

**CAPABLE PARTNERS PROGRAM**

**MID-TERM EVALUATION REPORT: HIGHLIGHTS AND  
PERFORMANCE MANAGEMENT PLAN FINDINGS**

**I. INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY HIGHLIGHTS**

In accordance with the five-year Leader with Associates Cooperative Agreement awarded on August 11, 2003 by USAID/DCHA/PVC-ASHA to the Academy for Educational Development (AED), with its partner Management Systems International (MSI), a mid-term review of the Capable Partners Program (CAP) was conducted by program staff in the first quarter of 2006.

An analysis of program data was based on the Objectives and Indicators included in the CAP Performance Management Plan (PMP), which was approved by the CTO in January 2004. This report is organized around those elements of the PMP, with information drawn from:

- review of key documents
- reports from Participating Organizations (POs),<sup>1</sup>
- measurement of changes in key areas of organizational capacity based on assessments using the Institutional Development Framework for baseline and follow-up measures, and
- Customer Satisfaction Surveys soliciting feedback about CAP programs and services from POs, Innovation Grantees, and USAID personnel.

Summary highlights include the following:

- To date, CAP has worked with 63 network partners in 35 countries.
  - 43 in the Africa region
  - 4 in the Europe/Central Asia region
  - 11 in the Asia region
  - 5 in the Latin America region
- To date, CAP's work has touched more than 1700 NGOs, cooperatives, ISOs and others.
- CAP has generated Associate Awards to date totaling \$10,567,040 and has pending Associate Awards totaling more than \$7,050,000.
- CAP has awarded 13 grants to NGOs and networks totaling approximately \$400,000.
- 93% of organizations participating in CAP's first Global Core Initiative demonstrated an increase in overall institutional capacity.
- Among CAP's participating NGOs and networks, for every program aspect included in the Customer Satisfaction Survey, a rate of 100% was reported, surpassing CAP's 80% PMP target.

---

<sup>1</sup> For the period covered, POs are defined as those organizations that have participated in the CAP Advocacy Fellows Program (Global Core Initiative #1 or GCI #1) and the Innovation Grants Program.

## II. BACKGROUND

Information detailing on-going program activities was included in the four semi-annual reports submitted to PVC covering the period through September 30, 2005. Highlights of those activities may be summarized as follows:

### A. GCI #1 -- Advocacy Fellows Program

- ◆ Discussions took place with representatives of USAID Regional Bureaus and selected Missions to request their assistance for the identification of NGO networks to participate in GCI #1, the Advocacy Fellows Program. Missions were offered an opportunity to provide Associate Awards for the participation of additional organizations. This process resulted in the selection of 17 organizations in 15 countries, as Missions in Ghana and Sudan executed small Associate Awards for the addition of a second organization from those countries. The countries represented and the sectors covered by participating organizations were:
  - Civil Society = Ghana, Sudan, Indonesia, Lebanon, Georgia, Tajikistan
  - Rule of Law = Ghana, Paraguay, Bulgaria
  - Environment = Mongolia, Peru
  - Health and Education = India, Albania, Zambia
  - Economic Growth = Sri Lanka, Guyana
- ◆ Week-long training workshops were held in Ghana (February 2004) and Turkey (June 2004), and one-year Advocacy Action Plans were developed by participating organizations.
- ◆ The Institutional Development Framework (IDF) was installed in all GCI #1 participating organizations between February and November 2004. This included the collection of baseline information, the identification of organizational priorities, and the formulation of Institutional Improvement Plans, which then became the basis for requests to CAP for technical assistance.
- ◆ In response to requests from POs, technical assistance was provided in late 2004 through early 2006 to strengthen these organizations in the priority areas identified in their Institutional Improvement Plans.
- ◆ Following completion of all IDF applications and the receipt of request for technical assistance, in February 2005, a Trend Analysis was conducted to identify similarities in the types of assistance needed within and across regions.
- ◆ The second application of the IDF within participating organizations was conducted in the last half of 2005, in order to measure the degree of change that may have occurred following the delivery of technical assistance.

## **B. GCI #2 – Monitoring Training for the West Africa Network for Peacebuilding (WANEP)**

- ◆ This activity was launched with a week-long training workshop held in Ghana in October 2005. Participants were representatives of the 12 national NGO networks that comprise the WANEP regional network, plus representatives from the four regional offices of the Economic Commission for West African States (ECOWAS), with which WANEP works. The workshop was followed by a two-day training of trainers, so that participants could return to their respective countries and deliver the monitoring training to the NGOs in their national networks. Given the end-of-year holidays, and the need for planning at the national level, follow-on activities have been delayed. The replication of the monitoring course, as well as the application of the IDF within each of the 12 national networks, is expected to begin within the next two months. Because of the premature stage at which this activity is currently found, it is not included in this mid-term evaluation. Rather, GCI #2 performance will be included in the final CAP evaluation report.

