

**United States Agency for International Development
Bureau of Democracy, Conflict and Humanitarian
Assistance**

**Office of Food for Peace
Fiscal Year 2011 Annual Results Report
ACDI/VOCA /Bangladesh**

Award Number:
AID-FFP-A-10-00012

Submission Date: November 7, 2011

| | |
|--|--|
| Awardee HQ Contact Name | Avram E. Guroff, Senior Managing Director, Food Security |
| Awardee HQ Contact Address | ACDI/VOCA, 50 F Street N.W., Suite 1075, Washington DC, 20001 |
| Awardee HQ Contact Telephone Number | (202) 879 0604 |
| Awardee HQ Contact Fax Number | (202) 626 8726 |
| Awardee HQ Contact Email Address | AGuroff@acdivoca.org |

| | |
|--|---|
| Host Country Office Contact Name | Marie Cadrin |
| Host Country Office Address | House 30, Road 19/A, Banani, Dhaka-1213 |
| Host Country Office Contact Telephone | 88-02-8836801 |
| Host Country Office Contact Fax Number | |
| Host Country Office Contact Email Address | mcadrin@acdivoca-proshar.org |

Acronyms

| | |
|-------|--|
| AFE | Action for Enterprise |
| ANC | Antenatal Care |
| BCC | Behavior Change Communication |
| BDHS | Bangladesh Demographic Health Survey |
| CARE | Cooperative Assistant for Relief Everywhere |
| CDC | Commodity Distribution Coordinator |
| CDMP | Comprehensive Disaster Management Program |
| CEGIS | Center for Environmental and Geographic Information Services |
| CFW | Cash For Work |
| CMAM | Community based Management of Acute Malnutrition. |
| CPP | Cyclone Preparedness Program |
| CRA | Community Risk Assessment |
| CSD | Central Storage Depot |
| CSS | Christian Service Society |
| DG | Directorate General |
| DGFP | Directorate General of Family Planning |
| DMB | Disaster Management Bureau |
| DMC | Disaster Management Committees |
| DND | Doer/NonDoer |
| DoE | Department of Environment |
| DRM | Disaster Risk Management |
| DRR | Disaster Risk Reduction |
| DRRP | Disaster Risk Reduction Plan |
| EPI | Expanded Program on Immunization |
| FDP | Food Distribution Point |
| FDC | Food Distribution Committee |
| FFW | Food For Work |
| FGD | Focus Group Discussion |
| FLC | Food Logistic Coordinator |
| FPI | Family Planning Inspector |
| FWA | Family Welfare Assistant |
| FWC | Family Welfare Center |
| FWV | Family Welfare Visitor |
| FY | Fiscal Year |
| GIAP | Gender Integrated Action Plan |
| GMP | Growth Monitoring and Promotion |
| GoB | Government of Bangladesh |
| HA | Health Assistant |
| HI | Health Inspector |
| HP | Health Promoter |
| IMCI | Integrated Management of Childhood Illness. |
| IR | Intermediate Result |

| | |
|---------|--|
| JHU | Johns Hopkins University |
| KII | Key Informant Interview |
| KU | Khulna University |
| M&E | Monitoring & Evaluation |
| MCHN | Maternal & Child Health Nutrition |
| MIS | Management Information System |
| ML | Mother Leader |
| MoF&DM | Ministry of Food and Disaster Management |
| MoHFW | Ministry of Health and Family Welfare |
| MoU | Memorandum of Understanding |
| MT | Metric ton |
| MYAP | Multi Year Assistance Program. |
| NDPD | National Disaster Preparedness Day |
| PCI | Project Concern International |
| PIO | Project Implementation Officer |
| PM2A | Prevention of Malnutrition Under two (2 years Age) Approach |
| PNGO | Partner NGO |
| PRA | Participatory Rural Appraisal |
| PROSHAR | Program for strengthening Household Access to Resources |
| PW | Pregnant Women |
| RCHCIB | Revitalization of Community Health Care Initiative in Bangladesh |
| RUTF | Ready to Use Therapeutic Food |
| SMC | Shelter Management Committees |
| SO | Strategic Objective |
| SoD | Standing Order on Disasters |
| SOP | Standard Operating Procedures |
| TAG | Technical Advisory Group |
| TC | Technical Coordinator |
| TOT | Training of Trainers |
| UAO | Upazila Agricultural Officer |
| UDMC | Union Disaster Management Committees |
| UFPO | Upazila Family Planning Officer |
| UH&FPO | Upazila Health & Family Planning Officer |
| ULO | Upazila Livestock Officer |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Programme |
| UNO | Upazila Nirbahi Officer |
| USAID | United States Agency for international Development. |
| UzDMC | Upazila Disaster Management Committees |
| WED | World Environment Day |

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| 1. Introduction: Annual Food Aid Program Results..... | 1 |
| Program Scale-Up | 1 |
| SO 1: Incomes and access to food of poor and ultra poor households improved | 4 |
| SO2: Health of pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and children under 5 (with particular attention to children under 2) improved..... | 5 |
| SO3: Institutions and households prepared to respond effectively to shocks | 8 |
| 2. Success Stories | 11 |
| National Disaster Preparedness Day (NDPD) to strengthen community’s resiliency to cope with disaster..... | 11 |
| National Level Activities | 11 |
| Local Level Activities | 11 |
| 3. Lessons Learned | 12 |
| SO 1: Incomes and access to food of poor and ultra poor households improved | 12 |
| SO2: Health of pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and children under 5 (with particular attention to children under 2) improved..... | 12 |
| SO3: Institutions and households prepared to respond effectively to shocks | 12 |
| Commodity management and logistics | 12 |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | 12 |

Attachments

- A. Indicator Performance Tracking Table
- B. Detailed Implementation Plan
- C. Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire
- D. Tracking Table for Beneficiaries and Resources
- E. Expenditure Report
- F. Monetization Tables
- G. Baseline Survey Report
- H. Supplemental Materials
 - H1. Two Success Stories
- I. Completeness Checklist

1. Introduction: Annual Food Aid Program Results

On May 24, 2010, ACDI/VOCA was awarded a five year Multi-Year Assistance Program (MYAP) from USAID to reduce food insecurity in three upazilas (Batiaghata, Lohagara and Sarankhola) of Khulna Division in Bangladesh.¹ The Program for Strengthening Household Access to Resources (PROSHAR) is an integrated initiative that promotes sustainable livelihood strategies, improved health and nutrition, and enhanced community ability to respond to vulnerabilities and shocks. During FY2011, PROSHAR established the necessary foundation to achieve the program goal of reducing food insecurity among vulnerable rural populations in the three upazilas noted above.

The goal is supported by three Strategic Objectives (SOs):

- **SO 1: Incomes and access to food of poor and ultra poor households improved;**
- **SO2: Health of pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and children under 5 (with particular attention to children under 2 years of age) improved; and**
- **SO3: Institutions and households prepared to respond effectively to shocks.**

Some preparatory accomplishments in each strategic objective (SO) are summarized in the chart below:

| SO | Accomplishments |
|-----|---|
| SO1 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identification of 6 shortlisted value chains for focus in coming year; 2. Validation of household vulnerability criteria to assist livelihood beneficiaries selection. 3. Completion of modules for Training of Trainers (TOT), gender and communication. 4. Establishment of initial linkages with private sector organizations in aquaculture, horticulture, livestock and poultry. |
| SO2 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Memoranda of understanding (MoUs) with Community Clinic Project & Directorate General of Family Planning. 2. 586 pregnant women in three phase-I² unions. 3. Food distribution to 335 individuals in 65 households. 4. Capacity assessment of community clinic, village doctors and drug sellers. 5. Provision of ANC services facilitated to 494 registered beneficiaries. |
| SO3 | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Capacity assessment of 3 upazila Disaster Management Committees (DMCs) and 23 union DMCs; 2. Observation of National Disaster Preparedness Day (NDPD) and World Environment Day (WED) where approximately 11,000 people participated; 3. Early warning capacity assessment in 23 unions. |

Program Scale-Up

Partner NGO Selection and Scale-Up: Most of the program's activities for all SOs in FY2011 were designed to be implemented by local sub-grantee NGOs, or "partner NGOs" (PNGOs). In order to ensure that the best-suited sub-grantee NGOs were identified, PROSHAR undertook a call for "expressions of interest", resulting in the receipt of 91 organizational expressions of interest. In March, 2011, these applications were reviewed and a shortlist of 17 organizations was prepared. These organizations were then requested to submit a full proposal, and 14 submitted full proposals by the deadline.

¹ For reporting purposes, the implementation year is considered June 1-May 31.

² Given the delays in partner NGO recruitment, PROSHAR staff began direct distribution without the participation of PNGOs, termed "Phase 1". These unions were: Khontaka Union, Sarankhola Upazila, Amirpur Union in Batiaghata Upazila, and Kashipur Union in Lohagara Upazila

ACDI/VOCA Awards and Compliance staff then traveled to Bangladesh in April, 2011, to evaluate the proposals. Three organizations were selected, with a back-up list prepared of 2 other organizations. In mid-May, 2011, PROSHAR Finance and Administrative personnel conducted a financial review and organizational assessment, which resulted in the replacement of one of the three top candidates with one organization from the back-up list.

These three organizations then were supported in preparing budgets for the planned year 1 activities as set out in the proposal, and this was completed by the end of June, 2011. In July 2011, PROSHAR received approval from the USAID Mission for its 2011-2012 subawards for these three PNGOs. PROSHAR determined that Fixed Obligation Grants (FOGs) were the most appropriate sub-grant mechanism, and these were signed on August 4, 2011. Initial FOGs (Phase 1) were developed for a 3 month period, then extended for an additional month to allow PNGOs sufficient time for hiring staff. The remaining grant period will begin December 1, 2011.

The three partner NGOs, Muslim Aid in Lohagara Upazila, CODEC in Sarankhola Upazila, and SHUSHILAN in Batiaghata Upazila, then began recruitment of key personnel and field staff for upazila and union level positions. Given the large number of applicants, the recruitment had not been completed as of the end of the fiscal year. However, Muslim Aid established its office in Lohagara in August 2011, while CODEC signed its lease agreement for its Sarankhola office in September, which was effective October 01, 2011.

Beneficiary Registration: Given the delays in PNGO recruitment, PROSHAR created a revised start-up plan in which enumerators were hired to register and validate pregnant women (PW) beneficiaries in place of PNGO staff, and PROSHAR staff began direct distribution without the participation of PNGOs. As a result, 586 beneficiaries were registered in the Phase 1 Unions: Khontaka Union, Sarankhola Upazila, Amirpur Union in Batiaghata Upazila, and Kashipur Union in Lohagara Upazila. During the registration process, the level of household vulnerability was also determined in order to identify SO1 Livelihoods beneficiaries.

Community Mobilization: At the same time, PROSHAR continued its community mobilization activities, including participation in upazila coordination health meetings. These meetings, which are attended regularly by PROSHAR Technical Coordinators, provide forums for discussing PROSHAR activities with the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW) staff. PROSHAR upazila teams also arranged meetings with local NGOs working on maternal health.

Key Assessments: Significant progress has also been made in FY2011 to ensure rapid and effective scaling-up of activities in FY2012. A number of preparatory activities were conducted, including the baseline survey, value chain assessments to shortlist key agriculture sub-sectors, assessments of community clinic capacity, assessments of early warning capacity, a shelter assessment, search and rescue capacity in the two high risk upazilas (Sarankhola and Batiaghata), an assessment of key behaviors influencing vulnerability of households in the target areas (which informed the behavior change and communication (BCC) strategy), and an assessment of barriers to promoting gender equity in the project areas. These assessments have been used to refine the detailed implementation plan for 2011/2012. PROSHAR also established offices in Khulna, and the three upazilas, recruited staff, and set up systems and logistics.

Lean Season Identification: As preparation for the first food distributions, PROSHAR identified the actual lean season for each upazila and validated the information collected through the baseline survey. This validation occurred through participatory rural appraisals (PRAs) conducted at the upazila level, with the participation of multi-sectoral stakeholders, such as the Upazila Chairman, Upazila Nirbahi Officer (UNO), Upazila Health & Family Planning Officer (UH&FPO), Medical Officer (MO), Upazila Livestock Officer (ULO), Upazila Agricultural Officer (UAO), Health Inspector (HI), Union Parishad Chairmen and Members, local leaders representatives from the grain and business communities, day laborers, PROSHAR beneficiaries and other community members, totaling 107 participants in the three upazilas. The results of these PRA activities were further validated through Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) conducted with women's groups in 8 of the 23 unions targeted for participation. These unions were selected to represent the range of unions, in terms of access to markets, and to reflect the different communication challenges faced in the outlying unions. All participants were local married women, and included pregnant women.

