

Client-Type Adapters

1. Introduction

“**Client-Type Adapters**” means that the consultant does not receive only a generic methodology, but rather short adaptation guides to apply the IGROW system according to the type of organization, client or context they are working with.

Put simply:

They are tools that help the consultant translate the same system for different types of clients without starting from scratch.

Because supporting each of the following is not the same:

- a small NGO without a formal technical team;
- a European foundation with internal processes;
- an organization that works with local partners;
- a university;
- a network or consortium;
- a social startup;
- an organization close to an audit;
- a consultant who wants to use the tool with their own clients.

The core system may be the same, but the way it is presented, prioritized and applied changes.

2. What “Client-Type Adapters” Are

Client-Type Adapters are short documents, matrices or practical guides that answer this question:

“If my client is this type of client, how should I use the system, which route should I prioritize, what language should I use, which deliverables should I adapt and what risks should I consider?”

They work as a kind of [methodological translator](#).

They do not change the IGROW method.

They ground it in different realities.

Simple Example

Let’s say the consultant is going to use the e-book:

Document Without Improvising

With a small NGO in LATAM or Europe, the approach could be:

“We are going to organize your documents, expenses and reports so you do not struggle when the donor asks for evidence.”

But with a European NGO that works with several partners, the approach would be different:

“We are going to install a minimum common system for document traceability so your implementing partners can report with greater consistency and lower risk.”

It is the same core content, but adapted to a different client, a different pain point and a different language.

That is an **adapter**.

3. What an Adapter Includes

Each adapter could be between **2 and 5 pages** and follow a simple structure.

Recommended Structure

Section	What It Answers
Type of client	Who is this adapter for?
Typical pain point	What problem does this client usually have?
Recommended language	How should you speak to them so they understand the value?
Priority route	Which e-books or modules should be used first?
Level of complexity	Basic, intermediate or advanced?
Key deliverables	What should be built?
Suggested sessions	How should the support process be organized?
Consultant alerts	What should be handled carefully with this type of client?
Possible offer	What service can the consultant sell to this client?

4. Types of Adapters You Could Include

For the **IGROW Consultant Toolkit**, I would include adapters such as these:

1. Adapter for a Small NGO

Typical Pain Point

They have a lot of commitment, few resources and informal processes.

How to Position the System

Do not talk about a “complex institutional system.” Talk about:

- minimum order;
- clarity;
- simple tools;
- practical capacity;
- less dependence on one single person;
- readiness for calls for proposals or donors.

Recommended Route

1. From Technical Project to Fundable Proposal
2. Beyond Fundraising
3. Evaluate Without Improvising
4. Document Without Improvising

Offer the Consultant Can Sell

Practical Strengthening Kit for Small NGOs in 6 Weeks

2. Adapter for a Medium-Sized NGO

Typical Pain Point

They have a team, projects and donors, but uneven processes.

How to Position the System

Talk about:

- standardization;
- internal quality;
- coordination between areas;
- consistency in proposals and reports;
- evidence management;
- efficiency.

Recommended Route

1. From Fundable Proposal to Competitive Proposal
2. Evaluate Without Improvising

3. Document Without Improvising
4. Beyond Fundraising

Possible Offer

Internal Quality System for Grants, MEL and Compliance

3. Adapter for an International NGO with Local Partners

Typical Pain Point

The European organization has high standards, but its local partners have different capacities.

How to Position the System

Talk about:

- partner capacity strengthening;
- accountability;
- donor-readiness;
- reporting consistency;
- evidence quality;
- risk reduction.

Recommended Route

1. Document Without Improvising
2. Evaluate Without Improvising
3. From Technical Project to Fundable Proposal
4. Beyond Fundraising

Possible Offer

Partner Capacity Building Toolkit

Here, the system is sold as a tool to strengthen implementing partners.

4. Adapter for Grantmaking Foundations

Typical Pain Point

The foundation funds projects, but grantees submit weak proposals or reports.

How to Position the System

It is not sold only for internal use. It is sold as:

- a resource for grantees;
- a capacity-strengthening tool;
- a guide to improve application quality;
- a common reporting standard;
- support for funded organizations.