## **C. Small Grant Programs**

- ◆ In early 2004, five target countries were identified for the Innovation Grants initiative. An APS was then developed and applications from NGO networks in those countries were solicited on May 1. After a careful review of the 19 concept papers received, and an objective analysis of the proposals submitted, five grants of approximately \$30,000 were awarded to organizations in the following countries:
  - Nepal
  - Vietnam
  - Tanzania
  - Nicaragua
- ◆ In early 2005, proposals for follow-on grants were invited from all organizations participating in GCI #1. This resulted in the award of nine grants to support advocacy efforts, develop institutional capacity, or support organizational learning.

## **D. Case Studies**

Case studies of organizations with which CAP has relations were commissioned for GCI #1 participant NESI in Sudan, and for Innovation Grant recipients in Nicaragua, Nepal and Vietnam. The purpose is to explore and document the evolution of NGO networks in situations affected by conflict, the measures they have adopted over time in pursuit of their goals, and their vision for the future.

Results will be published in the first semester of 2006 as a compendium, which will include lessons drawn from the experiences of the groups studied, along with recommendations addressed to donors for future support of NGO networks.

## **E. Information Dissemination**

- ◆ The CAP web portal, NGOConnect.NET, was created and launched in the first half of the program. It includes a wealth of resource materials for all phases of NGO-related programming.
  - Total Portal Accounts: 589
  - Total Knowledge Objects: 3793
  - Total Communities: 23
  - Total Topics: 998
  - Total Page Views (1/1/06 to 3/8/06): 10479
- ◆ NGOConnect also has been used to facilitate communication among participating organizations and others, and a distance-learning training module on the use of the IDF was launched in January 2006.
- ◆ The CAP newsletter, *NGOConnections*, is disseminated quarterly to approximately 750 recipients.

## **F. Associate Awards**

Associate Awards are separately prepared and administered by the executing mission or operating unit. Each has its own reporting requirements, PMP, monitoring and evaluation plan, etc. A complete description of all current, completed and pending Associate Awards is included in the Summary of CAP Activities, *Appendix 1*.

Associate Awards (current value: \$10,567,040) in progress or complete are as follows:

- ◆ USAID/Kenya Small Grants & Institutional Strengthening Programs I and II
- ◆ Strengthening Leading Mozambican NGOs and Networks
- ◆ Conflict-Sensitive Monitoring and Evaluation Workshop
- ◆ Ghana Advocacy Skills Training and Institutional Strengthening Program
- ◆ Sudan Advocacy Skills Training and Institutional Strengthening Program

Pending Associate Awards (\$7,050,000+) are as follows:

- ◆ Strengthening Democratic Governance in Nicaragua
- ◆ Liberia NGO Strengthening Program
- ◆ Mexico Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Shelter Project
- ◆ USAID/Kenya NGO Capacity Building Program (Health)
- ◆ Global Disabilities Empowerment Program
- ◆ Conflict Mitigation Pilot Program in Chad
- ◆ USAID/South Africa Community Capacity Building Program on Nutrition, Maternal Health and HIV/AIDS
- ◆ USAID Swaziland Community Capacity Building Program on Nutrition, Maternal Health and HIV/AIDS
- ◆ USAID/Lesotho Community Capacity Building Program on Nutrition, Maternal Health and HIV/AIDS

### III. FINDINGS

Findings are organized in accordance with the Objectives and Indicators included in the CAP PMP for this period. Results are as follows:

