



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

# SURVEY OF NGO SUSTAINABILITY INDEX USAGE AT USAID

SEPTEMBER 2010

# SURVEY OF NGO SUSTAINABILITY INDEX USAGE AT USAID

**September 2010**

**L. Jerome Gallagher**, Monitoring and Evaluation Analyst, USAID/Washington

This publication was produced for the United States Agency for International Development, Bureau for Europe and Eurasia's Program Office, Division of Strategic Planning and Analysis.

## **DISCLAIMER**

The author's views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government.

# INTRODUCTION

For thirteen years, the NGO Sustainability Index (NGOSI) for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia has reported on and scored the strength and viability of NGO sectors in countries of the region. Covering seven interconnected dimensions, the annual study currently combines a narrative with a numerical set of indicators to track sectoral progress and challenges in 29 countries and to provide for comparison on a sub-regional and regional level.<sup>1</sup>

Initially developed in 1997 as an internal tracking instrument, the role of NGOSI has expanded over time and has become a tool to inform a broad policy and development community internationally and in the countries of focus. USAID staff members in both Washington and the field who work on NGO sector issues remain a core audience for the NGOSI.

This report examines usage of the NGOSI at USAID and staff perceptions of the quality of the NGOSI. It is based on an on-line survey of fifty-three USAID staff members in both Washington and the field who are familiar with the NGOSI report.

## Survey Approach

The online survey of NGOSI usage included a series of questions regarding usage and perceptions of quality of the NGOSI at USAID. The survey also sought to elicit feedback from users on increasing usage and potential changes to the NGOSI. The survey protocol has 24 questions, including 19 close ended and 5 open ended questions. Following some initial questions on organizational affiliation, respondents were asked about their familiarity with the NGO Sustainability Index. Only those respondents who claimed that they were somewhat or very familiar with the NGOSI were asked to complete the main section of the survey regarding use and perceptions of quality. Respondents who were not at all familiar with the NGOSI were asked to stop the survey at that point. A copy of the survey questionnaire can be found in *Appendix A*.

The online survey was administered by the USAID knowledge services center. One hundred seventy-five (175) USAID staff members in both Washington DC and the field were selected to participate in the survey were sent an e-mail that explained the purpose of the survey, provided assurances of anonymity, and asked recipients to click a link to the survey website. The survey was open approximately three weeks, from August 5 to August 26, 2010. During that time, two reminder e-mails were sent to all individuals who were asked to participate.

## Selection of Survey Respondents

The 175 USAID staff members selected to participate in the survey were purposively selected as the population of individuals within USAID considered to be the most likely potential consumers of the NGOSI Report. This included 108 individuals in USAID field missions covered by the NGOSI and 67 individuals based in USAID/Washington. Field mission staff asked to participate included US nationals and Foreign Service nationals in democracy and governance (D&G) offices and program offices. Washington

---

<sup>1</sup> The current dimensions of the NGO Sustainability Index are: 1) Legal Environment, 2) Organizational Capacity, 3) Financial Viability, 4) Advocacy, 5) Service Provision, 6) Infrastructure, and 7) Public Image. The current list of 29 countries measured by the NGOSI in Europe and Eurasia includes: 1) the Northern Tier: Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia; 2) the Southern Tier: Albania, Bosnia, Bulgaria, Croatia, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia; 3) The Western Newly Independent States (W-NIS) and Caucasus: Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine; and 4) Central Asia: Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan.

based staff asked to participate include relevant staff members of the Europe and Eurasia Bureau (E&E), the Asia Bureau, and the D&G office of the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian Assistance (DHCA).

## FINDINGS

### Response Rates and Respondent Familiarity with NGOSI

Sixty-one (61) of the 175 USAID staff members who received a request to participate in the survey completed it, yielding a response rate of 35%. A breakdown of response rates is provided in Table 1. Of the sixty-one respondents, fifty-three (87%) reported that they were very or somewhat familiar with the NGO Sustainability Index, and thus were asked to complete full questionnaire. Given the low overall response rate, one cannot draw valid inferences from the respondents regarding the extent of familiarity with the NGOSI among the total population of potential NGOSI consumers at USAID invited to participate in the survey, or among USAID more generally. It is highly likely that some unknown number of non-respondents are also familiar with the NGOSI.