The team triangulated the information and PROSHAR has identified the following months as upazila lean seasons for family ration distribution:

- Batiaghata: September, October, and November
- Lohagara: October, November, and April
- Sarankhola: September, October, and November

Inception Meetings: As the formal entry point of PROSHAR into various communities, and in preparation for the initial commodity distributions, union level inception meetings were organized in each of the three initial unions receiving direct distribution under the leadership of the Union Parishad. Approximately, 60-70 participants attended the meetings, and included UNOs, UH&FPOs, Upazila Family Planning Officers (UFPO), Medical Officers - Maternal and Child Health and Family Planning, Agriculture Officers, fisheries officers, Project Implementation Officer (PIO), the Union Parishad Chairmen, Health and Family Planning Authorities like Family Welfare Visitors (FWV), Family Planning Inspectors (FPI), Family Welfare Assistants (FWA), Health Assistants (HA) and HIs. Community representatives included farmers, fishermen, husbands of pregnant women, religious leaders, community leaders, teachers, male and female students, community clinic land donors, the Food Distribution Committee (FDC) and PROSHAR representatives. During the inception meetings, a presentation on PROSHAR was given in which each of PROSHAR's Strategic Objectives was introduced.

USAID Mission Visits: PROSHAR was privileged to host USAID representatives from both the Bangladesh Mission and Washington, DC, on numerous occasions to observe program activities. Food for Peace Officer Paul Novick of USAID/Washington, along with Shahnaz Zakaria (AOTR), Mohammad Shibly and Tofayel Alam of USAID/Dhaka visited the PROSHAR Dhaka office for a presentation on the PROSHAR Baseline Survey on June 23 and visited the Khulna office and PROSHAR's program Upazilas from June 26-27. The meetings were productive and focused on the project's progress to date, as well as implementation challenges. PROSHAR's AOTR, Ms. Shahnaz Zakaria, also participated in the debriefing on PROSHAR BCC strategy on September 19, 2011 and observed our first ration distribution on September 29, 2011, providing her valuable feedback and guidance.

Staff Recruitment: PROSHAR recruited several highly qualified candidates to fill Key positions during FY2011. In May, 2011 PROSHAR hired an Administrative Director, followed by a permanent Chief of Party in August 2011, following a staffing change in this position. A new Monitoring and Evaluation Director was also hired in May 2011, and PROSHAR continues to seek a qualified Deputy Chief of Party (DCOP), following the dismissal of the former DCOP in November, 2010. A staffing firm has been hired to assist in filling this position, which is currently the only remaining open Key position.

NGO Coordination: FY2011 saw increased collaboration between PROSHAR and the two other MYAP partners in Bangladesh, CARE and Save the Children. PROSHAR actively engaged both organizations in discussions ranging from ration size to commodity management databases to beneficiary selection, all in an effort to learn from their experiences. PROSHAR is also coordinating with Save the Children for the opportunity to their McAID database for PROSHAR's monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and commodity management databases.

SO 1: Incomes and access to food of poor and ultra poor households improved

Program Implementation Strategy Workshop: PROSHAR SO1 staff participated in a three-day workshop in July, 2011, and developed a program implementation strategy and work plan that reflected the different agro-ecological characteristics of each upazila (see Attachment 3). The strategy identified the characteristics of the three target groups for participation in this strategic objective.

| Indicator | Ultra Poor/Most Vulnerable | Poor/Vulnerable | Small Farmer/ On the edge |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Monthly HH Income (Tk) | <4000 | 4000 - <5500 | 5500-7500 |
| Main Occupation | Agricultural day labor | Any day labor, Homestead farming, | Small farming, Off farm activities |
| Land size (decimals) | <10 | 10-50 | 50-100 |
| Domestic assets (Tk) | 10000 | 20000 | 40000 |
| Productive assets (Tk) | 4000 | 7000 | 16000 |
| Livestock assets (Tk) | 6000 | 8000 | 14000 |
| Ditch / Pond (decimals) | No ownership/access | <5 | >5 |
| Duration of food crisis period (month) | >4 | > 3 | 3 or <3 |
| Social Status | Widow/Female headed, HH member with disability | Minority ethnic groups | N/A |

**Note: 1 USD = approximately 74 Taka*

Data collected in the Phase 1 unions indicated that, on average 82% of PM2A beneficiaries fall within the groups targeted in SO1, with lower percentages (78.1%) in Lohagara and higher percentages (89.6%) in Batiaghata.

Group Formation: Ground work for group formation *was* completed. The PROSHAR team visited the Union Parishads in three upazilas and discussed the criteria for identification and ultimate selection of poor and ultra-poor households. Union Parishads have shared their list of poor and ultra-poor households with the PROSHAR team. These lists will be validated or adjusted through the information collected during beneficiary registration, and through PRAs that will be conducted at the village level.

Value Chain Analysis and Networking: Action for Enterprise (AFE) submitted the final report for value chain selection in Sarankhola Upazila. The value chain selection exercise resulted in the identification of six shortlisted value chains that have potential for improvement in PROSHAR implementation areas. AFE also submitted the final report on the handicrafts sector. Both reports were reviewed by the team and were used to identify interventions and activities that will best contribute to PROSHAR's beneficiaries.

In addition, the PROSHAR team identified the key actors in the aquaculture industry for all three upazilas. The team also began building networks with private sector enterprises in the poultry and livestock sectors, which included visiting providers of inputs for the poultry sector down to the union level.

Development of Curriculum/Training Modules: PROSHAR finalized a number of training modules for the PNGOs, which will also benefit staff working toward the other two SOs. These include a Training of Trainers module, a Communications Training module, and a Gender Integration module.

SO2: Health of pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and children under 5 (with particular attention to children under 2) improved

The MoU between the Revitalization of Community Health Care Initiative in Bangladesh (RCHCIB), Community Clinic Project and PROSHAR was signed on July 13, 2011. The MoU provides the framework within which collaboration with 55 RCHCIB clinics operating in the PROSHAR implementation area will occur. The Integrated Management of Childhood Illness (IMCI) unit of the Directorate General of Health issued a Letter of Support to PROSHAR on July 17, 2011. Finally, a MoU was signed on July 27, 2011, between the Directorate General of Family Planning (DGFP) and PROSHAR, which also outlines the framework for collaboration.

In response to concerns expressed by USAID regarding the speed of scaling up of SO2 activities, the PROSHAR team redesigned the scale up plan so that activities will begin in all unions by December 31, 2011. The scale up plan is presented in the table below:

| Phased Start-up of Activities | Batiaghata | Lohagara | Sarankhola |
|---|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 1: First food distribution Sept 29/Oct 3, 2011 | 1 union | 1 union | 1 union |
| 2: Registration of beneficiaries begins Oct 16, 2011 | 4 unions | 2 unions | 0 unions |
| 3: Registration of beneficiaries begins Nov 11, 2011 | 2 unions | 3 unions | 1 union |
| 4: Registration of beneficiaries begins Dec 11, 2011 | 0 unions | 4 unions | 1 union |
| 5: Registration of beneficiaries begins Dec 26, 2011 | 0 unions | 2 unions | 1 union |
| TOTAL UNIONS COVERED by December 31/2011 | 7 unions | 12 unions | 4 unions |

Prevention of Malnutrition in Children Under 2 Approach (PM2A): In FY2011, in order to help to prevent malnutrition, PROSHAR staff helped to mobilize the communities to participate in the national and local level campaigns related to Mother and Child Health and Nutrition (MCHN). These campaigns included: (a) National Immunization Days, (b) Vitamin-A and deworming campaigns, (c) National Breastfeeding Week, and (d) World Population Day.

In July 2011, PROSHAR developed an informational one-pager on the PM2A approach. This document contains information on PROSHAR's proposed PM2A activities, services, beneficiary selection and rations size and served as a helpful tool in sharing our PM2A approach with CARE and Save the Children and comparing our respective methodologies. This information also served to inform the July 28, 2011 meeting that occurred in Washington between ACIDI/VOCA, USAID and FANTA-2, where the direct distribution ration size was discussed and subsequently approved.

PM2A Beneficiary Registration: PROSHAR began its SO2 beneficiary selection process in August 2011. Three PROSHAR Technical Coordinators (TCs) and nine Commodity Distribution Coordinators (CDCs) were trained on beneficiary registration to ensure systematic registration. These staff provided training and oversight to enumerators hired to register pregnant women (PW) through house-to-house visits in the three Phase 1 Unions, followed by verification/validation of the PW by PROSHAR staff. A total of 586 pregnant women were registered and sensitized about the project objectives and their roles/responsibilities as PM2A beneficiaries. They were provided with PM2A growth monitoring/ration cards and advised to receive Ante-Natal Care (ANC) from nearby satellite clinics or health facilities. During the registration process, the CDCs also plotted the physical location of beneficiaries' houses on union maps to group them in a convenient way to form Care Groups (CG).

Training of Trainers on Care Groups: In March 2011, PROSHAR organized a week-long training for its staff on Care Groups, led by consultant Carolyn Wetzel. Topics covered included: CG criteria; how to form CGs; roles and responsibilities of CG personnel; how to monitor and evaluate data related to CGs; and working with volunteers. Many of the training activities were structured around small group work, providing participants with hands-on experience with designing, planning and evaluating Care Groups.

Development of Care Group Modules: The first module to be delivered to Care Groups was developed and is comprised of sessions on: (a) an overview of PROSHAR; (b) ante-natal care services; (c) growth monitoring and promotion (GMP); and (d) use of the PM2A rations.

Growth Monitoring Session with Expanded Program on Immunization (EPI): During FY2011, PROSHAR worked with Health Assistants (HA) and Health Inspectors and updated the EPI micro plan in all three upazilas to ensure GMP is covered in all EPI sessions.

Community Management of Acute Malnutrition Programming and Procurement of Ready to Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF): On May 26, 2011, PROSHAR submitted a detailed description of its Community Based Management of Acute Malnutrition (CMAM) program to USAID to explain how RUTF (specifically, PlumpyNut), if procured, would be used in the program. The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare outlined parameters and protocols within the National

Guidelines for the Management of Severe Acute Malnutrition in Bangladesh to guide PROSHAR. PROSHAR received approval from USAID on August 18, 2011 to purchase RUTF with monetization funds and received the formal support of the Ministry of Food and Disaster Management (MoF&DM) necessary for the importation application subsequently submitted to the Ministry of Commerce.

Health Clinic Services: There are 55 community clinics in the PROSHAR target areas. During FY2011, PROSHAR established relationships with these clinics and conducted a comprehensive assessment to have an understanding of the services provided, and how they can be improved. In addition, PROSHAR established relationships with two Smiling Sun Clinics franchises.

Integrated Management of Childhood Illnesses (IMCI) Training: Two PROSHAR staff participated in the GoB's IMCI annual work plan meeting, in which PROSHAR IMCI related activities were integrated for the period of July 2011 to June 2012. PROSHAR also negotiated and drafted a MoU with the IMCI unit to train 78 HAs, 85 FWAs, 25 Doctors, 30 Paramedics, and approximately 400 drug seller/village doctors from the three PROSHAR upazilas. It is expected that this MoU will be signed in the first quarter of FY2011/12.

Ante-Natal Care Activities: PROSHAR initiated a working relationship with the Family Planning Department in each upazila, as defined by its MoU, and with local NGOs working on maternal health. As a result, ANC services were provided to 494 registered PW during FY2011.

Capacity Building of Village Doctors, Drug Sellers and MoHFW Staff: In FY2011, PROSHAR conducted an assessment of village doctors and drug sellers in order to identify capacity gaps that could be addressed. The team also collected similar information about GOB staff working in this sector in each upazila. This information has been used to plan the training that will take place in FY 2012 to enhance IMCI and MCHN activities in PROSHAR areas.

Commodity Management and Logistics

Food Distribution Point (FDP) Selection and Validation: PROSHAR carefully selected FDPs to ensure reasonable access of the beneficiaries, so that no beneficiary was more than 5 km from a distribution point and that distribution points met the criteria outlined in PROSHAR's Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs). All sites were physically verified and community members were invited to a discussion about PROSHAR and the use of their facility as a FDP. A total of 67 FDPs were selected in PROSHAR target areas.