**Table: CAP PMP Performance Indicators, Definitions and Analyses, and Findings**

<i>Performance Indicators</i>	<i>Definition and Analysis</i>	<i>Findings</i>
<b>Objective 1: Operational and technical capacity of local NGOs, networks, and ISO, strengthened.</b>		
1.1 - % of POs that show increased capacity in one of the operational and technical areas they have targeted for strengthening.	<p>POs are the 17 organizations that participated in GCI #1, within which the IDF was applied.</p> <p>The “operational and technical areas” targeted were those 2-3 areas identified by POs for improvement during the IDF process.</p> <p>Strengthening these areas then became the basis of requests for TA from CAP.</p> <p>A rating of “increased capacity” requires an increase of at least 25% in the IDF score for the capacity areas targeted.</p>	<p>A total of 12 of the 17 POs targeted areas for strengthening and received TA in those areas. Some months later, the IDF was again applied in order to track any change that may have occurred. Of the 12, the % of improvement in the 2-3 areas targeted was:</p> <p><u>3 POs (25%) showed an improvement of 25% or better:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Ghana/LRC = 32%</li> <li>◆ Sudan/AORD = 27%</li> <li>◆ Tajikistan = 131%</li> </ul> <p><u>5 POs (42%) improved between 10% &amp; 25%:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Lebanon = 14%</li> <li>◆ Peru = 13%</li> <li>◆ Sudan/NESI = 12%</li>   <li>◆ Mongolia = 24%</li> <li>◆ Paraguay = 23%</li> </ul> <p><u>3 POs (25%) improved over 5%:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Bulgaria = 6%</li> <li>◆ Sri Lanka = 6%</li> <li>◆ India = 7%</li> </ul> <p><u>1 PO (8%) improved under 5%:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Indonesia = (-1.6%)</li> </ul> <p>Of the remaining 5 POs, 4 completed only the first application of the IDF for the following reasons:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 3 became unresponsive and did not receive TA (Guyana, Zambia, Ghana/GAPVOD).</li> <li>◆ In Albania, due to the factors beyond our control, the delivery of TA and the second IDF application are still pending.</li> </ul> <p>In Georgia the original PO (in reality a Mission-funded project) ceased to exist after the first IDF application; no priority areas were set or TA delivered. Fortunately, CAP has remained in contact with the follow-on organization (virtually the same structure and staff), and the second IDF application was conducted. As a result, while we have a score for overall improvement, in the absence of organizational priorities, there is no weighted score for this indicator.</p>
<p>1.2 - % of POs that demonstrate an increase in overall institutional capacity.</p>	<p>POs are the 17 organizations that participated in GCI #1, within which the IDF was applied.</p> <p>“Increased overall institutional capacity” is an increase in the overall score between the 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> IDF applications.</p>	<p>As explained above, a total of 13 POs received the second application of the IDF. An increase in overall institutional capacity was recorded in all but one case. (Indonesia, with a score of -1.6%, was the only PO that did not show an increase).</p> <p>Thus, nearly 93% of the POs demonstrated an increase in overall institutional capacity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Tajikistan 131%</li> <li>◆ Ghana/LRC 32%</li> <li>◆ Sudan/AORD 24%</li> <li>◆ Mongolia 23%</li> <li>◆ Paraguay 21%</li> <li>◆ Lebanon 15%</li> <li>◆ Peru 12%</li> <li>◆ Sudan/NESI 12%</li> <li>◆ Georgia 13%</li> <li>◆ India 7%</li> <li>◆ Bulgaria 5%</li> <li>◆ Sri Lanka 5%</li> </ul>

**Objective 2: Linkages among local organizations (NGOs, networks, governments and businesses) strengthened.**

<p>2.1 - % of POs that develop or expand inter-sectoral linkages at the local level.</p>	<p>For this period, POs are defined as those participating in GCI 1.</p> <p>“Inter-sectoral linkages” are formal or informal relations among organizations from two or more sectors (i.e., not-for-profit groups, private enterprise or government) for the purpose of sharing information or working toward a common development goal.</p>	<p>Information was collected from the 13 GCI 1 POs in which the IDF was applied twice. Two sub-components comprise this measurement: a) Ability to work with central and local government; and b) Ability to work with other NGOs.</p> <p>Strengthened linkages were recorded for 8 (62%) of the 13 POs tracked; no specific target was set in the PMP. Individual scores were as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Bulgaria 0.00%</li> <li>◆ Georgia 0.00%</li> <li>◆ Ghana/LRC 46.67%</li> <li>◆ India 7.14%</li> <li>◆ Indonesia -8.33%</li> <li>◆ Lebanon 11.11%</li> <li>◆ Mongolia 40.00%</li> <li>◆ Paraguay 47.06%</li> <li>◆ Peru -1.64%</li> <li>◆ Sri Lanka -6.00%</li> <li>◆ Sudan/NESI 8.33%</li> <li>◆ Sudan/AORD 3.85%</li> <li>◆ Tajikistan 400.00%</li> </ul>
--	---	--