<b>TABLE 1: RESPONSE RATES BY ORGANIZATIONAL CATEGORY</b>			
	<b>Completed</b>	<b>Contacted</b>	<b>Response Rate</b>
Field Mission D&G Offices <sup>2</sup>	22	41	54%
Field Mission Program Offices	22	67	33%
E&E/Asia Bureau	11	25	44%
DCHA/DG	6	42	14%
<b>Total</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>175</b>	<b>35%</b>

Despite the low response rate, the fifty-three respondents who report being familiar or very familiar with the NGOSI constitute a valuable group of USAID staff members for understanding how core consumers of NGOSI at USAID actually use the NGOSI and what they think about its quality. NGOSI. Not only are these respondents familiar with the NGOSI, but 87% of them have read at least part of the NGOSI report in the past year, over half of them (57%) reported being very familiar with the NGOSI, and almost half (49%) have participated in the NGOSI scoring or preparation at some point. Moreover, two-thirds of these respondents report that information about the NGO sector is important or very important to their work. Table 2 reports on the characteristics of these fifty-three NGOSI consumers, as well as a breakdown showing how these characteristics differ among those who are familiar and those who are very familiar with the NGOSI. Respondents very familiar with the NGOSI are more likely to be field office DG staff members who focus on NGOs in their work and have participated in the NGOSI scoring process at some point.

<sup>2</sup> Includes two staff members who reported serving in a field mission technical office other than the Democracy & Governance office. Both of these individuals stated that they were not familiar with the NGOSI, and thus only completed the first portion of the survey.

**TABLE 2: CHARACTERISTICS OF RESPONDENTS FAMILIAR WITH THE NGOSI**

	All (N=53)	“Very Familiar” Respondents (N=30)	“Somewhat Familiar” Respondents (N=23)
<b>Office</b>			
Field Mission D&G Offices	33%	51%	5%
Field Mission Program Offices	33%	20%	55%
E&E/Asia Bureau	18%	11%	27%
DCHA	9%	11%	5%
<b>Location</b>			
Eastern Europe	44%	42%	45%
Western NIS/Caucasus	23%	27%	20%
Central Asian Republics (CAR)	3%	6%	0%
Washington/DC	30%	24%	35%
<b>Employment Status</b>			
Foreign Service/Civil Service	53%	45%	60%
Foreign Service National	47%	55%	40%

## Use of the NGO Sustainability Index

Survey respondents had overwhelmingly positive views regarding the usefulness of the NGOSI. Among the survey respondents familiar with NGOSI, 77% declared the NGOSI either useful or very useful in providing them with the information they needed about the NGO sector in Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia. Of those who consider information on NGO sustainability to be important in their job, 86% considered it useful or very useful.

**TABLE 3: USEFULNESS OF THE NGOSI**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, by office, responses to, “How useful to you is the NGO Sustainability Index in providing you with information you need about the NGO sector in Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia?”

	All (N=53)	Field Office PO Staff (N=19)	Field Office DG Staff (N=19)	Washington Staff (N=15)
Very Useful	24%	12%	26%	33%
Useful	53%	47%	58%	53%
Slightly Useful	12%	18%	11%	7%
Not Useful	6%	12%	5%	0%
Don't Know	6%	12%	0%	7%

The NGOSI Report includes several components which have been generally consistent in recent years. These sections include an introduction and executive summary, sections that describe the seven dimensions of NGO sustainability and the rating methodology, a section of topical articles on NGO trends in the region, country reports for each of the 29 countries, and a compendium of the statistical data with data from previous reports. Each country report includes scores for each of the dimensions of NGO Sustainability, an overall sustainability score, and a narrative that describes changes in the past year for each of the dimensions of NGO Sustainability.

Survey respondents gave high ratings of usefulness for all components of the NGOSI. The country narratives had the highest rate of respondents reporting them very useful or useful (83%) while the topical articles was deemed useful or very useful by the lowest proportion of respondents (58%).

**TABLE 4: USEFULNESS OF NGOSI COMPONENTS**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, responses to, “Rate the usefulness to you in your work of each of the following parts of the NGOSI.”

