

World Vision Inc.

Institutional Capacity Building Program (ICB)

MID-TERM REVIEW

Final Report

Grant Number: AFP-A-00-03-00026-01

January 31, 2007

Prepared by

Tim Frankenburger

TANGO International, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms..... ii

I. BACKGROUND 9

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY 12

 A. Evaluation Objectives 12

 B. Mid-Term Review Approach and Schedule 12

III. MIDTERM REVIEW FINDINGS 15

 1. General Findings: Overall Improvements in WV Capacity to Implement
 Food Security Programs 15

 2. Review of SO1 – Food Security Vulnerability Assessment, Identification,
 and Programming 22

 3. Review of SO2 – Comprehensive Management of Title II Programs 32

IV. MIDTERM REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS 38

Appendix A: ICB Mid-term Review Scope of Work..... 44

Appendix B: WV ICB Mid-Term Evaluation Topical Outline 49

Appendix C: List of Persons Interviewed 56

Appendix D: WV ICB Indicator Tracking Matrix 58

Acronyms

ADP	Area Development Program
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance & Relief Everywhere
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
C-SAFE	Consortium for Southern Africa Food Security Emergency
CSB	Corn soya blend
CSM	Corn Soy Milk
CSR	Commodity Status Report
CTS	Commodity Tracking System
DAP	Development Assistance Program
DME	Design, Monitoring and Evaluation
FAM	Food Aid Management group
FFP	Food for Peace
FPMG	Food Program Management Group
FRT	Food Resources Team
FY	Fiscal Year
GINA	GWISER Information Needs Assessment
GIS	Geographic Information Systems
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
GWISER	Geospatial, Warning, Information, Surveillance, Evaluation, and Response
ICB	Institutional Capacity Building
IPTT	Indicator Performance Tracking Table
IR	Intermediate Result
IRD	International Relief and Development
ISA	Institutional Support Assistance
ISG	Institutional Support Grant
KMG	Knowledge Management Group
LOP	Life of Project
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MOU	Memorandum Of Understanding
MYAP	Multi-Year Assistance Program
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PEG	Program Enhancement Grant
PIE	Participatory Impact Evaluation
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal

PVO	Private Voluntary Organization
SC	Save the Children
SMT	Senior Management Team
SO	Strategic Objective
SOW	Scope of Work
TANGO	Technical Assistance to NGOs
TDI	Transformational Development Indicators
TU	Tulane University
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
WFP	World Food Programme
WV	World Vision
WVI	World Vision International
WV US	World Vision US

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

World Vision (WV) received a grant from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to implement a five-year Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Initiative, for a period of five years from September 30, 2003 through September 29, 2008. The purpose of the ICB initiative has been to support WV's Title II programs currently operating in thirteen different countries. The goal of the ICB initiative has been to increase the impact of food security programs in the field, by working together with local community organizations and international partners. The ICB proposal identified the following expected results:

- ◆ Improved food security vulnerability identification and programming.
- ◆ Improved comprehensive management of Title II programs.

In August 2006, TANGO International was contracted to undertake a mid-term review in order to assess WV's progress towards implementation of the ICB grant. This report documents the impact of the ICB grant on the stated goal, *to promote institutional excellence in the design and implementation of US Title II food programs worldwide to reduce food insecurity in vulnerable populations*. The report outlines progress toward realizing results at the halfway point of the ICB, examines results achieved, sets forth recommendations for WV management consideration as it implements the final two years of the ICB, and presents strategies for the future.

Key Findings

It is clear from this mid-term evaluation that WV Staff in the field offices as well as at organizational management levels have used the ICB resources efficiently and effectively to strengthen food security programming. Within two years, this ambitious ICB has been used to launch several essential initiatives to maintain WV's competitive position in food-resourced programming, including an innovative Geospatial, Warning, Information, Surveillance, Evaluation, and Response initiative (GWISER), the Mega Workshops, and the Competent Program Manager Framework. From an external perspective, the program designs are of high quality and were based on a good understanding of the current and changing food security context. Training and information-sharing events, particularly the three Mega Workshops held in 2004, 2005, and 2006, combined with the publication and the rollout of a key practitioner manual, the Competent

Program Manager manual have provided WV staff with an improved understanding of program design and implementation, development-relief programming, commodity management, and state-of-the-art developments in food security and food-assisted programming.