**Objective 3: Increased capacity of NGOs, networks and ISOs to engage in advocacy for key policies or programs.**

<p>3.1 - % of organizations that participate in CAP activities with improved advocacy capacity.</p>	<p>Organizations that participate in CAP activities are defined as all those participating in GCI 1.</p> <p>“Improved advocacy capacity” is defined as a positive change in the advocacy-related rows of the IDF.</p>	<p>As explained above (see Indicator 1.1), a change in capacity was measured for the 13 POs in which the IDF was applied twice. Advocacy capacity included three sub-components: a) Strategic Approach; b) Use of Research/Information; and c) Mobilizing Constituents.</p> <p>Improved advocacy capacity was recorded for 10 (77%) of the 13 POs tracked. Individual scores were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Bulgaria 9.52%</li> <li>◆ Georgia 0.00%</li> <li>◆ Ghana/LRC 34.62%</li> <li>◆ India 12.12%</li> <li>◆ Indonesia -2.63%</li> <li>◆ Lebanon -9.68%</li> <li>◆ Mongolia 12.50%</li> <li>◆ Paraguay 13.51%</li> <li>◆ Peru 3.33%</li> <li>◆ Sri Lanka 2.00%</li> <li>◆ Sudan/NESI 7.89%</li> <li>◆ Sudan/AORD 55.00%</li> <li>◆ Tajikistan 65.52%</li> </ul>
---	---	---

**Objective 4: Wide dissemination (NGOs, local cooperatives, ISOs, etc.) of tested innovations, best practices, lessons learned, and standards.**

<p>4.1 - # of U.S. and local NGOs, networks and ISOs that receive key capacity-building information from the CAP program.</p>	<p>This relates to reference materials or other types of information provided by CAP through a GCI program or otherwise. CAP will have mailed, e-mailed, handed out and/or provided via the website, information on NGO, network and ISO capacity building.</p>	<p>During the period covered, CAP disseminated key capacity-building information to a total of 202 organizations.</p> <p>Via NGOConnect resources are disseminated to approximately 600 registered users and an infinite number of guest users.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ <i>IDF Distance Learning Module</i> was accessed by 152 users; CD-ROM versions were requested by nearly 10% of users.</li> <li>◆ <i>Strengthening Civil Society Networks</i> was accessed by 188 users (in English and Spanish); 200 have been disseminated to date in hard copies.</li> </ul>
---	---	---

<p>4.2 - # of CAP target organizations that use information disseminated by CAP, adopting tested innovations, state-of-the-art approaches and best practices to solve problems.</p>	<p>Target organizations are those participating in GCI 1 and recipients of Innovation Grants.</p>	<p>A survey of target organizations showed that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 100% of respondents (9 organizations) had received resource materials from CAP or downloaded materials from NGOConnect.NET.</li> <li>◆ While one respondent did not indicate whether materials had been useful, all others (8) reported that they had been useful.</li> <li>◆ All organizations reported that the information provided by CAP had been used to “overcome challenges or solve problems.”</li> </ul> <p>Among the materials specifically mentioned were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ The Human Rights Education Handbook</li> <li>◆ Civil Society Networks</li> <li>◆ An Introduction to Advocacy</li> <li>◆ Monitoring and Evaluation materials</li> <li>◆ Building indicators</li> <li>◆ Guidelines and other materials regarding the IDF Process</li> <li>◆ Proposal guidelines</li> <li>◆ OCAT and TIPS on Measuring Institutional Capacity</li> </ul>
<p><b>Objective 5: CAP Program implemented effectively and efficiently.</b></p>		
<p>5.1 - # of requests for information and services from USAID operating units received by the CAP Program.</p>	<p>Includes request for information, Associate Awards or other services received by CAP from USAID OUs.</p>	<p>Requests for information and services were received from a total of 48 USAID operating units.</p>
<p>5.2 - % of requests for information and services from USAID OUs and development community responded to in a timely manner.</p>	<p>“Timely manner” means responding to requests within 24 hours by either acknowledging receipt or directly providing the information and/or services requested.</p>	<p>In 81.25% of cases, CAP responded to requests for information and services within 24 hours. In other cases, responses were transmitted within 48-72 hours, depending on the type of request and when it was received.</p>

