Approach</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants liked PIVOT’s multi-faceted, Cohort approach that provided dedicated space, time, and assistance to deepen and expand PSE work across their Missions to address development priorities. They appreciated PIVOT efforts to build relationships within and across Missions, create leaders at all levels, and change organizational culture and operations in ways tied directly to Mission priorities and the PSE and J2SR policies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Integrated Technical &amp; Interpersonal Competencies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants liked PIVOT’s efforts to combine PSE technical knowledge with interpersonal skills in CLA and leadership. Within the diverse Cohort group, some members emphasized the importance of the technical PSE knowledge, skills, and tools, while others highlighted the usefulness of CLA/change management processes and leadership development both for their PSE efforts and in other aspects of their jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structured Opportunities for Peer Learning and Collaboration</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Within Missions**: Change Teams provided opportunities for ongoing peer learning, feedback, support, motivation, and accountability. They also proved to be a useful vehicle for expanding and advancing PSE planning and activities within Missions.  
**Across Missions**: Cohort meetings, calls, and Affinity Groups provided structured activities that encouraged participants to share experiences, examples of success and failure, private sector contacts, and innovative tools for advancing PSE.  
**Across USAID/Washington operating units**: Cross-office planning and reflection embedded in PIVOT’s design fostered a sense of community among implementers that facilitated peer learning and collaboration around PSE across Bureaus and OUs within the Agency. |
| **Responsive Field Support** |
| Participants liked PIVOT’s demand-driven, tailored training and TDYs. Implementers noted that the sustained work with field staff helped them: 1) provide more targeted assistance; 2) design TA that built cumulatively; 3) develop sector-specific PSE roadmaps; 4) help participants interpret and operationalize policy within job contexts; 5) field test new tools; 6) connect Missions with relevant U.S. companies; and 7) transfer new responsive support practices to their work beyond PIVOT. |
| **Learning by Doing** |
| **PIVOT Change Management Plans** provided an important focal activity during the first half of the program for Change Teams to apply new knowledge and skills, build cross-office relationships, and developing actionable steps for advancing PSE tailored to their Mission priorities and country contexts. The Change Plans served as the basis for their Missions’ official PSE plans and informed CDCS development efforts.  
**Relationship building with private-sector companies** was a priority focus during the second half of the PIVOT program. Cohort members learned and applied skills in identifying alignment and converting opportunities into strategic programmatic approaches. They liked meeting with private sector companies, hearing a range of perspectives, and refining their presentation and relationship building skills. |
## WHAT WORKED WELL – PIVOT’S PROMISING PRACTICES

| Program Leadership and Facilitation | Participants liked PIVOT’s innovative design, fun and adaptive implementation, and inspiring leadership. They indicated that program implementers successfully created a strong sense of community conducive to learning and collaborating.  
**In-person Cohort meetings and regular calls** were both mentioned as effective in supporting learning, enthusiasm, momentum, and accountability.  
**CLA was modeled throughout program implementation:** For example, implementers integrated ‘pause and reflect’ opportunities throughout the program, consistently and intentionally invited participant feedback, input, and co-design, and adaptively managed the program to meet the various and changing needs of participants. |

## AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT – LESSONS LEARNED

| Staff Time and Program Time-Frame | • **PIVOT requires a significant time commitment:** Participants and Mission Directors noted that PIVOT and related PSE efforts placed relatively high demands on staff time that were, at times, difficult to manage given competing job priorities and Missions’ limited resources. Participants made a variety of suggestions to address this issue and many indicated that the time and resource investment in PSE was needed and useful.  
• **Longer time-frames needed to see concrete results:** Field staff indicated that they are just now starting to implement their new PSE Plans and need more time before there may be measurable results in terms of organizational changes and concrete outcomes from PSE activities. |
| Internal Stakeholder Involvement | • **Engage Leaders in PIVOT:** Participants emphasized the need for intentional and systematic ways of including mid-level and senior leaders in PIVOT to fit Missions’ more centralized decision-making and accountability structures, empower PIVOT Change Teams, and support cultural and operational shifts.  
• **Ensure Change Teams include PSE POCs, OAA, and Program officers.**  
• **Manage the diverse needs of participants:** The range of Cohort members’ exposure to PSE, job types, sectors or functional areas, levels of experience, etc. created important peer learning and collaboration opportunities, and supported PSE integration efforts within Missions. However, it also posed significant challenges in managing the different capacity building needs and interests within the Cohort. |
| Program Curriculum | Participants highlighted areas where PIVOT’s capacity building efforts needed additional adjustment, including: an earlier and stronger focus on PSE technical knowledge and skill-building; more practical applications of new information to staff jobs and Mission priorities, and earlier shifts to implementing PSE action items. Cohort members comments in this area highlighted their strong interest in practical, results-oriented activities that would demonstrate clear and concrete added value to Mission PSE efforts. |
| Program Management and Staffing | IPs discussed challenges in managing the dynamic program, especially given the diversity of participants’ perspectives and needs, and their geographic dispersion. Participants and implementers offered a range of suggestions to address program management issues, such as streamlining calls, increased program funding for travel to in-person Cohort meetings, and including in-house expertise on the implementing team to help contextualize learning within organizational procedures, resources, and dynamics. |
| Program Objectives and Theory of Change | • **Clarifying program objectives:** Some implementers and participants suggested the need for clearer program objectives and intended outcomes to help build participants’ confidence that their efforts are on track. Others raised questions about what “success” means (for the program and for PSE more generally) at individual, organizational, and PSE activity levels.  
• **Articulating PIVOT’s theory of change:** Some implementers suggested that PIVOT keep making its underlying assumptions about how change happens explicit to help participants better understand the relevance of PIVOT’s design and curriculum to change management efforts. |
### Organizational Enabling Conditions

| Leadership Support for PSE | Clear signaling from senior leadership in the Agency and PIVOT Missions that PSE and J2SR are priorities provided:  
| | • Urgency and momentum for PIVOT efforts;  
| | • Access to and partnerships with organizational decision-makers;  
| | • Support (human and financial) from OUs across USAID/Washington and across Missions;  
| | • Freedom to innovate in responding to identified needs; and  
| | • An environment conducive to changing organizational culture and operations. |
| Alignment with Agency Policies and Program Cycle Requirements | • PIVOT was directly aligned with and helped operationalize the PSE Policy, J2SR and Policy Framework, Prosper Africa initiative, and the Agency’s Leadership Philosophy within participating Missions.  
| | • Program Cycle planning helped prioritize and facilitate PIVOT’s efforts to integrate PSE into Missions’ work. PIVOT Change Teams provided timely assistance in developing required PSE Plans, and integrating PSE into their Missions CDCSs and PADs. |
| Staffing | • USAID staff’s passion, engagement, and commitment for development work generally, and in PSE specifically, drive program and Agency success.  
| | • PSE POCs provided important expertise and leadership for PIVOT Change Teams, as well as within Missions and Bureaus more generally |
| Technical Assistance | • Existing in-house PSE experience and expertise across the Agency provided PSE knowledge contextualized within understandings of Agency procedures, mechanisms, resources, dynamics, etc. |

### Organizational Barriers/Needs

| Leadership Support | Participants indicated that leaders need to provide additional resources (both human and financial) to support effective implementation of PSE efforts.  
| | • Some Mission Directors suggested that PSE should be a strong focus at the Mission Directors’ conference with longer-term opportunities for peer learning and mentoring that support Directors who have less PSE experience.  
| | • Some participants hoped that the Agency would take a leadership role in making PSE a whole-of-government initiative to help increase buy-in for a PSE approach among other U.S. Government agencies.  
| | • Some participants discussed the need for a clearer Agency narrative for addressing specific contextual barriers to PSE (e.g., cartels run by political elites) and stronger leadership in bringing Missions into relationships with regional and global private sector networks. |

---

29 See the Literature Review in Annex 2 for additional information about organizational contexts that support PSE.
### How did USAID’s organizational structures and staffing, policies, guidance, technical assistance, and capacity building enable PIVOT to foster self-reliance? 🗣️

**(SRLA Question #13)**

**Staffing**

- **Staffing shortages, rotations, and churn** were discussed as significant barriers to effective PSE efforts. Some participants noted that the departure/rotation of FSOs from PIVOT Change Teams (and more generally) interrupted program momentum and created issues around knowledge management.