Specific Achievements:

- ◆ Facilitation of three Mega Workshops are already successfully impacting food-assisted programming by improving program staff competencies, standardizing staff understanding of food-assisted programming approaches, and sharing knowledge and experience. Staff members have increased confidence in participating in collaborative enterprises, joint proposals and trainings, donor requirements, and discussion forums.
- ◆ WV has made strong progress in establishing GWISER as a community-based early warning system. The GWISER analyses have been used to improve Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) systems as well as community-based early warning. Although still relatively young as an initiative and limited to two pilot country offices, the GWISER initiative is clearly successfully impacting on WV's programming strategy. This coupled with the community based early warning work By Emory University on-going in Central America gives WV programming staff new tools to analyze food insecurity, risk, and vulnerability, and potentially improving programming focus and relevance.
- ◆ With the hiring of an HIV/AIDS specialist and maintaining the role of lead agency of the Consortium for Southern Africa Food Security Emergency C-SAFE Program, WV has moved aggressively forward in utilizing the ICB to integrate HIV/AIDS programming into food-assisted programming strategies. Several initiatives have commenced during the first three years of this ICB. WV has clearly demonstrated progress in integrating HIV/AIDS and food programming, managing to integrate HIV/AIDS components into 40 percent of all WV's food aid programs (Title II).
- ◆ WV has conducted two vulnerability assessments per year during the mid-term review timeframe in 2004 and 2005, fully meeting the target.
- ◆ Almost all WV food-assisted programs now conduct participatory impact evaluations (PIEs), which are on target and reflect improved information and

feedback flow, including reviews of lessons learned from the project monitoring cycles.

- ◆ Consisting of eight management modules, WV's Competency Framework Initiative has produced an invaluable and highly sustainable set of outputs for the organization and represents one of the major potential successes of the ICB. Program management participants from the ICB Manager to Country Directors have unanimously rated the inputs and outputs of the Project Management Trainer as highly effective, particularly in facilitating the training events and developing the training and assessment tools and materials.
- ◆ As a result of, extensive training, and technical assistance efforts, WV food-assisted programs are now managing to complete 90 percent of commodity reports on time. Commodity accounting and management systems are very effective. Commodity losses remain very low, at 0.5 to 0.7 percent during the ICB mid-term period. Staff can confidently manage and track commodities and complete and submit required commodity reports. These findings are consistent with the previous ISA grant period indicating that WV has maintained timely reporting and low commodity loss over time.

ICB Challenges and Follow-Up Issues:

The ICB challenges have been minor compared to the achievements and successes of the first two years of the ICB project:

- ◆ Some field staff complained of insufficient funds to attend workshops, to promote food aid programming initiatives learned from the workshops, or that some sectors were not able to attend Mega Workshops. This calls into question whether the right people are attending the workshop or should another mechanism be used to reach country level staff. Currently, there are no mechanisms in place to hold attendees accountable for transferring knowledge learned to other staff. Additional work need to be done to realize a multiplier effect of the workshops.