<p>5.3 - % of representatives from POs and participating USAID OUs that express satisfaction with CAP program performance.</p>	<p>Here, “POs” refers to all GCI 1 organizations, plus all recipients of Innovation Grants.</p> <p>“Participating USAID OUs” are those USAID offices that have been in contact with CAP regarding the selection of GCI organizations, target countries and grantees, or to discuss an associate award, or for any other purpose.</p>	<p>Information was collected through a customer satisfaction survey. The baseline was set at zero, and CAP aimed for an 80% satisfaction rate.</p> <p>A total of 9 responses came from POs (5 from GCI 1 organizations and 4 from Innovation grantees), while 11 came from USAID personnel.</p> <p><b>Responses from all 9 POs</b> included the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 77% reported they were <i>Very Satisfied</i> with the design and implementation of the program; 33% said they were <i>Satisfied</i>; none reported dissatisfaction;</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>100%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 100% responded that they were <i>Very Satisfied</i> with their interactions with CAP staff;</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>100%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ As an overall rating of CAP services and products, 77% responded that they were <i>Very Satisfied</i>, while 33% said they were <i>Satisfied</i>; no dissatisfaction was reported.</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>100%</b></p> <p><b>Responses from the 5 GCI 1 organizations</b> included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 66% were <i>Very Satisfied</i> with the quality of the advocacy training, while 33% were <i>Satisfied</i>, and none were dissatisfied;</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>100%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 33% were <i>Very Satisfied</i> with the usefulness to their organizations of the advocacy skills they learned; 66% said they were <i>Satisfied</i>, and none were dissatisfied;</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>100%</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Concerning the quality of the IDF process, as well as of the technical assistance provided, 33% responded <i>Very Satisfied</i>, and 66% said <i>Satisfied</i>;</li> </ul>
--	--	--

		<p>no dissatisfaction was reported. Total satisfaction rate = <b>100 %</b></p> <p>The <b>4 Innovation grantees</b> reported:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 50% were <i>Very Satisfied</i> with the grant application process, and 50% were <i>Satisfied</i>, while there was no dissatisfaction;</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>100 %</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ 100% were <i>Very Satisfied</i> with CAP's support to their organizations as grantees; none were dissatisfied.</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>100 %</b></p> <p>Of the 11 <b>responses from USAID personnel</b>, one responded <i>No Opinion</i> to all questions. Therefore, only 10 returns are included in the following responses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Degree of satisfaction with the relevance of the CAP program (design and structure) to the needs of your operating unit: 50% <i>Very Satisfied</i>; 30% <i>Satisfied</i>; 20% <i>Unsatisfied</i>;</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>80 %</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Degree of satisfaction with the quality of CAP services to USAID missions and OUs, NGOs, NGO networks, and others: 40% <i>Very Satisfied</i>; 40% <i>Satisfied</i>; 20% <i>Unsatisfied</i>;</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>80 %</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Degree of satisfaction with their interactions with CAP staff: 70% <i>Very Satisfied</i>; 10% <i>Satisfied</i>; 20% <i>Unsatisfied</i>;</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>80 %</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◆ Satisfaction with CAP information materials: 40% <i>Very Satisfied</i>; 30% <i>Satisfied</i>; 30% <i>Unsatisfied</i>.</li> </ul> <p>Total satisfaction rate = <b>70 %</b></p>
--	--	---

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

A careful analysis of the findings described in the foregoing section leads to a number of conclusions concerning CAP experience to date and lessons for the future. The most relevant of the conclusions drawn may be summarized as follows:

1. CAP's focus beyond individual organizations to NGO networks greatly broadened the program's impact. By working directly with 63 networks in all four regions, CAP was able to touch more than 1,700 organizations around the globe.
2. By providing both technical training in advocacy and organization development assistance for the NGOs selected to participate in the first Global Core Initiative, CAP was able to develop a holistic understanding of those organizations and their needs and to build an on-going relationship.
3. The overall response rate to the Customer Satisfaction Survey disseminated by CAP for the purposes of this Mid-term Evaluation Report was 22.7%, indicating that CAP stakeholders are actively engaged in the CAP program.
4. NGOConnect.NET was seen as a valuable tool for extending the reach of the program to USAID missions and operating units, participating organizations, ISOs, and civil society organizations, as it allowed the program to disseminate information, engage stakeholders, and create linkages with a much wider audience.
5. The number of Participating Organizations and Innovation Grantees using CAP materials indicates that the program is developing and disseminating materials that are appropriate and useful for NGOs and NGO networks in a wide range of contexts.
6. Because CAP consulted USAID operating units with regard to participant selection and other aspects of the activities undertaken, a high level of interest and satisfaction was achieved. This is demonstrated, for example, by the fact that nearly 17 percent of the USAID personnel contacted responded to the CAP Customer Satisfaction Survey. A number of them took the time also to send additional comments, such as:
  - a. "The direct contact via email at the time of start-up was very useful. Subsequently, the 'mailing list' arrangement worked very well for me."
  - b. "The website provides information that is useful to NGOs/networking in general."
  - c. "Since the Mission was working with a number of host country NGOs, in 2003 CAP was perceived by the Mission as a service provider for providing advocacy skills which would benefit the local NGOs."
  - d. "We have received progress reports on the program from time to time. This was useful and appreciated."
  - e. "For the service provided by CAP in 2003-2004, we are satisfied that the candidate was trained. CAP is not pre-packaged, but very adaptable in

terms of a program that could parallel existing programs that are not adequately addressing the needs of weak NGOs.”