Formation and Training: For the initial commodity distribution, eight Food Distribution Committees were formed in the three Phase 1 unions, and oriented to their roles and responsibilities. Each committee has seven members, including at least one female Union Parishad member. In addition, PROSHAR organized a two-day training for Commodity Distribution Coordinators (CDCs) and relevant commodity staff on SOPs.

Ration Distribution in FY2011: PROSHAR's first distribution took place on September 29, 2011, at Kashipur Union Parishad (in Lohagara Upazila) in the presence of USAID representatives, Ms. Shahnaz Zakaria and Mr. Abdullah Al Mamun. A total of 65 beneficiaries

received household rations, thereby increasing food availability for 335 people in these 65 households. PROSHAR personnel monitored each step in order to identify potential weaknesses in the system. Overall, the distribution proved successful and was carried out as planned. Following the distribution, minor changes were made to improve the efficiency of the distribution, e.g., the scooping method, and to reduce the waiting time for beneficiaries.

Commodity Distribution Status: The commodity distribution status (MT) as of September 30, 2011, was as follows:

| Commodity | Lohagara (MT) | Total (MT) |
|------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Wheat | 1.43 | 1.43 |
| Lentils | 0.33 | 0.33 |
| Veg. Oil | 0.09 | 0.09 |
| Total | | 1.85 |

SO3: Institutions and households prepared to respond effectively to shocks

PROSHAR's SO3 strategy was designed to build on the existing capacity of local stakeholders in Bangladesh, integrate its activities with initiatives underway with the Government of Bangladesh (GoB), and link to universities in Bangladesh and abroad to raise the rigor with which the program's activities are implemented, monitored, evaluated, and shared. In order to implement this strategy, PROSHAR formalized relationships with key agencies at the international, national, upazila, union and ward levels including: the Disaster Management Bureau (DMB), the Comprehensive Disaster Management Program (CDMP), the Department of Environment (DoE), Khulna University (KU), the National Alliance on Disaster Risk Reduction Initiatives, Johns Hopkins University (JHU), the Center for Environmental and Geographic Information Services (CEGIS), the Cyclone Preparedness Program (CPP), and 29 Disaster Management Committees (DMCs) at the union (23), upazila (3) and district (3) levels.

PROSHAR held its first Technical Advisory Group (TAG) meeting on September 21, 2011, with six members attending from the DMB, CDMP, UNDP, University of Dhaka (Department of Geography & Environment), KU (Environmental Science Discipline), and JHU. The TAG will assist PROSHAR to implement Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) activities at the community level through knowledge sharing, document review and field observations. During this first meeting, the TAG gave valuable inputs on potential SO3 interventions which were then incorporated into the most recent work plan. These suggestions included mapping out government initiatives on DRR along with NGO mapping which is now underway.

Status Assessment of Disaster Management Committees (DMCs): PROSHAR assessed the status of DMCs against the DMB's Standing Order on Disasters (SoD) to determine how functionality and to initiate collaboration with them. The assessment found that committees were formed at the upazila level, yet none were functioning.

In collaboration with upazila officials, PROSHAR organized training for 159 committee members from all upazila disaster management committees (UzDMC) in the PROSHAR program area (Sarankhola on May 3, 2011; Lohagara on May 22, 2011 and Batiaghata on May 25, 2011), and one Union Disaster Management Committee (UDMC) to activate them and build

their capacity in the area of Disaster Risk Management (DRM). During the training, it was discovered that none of the committees were familiar with the SoD or their duties to prevent, prepare and respond to disasters; moreover, two of the three UzDMCs had never convened prior to the training. Since then, three upazila DMCs have been meeting monthly, and are committed to meet as required during disasters to support emergency response and coordination efforts.

Disaster Preparedness and Response Capacity Assessment of DMCs: In July 2011, PROSHAR assessed the disaster preparedness and response capacity of all UzDMCs, as well as of 23 UDMCs in preparation for planning union level activities. The assessment considered how well equipped committees were to prevent, mitigate and respond to emergencies and identified opportunities to strengthen local understanding of early warning and initial response, such as first aid and search and rescue. PROSHAR incorporated these findings into its planned capacity building efforts, particularly those focused on the ward and union level DMCs. The assessment helped to refine strategies that PROSHAR will utilize with local partners, such as CPP, CDMP and other existing NGOs in the area, to meet the needs for materials and training for key groups.

Existing Community Infrastructure Assessment: Cyclone/flood shelters are essential for saving the lives and protecting the assets of affected people at the time of a disaster. PROSHAR completed a detailed assessment of the existing shelters within the PROSHAR working area (23 unions) to identify the physical conditions, facilities, gaps and capacity of the shelters. This assessment determined that:

- There are a total of 99 reinforced concrete shelters (82 in Sarankhola, 16 in Batiaghata and 1 in Lohagara) in PROSHAR program areas.
- In most of the shelters, water-sanitation facilities are very poor, Shelter Management Committees (SMCs) are almost inactive, and roads linking the community and shelter are very poor or absent. While physical conditions are repairable, repair and maintenance work of shelters are not being carried out on a regular basis.

The assessment identified key opportunities for PROSHAR to improve the current status of cyclone/flood shelters by engaging communities and relevant stakeholders in the repair and maintenance of the shelters, which will guide work under this SO in the coming year.

Early Warning Systems: As part of initial assessments of local preparedness and capacity to respond to disasters, PROSHAR conducted an assessment on the adequacy of early warning, search and rescue and first aid equipment in all 23 PROSHAR unions. The assessment also identified locations of equipment that could be rented, their condition and further requirements for providing early warning to the communities and conducting emergency response actions. Three key findings of the assessment were: (1) only 4 UDMCs possessed a limited amount of early warning equipment; (2) no search and rescue or first aid equipment was available within any of the assessed UDMCs; and (3) the Cyclone Preparedness Program (CPP) in Sarankhola Upazila had some early warning equipment, but not all of it was functional.

Based on the findings of the assessment described above, PROSHAR procured early warning materials and is in the process of designing specialized training curricula for the target

communities. Early warning, search and rescue, as well as first aid materials were procured for five DMCs in Sarankhola and eight DMCs in Batiaghata Upazilas.³

Increasing Knowledge and Skills: A major component of PROSHAR's DRM strategy is to generate risk reduction awareness among target areas and strengthen community resiliency to cope with disasters. In line with existing national level campaigns, PROSHAR organized two events to increase knowledge on disaster preparedness and environmental issues during FY2011 which benefited an estimated 11,000 people across project areas. Activities included:

Observing National Disaster Preparedness Day (NDPD): In Dhaka, on March 31, 2011, PROSHAR actively participated in scheduled NDPD events, including a national rally, to support public awareness for disaster preparedness and to introduce PROSHAR to a wide audience of stakeholders. At the local level, PROSHAR and UzDMCs organized rallies, discussion sessions and other interactive activities throughout project areas, engaging more than 1,000 students in efforts to generate community awareness. Around 7,000 people benefited from PROSHAR's NDPD activities.

Observing World Environment Day (WED): On June 5, 2011, PROSHAR organized a number of activities at divisional and upazila levels to commemorate World Environment Day and increase public awareness on environmental risks and vulnerabilities along coastal communities of Bangladesh. In collaboration with the DoE, KU and UzDMCs, PROSHAR organized rallies, seminars, and cultural programs as well as essay and art competitions which reached around 4,000 people with key messages. PROSHAR also initiated a tree planting project and successfully planted 90 coconut saplings in three schools.



Pot Song on NDPD 2011 at National Disaster Preparedness Day. The disaster preparedness and response pot song was performed by Rupantor's (a Khulna-based NGO) cultural team was on behalf of PROSHAR at Osmani Sriti Milonayotan (Osmani Memorial auditorium). Photograph by Mr. Md. Atiq Uz Zaman, March 31 2011.

National Level Highlights:

- 40,000 posters highlighting the theme of the NDPD were printed and posted around the country (PROSHAR funded 10,000 copies).
- A Newspaper supplement describing PROSHAR program was printed in two national newspapers (The Daily Star and The Daily Ittefaq) on March 31, 2011, with a circulation of more than 400,000 copies nationwide.
- Hundreds of thousands of Bangladeshis were made aware of NDPD and its theme *Disaster Preparedness at Households Saves Lives and Livelihoods* through mass media.
- PROSHAR was introduced to MoFDM and the Directorate of DBM to raise awareness of MoFDM and DBM about PROSHAR's strategies and geographical areas.

³ These materials were distributed in October, 2011

2. Success Stories

National Disaster Preparedness Day (NDPD) to strengthen community's resiliency to cope with disaster

National Disaster Preparedness Day (NDPD) was celebrated on March 31, 2011, with the theme of “Disaster Preparedness at Households Saves Lives and Livelihoods.” Given that a key component of the PROSHAR program is to strengthen communities' resiliency to cope with disaster, PROSHAR actively participated in NDPD events at the national and local levels.

National Level Activities: The Honorable Minister of Food and Disaster Management attended the national rally and seminar as Chief Guest. In addition, the Chairman of the Bangladesh University Grant Commission presented a key note paper on the NDPD.

PROSHAR also contributed to a newspaper supplement with a special message from the Honorable President, Prime Minister, Minister of the MoFDM, Secretary of the MoFDM, and DG of DMB. A short note on PROSHAR was published in the supplement. In this way, PROSHAR received national coverage through print and electronic media.

Local Level Activities:

Sarankhola Upazila: NDPD was observed over two days. PROSHAR assisted in holding a student gathering and quiz competition on disaster topics and organized a rally, a discussion session on disaster preparedness, and an award ceremony. About 500 people including students, teachers, local government officials and journalists attended the two days of events. The respective UNO and PIO led the events on behalf of the upazila administration.

Batiaghata Upazila: NDPD was observed over two days. PROSHAR held discussion sessions on disaster preparedness and a quiz competition with students. Around 150 students participated in the quiz competition. PROSHAR staff together with the upazila administration organized a rally with approximately 150 people. Around 235 participants attended the discussion meeting and award ceremony.



Honorable Minister Dr. Muhammad Abdur Razzaque, and Secretary of MoFDM Dr. Aslam Alam are leading the rally of the NDPD at Dhaka on March 31, 2011
Photographer- Zakir Hossain

Local Level Highlights:

- Approximately 1,000 school student participated in the discussions, rally and quiz competitions
- Around 5,000 people were sensitized about NDPD and the PROSHAR project through loud speaker messages, rallies, promotional posters, etc.
- Approximately 30 government officials, 40 teachers, 25 staff from local NGOs, 10 staff from local government offices and 8 staff from local media participated in the NDPD events.
- 45 coconut saplings were given to the students as gifts for participating in the Quiz Competition.



Local level student rally for NDPD at Lohagora on March 31, 2011
Photographer: Md. Joyнал Abedin

Lohagara Upazila: Three events were held: a rally, a quiz competition for school students, and a discussion meeting. Around 275 people, including students, GoB and NGO officials, school teachers and local people participated. The UNO chaired the program while the Upazila Chairman attended as Chief Guest. Around 300 participants attended the session. All participants including representatives from the local administrations, elected members, teachers/religious leaders and NGO representatives stressed adequate preparedness for reducing disaster risk and losses during their discussions. Special emphasis was placed on how individuals can increase their resilience to shocks to be better prepared for disasters. PROSHAR facilitated the program and provided support to ensure its success.

3. Lessons Learned

General: PROSHAR has learned to organize the inception meetings on a large scale so that more community people can participate. In addition, a cultural program will be added to the inception meetings to promote greater community participation.

SO 1: Incomes and access to food of poor and ultra poor households improved

- Due to low numbers of NGOs presently operating in this area, and traditional attitudes about the rights of the ultra-poor to access government services, considerable effort will be needed to ensure the engagement of the ultra-poor.

SO2: Health of pregnant and lactating women (PLW) and children under 5 (with particular attention to children under 2) improved

- PROSHAR will need to negotiate with the GoB to include GMP into the EPI sessions in order to ensure sustainability of this activity.
- PROSHAR needs to communicate directly with the GoB and NGO service providers to ensure the regularity of EPI sessions and ANC services to all beneficiaries.

SO3: Institutions and households prepared to respond effectively to shocks

- Training of all DMC volunteers is not required. Only new volunteers will be trained.
- Involving school students, particularly through quiz competitions, is an effective means of raising mass awareness.
- Involving government stakeholders at all levels is critical.

Commodity Management and Logistics

- More training of FDC members is needed so that they are clear on their roles and responsibilities.
- Appropriate information systems are needed to ensure that illiterate beneficiaries are informed about the ration sizes.
- Additional training and monitoring is needed to ensure proper scooping and packing during the food distribution.
- PROSHAR will need to develop a strategy to ensure food distributions occur as close to planned distribution dates whenever hartals and other strikes disrupt planned distribution.