- **Staff incentives, recognition, and empowerment**: Participants highlighted the need for incentive structures that link employee reward systems with PSE performance and recognize PSE expertise and experiences as criteria for upward mobility. They suggested raising the profile of PSE work (e.g., recognizing excellence in PSE as part of Missions’ annual award ceremony). They also urged Mission leaders to empower employees with PSE expertise to help drive organizational change by providing leadership opportunities and authority.

- **Flexible or dedicated staff time for PSE**: Cohort members emphasized the need for allocated time for PSE efforts such as outreach, relationship building, and management.

- **PSE integrated into position descriptions, work objectives, and performance reviews** would support staff in aligning their PSE efforts with job requirements.

- **Hiring additional in-house PSE expertise**: Mission Directors and Affinity Group Leads emphasized that the Agency can't effectuate cultural change without hiring additional in-house expertise in PSE and innovative finance.

**Funding Constraints and Inflexibility**

- **Flexible funding mechanisms and expedited procurements**: Participants highlighted the need for flexible funding mechanisms and procedures outside of existing programmatic frameworks both at headquarters and in Missions. This includes innovation funds that support PSE exploration, experimentation, and Mission-led proposals; non-grant financial mechanisms open to a variety of sectors and stakeholders; more fungible resources with longer expiration dates; and more “friendly” funding processes that allow for quick deployment of capital and innovative (rather than procurement-driven) partnerships.

- Limited funding for direct hires to travel to in-person Cohort meetings affected PIVOT's capacity building and peer learning efforts

**Cultural, Structural, and Operational Support for PSE**

- **Organizational culture**: Participants noted a variety of changes needed, including more openness to new ideas and new ways of engaging private-sector stakeholders; opportunities for experimentation and reflection on PSE efforts; structured opportunities for peer dialogue on PSE; attention to managing resistance and counter-narratives to PSE within the Agency; and assistance managing expectations for rapid organizational change and concrete results.

- **Organizational structures**: Some participants highlighted the need for Agency guidelines and institutionalization that backed PIVOT’s integrated approaches (e.g., cross-sector and cross-Mission peer learning and collaboration) and PSE more generally (e.g., more PSE coordination across Bureaus.)

- **Organizational operations**: Participants emphasized the need for time-saving processes and systems for outreach, due diligence, and relationship management. Clearer understandings and access to PSE knowledge and financial resources and tools, including roadmaps with clear steps and decision points that focus on the “what” of options available and the “how” to do it (e.g., for blended finance, structuring partnerships, and utilizing mechanism).

**Technical Assistance**

Some Mission Directors highlighted the need for more PIVOT-like technical support that included Missions’ early input and co-design of support so that assistance is context-sensitive and clearly aligns with Mission strategies and needs.
**What context-specific factors drive effective engagement with the private sector?**