- f. “I am satisfied because it is not a simple course, but an exchange between many experienced persons. It was very useful for me.”
  - g. “I think the services are of good quality and it is the impression of many people that benefited of CAP services.”
  - h. “[The program] was very flexible and comprehensive and combined theory and practice to deliver a content that has remained with and continues to guide participants in their daily work in conflict zones. As for the needs of my unit, it was a God send as it is just what we need in our program...”
7. A high level of satisfaction also was achieved among the participating NGOs and networks. For every program aspect included in the Customer Satisfaction Survey, a rate of 100 percent was reported, thus surpassing CAP’s 80% target.

## Appendix 1: Summary of CAP Activities

### CAP Core – Leader with Associates Award

Activity	Description	Location	Dates	Sectors/Areas
<b>Advocacy Fellows Program</b>	<p>Two-year initiative supporting 17 NGOs and networks with advocacy training, the development of Advocacy Action Plans, institutional strengthening processes, and small grants.</p> <p><b>Advocacy skills:</b> Training in advocacy, development of Advocacy Action Plans, and on-going monitoring and evaluation.</p> <p><b>Institutional strengthening:</b> Facilitation of participatory organizational assessments (baseline and follow-ups), development of Institutional Improvement Plans, and provision of technical assistance.</p> <p><b>Small grants:</b> One-year grants awarded to support advocacy campaigns, organizational learning and/or institutional strengthening activities.</p> <p><b>Appendix I:</b> IDF Results  <b>Appendix II:</b> Advocacy Fellows Program Feedback  <b>Appendix III:</b> Advocacy Fellows Program Highlights  <b>Appendix IV:</b> Follow-on Grant Recipients</p>	<p><b>*Global*</b></p> <p>Guyana  India  Albania  Georgia  Paraguay  Ghana  Indonesia  Tajikistan  Sudan  Lebanon  Sri Lanka  Peru  Bulgaria  Mongolia  Zambia</p>	2004-2006	<p>Advocacy  Youth  Citizen participation  Environment  Human Trafficking  Anti-corruption  Human Rights  Transparency  Economic Development  Conflict Management</p> <p>Institutional  Strengthening  Network development</p>
<b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Program</b>	<p>Two-year initiative with regional and national networks of NGOs to strengthen their monitoring and evaluation capacities and support their institutional development.</p> <p><b>Monitoring Training and Institutional Strengthening Program for the West Africa Network for Peace Building (WANEP):</b> Customized monitoring training for conflict-affected environments, and institutional strengthening process for 12 national WANEP networks.</p>	<p><b>*West Africa*</b></p> <p>Senegal  Liberia, Gambia  Ghana, Togo  Benin, Guinea  Sierra Leone  Guinea Bissau  Burkina Faso  Cote d' Ivoire  Nigeria</p>	2005-2006	<p>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation  Conflict Management</p> <p>Institutional  Strengthening  Network development</p>

Activity	Description	Location	Dates	Sectors/Areas
<p><b>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Program (continued)</b></p>	<p><b>Evaluation Certificate Course and Institutional Strengthening Program for Action Against Trafficking and Sexual Exploitation of Children (ATSEC):</b> Evaluation course for ATSEC members, implementation of evaluation techniques for selected anti-trafficking projects, institutional strengthening processes (India, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka and Nepal), and network development (Pakistan and Afghanistan).</p>	<p>*South Asia* India Bangladesh Pakistan Sri Lanka Nepal Afghanistan</p>	<p>2006-2007</p>	<p>Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Human Trafficking  Institutional Strengthening Network Development</p>
<p><b>Public-Private Partnerships</b></p>	<p>This initiative will support the development of public-private partnerships. It will be launched in 2007.</p>	<p>Global</p>	<p>2007-08</p>	<p>Global Alliances Public-Private Partnerships  Institutional Strengthening Network Development</p>
<p><b>Innovation Grants</b></p>	<p>Provision of small grants to help form, strengthen, and/or sustain NGO networks, intermediary support organizations (ISOs), coalitions, and other local support mechanisms.</p> <p><b>Ometepe's Civil Organizations Network – Nicaragua.</b> Ometepe is a network of civil society organizations focused on enhancing the participation of CSOs in the municipal development process. Ometepe's project is designed to involve a wide variety of civil society organizations in influencing local policies and laws.</p> <p><b>Instituto de Estudios Nicaragüenses (IEN) – Nicaragua.</b> IEN is a non-government research organization committed to supporting civic participation and good governance in Nicaragua. IEN's project will bring together national and local civil society organizations to build capacity through private-public partnerships, thus creating a bottom-up demand for greater rule of law, decentralization, transparency, accountability, and responsiveness to citizen demands.</p>	<p>Nicaragua Vietnam Nepal Tanzania  Nicaragua          Nicaragua</p>	<p>2005-2006</p>	<p>Network Strengthening Gender-based Violence Civic Participation Social Services Advocacy Environment</p>