Recommended Route

1. From Technical Project to Fundable Proposal
2. Evaluate Without Improvising
3. Document Without Improvising
4. Social ROI

Possible Offer

Grantee Readiness Program

5. Adapter for Universities or Research Centers**Typical Pain Point**

They have technical or academic knowledge, but they do not always know how to turn it into a fundable proposal.

How to Position the System

Talk about:

- translational research;
- research-to-funding;
- theory of change;
- impact pathway;
- stakeholder engagement;
- donor language.

Recommended Route

1. From Paper to Fundable Proposal

2. From Technical Project to Fundable Proposal
3. Grantwriting + Storytelling
4. Social ROI

Possible Offer

Research to Fundable Project Lab

6. Adapter for Consortia and Networks

Typical Pain Point

Many organizations, different styles, little common methodology.

How to Position the System

Talk about:

- shared language;
- common standards;
- coordination;
- clarity of roles;
- common tools;
- narrative and operational coherence.

Recommended Route

1. From Technical Project to Fundable Proposal
2. Document Without Improvising
3. Evaluate Without Improvising
4. Midterm Evaluation

Possible Offer

Common Framework for Consortium Implementation

7. Adapter for Organizations Close to Audit or Project Closure

Typical Pain Point

They need to organize evidence late, under urgency and pressure.

How to Position the System

Talk about:

- audit-readiness;
- evidence recovery;
- risk mitigation;
- reporting consistency;
- gap analysis.

Recommended Route

1. Document Without Improvising
2. Midterm Evaluation
3. Coherent Report
4. Gap Matrix

Possible Offer

Audit-Ready Sprint

8. Adapter for Social Startups or Impact Ventures

Typical Pain Point

They have an attractive solution, but they cannot always explain impact, sustainability or social value.

How to Position the System

Talk about:

- impact model;
- early evidence;
- pitch;
- cost per outcome;
- sustainability;
- value for funders.

Recommended Route

1. Grantwriting + Storytelling
2. Social ROI

3. From Technical Project to Fundable Proposal
4. Beyond Fundraising

Possible Offer

Impact & Funding Readiness Sprint

Concrete Example of an Adapter

It could look like this:

Adapter: Small NGO

Client Profile

Small organization with a reduced team, high operational workload and little formal structure for developing proposals, measuring results or documenting projects.

Main Pain Point

The organization does a lot of valuable work, but struggles to translate it into proposals, evidence, reports or clear systems for donors.

Recommended Language

Use phrases such as:

- “practical order”;
- “minimum viable system”;
- “simple tools”;
- “less improvisation”;
- “more clarity to present and report”;
- “strengthen capacity without creating bureaucracy.”

Avoid Language Such As:

- “complex institutional architecture”;
- “methodological assurance framework”;
- “advanced compliance system”;
- “multi-level integrated model.”

Because it may sound too big and scare the client. And no one happily buys something that sounds like an audit dressed in a gray suit.

Recommended Route

Stage	Route
First step	Entry diagnosis
Route 1	From Technical Project to Fundable Proposal
Route 2	Evaluate Without Improvising
Route 3	Beyond Fundraising
Route 4	Document Without Improvising

Minimum Deliverables

- simple institutional diagnosis;
- base proposal;
- basic indicator matrix;
- donor map;
- minimum document repository;
- 90-day next-step plan.

Suggested Sessions

Session	Topic
Session 1	Diagnosis and prioritization
Session 2	Proposal or funding case
Session 3	Evidence and indicators
Session 4	Resource mobilization
Session 5	Documentation and reporting
Session 6	Implementation plan

Possible Offer for the Consultant

Practical Strengthening for Small NGOs in 6 Weeks

Commercial Promise

In 6 weeks, the organization will have a clearer base proposal, a minimum evidence system, an initial donor map and a practical route to organize its next steps in funding and management.

Why This Increases the Value of the Toolkit

The adapters make your offer look much more professional because they show that you are not selling isolated content, but a methodology that can be applied to different contexts.

For the consultant, the benefit is huge:

- they know how to start with each type of client;
- they can diagnose faster;
- they do not freeze when facing different realities;
- they can adapt the language;
- they can prepare commercial proposals faster;
- they can sell specific packages;
- they can avoid using the same approach for everyone.