Monitoring & Evaluation

- Monthly refresher trainings will be needed for M&E of PNGOs, as there are insufficient numbers of persons with M&E experience to meet the needs at the upazila level.

| PROSHAR Indicator Performance Tracking Table | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|
| No. | Indicator | Direction of Change | Baseline | Yr1 Target FY11 Oct 2010-Sep 2011 | Actual FY11 | Act/Target FY11 | Yr2 Target FY12 Oct 2011-Sep 2012 | Actual FY12 | Act/Target FY12 | Yr3 Target FY13 Oct 2012-Sep 2013 | Actual FY13 | Act/Target FY13 | Yr4 Target FY14 Oct 2013-Sep 2014 | Actual FY14 | Act/Target FY14 | Yr5 Target FY15 Oct 2014-May 2015 | Actual FY15 | Act/Target FY15 | LOA |
| OP1 | Total # rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions (F) | (+) | 0 | | 923 | | 16,944 | | | 24,020 | | | 22,299 | | | 18,149 | | | 51,724 |
| Objective 1: Income and access to food of poor and ultra poor households improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IM1 | Average # of months of adequate household food provisioning | (+) | 9.0 (8.89 - 9.12) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10.2 | | | 10.2 |
| IM2 | Average household dietary diversity score | (+) | 6.6 (6.57 - 6.71) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 6.9 | | | 6.9 |
| IM3 | Gross margin per unit of measure at the household level | (+) | 12,495.10 (10,764.0 - 14,226.2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 14,994 | | | 14,994 |
| OC1 | Average revenue from off-farm activities | (+) | NA | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4,800 | | | 4,800 |
| OC2 | Average rural household revenue from sale of commodities | (+) | 20,299.00 (18,216.9 - 22,381.1) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 23,344 | | | 23,344 |
| OC3 | Value of a set of assets (including savings, livestock, etc.) | (+) | 48,453.04 (46,399.3 - 50,506.8) | | | | | | | | | | | | | 60,566 | | | 60,566 |
| IR 1.1: Agricultural productivity increased and diversified | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC4 | # of farmers, processor and others who have applied new technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance | (+) | 0 | | | | 1,130 | | | 4,062 | | | 8,604 | | | 10,072 | | | 10,072 |
| Sub IR 1.1.1: Access to agricultural inputs and technology expanded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC5 | % of beneficiaries (farmers) using a project-defined minimum number of sustainable agriculture technologies | (+) | 0% | | | | 5% | | | 35% | | | 50% | | | 60% | | | 60% |
| OC6 | % of beneficiaries who cultivate a new crop as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | 10% | | | 35% | | | 60% | | | 70% | | | 70% |
| OC7 | # of smallholders that report satisfaction with extension services as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 740 | | | 6,649 | | | 12,210 | | | 16,280 | | | 16,280 |
| OC8 | Change in yield of targeted crops | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC8.1 | Rice (HYV) | (+) | 2,848.8 (2,614.1 - 3,083.5) | | | | 3,275 | | | 3,416 | | | 3,700 | | | 3,844 | | | 3,844 |
| OC8.2 | Rice (LYV) | (+) | 1,918.8 (1,711.7 - 2,125.9) | | | | 2,013 | | | 2,052 | | | 2,071 | | | 2,071 | | | 2,071 |
| OC8.3 | Rice (Local) | (+) | 2,116.8 (1,995.4 - 2,238.1) | | | | 2,221 | | | 2,265 | | | 2,288 | | | 2,288 | | | 2,288 |
| Sub IR 1.1.2: Producers have improved knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OP2 | # of producer groups formed/strengthened | (+) | 0 | | | | 257 | | | 770 | | | 1,154 | | | 1,282 | | | 1,282 |
| OC9 | % of producer groups with women in leadership positions | (+) | 10% | | | | 15% | | | 30% | | | 45% | | | 45% | | | 45% |
| OC10 | % beneficiaries using improved crop seeds and improved varieties or production technologies as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | 20% | | | 35% | | | 50% | | | 60% | | | 60% |
| OC11 | % of producer groups members demonstrating an understanding of the benefits of group formation | (+) | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 80% | | | 80% |
| Sub IR 1.1.3: Producers adopt improved/appropriate practices | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OP3 | # of rural households benefiting from activities to maintain or improve household access to food during the FY | (+) | 0 | | | | 6,425 | | | 19,250 | 28850 | 32050 | 28,850 | | | 32,050 | | | 32,050 |
| OP4 | # of individuals who have received USG supported short term agricultural sector/food security productivity training | (+) | 0 | | | | 4,500 | | | 6,652 | | | 10,597 | | | 12,210 | | | 12,210 |
| OP5 | # demonstration plots used/established | (+) | 0 | | | | 586 | | | 1,793 | | | 2,702 | | | 2,989 | | | 2,989 |
| OP6 | # of microenterprises participating in USG assisted value chains | (+) | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2,442 | | | 2,442 |
| IR 1.2: Market linkages developed and strengthened | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC12 | % of agricultural smallholders reporting increased market access and use as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 60% | | | 60% |
| Sub IR 1.2.3: Post harvest value-added opportunities expanded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC13 | Value of production per HH of targeted commodities sold by farmers | (+) | NA | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2,442 | | | 2,442 |
| Sub IR 1.2.2: Producers cooperation improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC14 | # of producers groups bulking as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 20 | | | 60 | | | 80 | | | 100 | | | 100 |
| Sub IR 1.2.1: Market actors integration enhanced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC15 | # of producer groups receiving services from private sector as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 162 | | | 285 | | | 407 | | | 488 | | | 488 |
| OC16 | # of smallholders paying for services (initially subsidized by PROSHAR) | (+) | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 1,354 | | | 2,151 | | | 2,518 | | | 2,518 |

| PROSHAR Indicator Performance Tracking Table | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------------------------|
| No. | Indicator | Direction of Change | Baseline | Yr1 Target FY11 Oct 2010-Sep 2011 | Actual FY11 | Act/Target FY11 | Yr2 Target FY12 Oct 2011-Sep 2012 | Actual FY12 | Act/Target FY12 | Yr3 Target FY13 Oct 2012-Sep 2013 | Actual FY13 | Act/Target FY13 | Yr4 Target FY14 Oct 2013-Sep 2014 | Actual FY14 | Act/Target FY14 | Yr5 Target FY15 Oct 2014-May 2015 | Actual FY15 | Act/Target FY15 | LOA |
| Sub IR 1.2.3: Post harvest value-added opportunities expanded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC17 | % of producer groups members demonstrating satisfaction with vertical linkages created as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | 20% | | | 45% | | | 55% | | | 60% | | | 60% |
| Sub IR 1.2.4: Access to market services improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC18 | % of producer groups members reporting increased awareness of available financial services as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | 30% | | | 45% | | | 60% | | | 80% | | | 80% |
| OC19 | # of agricultural beneficiaries HH with savings | (+) | 135 | | | | 450 | | | 1,200 | | | 1,850 | | | 2,188 | | | 2,188 |
| OC20 | # of agricultural beneficiaries HH with access to credit | (+) | 1,477 | | | | 3,282 | | | 7,658 | | | 9,846 | | | 13,128 | | | 13,128 |
| OP7 | # of enterprises/producers receiving grants | (+) | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 3,000 | | | 6,000 | | | 9,000 | | | 9,000 |
| IR 1.3: Non-agricultural opportunities expanded and diversified | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC21 | % of non-agriculture beneficiaries who demonstrate diversifying their productive opportunities as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | 3% | | | 7% | | | 10% | | | 12% | | | 12% |
| Sub IR 1.3.1: Access to non agricultural inputs and technology expanded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OP8 | # of alternative livelihood groups formed/strengthened | (+) | 0 | | | | 22 | | | 45 | | | 61 | | | 61 | | | 61 |
| OC22 | % of alternative livelihood groups members demonstrating understanding of the benefits of group formation as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 80% | | | 80% |
| OC23 | % of alternative livelihood groups members reporting increased market access and use | (+) | 0% | | | | | | | 45% | | | | | | 80% | | | 80% |
| Sub IR 1.3.2: Entrepreneurs have improved knowledge | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC24 | # of non-agriculture beneficiaries HH with savings as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 55 | | | 112 | | | 152 | | | 152 | | | 152 |
| OC25 | # of non-agriculture beneficiaries HH with access to credit as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | NA | | | | 330 | | | 675 | | | 915 | | | 915 | | | 915 |
| Sub IR 1.3.3: Entrepreneurs adopt improved/appropriate practices | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC26 | % of non-agriculture beneficiaries who adopted at least 1 technology introduced by the PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | 0% | | | 5% | | | 7% | | | 10% | | | 10% |
| OP9 | # of individuals who have received USG supported short term non-agricultural sector productivity training | (+) | 0 | | | | 320 | | | 1,125 | | | 1,525 | | | 1,525 | | | 1,525 |
| Objective 2: Health of pregnant and lactating women and children under 5 (with particular attention to children under 2) improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IM4 | Percentage of stunted (HAZ <-2) children aged 0-59 (height-for-age - 2 S.D.) | (-) | 42.4% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 34.4% | | | 8% points lower from baseline |
| IM5 | Percentage of underweight (WAZ <-2) children aged 0-59 (weight-for-age - 2 S.D.) | (-) | 31.4% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 24.4% | | | 7% points lower from baseline |
| OC27 | Prevalence of exclusive breast feeding of children under six months | (+) | 41.4% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 60% | | | 45% higher than baseline |
| OC28 | % chronic malnutrition (energy deficient) of ever-married women 15-49 (BMI < 18.5mm) | (-) | 23.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 21.5% | | | 10% lower from baseline |
| OP10 | # of targeted direct beneficiaries reached | (+) | 0 | | 764* | | 45,113 | | | 94,843 | | | 105,890 | | | 56,160 | | | 152,112 |
| IR 2.1: Malnutrition prevented and treated | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC29 | Number of children reached by USG supported nutrition programs | (+) | 0 | | | | 8,847 | | | 18,793 | | | 22,378 | | | 12,432 | | | 30,823 |
| Sub IR 2.1.1: PLW & Children under 2's access to nutrition and health services improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC30 | % of children under 2 who are underweight (weight-for-age - 2 S.D.) | (-) | 22.7% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 19.3% | | | 15% lower from baseline |
| Sub IR 2.1.2: Improved availability of and access to CMAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC31 | % of severely malnourished children who recovered after receiving SAM treatment | (+) | NA | | | | 80% | | | 80% | | | 80% | | | 80% | | | |
| OC32 | % of caregivers who adopted at least three of the recommended behaviors as a result of USG assistance | (+) | 0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 60% | | | 60% |
| OC33 | Proportion of children born in the last 24 months who were put to the breast within one hour of birth | (+) | 38.2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 57.3% | | | 50% higher than baseline |
| OP11 | # of pregnant/lactating women completing at least 12 months of PM2A programming | (+) | 0 | | | | 7,459 | | | 9,946 | | | 9,946 | | | - | | | 27,351 |
| OP12 | # of children over 23 months who have completed the full PM2A program | (+) | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 4,970 | | | 9,948 | | | 2,487 | | | 17,405 |
| IR2.2: Improved effectiveness of health clinic services | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| PROSHAR Indicator Performance Tracking Table | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|---------------------------|
| No. | Indicator | Direction of Change | Baseline | Yr1 Target FY11 Oct 2010-Sep 2011 | Actual FY11 | Act/Target FY11 | Yr2 Target FY12 Oct 2011-Sep 2012 | Actual FY12 | Act/Target FY12 | Yr3 Target FY13 Oct 2012-Sep 2013 | Actual FY13 | Act/Target FY13 | Yr4 Target FY14 Oct 2013-Sep 2014 | Actual FY14 | Act/Target FY14 | Yr5 Target FY15 Oct 2014-May 2015 | Actual FY15 | Act/Target FY15 | LOA |
| OC34 | % of trained Health Assistants that appropriately apply and treat children (2-59 months) using the IMCI protocol as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | 50% | | | 85% | | | 85% | | | 85% | | | 85% |
| Sub IR 2.2.1: Integrated services of community health clinics improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC35 | % of targeted health facilities with trained staff in IMCI as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0% | | | | 30% | | | 60% | | | 80% | | | 80% | | | 80% |
| OP13 | % program communities who have received GMP and antenatal services on a monthly basis over the previous three months | (+) | 0% | | | | 50% | | | 80% | | | 90% | | | 90% | | | 90% |
| OC36 | % of women who received at least 3 antenatal checkups by a qualified provider during pregnancy | (+) | 32.3% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 50% | | | 55% higher than baseline |
| OC37 | % of children age 0-23 months whose births were attended by skilled personnel in targeted areas. | (+) | 33.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 41.3% | | | 25% higher than baseline |
| OC38 | % of mothers of children age 0-23 who received a post-partum visit from an appropriate trained health worker within two days after the birth in targeted areas | (+) | 46.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 56.7% | | | 21% higher than baseline |
| OC39 | % of mothers of children 0-23 months who received high-dose vitamin A supplement within six weeks post-partum | (+) | 34.6% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 55.4% | | | 60% higher than baseline |
| OC40 | % of children 6-23 months of age with 3 appropriate infant and young child feeding practices (IYCF) (continued breastfeeding, age-appropriate dietary diversity, age-appropriate frequency of feeding) | (+) | 29.2% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 36.5% | | | 25% higher than baseline |
| OC41 | % of children aged 6-23 months of age with diarrhea who were offered increased fluids during illness | (+) | 17.9% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 28.6% | | | 60% higher than baseline |
| OC42 | % of children aged 0-23 months of age with diarrhea continuously fed during illness | (+) | 58.1% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 72.6% | | | 25% higher than baseline |
| OC43 | % of children 0-23 months who had symptoms of ARI that sought advice or treatment from trained health care provider | (+) | 37.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 46.3% | | | 25% higher than baseline. |
| Sub IR 2.2.2: Partnerships between health facilities and the communities (they serve) improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC44 | % of households with soap and water at a hand washing station commonly used by family members | (+) | 23.0% | | | | | | | | | | | | | 36.8% | | | 60% higher than baseline |
| OP14 | Average # of supervisory visits per month to observe case management as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 40 | | | 78 | | | 78 | | | 78 | | | 78 |
| OP15 | Average monthly management meetings held at targeted clinics | | 0 | | | | 55 | | | 55 | | | 55 | | | 55 | | | 55 |
| Sub IR 2.2.1: Integrated services of community health clinics improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OP16 | # of facility based people trained in IMCI as a result of PROSHAR intervention | | 0 | | | | 55 | | | 55 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | | 110 |
| Sub IR 2.2.2: Partnerships between health facilities and the communities (they serve) improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OP17 | # of community health groups that have met in the last month | | 0 | | | | 55 | | | 55 | | | 55 | | | 55 | | | 55 |
| OP18 | # of community persons trained in child health care & nutrition through USG-Support health area program | | 0 | | | | 8,095 | | | 8,095 | | | 5,667 | | | 4,048 | | | 8,095+ |
| Objective 3: Institutions and Households prepared to respond effectively to shocks | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OP19 | # of targeted direct beneficiaries reached | (+) | 0 | | 159 | | 9,240 | | | 15,301 | | | 18,589 | | | 21,869 | | | 39,274 |
| OP20 | # of unions with pre-positioned health, hygiene, water, sanitation, food supplies in accordance with their emergency plans as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 4 | | | 11 | | | 17 | | | 23 | | | 23 |
| IR. 3.1 Disaster Risk Reduction Plans (DRRPs) functional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC45 | # of communities (wards) with Community Risk Assessments and vulnerability maps developed according to GoB and PROSHAR standards | (+) | 0 | | | | 99 | | | 207 | | | 207 | | | 207 | | | 207 |
| OP21 | # of functional DMCs at the ward, union, upazila levels as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | 4 | | 15 | | | 60 | | | 90 | | | 117 | | | 117 |
| OP22 | # of DMCs members trained in prevention, mitigation, preparation and response to shocks as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 963 | | | 1,386 | | | 891 | | | 3,240 | | | 3,240 |