*(PSE Evidence and Learning Plan Question #2/SLRA Question #4)*

### Enabling Conditions

| Political | • National government support for enterprise-driven development and private sector investment as a core strategy for addressing development challenges and supporting self-reliance including:  
  - National development plans and investment policies where private-sector companies plays a key role in helping to reach development objectives;  
  - Explicit national commitment to attracting foreign investment and responsible corporate actors, and to tapping into global markets to fund sustainable growth and foster self-reliance;  
  - Prioritization and support for new forms of financing;  
  - Support for development of specific sectors or types of businesses (e.g., SMEs);  
  - Commitment to fighting corruption, improving transparency, and creating a strong business enabling environments  
  • Robust regulatory and institutional architectures that support rule-based interactions for businesses, fight corruption, and promote a level playing field for competitive innovation are critical.  
  • Stability: Investors and foreign companies consider the country a stable democracy supported PSE and innovative finance efforts.  
  **Impact on USAID Staff:** Good relationships with government counterparts and successful past work together facilitates PSE efforts. |
| Economic | • Commercial bank support for innovative finance: A few participants mentioned that commercial banks in their country were interested in diversifying their loan portfolios and exploring innovative financing solutions. |
| Maturity of Business Community | • Vibrant private sector: A few field staff noted that the private sector in their country offered a wide range of potential business partners, private-sector innovations and expertise, and untapped investment capital. Some mentioned the growing involvement and advocacy of private-sector actors in improving services and accountability. In addition, some indicated that multinational companies considered their countries a regional hub for business.  
  • **Impact on USAID Staff:** Staff based in countries with strong and diverse business communities indicated that they had plenty of opportunities for PSE. However, they also faced many challenges and questions around which opportunities they should focus on, with whom, and how. Several Cohort members and Directors indicated that they had good past experiences with private-sector companies and had relatively strong networks of contacts to support future efforts. |
| Social Conditions | • Motivated, young workforces: Some Cohort members mentioned large, youthful populations in their country that have proven to be ready, in agriculture and other sectors, to learn new skills to improve their standard of living. This has encouraged private-sector investment and activities and supported staff PSE efforts. |
### What context-specific factors drive effective engagement with the private sector?
(PSE Evidence and Learning Plan Question #2/SLRA Question #4)

#### Barriers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Political</th>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Maturity of Business Community</th>
<th>Social Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Corruption</strong>: significant levels of corruption. Cartels and monopolies run by political elites/parastatal firms and government-controlled industries crowd-out firm growth. Unenforced regulations and laws.</td>
<td>• <strong>Stagnant or volatile economies</strong>: For some PIVOT Missions, the national economies are stagnant or hitting a rough patch; growth has weakened and a number of sectors are experiencing strain. Caps on interest rates have impacted private lending and limited where private-sector actors want to invest. In others, significant currency volatility, high national interest rates, uncertainty caused by restructuring in financial/banking systems, and low capacities or limited access to finance discourage PSE opportunities.</td>
<td>• Some participants described young or fragmented local private sectors that lacked associations, had relatively small or nascent capital markets, or offered few reliable and reputable potential partners. Others discussed local private sectors that were used to grant support and unprepared for investors looking for commercial, risk-adjusted returns.</td>
<td>• <strong>Resistance to change</strong>: Cohort members also mentioned PSE barriers related to conservative mindsets among many key actors that resist change (e.g., national/cultural attitudes about natural resources).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Bureaucratic permitting process</strong> for public-private partnerships that created significant delays and barriers in formalizing PPPs.</td>
<td>• International investors may see their countries as commercially limited (e.g., low natural resources; land-locked).</td>
<td>• <strong>Difficulties doing business</strong>: Some Mission contexts had very low rankings on the “ease of doing business” index (e.g., high shipping costs, poor roads, unreliable utilities), which limited international business interests.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Increasingly strong presence of Chinese investment</strong> that often counters USAID’s objectives and impacts their relevance to the private sector.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Conflict or political crises</strong>: Countries with current or recent histories of violent conflict, violent extremism, or persistent cycles of political crises were considered high-risk environments for investors and multinational companies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Impact on USAID Staff</strong>: Need strong due diligence processes and must be careful not to enable actors whose interests they don’t share. Staff can play a convening and influencing role to support opportunities/forums for dialogue throughout the policy cycle. Ensure inclusivity (e.g., SMEs and MSME are viewed as partners rather than beneficiaries; explicit efforts to work with women, poor, ethnic minorities, youth, smallholder farmers, remote populations); diversity of sectors represented, dialogue platforms/opportunities at national, district, and local levels. Empower local private sector as change agents/owners of legal or regulatory reform (with precautions again creating non-tariff barriers to trade.) Integrate PSE into fiscal transparency and anti-corruption initiatives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic</th>
<th>Maturity of Business Community</th>
<th>Social Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• <strong>Stagnant or volatile economies</strong>: For some PIVOT Missions, the national economies are stagnant or hitting a rough patch; growth has weakened and a number of sectors are experiencing strain. Caps on interest rates have impacted private lending and limited where private-sector actors want to invest. In others, significant currency volatility, high national interest rates, uncertainty caused by restructuring in financial/banking systems, and low capacities or limited access to finance discourage PSE opportunities.</td>
<td>• Some participants described young or fragmented local private sectors that lacked associations, had relatively small or nascent capital markets, or offered few reliable and reputable potential partners. Others discussed local private sectors that were used to grant support and unprepared for investors looking for commercial, risk-adjusted returns.</td>
<td>• <strong>Resistance to change</strong>: Cohort members also mentioned PSE barriers related to conservative mindsets among many key actors that resist change (e.g., national/cultural attitudes about natural resources).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PROGRAM OUTCOMES**