	<b>Very Useful</b>	<b>Useful</b>	<b>Slightly Useful</b>	<b>Not Useful</b>	<b>Don’t Know</b>
Executive Summary (N=49)	25%	51%	12%	2%	11%
Country Narrative (N=48)	30%	53%	11%	0%	6%
Index Scores (N=48)	27%	50%	9%	5%	9%
Dimension Scores (N=48)	25%	52%	9%	5%	9%
Topical Essays (N=47)	17%	41%	27%	10%	5%

Respondents were also asked to compare how important the NGOSI is for them compared to other sources of information they might use to understand the NGO sector in Europe and Eurasia. While only 8% of respondents report that the NGOSI is the most important source of information they use for understanding the NGO sector in Europe and Eurasia, an additional 73% declared that it is at least as important as other sources of information they use. Other sources of information mentioned by at least five respondents as being used to understand NGO issues in Europe and Eurasia included the Freedom House Nations in Transit report (17 mentions); annual reports, assessments and evaluations by USAID and other stakeholders (14 mentions); the Freedom House Freedom in the World report (8 mentions); and World Bank reports (5 mentions).

**TABLE 5: COMPARISON OF NGOSI TO OTHER SOURCES OF INFORMATION ABOUT THE NGO SECTOR**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, by office, responses to, “How does the NGOSI compare to other sources of information you use for understanding the NGO sector in the Europe or Eurasian Country that you work in or on?”

	<b>All (N=51)</b>	<b>Field Office PO Staff (N=18)</b>	<b>Field Office DG Staff (N=19)</b>	<b>Washington Staff (N=14)</b>
It is the <i>most</i> important source of information I use	8%	0%	5%	21%
It is as important as other sources of information I use	73%	67%	79%	71%
It is <i>not</i> as important as other sources of information I use	8%	6%	16%	0%
It is not a source of information I use	12%	28%	0%	7%

### How is NGOSI Used

Respondents were asked how they have used the NGOSI Report in the past 12 months, both for informational purposes and for more specific managerial purposes, from a pre-selected list of potential uses. Responses are reported in Table 6. Respondents were also asked to provide examples of how they have used it.

**TABLE 6: USE IN THE PAST 12 MONTHS**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, by office, responses to, “Have you used the information from the NGOSI for the following purposes in the past 12 months?”

	All (N=53)	Field Office PO Staff (N=19)	Field Office DG Staff (N=19)	Washington Staff (N=15)
<b>Informational Use</b>				
Understand NGO Sector in a Specific Country	47%	21%	58%	67%
Understand NGO Trends over Time	45%	21%	63%	53%
Understand NGO Sustainability Across the Region	30%	11%	21%	67%
Compare with Other Countries	28%	11%	42%	33%
<b>Specific Uses</b>				
Use in Program Design	30%	26%	42%	20%
Use in Strategic Planning	25%	21%	21%	33%
Use in M&E of Specific program	25%	26%	37%	7%
Use for Research/Analysis	23%	11%	26%	33%
Use in Performance Plan and Report (PPR)	23%	16%	42%	7%
Use in a Performance Management Plan (PMP)	23%	32%	32%	0%
Use in Determining Funding Priorities	17%	11%	16%	27%
Use in Starting a Dialogue	15%	5%	21%	20%
<b>Haven't Used</b>	6%	21%	5%	0%

More respondents noted using the NGOSI for various informational purposes over the past 12 months than for any specific programmatic or managerial purposes. Understanding the NGO sector in a particular country was the use most frequently reported by survey respondents. How the NGOSI was used for informational purposes among USAID respondents differed somewhat depending on the office in which respondents worked. USAID Washington staff who were surveyed was much more likely than field office staff to report using the NGOSI to understand trends in the region. Program office respondents in the field offices (who tended to be less familiar with the NGOSI compared to Washington and DG field office respondents) were typically less likely to use the NGOSI for any informational purposes.

Among the specific uses respondents were asked about, using the NGOSI for program design was the most cited, with nearly a third of respondents reporting this use. Again, there were notable differences in use among different offices. Program office respondents in the field were the most likely to report that they haven't used the NGOSI in the past 12 months (21%, compared to 5% of DG field staff and 0% of Washington Staff). The most frequent specific use cited by program office staff was using it for the mission Performance Management Plan (32%), which program offices typically prepare in coordination with technical offices.