Activity	Description	Location	Dates	Sectors/Areas
<b>Innovation Grants (continued)</b>	<p><b>Center for Education Promotion and Empowerment of Women (CEPEW) – Vietnam.</b> CEPEW is a network of Vietnamese NGOs focused on women’s rights and alleviating poverty. CEPEW’s project is to improve the operational skills of CEPEW member organizations, improve information sharing across the network, and promote cooperation between NGOs and government agencies working on poverty reduction.</p> <p><b>SAATHI – Nepal.</b> SAATHI is a coalition of organizations focused on improving the lives of Nepali women and children. SAATHI’s project is to create a network in order to better address challenges—particularly violence faced by Nepali women and children—by providing training and resources to members and others.</p> <p><b>PAMOJA Trust – Tanzania.</b> PAMOJA Trust is a Tanzanian organization that seeks to create a common space of dialogue for local government, the private sector and civil society. PAMOJA’s project will strengthen the capacity of NGOs and their networks to advocate and implement policies leading to sustainable development in the Kilimanjaro Region of Tanzania.</p>	<p>Vietnam</p> <p>Nepal</p> <p>Tanzania</p>		<p>Network Strengthening Gender-based Violence Civic Participation Social Services Advocacy Environment</p>
<b>NGOConnect.NET</b>	<p>Dynamic, interactive web portal that provides tools, theoretical frameworks, innovations and lessons learned through an online library of resources, public and private online communities, and distance learning modules.</p>	<p>Global</p>	<p>2004-2008</p>	<p>Organizational Development Technical Capacity Social Legitimacy Financial Viability</p>
<b>Resource Development &amp; Learning Agenda</b>	<p><b>Network Case Studies:</b> Descriptive portrayal of NGO networks active in conflict-affected environments in Nepal, Sudan, Nicaragua, and Vietnam.</p>	<p>Vietnam Sudan Nepal Nicaragua</p>	<p>2005-2006</p>	<p>Network Strengthening Conflict Management Institutional Strengthening</p>

Activity	Description	Location	Dates	Sectors/Areas
<b>Resource Development &amp; Learning Agenda</b>	<b>Technical Resources to Support Civil Society Networks:</b> Desk review and field research with network stakeholders in four regions to develop network resources. Resource materials will include conceptual on network principles, design, and capacity-building, as well as practical tools for use in training and technical assistance.	Global	2004-2008	Network Strengthening Conflict Management Institutional Strengthening

### CAP Associates Awards

Award	Amount	Description	Location	Dates	Sectors/Areas
<b>USAID/Kenya Small Grants &amp; Institutional Strengthening Program (CAP Kenya I)</b>	\$999,079	Funded under the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), this project strengthened the organizational and technical capacity of organizations in Kenya working at the community level with HIV/AIDS-affected orphans and vulnerable children.	Kenya	Nov 2004 – Nov 2005	HIV/AIDS Health Disabilities  Grants Management Institutional Strengthening
<b>USAID/Kenya Small Grants and Institutional Strengthening Program (CAP Kenya II)</b>	\$9,000,000	This project continues the activities begun under CAP Kenya I.	Kenya	Dec 2005 – Dec 2008	HIV/AIDS Health Disabilities  Grants Management Institutional Strengthening
<b>Strengthening Leading Mozambican NGOs and Networks</b>	\$400,000	USAID/Mozambique engaged CAP to design and implement an institutional strengthening program for leading Mozambican NGO networks providing HIV/AIDS services in their communities.	Mozambique	Jan – June 2006	HIV/AIDS Health FBOs  Institutional Strengthening Network Strengthening