| PROSHAR Indicator Performance Tracking Table | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|---------------------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|--------|
| No. | Indicator | Direction of Change | Baseline | Yr1 Target FY11 Oct 2010-Sep 2011 | Actual FY11 | Act/Target FY11 | Yr2 Target FY12 Oct 2011-Sep 2012 | Actual FY12 | Act/Target FY12 | Yr3 Target FY13 Oct 2012-Sep 2013 | Actual FY13 | Act/Target FY13 | Yr4 Target FY14 Oct 2013-Sep 2014 | Actual FY14 | Act/Target FY14 | Yr5 Target FY15 Oct 2014-May 2015 | Actual FY15 | Act/Target FY15 | LOA |
| OP23 | # of Unions with DRR Plans created according to PROSHAR and GoB standards | (+) | 0 | | | | 11 | | | 23 | | | 23 | | | 23 | | | 23 |
| OP24 | # of DMCs that have comprehensive Disaster Risk Reduction Plans as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 110 | | | 233 | | | 233 | | | 233 | | | 233 |
| OP25 | # of agreements established with key public and private sector partners to support implementation of DRR plans. | (+) | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 3 | | | 7 | | | 12 | | | 12 |
| OP26 | # of projects included in DRR plans successfully accomplished with CFW resources, disaggregated by project type as a result of PROSHAR intervention. | (+) | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 76 | | | 228 | | | 304 | | | 304 |
| OP27 | # of communities (wards) with emergency plans that incorporate activities related to WASH, protection of vulnerable populations, evacuation, shelter, nutrition, and health as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 99 | | | 207 | | | 207 | | | 207 |
| IR 3.2: Early warning systems functional | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OC46 | # of assisted communities (wards) with disaster early warning and response (EWR) systems in place as a result of project assistance | (+) | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 99 | | | 207 | | | 207 | | | 207 |
| OP28 | # of communities (wards) monitoring trigger indicators associated with vulnerabilities identified in their Community Risk Assessments | (+) | 0 | | | | 0 | | | 99 | | | 207 | | | 207 | | | 207 |
| IR 3.3: Increased knowledge and skills on disaster risk management (DRM) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| OP29 | # of Communities (wards) utilizing new resources from public, private, and NGO partners to implement DRR plans | (+) | 0 | | | | 15 | | | 60 | | | 90 | | | 117 | | | 117 |
| OP30 | # of people trained in disaster preparedness as result of USG assistance | (+) | 0 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 39,274 |
| OP31 | # of communities (wards) participating in training and awareness campaigns on disaster preparedness, prevention, mitigation and response as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 36 | | | 99 | | | 207 | | | 207 | | | 207 |
| OP32 | # of local NGOs, CBOs, and volunteer groups trained in coordinated humanitarian assistance as a result of PROSHAR intervention | (+) | 0 | | | | 480 | | | 150 | | | 100 | | | 0 | | | 730 |
| Note: This IPTT is updated from the version submitted to USAID on September 15, 2011. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: PROSHAR will collect baseline values for those indicators for which we do not have baseline values once when we start working with our beneficiaries | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: Serial numbers of OC indicators have been revised, per USAID's recent feedback on the PROSHAR M&E Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Note: OP= Output; OC= Outcome; IM= Impact; NA= Not available | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| * Including the family members of 65 households who received rations through the lean session distribution. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

General and Detailed Implementation Plan prepared December 2010 with FY2011 ARR Comments Added November 2011