Thirty-two percent of democracy and governance field office staff also reported using it for preparing a PMP, but the most frequent specific uses reported by DG field staff were program design (42%) and preparing the Performance Plan and Report (42%), an annual report on program performance that is sent to Washington and includes various indicators of progress. Overall, DG field staff cited more uses of the NGOSI on average compared to PO field staff and Washington based staff. As expected, Washington staff members were less likely to report using the NGOSI for the field oriented PMP and

PPR documents. Instead, the specific uses most frequently reported by Washington staff included strategic planning (33%) and research and analysis (33%).

Respondents provided numerous examples of uses of the NGOSI, with the most common examples referring to the use of NGOSI data in indicators of NGO sector progress. Examples include:

“To track progress for higher level indicators for civil society development.”

“NGOSI score is used as a custom indicator for the Mission Performance Report.”

“To set indicators for the MRSP and PMP.”

“While exploring what types of indicators to use for the Democracy and Governance PMP, we have looked into the Index.”

“I tracked broad trends in the region and include the NGOSI data in that analysis.”

Respondents also frequently mentioned its use for program design and strategic planning. Examples include:

“For programming civil society programs in [country X], in particular to identify the biggest challenges in the area of sustainable development of the NGO sector.”

“NGOSI is a useful tool that summarizes the state of the NGO sector and we used it for the design of the new civil society program in addition to the sector assessment findings.

“To develop a scope of work for a civil society program.”

“For strategic planning purposes and to measure progress in country against other countries in the region.”

## Perceptions of the Quality of NGOSI

USAID online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI were also asked a series of questions rating various dimensions of accuracy and quality of the NGOSI from excellent to poor. Responses are presented in Table 7. As one would expect given the high marks for the usefulness of the NGOI, responses on NGOSI quality were positive overall. More than 50% of respondents rated as either good or excellent the “accuracy of the country narratives and the “presentation of findings.” On two more dimensions, the “accuracy of the country scoring” and the “transparency of the scoring methodology”, positive responses (excellent or good) outnumbered negative responses (fair or poor). On only two dimensions, “reliability of the scoring methodology” and “timeliness of the report” did ratings of fair and poor outnumbered ratings of good or excellent.

**TABLE 7: RATINGS OF NGOSI QUALITY**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, responses to, “Rate the quality of the NGOSI along the following dimensions.”

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
Transparency of the Scoring Methodology	15%	29%	17%	3%	35%
Accuracy of Country Narratives	12%	51%	10%	0%	27%
Presentation of Findings	12%	46%	15%	0%	27%
Accuracy of Country Scoring	9%	39%	21%	0%	31%
Reliability of the Scoring Methodology	7%	19%	33%	4%	36%
Timeliness of the Report	0	30%	36%	6%	28%

On all of these questions of NGOSI quality, a substantial minority, ranging from 27% to 36%, responded “don’t know”. The vast majority of these were respondents who identified as being only *somewhat* familiar with the NGOSI. Those very familiar with the NGOSI were much less likely to report “don’t know” on each dimension (ranging from 3% to 9%) and were also more likely than those less familiar with the NGOSI to report responses at either extreme of the scale, either “excellent” or “poor”, on each dimension. The overall ranking of the quality dimensions was similar among both those very familiar and those somewhat familiar, though, with “accuracy of country narratives” receiving the highest percent of positive ratings (excellent or good) and “timeliness of the report” and “reliability of the scoring methodology” receiving more negative ratings than positive ratings.

Respondents were asked additional questions regarding the accuracy of the NGOSI in the country that they work in or on, which may provide some further insight into the reasons for the lower ratings reported above for “reliability of the scoring methodology” relative to the ratings for “accuracy of the country narratives” and “accuracy of the country scoring.” As seen in Table 8, respondents overwhelmingly agreed that the NGOSI generally describes sustainability in the NGOSI sector, but were less likely to agree that the NGOSI accurately captures differences in NGO sustainability from one year to the next or from one country to the next.