### Staff Capacity Building

- **PSE and Agency Policies:** Participants showed significant gains in knowledge and skills related to PSE and Agency policy implementation since the start of PIVOT (e.g., improved general and sector-specific PSE knowledge; increased abilities to identify alignment between USAID and private-sector companies’ interests). On specific PSE items where pre- and post-test data were available for both PIVOT Cohort members and a non-PIVOT PSE POC comparison group, results showed that while the PIVOT Cohort had significant lower scores than the PSE POC comparison group at the beginning of the program (in pre-tests), by the end of the program (in post-tests), there were no differences in scores between the two groups.

- **CLA and Change Management:** Participants showed significant increases in CLA knowledge and skills as well (e.g., pause and reflect processes, flexibility or adaptability, and change management) and significantly better understandings of CLA than the PSE POC comparison group. The comparative analysis of PSE plans also found that CLA principles and processes appear more frequently in PIVOT PSE Plans than in non-PIVOT PSE Plans.

- **Leadership:** In the Outcome Harvesting analysis, participants ranked their new leadership skills (e.g., mindfulness, presentation and facilitation skills, effective feedback skills) and PSE skills as the most significant changes since the start of the PIVOT program.

### Relationship Building

- **Change Teams:** For Cohort members, trust and collaboration within their Change Team were two of the ten highest scored items on the survey. In addition, Cohort members rated their Change Teams significantly higher than PSE POC’s rated their PSE working groups in terms of trust, communication, collaboration, productivity, and innovation.

- **Responsive Field Support:** The Learning Review Survey found that Cohort members rated USAID/Washington field support significantly higher than non-PIVOT PSE POCs in connecting U.S. companies with Missions; demand-driven, tailored assistance; and continuity and sustained TA that helps work build cumulatively.

### Organizational Changes

Participants identified significant increases in their Mission’s organizational readiness for PSE and Mission staff understanding of Agency policies since the start of PIVOT. They also rated their Mission staff’s openness to integrating CLA into Mission operations significantly higher than the PSE POC comparison group. However, survey results showed no difference in ratings of other organization-level items. For both groups, the ten lowest scored survey items focused on organization-level conditions for PSE (e.g., PSE metrics and evaluation, the availability of flexible or dedicated PSE funds).

During interviews, participants and Mission Directors highlighted organizational changes in: 1) increased staff awareness and interest in PSE across the Mission; 2) PSE integrated into Mission planning and programming across the Program Cycle; 3) expanded leadership support for PSE; 4) improved cross-office collaboration; and 5) new approaches to PSE (e.g., more proactive PSE efforts, increased stakeholder consultations; more collaborative approaches.)

In addition to changes in Missions, program implementers also noted that PIVOT had helped support connections across USAID/Washington operations and shifted how some OUs provide PSE support to others.

### Changes in PSE Activities

Although participants mentioned working with new kinds of private sector entities and increased meetings with private-sector stakeholders, findings indicated that PIVOT has not yielded concrete results yet in terms of creating new private-sector partnerships or mobilizing private-sector resources. Cohort members were quick to point out that their PSE efforts are still new and that longer time frames are needed to see tangible results.