- ◆ GWISER is clearly a WV ICB success story in its inception and initial piloting activities, but close to 80 percent of questionnaire respondents (including both management and field based staff members) outside of the piloting countries did not understand GWISER's purpose or were able to discuss GWISER for this evaluation. In addition, some of the GWISER tools may require modifications to promote accessibility and usability by field staff. Efforts need to be made to consolidate the useful tools derived from GWISER and other early warning initiatives in Central America and make these available to a wider number of WV staff.
- ◆ GWISER management felt that there was a lack of funds in the field to do follow up work. Other field staff mentioned the need for more comprehensive training, awareness and promotion of assessment methodologies, which could help them to address the underlying causes of vulnerability.
- ◆ The rollout of the lessons learned or best practices from Title II programming endeavors, including the training workshops, has sometimes been slow, hindering institutionalization of the lessons learned. One theme emerging from this evaluation is the very uneven follow-up process subsequent to workshop events, which can bypass field staff who must focus their efforts on day-to-day program implementation. About 30 percent of the respondents stated that there was weak follow-up in the field for the ICB and Mega Workshops for various reasons. Likewise, at least three different ICB managers interviewed felt that follow-up in the field was weak. Country office participants would like to see a systematic process to promote follow-up activities to take advantage of the newfound ideas and initiatives in order to maintain the enthusiasm and take advantage of new learning from the workshops.
- ◆ The Mega Workshops included so many participants that small group work and reflection were difficult to accommodate. Some staff would have appreciated the opportunity to gather into small groups to discuss themes related to specific sectors or programming issues with personnel from other country offices or with partner staff. This finding may support the need to hold regional workshops where small group work is more feasible rather than one large Mega Workshop, or hold attendees accountable for follow up workshops in country offices.

Key Recommendations

Below is an abbreviated version of the key recommendations, which are discussed in detail at the end of this report:

1. Continue to promote capacity building for field staff in the country offices.
2. Consider replicating the Mega Workshops in smaller fora at the regional level.
3. Maintain the functional partnership with Tulane University and Emory University in the remaining two years of the grant.
4. Maintain proactive participation in NGO food security fora and programming initiatives.
5. Capture lessons learned from GWISER work in Mozambique and Central America for use and application elsewhere.
6. Continue to take a leadership role in adapting NGO input for topical program manuals such as the HIV/AIDS program manual.
7. Consider incorporating additional measures to capture the impact of ICB initiatives.

I. BACKGROUND

Since its founding in 1950, World Vision (WV) has expanded to become one of the world's largest and most successful Christian humanitarian organizations. Its focus is on serving the world's poorest children and families in over 100 countries—a task that is supported by an international staff of over 18,000.

WV has over two decades of experience in food aid dating back to its initial large-scale responses to food insecurity in Poland and Ethiopia during the 1980s. Since that time, WV has expanded its food programs to include successful partnerships with multiple governments and donor agencies, including USAID Food for Peace (FFP) and the World Food Programme (WFP). Most recently, WV has collaborated with Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE), Catholic Relief Services (CRS), as well as other national and international partners on implementation of the Consortium for Southern Africa Food Security Emergency (C-SAFE) Program.

WV currently programs 7700 projects throughout the world, implementing:

- ◆ Child sponsorship
- ◆ Child survival
- ◆ Water resource development and management
- ◆ Reforestation
- ◆ Agricultural production
- ◆ Education
- ◆ Infrastructure
- ◆ Emergency relief
- ◆ Food assistance programs

WV currently implements Title II emergency relief and development programs in Ethiopia, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Lesotho, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Uganda, Zambia, and Zimbabwe.

The overall goal of the Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) program has been to improve WV's institutional capacity to undertake effective food security programming using USAID P.L.480 Title II resources. The primary objectives of the program have been to improve identification of populations vulnerable to

food insecurity and to better manage comprehensive and appropriate food aid interventions supported by Title II resources.

The current ICB project builds on previous USAID/FFP institutional support in the form of the Program Enhancement Grant (PEG), Institutional Support Grant (ISG), and Institutional Support Assistance (ISA). The ICB project coincides with WV commitment to food security programming as evidenced by two food resource teams: one in Washington dealing with Title II resources (Food Resources Team) and one in South Africa dealing with WFP and other food resources (Food Programming Management Group). Toward these ends, WV has sought through the ICB to improve food security programming by instituting appropriate systems and learning lessons related to the following ICB activities:

- ◆ Promoting collaboration with other Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs) on cross-cutting issues.
- ◆ Enhancing WV's Food Resources Global Information System.
- ◆ Piloting the Geospatial, Warning, Information, Surveillance, Evaluation, and Response (GWISER) system to more effectively monitor vulnerabilities.
- ◆ Improving WV capacity in food-assisted programming management, implementation, design, monitoring, and evaluation.
- ◆ Enhancing food assessment capacity.
- ◆ Integrating the WV HIV/AIDS response with food-assisted and other food security programming in order to improve programming effectiveness.
- ◆ Instituting comprehensive, competency-based staffing standards.