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | Year 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | Comments |
|---|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| Program Implementation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Coordinate with other Cooperating Sponsors | ACDI/VOCA | | | | | | | | | | | | | On track |
| Technical Assistant and Integrated management Training for PROSHAR Partners | ACROSS S0s PROSHAR TEAM | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin November, 2011 |
| Quarterly Management Meetings | Across PROSHAR TEAM & IPS | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin November, 2011 |
| Program close out planning | ACDI/VOCA | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Commodity Management and Logistics | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Publish bid for internal transport contract(s), select vendor(s) and sign contract(s) | ACDI/VOCA Commodity Management Team | | | | | | | | | | | | | Complete. Signed August 2011, no need to recompet until June, 2012 |
| Coordinate sale of commodity with GoB | ACDI/VOCA Commodity Management Team | | | | | | | | | | | | | Completed |
| Submit call forward | ACDI/VOCA COP and Commodity Management Team | | | | | | | | | | | | | Delayed. Have excess stocks due to delays in beginning distribution – call forward will occur in December-March. |
| Distribution food transported to satellite warehouses | ACDI/VOCA Commodity Management Team & S02 Staff | | | | | | | | | | | | | On schedule |
| Conduct commodity inventory and submit reports | ACDI/VOCA Commodity Management Team | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ongoing, on schedule |
| Prepare and submit monetization sales reports | ACDI/VOCA Commodity Management Team | | | | | | | | | | | | | On schedule. Done in collaboration with commodity reports (HQ) |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | Year 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | Comments | |
|---|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----------|---|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | | |
| Prepare and submit all commodity reports as required by Regulation 11 | ACDI/VOCA Commodity Management Team and CoP | | | | | | | | | | | | | | On schedule |
| Reporting and Deliverables | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Quarterly Financial Reports to USAID | ACDI/VOCA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | On Schedule |
| Annual FFP results reports (SAPQ/PREP) | ACDI/VOCA | | | | | | | | | | | | | | On Schedule |
| Branding and Marking Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Revision will be resubmitted with PREP |
| Annual Resource Report | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Completed |
| Pipeline Resource Estimate Proposal | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Completed |
| Close-Out Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Monitoring, Evaluation and Reporting | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Develop M&E Plan for Operational Use | PROSHAR M&E TEAM & IPs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ongoing |
| Review and refine MIS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ongoing |
| Train PVO staff on refined MIS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin Nov 2011 |
| Midterm process evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin in FY03 |
| Final impact evaluation | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Goal: Reduced Food Insecurity Among Vulnerable Rural Populations in Select Upazilas in Khulna Division | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Grant Management | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Evaluate performance of IY1 sub-grantees | COP, Team Leaders, Deputy Team Leaders, Contract & Grants Manager | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ongoing. FOG Phase 1 extended to Nov 30 2011 – performance evaluation has begun and will continue to year end |
| Initiate competitive selection process to select local implementing partners | COP, Team Leaders, Deputy Team Leaders, Contract & Grants Manager | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Completed. Finalized early – July, 2010. |
| Carry out due diligence on shortlisted applicants | COP, Team Leaders, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Completed. |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | Year 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | Comments |
|---|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| | Deputy Team Leaders, Contract & Grants Manager | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finalize selection of local implementing partners | COP, Team Leaders, Deputy Team Leaders, Contract & Grants Manager | | | | | | | | | | | | | Completed June, 2011 |
| Carry out training for local implementing partners on compliance issues | Contract & Grants team | | | | | | | | | | | | | On schedule |
| Training for Partners on Technical Approaches/Integration Management Modalities | All PROSHAR across SOs/management (ACDI/VOCA and PCI) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned to begin November, 2011 |
| Quarterly Planning Meetings for all PROSHAR Implementing Partners in Khulna | All PROSHAR across disciplines | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin November, 2011 |
| Objective 1: Income of poor and ultra poor households increased | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| TOT for NGO partner staff & gov't extensionists on year 1 curriculum | Livelihoods Team Leader, Production & Market Linkages Training/Curriculum Dev. Spec | | | | | | | | | | | | | Training of PNGO staff to begin in November. Delayed due to insufficient number of staff hired. No training will be provided to government staff |
| TOT for NGO partner staff & gov't extensionists on year 2 curriculum | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IR 1.1: Agricultural productivity increased and diversified | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IR 1.1.1: Access to inputs, key assets and technology expanded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Facilitate relationship between beneficiaries and private sector to increase access to inputs | Marketing Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in January, 2012 |
| Make grant fund available to producer groups/enterprises for inputs, equipment and services | Marketing Specialist, Grants | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin in April/May, 2012, once grant strategy is |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | Year 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | Comments |
|--|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| | Management Staff | | | | | | | | | | | | | completed and groups are formed. Delayed by 10 months |
| IR 1.1.2: Producers have access to knowledge and skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Train groups using year 1 curriculum on collaborative behavior as part of full 2-year training package | NGO partners with support from Group Formation Specialist, Ag Coord. | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin November, 2011 |
| Encourage women's participation and leadership in producer groups | | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin November, 2011 |
| Continue producer group development with an additional 1063 groups | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ongoing from November, 2011, dependent upon registration of SO2 beneficiaries |
| Train groups using year 2 curriculum on collaborative behavior as part of full 2-year training package | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Year 1 and Year 2 curriculums have been merged into 1 training. This will now be part of the training beginning in November, 2011 |
| Provide training on improved production and post harvest handling through use of demonstration plots | NGO partners/ Input suppliers/ govt extensionists with support from Production Specialists, Ag Coord. | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin November, 2011 |
| Use farmer, government and private sector demonstration plots as teaching tools | | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin November, 2011 |
| Collaborate with Dept. of Ag Extension and other government agencies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin January, 2012 |
| Reinforce health/nutrition messages in through collaboration with SO2 care groups | | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin November, 2011 |
| Partner NGO staff to visit farmers to follow up on training | NGO partner staff/Ag coord | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin November, 2011 |
| Create mechanisms for sharing information between government ag, livestock and fisheries departments | Livelihood team leader, Liaison Specialist, | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin January, 2012 |
| Work with government's Agriculture Information Service to share success stories using different media | Liaison Specialist, Production | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not planned in the new Workplan. This will be ad hoc as |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | Year 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | Comments |
|--|--|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| | Specialists | | | | | | | | | | | | | lessons emerge |
| Introduce a menu of fresh water harvesting technologies to beneficiaries | Production Specialists, Ag Coord. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Aquaculture will be started in January, 2012. |
| Build/rehabilitate basic storage facilities | Productions Specialist, Ag Coord. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Dependent upon the grant strategy |
| Offer the Farming as a Business curriculum to producer group beneficiaries | NGO partners with support from Production Specialists, AgCoord | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in January, 2012 |
| Partner with local universities | Liaison Specialist, Production Specialists | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not a priority for Year 2 – will begin in Year 3, depending upon interest |
| Arrange internships at SMEs to develop beneficiary business skills | Liaison Specialist, Marketing Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | Postponed from year 2 – will begin in Year 3 depending upon level of interest and resource availability |
| Initiate women's mentorship program | COP, Liaison Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | Postponed to Year 3 after women's groups formed |
| IR 1.1.3: Producers adopt improved/ appropriate technologies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Pilot new ag technologies before rolling out more widely | Production Specialists, Ag Coord. | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in November, 2011 |
| Introduce new adaptation practices | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will be done through farmers' field days that will begin in January, 2012 |
| IR 1.2: Market linkages developed and strengthened | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IR 1.2.1: Market actors integration enhanced | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Link producer groups to buyers | Marketing Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin with horticulture groups in December, 2011 |
| IR 1.2.2: Producers cooperation improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | Year 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | Comments |
|--|--|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| Facilitate producer group members' participation at trade fairs and other networking opportunities | Liaison Specialist, Marketing Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin in February, 2012 |
| Link beneficiaries with asset base to sources of credit | Livelihoods Team Leader, Liaison specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin in February, 2012 |
| IR 1.2.3: Post harvest value-added opportunities expanded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in Y3 |
| IR 1.2.4: Access to market services improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Arrange for stakeholders in key value chains to share knowledge/provide capacity building to producer groups | Liaison Specialist, Marketing Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in January, 2012 |
| Include credit management and savings promotion as part of FaaB curriculum | Livelihoods Team Leader, Liaison specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in January, 2012 |
| Provide technical support to ongoing MIS supported by government and donor programs | Livelihoods Team Leader, Liaison specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not a priority for Year 2 may be considered for Year 3 |
| IR 1.3: Non-agriculture opportunities expanded and diversified | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IR 1.3.1: Access to inputs, key assets and technology expanded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Link non-producer groups to organizations with required technical expertise | Marketing Specialist, Production Specialists, Liaison Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in March, 2012 |
| Create/Strengthen 118 groups over LOP | NGO partners with support from Production Specialists, Ag Coord | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in January, 2012 |
| IR 1.3.2: Entrepreneurs have access to knowledge and skills | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Provide direct capacity building through TA/volunteers | Marketing Specialist, | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not a priority for Year 2. May be |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | Year 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | Comments |
|---|---|--------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| | Production Specialists, Liaison Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | considered for Year 3 |
| Provide training and technical assistance | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Will begin in March, 2012. |
| IR 1.3.3: Entrepreneurs adopt improved/ appropriate technologies | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Promote non-farm options not related to agriculture where other livelihood options are not viable | NGO partners with support from Production Specialists, Ag Coord | | | | | | | | | | | | | Cross-visits are planned and will begin in April, 2012 |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | FY 2011 (Year 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| Objective 2: Health and Nutrition of Women and Children Improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IR 2.1: Malnutrition prevented and treated | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review of Growth Monitoring efforts (2 day training/ planning session by HN/M&E/Training mgmt staff (5) in Khulna. | Team Leader and DTL H&N, BCC/Training Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in November, 2012 |
| Refresher/Update GM TOT: CC Liaison Officers (3), GM Facilitators (8), NGO CG Supervisors (8) and promoters (24) and PCI Technical Coordinators (3) will receive a 4-module training update in Khulna. | Team Leader and DTL H&N, BCC/Training Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in November, 2012 |
| Refresher training on MUAC for Care Group leaders at union level. | DTL H&N, BCC/Training Specialist, H&N Specialist, Technical coordinator, | | | | | | | | | | | | | To occur in March – April, 2012 |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | FY 2011 (Year 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| Implementation of CMAM through Community Clinic | Team Leader and DTL H&N, BCC/Training Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | March, 2012 |
| Implementation of GMP activities | NGO GMP Facilitators and HAs | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in November, 2012 |
| Implementation of CMAM activities from outreach sites | H&N Specialist, Technical Coordinator, NGO GMP Facilitators & HAs | | | | | | | | | | | | | To begin in May 2012 |
| Refresher of Commodity Distribution and Monitoring 1 day training/planning session by the Commodity Distribution Coordinator staff (9) in Khulna. | DTL H&N, BCC/Training Specialist, H&N Specialist, | | | | | | | | | | | | | Began in September, 2011 |
| PM2A Food Distribution | Distribution Coordinators & End-use checkers. | | | | | | | | | | | | | Food distribution began in support of the roll-out of PM2A. in September, 2011. Twenty of twenty-three unions will be covered by December, 2011. |
| IR. 2.2. Access to integrated health services expanded | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Training of HAs and Supervisors in IMCI | RTM contract | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for Jan – March 2012 |
| Facilitated Supervision of HAs using IMCI | HA supervisors & Division H&N Asst. Mgr | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for Feb – May, 2012 |
| Review of HHCC Training. 1 day review session by HN/M&E/Training mgmt staff (5) and CC Liaison Coordinators (3) in Khulna. | Team Leader and DTL H&N, BCC/Training Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for Jan, 2012 |
| Review of Progress towards HHCC | Team Leader | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for Jan, 2012 |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | FY 2011 (Year 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | | |
| Action Plan. Div. H&N Specialist, BCC/Training Speci., Div. M&E Sepcialist, 3 Upz. Coordinators 3 CC Liaison Officers and 6 Upz level MoHFW staff. 1 day meeting. | and DTL H&N, BCC/Training Specialist | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Review and dissemination of Upazila level action plan - with 45 participants per Upazila for a 1 day workshop. | H&N Specialist and TC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for April, 2012 |
| Clinical Training on IMCI for Upazila Health Complex Service provider (Paramedics- MA, SACMO, FWV, & Nurses and Medical Officer) for strenthening IMCI service of Upazila Health Complex (30 Paramedics/batche/ and 25 Medical Officer | Team Leader and DTL H&N, and IMCI unit of MoH | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for December, 2011 |
| Workshop on IMCI at Division, and Upazila levels for IMCI implementation. Meeting with MoH, UNICEF, WHO and other partners at Division and upazila level for quality implementation of IMCI | H&N Specialist, TC and Divisional Director- Health, UHFPO | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for January and April 2012 |
| Orientation and Development of the Community Health Committee training. 2 day training for (3) CC Liaison Officers | H&N Specialist and TC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Started in October – 2 nd 2 groups will be in November, 2011. |
| Meetings with Community Clinic management committee for maximum utilization of its services three meeting for each CC/Year | H&N Specialist,TC and NGO liaison officer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for February – May, 2012 |
| Upz level workshops on MNC based on Gap Analysis | DTL, H&N Specialist,TC and NGO liaison officer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not scheduled |
| Implementation of HHCC action plans | Community Clinic and Upz Health Complex | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for April, 2012 |
| IR. 2.3. Household and community response to health challenges improved | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Refresher TOT on Care Group modules | Team Leader | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for March, |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | FY 2011 (Year 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | | |
| of DTL, H&N Specialist Technical Coordinator,CG Supervisors and Promoters, CC Liaison officer, and GM facilitators | H&N and Consultant | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 2012 |
| Refresher training for continuing Care Group leaders, and selection of New Care Group Leaders (Mothers, Fathers, Grandmothers) | NGO Promoter and CG Supervisors | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned on a continuous basis as required, beginning November, 2011 |
| Meeting /Training of CG Leaders (Mothers – monthly; Fathers and Grandmothers quarterly) | NGO CG Promoters NGO Partner Clinical Coordinators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for October, 2011 |
| Orientation and Development of the Drug Seller Training. 3 day training for HN Coordinator, CC Liaison Officers, Tech Coordinators, UHC (13) . | Team Leader H&N, DTL and H&N Specialist IMCI unit of MoH, | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not yet planned |
| Training of Pharmacists, Drug Sellers and Village Doctors on C-IMCI and Essential Drugs | Team Leader H&N, DTL and H&N Specialist IMCI unit of MoH,NGO Partner Community clinic liaison officer | | | | | | | | | | | | | | MoU with IMCI to be signed in October-November, 2011, and training to occur in January-February, 2012. |
| Obejctive 3: Resiliency to shocks and their long term impacts strengthened | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Finalization of training materials and assessment tools | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Partner NGOs training materials will be completed by end of October, 2012; Beneficiaries' training materials will be completed by May, 2012. |
| Training of PROSHAR Partners | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader | | | | | | | | | | | | | | To be started in mid-October, 2011 |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | FY 2011 (Year 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | |
| | (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| IR. 3.1. Community-level mechanisms for mitigation & response to shocks strengthened | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| DRM Awareness Campaigns | NGO Partners | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for Oct, 2011 – March 2012 |
| DRM Committees Formed and Trained | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for March – May, 2012 |
| Vulnerability Maps/ CRA's Compiled and Analyzed, inserted into GIS | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | By Ward, will be completed in January, 2012; By union will be completed in December, 2011. |
| Vulnerability Maps and Analysis presented to key partners | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for January – March, 2012 |
| Union, Upazila and District DMCs trained | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for December, 2011 and March, 2012 |
| Risk Reduction Strategies Reviewed with TAG | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for Dec., 2011 and March, 2012 TAG meeting |
| Communities Develop DRR Plans | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for Jan – March, 2012 |
| DRR Plans Analyzed and Compiled, presented to partners | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned to begin in April, 2012 |
| DRR plans shared with key resource providers | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for May, 2012 |

| Key Activities Planned | Persons Responsible | FY 2011 (Year 2) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|---|
| | | J | J | A | S | O | N | D | J | F | M | A | M | | |
| DRMCs trained and assisted to apply for resources to implement DRR Plans | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not prioritized for Year 2 implementation |
| CFW Activities Carried out in Most Vulnerable Wards | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Not planned – dependent upon finalization of CFW/FFW strategy in support of SO3 |
| IR. 3.2. Local organizations, government, and communities' response to disasters strengthened | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PROSHAR Disaster Response Team Formed | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned to begin November 2011 |
| PROSHAR Partners and other organizations trained in collaborative humanitarian assistance | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | This has been integrated into startup training activities. |
| PROSHAR Emergency Response Coordination Workshop convened | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Planned for October, 2011 and March, 2012, dependent upon other MYAP partners' availability |
| Communities Trained and supported to Utilize EWS Systems | SO3 Team Leader (Dhaka) , Deputy Team Leader (Khulna) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | On track |

FFP Standardized Annual Performance Questionnaire (SAPQ) - FY 2011

YOUR COMMENTS

AWARDEE FOOD AID PROGRAM INFORMATION

| | |
|--|---|
| Awardee Name(s) | ACDI/VOCA |
| Host Country <i>(or Countries, for Regional Programs)</i> | Bangladesh |
| Program location(s) in the host country | Khulna Division |
| Program Start Date <i>(mm/dd/yy)</i> | 5/24/10 |
| Program Expiration Date <i>(mm/dd/yy)</i> | 5/31/15 |
| Program Name | PROSHAR (Program for Strengthening Household Access to Resources) |
| Award Number | AID-FFP-A-10-00012 |

AWARDEE CONTACT INFORMATION

| | |
|--|---|
| Contact Name (person filling out the SAPQ) | Marie Cadrin |
| Contact Email | mcadrin@acdivoca-proshar.org |
| Contact Address | House 30, Road 19/A, Banani, Dhaka-1213 |
| Contact Phone | 88-02-8836801 |

Please follow the instructions that appear in the yellow boxes!