**TABLE 8: PERCEPTIONS OF NGOSI ACCURACY**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, responses to, “Considering the country or countries included in the NGOSI that you work in or are most familiar with, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements”

	<b>Agree or Strongly Agree</b>	<b>Disagree or Strongly Disagree</b>	<b>Don’t Know</b>
NGOSI accurately describes the sustainability of the NGO Sector (N=52)	72%	6%	23%
NGOSI accurately captures change in NGO sustainability from on year to the next (N=52)	54%	17%	29%
NGOSI accurately scores the sustainability of the NGO sector compared to other countries in the region (N=52)	47%	16%	38%

Open-ended feedback from respondents that address the quality of the index were generally positive. For instance:

“This tool is one of the unsung initiatives of USAID and deserves more.”

“Good reference material and a good short read when you need information about a specific country.”

“An excellent reference point.”

However, some of the feedback articulated the concerns regarding the accuracy and reliability of the NGOSI methodology:

“The only drawback [of the NGOSI] is that the scoring methodology is not statistically based and has an uncontrolled margin of error.”

“A solid examination of the methodology and the process for identifying who should be involved in the rating is very important.”

“Ratings are still very subjective.”

“It is difficult to judge the accuracy of the index...I don’t know the extent to which the methodology could or should be improved, though it makes sense to examine it thoroughly and compare it with the methodology and results of other similar efforts.”

## Improvements to the NGOSI

Survey respondents were asked how they would recommend increasing NGOSI usage and about specific proposals to change the coverage of the NGOSI and the frequency of the NGOSI report.

### Increasing Usage of the NGOSI

Survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI were asked to select the three most important actions USAID could take to improve usage of the NGOSI from a pre-selected list. Responses are provided below. Publishing the report earlier in the year was the most frequently suggested action (53%), followed by translating the report into the local language (49%) and increasing outreach and dissemination (45%) and making the NGOSI data easily accessible online (42%). Responses varied considerably among USAID Washington staff, field office program office staff, and field office DG staff. For instance, among USAID Washington respondents, making the data more easily accessible online was the most highly reported suggestion. This may reflect the fact that USAID Washington staff members are more likely than field office staff to use the data to understand NGO sustainability for multiple countries across the region. Field office DG respondents were far more likely than field office program office respondents to suggest translating the report into local languages and improving the methodology.

**TABLE 9: HOW TO INCREASE USAGE?**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, responses to, “Each of the following is an action that USAID could take to potentially increase usage of the NGOSI. Please select the most important actions (no more than three) that you think USIAD should take to increase usage of the NGOSI.”

	All (N=53)	Field Office PO Staff (N=19)	Field Office DG Staff (N=19)	Washington Staff (N=15)
Publish the report earlier in the year	53%	58%	63%	33%
Translate the report into local languages	49%	37%	58%	53%
Increase outreach and dissemination	45%	53%	32%	53%
Make the NGOSI data easily accessible online	42%	42%	26%	60%
Improve the methodology	36%	26%	53%	27%
Define terms better	11%	11%	11%	13%
Improve the presentation	9%	5%	5%	20%
None of these	8%	11%	5%	7%

### Eliminating Non-USAID Presence Countries

Respondents were asked how important it is for the NGOSI to include countries where USAID does not have a mission presence (primarily the Northern Tier countries). Responses were overwhelmingly in support of including non-USAID mission presence countries with 80% reporting it is important or very important to keep them. The strongest support comes from Washington respondents, with 60% reporting that it is very important to keep the non-USAID presence countries, compared to only 15% of field office respondents who agreed that it is very important. Again, this likely reflects the greater use by Washington staff in comparing countries across the region for research and analysis. One respondent noted: “As a comparative analysis, it is important to continue to include the Northern Tier and non-presence countries in the Index...It is...an excellent point of comparison for the NGOs in the Southern Tier...”

**TABLE 10: HOW IMPORTANT TO KEEP NON USAID PRESENCE COUNTRIES?**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, by office, responses to, “How important is it to you that the NGOSI report include the Central and Eastern European countries where USAID does not have a mission presence (Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia)?”