The two Strategic Objectives (SO) and Intermediate Results (IR) supported by the ICB grant include:

SO1: Improved food insecurity vulnerability identification and programming

IR 1.1: Improved use of food security data for program design, implementation, and evaluation of programs.

IR 1.2: Established and implemented best practices in vulnerability targeting.

SO2: Improved comprehensive management of Title II programs

IR 2.1: Identified and implemented best practices for program impact evaluation.

IR2.2: Institutionalized standards and best practices for food security program management.

IR2.3: Upgraded and implemented best practices in commodity management and accountability.

WV's five-year ICB Program was started on September 1, 2003; therefore, the program has been operational for approximately three years at the time of this midterm evaluation.

II. EVALUATION METHODOLOGY

A. Evaluation Objectives

The purpose of the mid-term review has been to assess the extent to which activities are occurring as originally planned. The evaluation should also provide an opportunity for WV staff to step back and review initial plans and ascertain the extent to which they are meeting the capacity building needs of the organization. This review therefore seeks to be directed toward learning as well as measuring results achieved.

The mid-term review was designed to carry out the following tasks:

- Determine the degree of progress of the ICB program toward initial targets (compare stated objectives and activities with actual progress towards targets established in indicator tracking table).
- Verify that current indicators have direct linkages with activities; recommend alternative indicators if necessary and appropriate.
- Determine the appropriateness of activities implemented as part of the ICB program.
- Identify previous and current constraints and/or difficulties.
- Identify and analyze key successes and notable achievements.
- Make recommendations for future capacity building activities.
- Conduct analysis of project management (including financial and programmatic).
- Conduct analysis of ICB's impact on WV's capacity building and the sustainability for food aid programming.
- Conduct analysis of collaborative activities and any efficiency achieved as a result.

The ICB Mid-Term Review Scope of Work (SOW) is attached as Appendix A.

B. Mid-Term Review Approach and Schedule

The mid-term evaluation process commenced with a review of key documents produced and used by or for the ICB, including:

- *ICB Proposal of June 2003*
- *ICB Annual Work plans, FY 2004–2007*
- *ICB Annual Reports, 2004 & 2005*
- *GWISER System Design Requirements, 2006*
- *WV ICB Monitoring and Evaluation Plan*
- *A range of GWISER documents*
- *Program Management Training documents*
- *ICB funded HIV/AIDS, Food and Nutrition Newsletters*
- *A range of presentations and supporting documentation from the three Mega Workshops*

Phone discussions were also conducted with the WV Senior Director and ICB Grant Manager prior to undertaking the office and field interviews in order to achieve clarity on the mid-term review objectives, process, and logistical arrangements. A topical outline for Interview Focus Questions was developed and shared with the ICB Grant Manager, the Food Manager, and the Capacity Building Manager prior to commencing the interviews. The WV ICB Mid-Term Review Topical Outline is attached as **Appendix B**.

In order to fulfill the SOW described above, the evaluator attended WV's annual Food Aid Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand from August 21 – 25, 2006, during which additional meetings were held with members of the ICB midterm evaluation review team and other staff that were connected to the grant. The evaluator interviewed several of the WV field and management staff during that workshop and others during a subsequent visit to Washington DC. Fourteen key informant interviews were carried out in total. Other key partner managers were interviewed by telephone (3) and in Washington, such as International Relief and Development (IRD) staff (3). In addition, 20 field and management staff from WV offices implementing food-resourced programs responded in writing to the guiding topical outline of questions. In total, 40 people were either interviewed or responded to a questionnaire.