<b>Award</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Dates</b>	<b>Sectors/Areas</b>
<b>Conflict Sensitive Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Workshop</b>	\$143,395	CAP designed and facilitated a pilot workshop in Accra, Ghana, for USAID staff, international PVOs, and local NGOs on conflict-sensitive monitoring and evaluation.	West Africa	Sept 2004 – April 2005	Monitoring & Evaluation Conflict Management
<b>Ghana Advocacy Skills Training and Institutional Strengthening Program</b>	\$12,283	The USAID/Ghana Mission provided funding to allow the Legal Resources Centre, an NGO in Ghana, to participate in CAP's Advocacy Fellows Program.	Ghana	Sept 2004 – Aug 2005	Advocacy Human Rights Institutional Strengthening
<b>Sudan Advocacy Skills Training and Institutional Strengthening Program</b>	\$12,283	The USAID/Sudan Mission provided funding to allow the African Center for Relief and Development, an NGO in Sudan, to participate in the GCI Advocacy Fellows Program.	Sudan	Sept 2004 – Aug 2005	Advocacy Conflict Management Institutional Strengthening
<b>Total Awards</b>	<b>\$10,567,040</b>				

### **Pending CAP Associates Awards**

<b>Pending Award</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Sectors/Area</b>
<b>Strengthening Democratic Governance in Nicaragua</b>	TBD	Program to engage civil society to advance democratic reforms through the active participation of civil society organizations (CSOs) at all levels in raising public awareness about key policy issues, monitoring government performance, and advocating for policy development and implementation.	Nicaragua	Advocacy Governance Civil Society Strengthening

<b>Pending Award</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Sectors/Area</b>
<b>Liberia NGO Strengthening Program</b>	\$250,000	NGO sector assessment and strengthening program.	Liberia	Civil Society Strengthening Institutional Strengthening
<b>Mexico Trafficking in Persons (TIP) Shelter Project</b>	\$2,800,000	Program to combat trafficking of women and children through network development, research activities, advocacy campaigns, and technical support for the provision of social services.	Mexico	Human trafficking Network Strengthening
<b>USAID/Kenya Small Grants and Institutional Strengthening Program (CAP Kenya II)</b>	\$2,800,000	Expansion of activities.	Kenya	HIV/AIDS Health Disabilities Substance Abuse Grants Management Institutional Strengthening
<b>Strengthening Leading Mozambican NGOs and Networks</b>	\$1,200,000	Expansion of activities.	Mozambique	HIV/AIDS Health FBOs Institutional Strengthening Network Strengthening
<b>Disabilities</b>	TBD	TBD	Global	Health Disabilities
<b>Chad</b>	TBD	TBD	Chad	Conflict Management

<b>Pending Award</b>	<b>Amount</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Sectors/Area</b>
<b>South Africa</b>	TBD	Program to build capacity for NGOs that provide community-based care to HIV-positive women and their families; enhance M&E capacity through the integration of indicators on HIV and infant feeding; promote and disseminate best practices and BCC materials related to infant and young child feeding in the context of HIV; and enhance advocacy capacity related to the finalization of revised PMTCT guidelines.	South Africa	Health HIV/AIDS Nutrition Monitoring & Evaluation  Institutional Strengthening Network Strengthening
<b>Swaziland</b>	TBD	Program to build capacity for NGOs that provide community-based care to HIV-positive women and their families; enhance M&E capacity through the integration of indicators on HIV and infant feeding; promote and disseminate best practices and BCC materials related to infant and young child feeding in the context of HIV; and enhance advocacy capacity related to the finalization of revised PMTCT guidelines.	Swaziland	Health HIV/AIDS Nutrition Monitoring & Evaluation  Institutional Strengthening Network Strengthening
<b>Lesotho</b>	TBD	Program to build capacity for NGOs that provide community-based care to HIV-positive women and their families; enhance M&E capacity through the integration of indicators on HIV and infant feeding; promote and disseminate best practices and BCC materials related to infant and young child feeding in the context of HIV; and enhance advocacy capacity related to the finalization of revised PMTCT guidelines.	Lesotho	Health HIV/AIDS Nutrition Monitoring & Evaluation  Institutional Strengthening Network Strengthening

Pending Award	Amount	Description	Location	Sectors/Area
Mozambique	TBD	Program to build capacity for NGOs that provide community-based care to HIV-positive women and their families; enhance M&E capacity through the integration of indicators on HIV and infant feeding; promote and disseminate best practices and BCC materials related to infant and young child feeding in the context of HIV; and enhance advocacy capacity related to the finalization of revised PMTCT guidelines.	Mozambique	Health HIV/AIDS Nutrition Monitoring & Evaluation  Institutional Strengthening Network Strengthening
Total Awards	\$7,050,000 + TBD			