	<b>All (N=44)</b>	<b>Field Office PO Staff (N=17)</b>	<b>Field Office DG Staff (N=17)</b>	<b>Washington Staff (N=10)</b>
Very Important	25%	6%	24%	60%
Important	55%	76%	53%	20%
Slightly Important	11%	6%	12%	20%
Not at all Important	0%	0%	0%	0%
Don't know	9%	12%	12%	0%

## Publishing Every Other Year

USAID online survey respondents were also asked how important it is for the NGOSI to be published on annual basis rather than every other year. Again, responses were again overwhelmingly in support of current practices; 82% stated that it is important or very important to keep the report annual.

**TABLE 11: HOW IMPORTANT TO KEEP ANNUAL?**

Online survey respondents familiar with the NGOSI, by office, responses to, “How important is it to you that the NGOSI report is published on an annual basis rather than every other year?”

	<b>All (N=49)</b>	<b>Field Office PO Staff (N=17)</b>	<b>Field Office DG Staff (N=17)</b>	<b>Washington Staff (N=15)</b>
Very Important	41%	29%	47%	47%
Important	41%	47%	41%	33%
Slightly Important	14%	18%	12%	13%
Not at all Important	0%	0%	0%	0%
Don't know	4%	6%	0%	7%

## CONCLUSION

Among respondents to the survey, most perceive the NGOSI and its constituent parts to be useful for understanding NGO sector issues; over three-quarters of respondents stated that the NGOSI is either useful or very useful. The most frequently cited uses of the NGOSI are for general informational purposes, such as understanding the NGO sector in a specific country and understanding NGO trends over time. Examples of specific uses provided by respondents include using the NGOSI scores as indicators for tracking NGO sector progress and to inform civil society program design and strategic planning.

Consistent with the high marks respondents gave for the usefulness of the NGOSI, respondents also scored the NGOSI highly on several dimensions of quality, including the accuracy of the country narratives (65% rating good or excellent) and the presentation of the findings (58% rating good or excellent). Respondents were less positive about the timeliness of the report (30% rating good or

excellent) or the reliability of the scoring methodology (26% rating good or excellent). Comments from some respondents suggested that the methodology of the scores should be re-examined. However, respondents most frequently suggested increasing usage of the report by publishing the report earlier (53%), translating the report into the local languages (49%), increasing outreach and dissemination (45%), and making the NGOSI data more easily accessible on-line (42%).

# ANNEX A

## NGO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia Survey

Please answer all of the questions below. Your responses are very important to us. All responses are anonymous and the data will be kept confidential. Responses will be reported only in aggregate.

---

1. Where do you currently work?

- Europe (Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia)
- Eurasia (Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Moldova, Russia, Ukraine)
- Central Asia (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan)
- Washington or E&E Regional Service Center (Budapest)
- Other (please specify):

2. In which of the following offices/bureaus/departments do you work?

- Field Mission Program Office/Program Support Office
- Field Mission Democracy and Governance Office
- Field Mission other technical office (economic growth, health, etc.)
- Bureau for Europe and Eurasia/Asia Bureau/RSC
- DCHA/DG
- State Department
- Other (please specify):

3. Which of the following describes your employment status?

- Foreign Service Officer/Foreign Service Limited
- Foreign Service National/Third Country National
- Civil Service/ Personal Services Contractor/Institutional Contractor
- Other (please specify):

4. How familiar are you with the NGO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia?

- Very familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Not at all familiar (If selecting this option, you may end the survey at this point.)

5. Have you ever been involved in the preparation/scoring of the NGO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia?

- Yes
- No

6. In the past 12 months, have you read any part of a NGO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia report?

- Yes
- No
- Don't know

7. The sections of the NGO Sustainability Index Report that you are primarily interested in are (check all that apply):

- The country report for the country that I currently work in or on
- Other country reports
- The executive summary
- The statistical annexes
- Topical essays on specific NGO issues
- None of these

8. Have you used the information from the NGO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia for the following purposes in the past 12 months or ever? (check all that apply):