You may make comments, if desired in this column. i.e., if you are uncertain whether a particular indicator is what FFP is looking for, mention it here.

| | | | |
|----------|--|--------|--|
| 0 | Was your food aid program awarded in FY2011? | Yes/No | |
| | | No | |

SECTION 1: Data from a Representative Population-based Survey

This section asks for impact data coming from a quantitative survey such as a baseline or final evaluation

| | | | |
|----------|--|----------|--|
| 1 | <p>Did your food aid program conduct a quantitative, population-based, statistically representative survey such as a baseline or final evaluation in FY11 (or in FY10 and you did not report the results in last year's SAPQ)?</p> <p>Answer "Yes, '11" if you conducted a survey in FY11. Answer "Yes, '10" if you conducted a survey in FY10 but you did not report on it in last year's FY10 SAPQ because the final data were not yet available. If you conducted a survey in FY10 and already reported the results in the FY10 SAPQ, choose "No".</p> | Yes/No | |
| | | Yes, '11 | |

| | | | |
|----------|---|--|--|
| 2 | <p>Which type of quantitative survey did your program conduct in FY11 (or in FY10 and you did not report the results in last year's SAPQ)?</p> | | |
| | Baseline Survey | | |

| | | | |
|----------|---|--------|--|
| 3 | <p>Are the final data from your program's survey available at this time?</p> <p>Do not answer "Yes" if you have preliminary data only. If final data are not yet available, answer "No" and report on them in next year's SAPQ. Only final data should be entered into the SAPQ.</p> | Yes/No | |
| | | Yes | |

| | | | |
|----------|---|--------|--|
| 4 | <p>Does your program aim to improve household food access?</p> <p>A program that aims to improve household food access generally promotes agricultural production, agricultural product processing and marketing, microcredit and other income- and employment-generation activities</p> | Yes/No | |
| | | Yes | |

1A: Months of Adequate Food Provisioning (Impact Indicator)

| | | | |
|----------|--|------------------------------|--|
| 5 | <p>What is the estimated total number of households in your target geographic area?</p> <p>How many households live in your target geographic area? (This is not the <i>sample</i> size, it's the <i>population</i> size)</p> | FY 11 | |
| | | # households in target areas | |
| | | 94,673 | |

| | | | |
|----------|---|--------|--|
| 6 | <p>In the survey, did your program measure average number of months of (in)adequate food provisioning, following the standard FANTA methodology for this indicator?</p> <p>See the "Definitions" tab for a description of the standard methodology for this indicator.</p> | Yes/No | |
| | | Yes | |

| 7 | <p>What was the average number of months of adequate food provisioning?</p> <p>Fill out the table below with the final data from your survey. If you measured INADEQUATE instead of ADEQUATE months, convert your data to ADEQUATE months (12 - number of inadequate months). Only provide data if you used the standard FANTA methodology.</p> <p>If this is a baseline survey, please also provide your final evaluation target for this indicator.</p> <p>If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the average number of months of adequate food provisioning data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY11 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.</p> | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|----------------|--|----------------------------------|--|--|-------------------------|--|----------|----------------|----------|----------------------------------|-------------|--|--|---|-----|---|------|----|--|--|--|
| | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th rowspan="2">Indicator</th> <th colspan="2">FY 11</th> <th colspan="2">Most recent FY prior to FY11 (enter n/a if FY11 was the baseline)</th> <th colspan="2">Final Evaluation Target</th> </tr> <tr> <th># months</th> <th>From which FY?</th> <th># months</th> <th>What FY is the final evaluation?</th> <th># of months</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Average number of months of ADEQUATE food provisioning</td> <td style="text-align: center;">9</td> <td style="text-align: center;">n/a</td> <td style="text-align: center;">#</td> <td style="text-align: center;">FY15</td> <td style="text-align: center;">10</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | Indicator | FY 11 | | Most recent FY prior to FY11 (enter n/a if FY11 was the baseline) | | Final Evaluation Target | | # months | From which FY? | # months | What FY is the final evaluation? | # of months | | Average number of months of ADEQUATE food provisioning | 9 | n/a | # | FY15 | 10 | | | |
| Indicator | FY 11 | | Most recent FY prior to FY11 (enter n/a if FY11 was the baseline) | | Final Evaluation Target | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | # months | From which FY? | # months | What FY is the final evaluation? | # of months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Average number of months of ADEQUATE food provisioning | 9 | n/a | # | FY15 | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

1B: Household Dietary Diversity (Impact Indicator)

| | | | |
|----------|---|--------|--|
| 8 | <p>In the survey, did your food aid program measure household dietary diversity, following the standard FANTA methodology for this indicator?</p> <p>See the "Definitions" tab for a description of the standard methodology for this indicator.</p> | Yes/No | |
| | | Yes | |

What was the average household dietary diversity score?

Fill out the table below with the data from your survey. Only provide data if you used the standard FANTA methodology.

If this is a baseline survey, please also provide your final evaluation target for this indicator.

9 If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the average dietary diversity score from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY11 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

| Indicator | FY 11 | | Most recent FY prior to FY11 (enter n/a if FY11 was the baseline) | | Final Evaluation Target | |
|---|------------------|----------------|--|----------------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | # of food groups | From which FY? | # of food groups | What FY is the final evaluation? | # of food groups | |
| Average household dietary diversity score | 7 | n/a | # | FY15 | 7 | |

10 Does your program aim to improve the nutritional status of children 0-24 months old?

| |
|--------|
| Yes/No |
| Yes |



1C: Underweight (Impact Indicator)

11 In the survey, did your food aid program measure the prevalence of underweight (WAZ <-2) in children 0 - 59 months of age?

If you measured underweight for a different age group, or you used a different measure or cutoff, answer NO.

| |
|--------|
| Yes/No |
| Yes |

12 What was the prevalence of underweight (WAZ <-2) in children 0 - 59 months of age?

If this survey is a baseline survey, please also provide your final evaluation target for this indicator.

If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the underweight data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY11 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

| Indicator | FY 11 | | Most recent FY prior to FY11 (enter n/a if FY11 was the baseline) | | Final Evaluation Target | |
|---|---------------|----------------|---|----------------|----------------------------------|---------------|
| | % underweight | From which FY? | % underweight | From which FY? | What FY is the final evaluation? | % underweight |
| % of underweight (WAZ<-2) children 0-59 months of age | 31% | n/a | # | | FY15 | 24% |

13 What is the estimated total number of children 0-59 months of age, living in your target geographic area?

How many children 0-59 months live in your geographic area? (This is the *population* size, not the *sample* size)

| |
|-----------|
| FY 11 |
| # 0-59 mo |
| 58983 |

1D: Stunting (Impact Indicator)

14 In the survey, did your food aid program measure the prevalence of stunting (HAZ <-2) in children 6 - 59 mo of age?

If you measured stunting for a different age group, or you used a different measure or cutoff, answer NO.

| |
|--------|
| Yes/No |
| Yes |

15 What was the prevalence of stunting (HAZ <-2) in children 6 - 59 mo of age?

If this survey is a baseline survey, please also provide your final evaluation target for this indicator.

If this survey is a final evaluation, please also provide the stunting data from the most recent population-based survey prior to FY11 (probably from your baseline survey). Indicate the year in which the data were collected.

| Indicator | FY 11 | | Most recent FY prior to FY11 (enter n/a if FY11 was the baseline) | | Final Evaluation Target | |
|---|-----------|----------------|---|----------------|----------------------------------|-----------|
| | % stunted | From which FY? | % stunted | From which FY? | What FY is the final evaluation? | % stunted |
| % of stunted (HAZ<-2) children 6-59 months of age | 42% | n/a | # | | FY15 | 34% |

16 What is the estimated total number of children 6-59 months of age, living in your target geographic area?

How many children 6-59 months of age live in your geographic area? (This is the *population* size, not the *sample* size.)

| |
|-----------|
| FY 11 |
| # 6-59 mo |
| 53084 |

SECTION 2: Annual Monitoring Data

This section asks for data about direct beneficiaries, coming from your routine monitoring system

17 Did your food aid program implement activities (deliver goods and services (assistance) to beneficiaries) in FY11?

| |
|--------|
| Yes/No |
| Yes |

2A: Anthropometry (Monitoring Indicators)

18 Did your food aid program implement activities to maintain or improve the nutritional status of beneficiaries in FY11?

| |
|--------|
| Yes/No |
| Yes |

19 What anthropometric indicators does your program use for regular monitoring of the nutritional status of beneficiaries?

For each indicator, fill in the desired direction of change (increase or decrease) and the data for FY 11 and the previous year, FY 10. It is OK to leave prior year data blank if you do not have beneficiary data from the prior year.

Fill out the table below with the ANTHROPOMETRIC indicators used by your program for annual monitoring of the nutritional status of your program's beneficiaries. Please write the precise definition for each indicator, including the measure used and the age group (e.g. % of children 0 - 23 mo old with WAZ <-2). In other words, do not write simply "Malnutrition rate" or "Recovery rate" or "% graduating from feeding program" without explaining what anthropometric measure and cutoff is used.

Please provide only ANTHROPOMETRIC indicators which are a measure of the physical body. Acceptable anthropometric measures include prevalence of stunting (height for age Z - HtA), underweight (weight for age - WtA), wasting (weight for height WtH), weight gain, growth faltering (trend of weight gain), body mass index (BMI), middle-upper arm circumference (MUAC); average HtA Z score (HAZ), WtA Z score (WAZ), WtH Z score (WHZ); proportion of children/adults recuperating to defined cutoffs (e.g. WAZ 80% median). Measures such as breastfeeding, vaccination rates, or numbers of ration recipients are NOT anthropometric.

Only include data for indicators that you monitor annually among direct beneficiaries. These data will be based on regular monitoring of your program beneficiaries and not on a representative sample survey of a broader population. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION

| Indicators | Desired direction (+ / -) | FY 11 actual % | FY 10 actual % |
|------------|--|----------------|----------------|
| | 19.1 Although the program does implement activities to maintain or improve the nutritional status of beneficiaries, the program does not measure anthropometric indicators on an annual basis. | | % |
| 19.2 | | % | % |
| 19.3 | | % | % |

19.4

[Empty cell]

[Empty cell]

%

%

[Empty cell]

2B: Behavior Change: Health, Nutrition, Hygiene (Monitoring Indicators)

| | | |
|----|---|--------|
| 20 | Did your program implement activities to improve the health, nutrition or hygiene behaviors of beneficiaries in FY11? | Yes/No |
| | | No |

If No, skip ahead to Question 22

21 What behavior change indicators does your program use for regular monitoring of beneficiaries?

For each indicator, fill in data on the FY 11 indicator value (i.e. the result achieved) and the number of beneficiaries reached in FY11. Please provide future year targets for the indicator, as applicable.

Use the drop down menu to select the indicator on which you are reporting. Give the percentage (%) of **beneficiaries** adopting the improved health, nutrition or hygiene behaviors. You may take a census or a sample of your beneficiaries. DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION. Only the indicators on the drop down menu can be included.