A complete list of persons and positions interviewed by organization and office is attached as **Appendix C**.

III. MIDTERM REVIEW FINDINGS

WV's ICB program has sought to realize two strategic objectives, to:

1. Achieve improved food insecurity vulnerability identification and programming through two relevant intermediate results.
2. Support improved comprehensive management of Title II programs through three intermediate results.

1. General Findings: Overall Improvements in WV Capacity to Implement Food Security Programs

Training and information-sharing events, particularly the three Mega Workshops held in 2004, 2005, and 2006, combined with the publication and roll-out of key practitioner manuals, such as the *Competent Program Manager* manual and the Commodity Management manual, have provided WV staff with an improved understanding of program design and implementation, development-relief programming, commodity management, and state-of-the-art developments in food security and food-assisted programming. Based on questionnaire feedback, nearly two-thirds (roughly 65 percent) of the field staff reported that program management, professionalism, and the technical skills of staff involved in food security programming have increased substantially since the inception of the current ICB. This was reinforced by the majority of the senior staff interviewed. In addition, this evaluator has attended all three Mega Workshops and has noted a substantial qualitative improvement in the level of discourse on program design, M&E, and program management among field staff attending the workshops.

The intensive training program was designed and developed to strengthen the understanding of field staff, managers, and in some cases partners (i.e. IRD), in food security concepts, commodity management, the application of assessment methods, monitoring and evaluation, and program management in general. WV has dedicated enhanced attention to program learning, documentation, and development of best practice models. The ICB program has built food programming staff capacity in understanding USAID guidelines and food handling procedures. During this ICB period, WV staff have seen improved information sharing resulting from the Mega Workshops as well as the "best

practice" competitions. ICB management and field staff appreciate the variety of tools related to food security programming produced during the past two years. Field staff have therefore increased their confidence and changed their perceptions of their roles in food security programming based on the exposure to information through this initiative. Nearly two-thirds (roughly 65 percent) of the participants in this mid-term evaluation believe that they now have the tools to improve programming and management in their projects and that these tools have, in fact, been disseminated. All respondents mentioned that their knowledge has increased and they have gained a wider and more holistic perspective on food security and food aid programming.

Feedback from FANTA also indicates that WV staff have demonstrated improved technical capacity, willingness to learn and to innovate, that there is a genuine corporate commitment to capacity building, and that WV has used the ICB to improve program processes.

Key outcomes and products emanating from the ICB initiative include:

- ◆ Management and grant training and tools
- ◆ Improved program design and implementation, and M&E and data collection systems
- ◆ GWISER (discussed in detail below)
- ◆ Bi-monthly newsletter on HIV/AIDS, nutrition, and food
- ◆ Programming networks resulting from the mega workshops

The following priority activities described in the ICB proposal apply to both Strategic Objectives:

- ✓ *Collaborate with PVOs on cross-cutting issues through participation in FAM*

As an active member of the Food Aid Management (FAM) group, which has been defunct since 2005 after USAID discontinued funding support, WV participated regularly in the FAM working groups, the Steering Committee and annual meetings, and contributed to the FAM library and database. Although FAM was phased out in Year 1, WV appears to have continued to work with other NGOs to maintain some key functions of FAM, specifically the website. WV has hosted joint-PVO trainings and meetings and has shared programming experience and best practices with the other primary members of the CSAFE consortium – CARE

and CRS. Other PVOs have heard about the Mega Workshops and begun to request WV for participation in future workshops. WV has also recently participated in The Food Security Assessment Workshop in September 2006 organized by Save the Children, and hosted a workshop to review a Food Assistance and HIV/AIDS programming manual jointly developed by FANTA and WFP. Several NGOs attended this meeting.

WV has developed functional partnerships with organizations on cross-cutting issues of importance to each organization in promoting improved programming. For example, in 2005, WV and United Nations Development Program (UNDP) in Mozambique developed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) designed to enhance cooperation and synergy toward the implementation, dissemination, and coordination of best practices for community-based risk and vulnerability reduction. Program sharing remains primarily informal, however. The loss of FAM has increased the difficulty in maintaining connections with other NGOs, and there is much less opportunity for food aid NGOs to establish relationships.