	Ever	Past 12 Months
a. Understand NGO sustainability in a particular Europe or Eurasian country		
b. Understand NGO sustainability for multiple countries or regions of Europe and Eurasia		
c. Compare NGO sustainability across countries in the Europe and Eurasia region		
d. Understand trends in NGO sustainability in a country or countries of Europe or Eurasia		
e. Monitoring or evaluation of specific civil society programs		
f. Research/Analysis of NGO sector in Europe or Eurasia		
g. Preparing a Performance Plan and Report		
h. Preparing a Performance Monitoring Plan (PMP)		
i. Program design		
j. Strategic planning		
k. Determining funding priorities		
l. Starting dialogue with policy makers/NGO stakeholders		
m. Other (please specify):		
n. I haven't used the information from the NGO Sustainability Index		

9. Please provide one or two examples of how you have used information from the NGO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia:

10. How important is information about NGO sustainability in Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia to you in your work?

- Very important
- Important
- Slightly important
- Not important
- Don't know

11. How useful to you is the NGO Sustainability Index in providing you with information you need about the NGO sector in Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia?

- Very useful
- Useful
- Slightly useful
- Not useful
- Don't know

12. How does the NGO Sustainability Index Report for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia compare to other sources of information you use for understanding the NGO sector in the Europe or Eurasian country or region that you work in or on?

- It is the most important source of information I use
- It is as important as other sources of information I use
- It is not as important as other sources of information I use
- It is not a source of information I use

13. What other sources of information do you use to understand NGO issues in the Europe or Eurasian country or region that you work in or on?

14. Please rate the usefulness to you in your work of each of the following parts of the NGO Sustainability Index report for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia:

	Very useful	Useful	Slightly useful	Not useful	Don't know
a. Executive summary					
b. Country narratives					
c. Country NGO Sustainability Index scores					
d. Country scores on each dimension of NGO sustainability					
e. Topical essays on specific NGO issues					

15. Each of the following is an action USAID could take to potentially increase usage of the NGO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia. Please select the most important actions (**no more than three**) that you think USAID should take to increase usage of the NGO Sustainability Index:

- Translate the report into local languages
- Publish the report earlier in the year so that it is closer to the reporting period
- Improve the methodology of the scoring process
- Improve the presentation/formatting of the report
- Make the NGOSI data easily accessible online (excel access)
- Define terms better (what is an NGO, are cooperatives included in this definition, etc.)
- Increase outreach and dissemination of the report
- None of these

17. Considering the country or countries included in the NGOSI for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia that you work in or are most familiar with, to what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly disagree	Don't know
a. The NGO Sustainability Index accurately describes the sustainability of the NGO sector.					
b. The NGO Sustainability Index accurately captures changes in NGO sustainability from one year to the next.					
c. The NGO Sustainability Index accurately scores the sustainability of the NGO sector compared to other countries in the region.					

18. Please rate the quality of the NGO Sustainability Index for Central and Eastern Europe and Eurasia along the following dimensions (Excellent, Good, Fair, Poor):

	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't know
a. Accuracy of the country scoring					
b. Accuracy of country narratives					
c. Reliability of the scoring methodology					
d. Transparency of the scoring methodology					
e. Presentation of findings					
f. Timeliness of the report					

19. The NGO Sustainability Index is a composite index of seven dimensions of NGO Sustainability. For each dimension listed below, please indicate if you think the dimension is very important, important, slightly important, or not at all important with regard to NGO sustainability:

	Very important	Important	Slightly important	Not at all important	Don't know
a. Legal Environment					
b. Organizational Capacity					
c. Financial Viability					
d. Advocacy					
e. Service Provision					
f. Infrastructure					
g. Public Image					

20. Are there other dimensions of NGO sustainability that should be included in the NGO Sustainability Index?

21. How important is it to you that the NGO Sustainability Index report is published on an annual basis rather than every other year?

- Very important
- Important
- Slightly important
- Not important
- Don't know

22. How important is it to you that the NGO Sustainability Index report include the Central and Eastern European countries where USAID does not have a mission presence (Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia)?

- Very important
- Important
- Slightly important
- Not important
- Don't know

23. Please suggest topics that you would like to see addressed in articles to appear in future editions of the NGO Sustainability Index.

24. Please share any additional feedback you have regarding the NGO Sustainability Index for Eastern Europe and Eurasia.

*Thank you for your time!*