See FFP Information Bulletin 07-02 (http://www.usaid.gov/our_work/humanitarian_assistance/ffp/fy08_ffpb_new_reporting.pdf) for further information on these indicators. For indicators with an *, the specific behaviors that comprise these indicators are to be defined by the awardee. See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "beneficiaries".

| Indicators | FY 11 | | Future Targets | | | |
|------------|----------|-----------------|----------------|----------|----------|-------|
| | actual % | # beneficiaries | FY 12 | FY 13 | FY 14 | FY 15 |
| | target % | target % | target % | target % | target % | |
| 21.1 | % | # | % | % | % | % |
| 21.2 | % | # | % | % | % | % |
| 21.3 | % | # | % | % | % | % |
| 21.4 | % | # | % | % | % | % |

2C: Agricultural Extension (Monitoring Indicator)

| | | |
|----|---|--------|
| 22 | Did your food aid program provide farmers with extension/outreach services in FY11? | Yes/No |
| | | No |

If No, skip ahead to Question 28

23 How many farmers (individuals, not households) received extension/outreach services in FY11?

Please provide future year targets for number of farmer beneficiaries, as applicable.

| FY 11 | Future Targets | | | |
|-------|----------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| | FY 12 | FY 13 | FY 14 | FY 15 |
| | # farmers | # farmers | # farmers | # farmers |
| # | # | # | # | # |

| | | |
|----|---|----------------|
| 24 | How many sustainable agricultural technologies did your program transfer in FY11? | # technologies |
| | See the "Definitions" tab for more information about "agricultural technologies" | # |

25 What are the sustainable agricultural technologies your program made available for transfer in FY11?

If you transferred more than 10 technologies, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.

| | |
|-------|--|
| 25.1 | |
| 25.2 | |
| 25.3 | |
| 25.4 | |
| 25.5 | |
| 25.6 | |
| 25.7 | |
| 25.8 | |
| 25.9 | |
| 25.10 | |

| | | |
|----|---|----------------|
| 26 | What is the minimum number of sustainable agricultural technologies your program would like an individual farmer to use/adopt as a result of your program's assistance? | # technologies |
| | See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "minimum number." This number should be less than the response to question 22. | # |

27 What percentage (%) of program beneficiaries (farmers) adopted the minimum number of technologies in FY11?

Please provide the future year targets, as applicable.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

| FY 11 | Future Targets | | | |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| | FY 12 | FY 13 | FY 14 | FY 15 |
| | % beneficiary farmers | % beneficiary farmers | % beneficiary farmers | % beneficiary farmers |
| % | % | % | % | % |

2D: Disaster Early Warning Systems (Monitoring Indicator)

| | | |
|----|--|--------|
| 28 | Did your food aid program assist communities to develop disaster early warning and response systems in FY11? | Yes/No |
| | | No |

See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "disaster early warning and response system".

If No, skip ahead to Question 31

| | | |
|----|--|---------------|
| 29 | How many communities does your program plan to assist to develop disaster early warning and response systems over the life of the award? | # communities |
| | | # |

30 How many of your program's targeted communities had disaster early warning and response systems in place in FY11 as a result of your program's assistance?

Please provide the future year targets for # of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have early warning systems in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

| FY 11 | Future Targets | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | FY 12 | FY 13 | FY 14 | FY 15 |
| # communities | # communities | # communities | # communities | # communities |
| # | # | # | # | # |
| (Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place | #VALUE! | #VALUE! | #VALUE! | #VALUE! |



2E: Infrastructure To Mitigate Shocks (Monitoring Indicator)

31 Did your food aid program assist communities to improve or develop physical infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks in FY11?

See the "Definitions" tab for a definition of "infrastructure"

| |
|--------|
| Yes/No |
| No |

If No, skip ahead to Question 35

32 How many communities does your program plan to assist to improve or develop infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks over the life of the award?

| |
|---------------|
| # communities |
| # |

33 What kinds of physical infrastructure did your program improve or develop in FY11?

If there are more than 5 kinds of infrastructure, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.

33.1 _____

33.2 _____

33.3 _____

33.4 _____

33.5 _____

34 How many of your program's targeted communities had improved physical infrastructure to mitigate the impact of shocks in FY11 as a result of your program's assistance?

Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have infrastructure in place in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

| FY 11 | Future Targets | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | FY 12 | FY 13 | FY 14 | FY 15 |
| # communities | # communities | # communities | # communities | # communities |
| # | # | # | # | # |
| (Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place | #VALUE! | #VALUE! | #VALUE! | #VALUE! |



2F: Safety Nets (Monitoring Indicator)

35 Did your food aid program assist communities to strengthen safety nets to address the needs of their most vulnerable members in FY11?

A community-based safety net supported under a Title II development program can be a broadly defined system for addressing the food security needs of a community's most vulnerable members during a shock. A community-based safety net is: managed and maintained by the community; internally resourced, at least in part; and can be year round or seasonal. Examples include community food banks or insurance schemes.

| |
|--------|
| Yes/No |
| No |

If No, skip ahead to Question 38

36 How many communities does your program plan to assist to strengthen safety nets over the life of the activity?

| |
|---------------|
| # communities |
| # |

37 How many of your programs targeted communities that had safety nets in place in FY11 as a result of your program's assistance?

Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have safety nets in place in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25.

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

| FY 11 | Future Targets | | | |
|---|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | FY 12 | FY 13 | FY 14 | FY 15 |
| # communities | # communities | # communities | # communities | # communities |
| # | # | # | # | # |
| (Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place | #VALUE! | #VALUE! | #VALUE! | #VALUE! |



2G: Community Capacity (Monitoring Indicator)

38 Did your food aid program assist communities to strengthen community capacity in FY11?

Community capacity refers to a community's ability to govern itself; to organize, analyze, plan, manage, problem-solve, implement actions, and represent its interests and participate in broader fora. This goes beyond targeted efforts to strengthen communities in nutrition, agriculture, infrastructure, early warning, or other topics covered elsewhere in the SAPQ.

| |
|--------|
| Yes/No |
| No |

If No, you are FINISHED. Submit the SAPQ.

39 How many communities does your program plan to assist to strengthen community capacity over the life of the award?

| |
|---------------|
| # communities |
| # |

What are the components of community capacity that your program strengthened in FY11?

40

Select from the drop down menu. If there are more than 10 components, you can list the others in the comments column to the right.

| | |
|-------|--|
| 40.1 | |
| 40.2 | |
| 40.3 | |
| 40.4 | |
| 40.5 | |
| 40.6 | |
| 40.7 | |
| 40.8 | |
| 40.9 | |
| 40.10 | |

How many of your program's targeted communities had strengthened community capacity in FY11 as a result of your program's assistance?

41

Please provide the future year targets for number of communities, as applicable. Future targets should be cumulative. For instance, if 25 communities have strengthened capacity in Year 1 and another 25 are added in Year 2, then the Year 2 target would be 50, not 25

DO NOT PROVIDE DATA FROM A POPULATION BASED SURVEY SUCH AS A BASELINE OR FINAL EVALUATION.

(Automatic Calculation) % of communities with disaster early warning systems in place

| FY 11 | Future Targets | | | |
|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| | FY 12 | FY 13 | FY 14 | FY 15 |
| # communities | # communities | # communities | # communities | # communities |
| # | # | # | # | # |
| | #VALUE! | #VALUE! | #VALUE! | #VALUE! |

Congratulations! You have finished the SAPQ

Attachment H1: PROSHAR Success Stories (supplemental)

1. Developed BCC Strategy to Create Positive and Sustainable Changes in the Community

PROSHAR realized that the use of Behavior Change Communications (BCC) would be the best way to bring about positive and sustainable change, and felt that BCC is more effective than just awareness activities for motivating people to accept new, positive practices and for encouraging individual advocacy to modify existing practices.

PROSHAR has three different Strategic Objectives (SOs), but in order to address these, there is a need for a BCC strategy and integrated activities to achieve the overall goal. It is imperative to identify the key behaviors and information/messages for each SO in order to properly address changes in the desired behaviors. From the BCC Strategy development process PROSHAR was able to develop a framework in which individual activities are mentioned for each SO. The BCC strategy will provide a guide to staff to achieve all Intermediate Results (IRs) under the three SOs.

PROSHAR's three implementation Upazilas have unique geographical characteristics which have an impact on the behavioral patterns in agriculture and disaster risk management. Some variation in activities will therefore be required for each Upazila, but the BCC Strategy will provide a common platform for changing behaviors of the target audiences appropriate for achieving the SOs.

A participatory process was used for developing the BCC Strategy. The objective of the Strategy is to guide the staff in a shared vision which clearly delineates future directions and priorities. The strategy was developed by defining priority behaviors and target groups, conducting qualitative research - including barrier analysis - using



Group work in a field level workshop with local institutions, elites, elected body, farmers at Batiagahata on August 8, 2011

Photographer: SAM Husain



Doer and NonDoer FGD with farmers (men & women) at Lohagora on August 14, 2011

Photographer: SAM Husain

secondary information from the baseline survey and the Bangladesh Demographic and Health Survey (BDHS) 2007, developing messages, defining materials, channels, and capacity building events, and including advocacy issues and activities to promote sustainability.

PROSHAR organized twelve focus group discussions (FGDs) for SO1, Livelihoods, and SO3, Disaster Preparedness, and conducted 600 Doer & NonDoer (DND) house-to-house interviews for SO2, Maternal and Child Health, in the three implementation areas.

PROSHAR staff created the BCC framework based upon currently planned activities, proposed activities based on priority determinates, and the results of the FGD/DND research. Work was also completed on message development and integration of activities.

The strategy clearly and succinctly defines how the BCC activities will affect the broader program environment by empowering people to change their behavior and by facilitating social change. The PROSHAR BCC Strategy will enhance the program's power to achieve its objectives and goals.



Doer & NonDoer household interviews at Lohagara on August 16, 2011

Photographer: SAM Husain

2. Developed Gender Integrated Action Plan to Improve Gender Equity in the Community

PROSHAR is a large integrated program that operates in agricultural, health and disaster risk management sectors. It requires analysis of how gender relations can affect and be affected by the operational and technical design of the program with regards to both program objectives and how gender dynamics intersect across objectives and sectors.

PROSHAR did the following to integrate gender principles into development activities.

- Train PROSHAR staff on the integration of gender principles into development activities;
- Undertake a participatory gender analysis;
- Develop a gender integrated action plan for PROSHAR and partner NGOs.

The objectives of the gender analysis are:

- Assess the major constraints of the rural women in context of agricultural, health and disaster risk management issues;
- Identify available government services in Upazilas and access to services; and
- Recommend for addressing gender equity issues and empowerment for rural women

In the total process PROSHAR involved key stakeholders using various participatory facilitation methods so that the stakeholders can play active roles to identify the required pragmatic actions using available resources. PROSHAR completed several trainings, meetings, 3 Upazila level workshops for key stakeholders, 33 FGDs, 20 Key



Focus group discussion (FGD) with female beneficiaries at Hogolbunia Village of Batiaghata Upazila held on September 17, 2011

Photographer - Ashek Md. Joglul Abedin, PMID

People in photo- Padma Bati Mandal, Nilima, Niliboti, UshaRani, Gouri Mallik, Shiboti Rani, Drobo Boiragi, Ruji das, Hirammon, Dipali



FGD with male beneficiaries at Matha Vanga Village of Batiaghata Upazila held on September 14, 2011

Photographer- Muktarul Islam, PROSHAR

People in photo-Ilias Shekh, Ibraheem, Golap, Rabiul, Shafiqul, Sujan, Majed, Saiful, Gaush, Tutul, Ruma, Ashek, Ali, Tutul, Hakim Sardar, Ruma

Informant Interviews (KIIs), and analyzed gender barriers within 50 days. Selected trained PROSHAR staff collected data through FGDs and KIIs and analyzed other secondary data. Three separate groups were formed with SO representatives to prepare their own GIAPs against the identified gender concerns for specific SOs.

Using the gender analysis findings PROSHAR developed a Gender Integrated Action Plan (GIAP) which will be used as the strategy for activities to be undertaken by PROSHAR as well as its stakeholders. PROSHAR considered the following variables in the action plan.

- Areas of gender concerns identified in PROSHAR;
- Present status and future scopes of the men and women entitlements in agricultural, health and disaster risk management sector; and
- Capacity, readiness and willingness of the stakeholders for addressing the gender concerns.

PROSHAR followed the following steps to develop the GIAP in order to ensure gender equity in the community.

- Conducted the Gender and Development Training for PROSHAR staff;
- Trained selected PROSHAR staff to conduct gender analysis;
- Conducted workshops at Upazila Level;
- Conducted KII and FGDs at the service provider and target group level;
- Analyzed data and prepared gender analysis report; and
- Conducted workshop to develop GIAP.



Workshop at Lohagora Upazila held on Sept 12, 2011

Photographer- Tanim Ahmed, PMID

Persons in photo- S. M. A Hannan-Upazila Chairman, Arun Kumer Mandal-Upazila Nirbahi Officer, Moushumi Rani Majumdar-Upazila Women Affairs Officer, Md. Joynal Abedin-PROSHAR, Raghunath Kor-Upazila Agriculture Officer, Syed Md. Azim Uddin-Project Implementation Officer, Hosne Ara Happy-Upazila Fisheries Officer, Bashir Ahmed-PMID, Shahana Jannat-PMID, Begum Zerina Reshma-PROSHAR, Badar Khondaker, Dr. Kaz Mustain Billah- Upazila Livestock Officer, Shahanara Shameem-Upazila Vice Chairman



Key Informant Interview (KII) at Bangladesh Fisheries Research Institute, Bagerhat held on September 15, 2011

Photographer- Shahana Jannat, PMID

Person in photo- Dr. Masud Hossain Khan-Principal Scientific Officer, Bashir Ahmed-PMID, Reshma-PROSHAR