WV has also been a good mentor to smaller NGOs such as IRD. IRD staff were invited to participate in the Mega workshops, and have found the materials from these workshops to be very helpful in guiding their programming efforts. According to IRD staff, WV has been very open about sharing their tools and manuals with IRD, and has been an excellent mentor from IRD's perspective.

✓ *Enhance WV's Food Resources Global Information System*

- ◆ WV is apparently close to completing a comprehensive document management system for the Food Resources Team (FRT) after conducting an audit of existing information systems during Year 1 of the ICB. The food resources Global Information System is designed to coordinate with WV's Knowledge Management Group (KMG) and WV Partnership. ICB Staff also supported a needs assessment of Dulles Technologies (the company used by WVUS's Washington, DC KMU to describe core business practices) related to the management of Title II resources. The assessment found that significant customization to the corporate databases is required to include commodity tracking and other food programming elements into WV's GIS. This will facilitate the development of information systems functionality that is appropriate for managing food resources.

✓ *Provide formal workshop training*

The mega workshops, which formed the primary ICB formal workshop training strategy, have elicited more comments and discussion than any other issue or activity under review in this ICB mid-term evaluation. WV has now convened three Mega Workshops, one per year with a starting date of 2004. They are called 'Mega Workshops' because up to 200 WV staff from around the world joined headquarters staff and management to discuss topics of importance and relevance to food-assisted programming endeavors, with practitioners and experts from within and outside of World Vision.

Each workshop included:

- ◆ Plenary sessions facilitated by internationally-known leaders in the fields of food security and poverty alleviation.
- ◆ Elective sessions on a range of cross-sector issues such as the Development Relief approach, HIV/AIDS, gender, micro-enterprise development, and transformational development facilitated by WV leaders of programming initiatives.
- ◆ Program implementation issues such as program management, commodities management, program design, and monitoring and evaluation.

WV field staff and management have overwhelmingly agreed (100 percent of respondents) that the workshops are already successfully affecting their food-assisted programming by improving program staff competencies, staff understanding of food-assisted programming approaches, sharing knowledge and experience, and through sector/program specific requirements and trainings. The workshops brought commodity managers, program managers, M&E managers, and finance managers together for the first time to discuss food management as a holistic enterprise for WV. Staff members have increased confidence in participating in collaborative enterprises, joint proposals and trainings, donor requirements, and discussion forums.

Field staff have clearly appreciated the discussion of best practices, policies, trends, and future initiatives, which involved partner organizations and speakers from agencies including FFP, European Union, WFP, USDA, shipping agencies,

and universities. ICB evaluation respondents believe that the cross-fertilization and sharing process is bringing a renewed commitment within the organization, in the field as well as at headquarters, to quality integrated food security programming. Networking and participation of a variety of WV country staff and other NGOs was a key success. Some of the country offices have promoted cross-visits to learn from other programs after returning from the workshops.

Mega Workshop general outcomes and tangible achievements included:

- ◆ Understanding the development relief programming framework and strategy which underpins the FFP approach.
- ◆ Familiarization with FFP and food aid regulation, which will contribute to improved field activity implementation.
- ◆ Face-to-face meetings with headquarters-based FRU team members and field-based program implementers, which creates newfound synergies, communication, and potential follow-up.
- ◆ Interaction with experienced food-assisted programming practitioners, exposing staff to a wide range of topics pertaining to food resources management, lessons learned, and best practices from various regions of the WV world and beyond.
- ◆ Frank discussion about the future of food aid and implications for WV in adapting to changing environments and realities.
- ◆ Networking opportunities, allowing staff insight into other units within the organization and fostering improved working relationships in particular amongst DME, project managers, and finance teams.
- ◆ Well-organized, pertinent, and applicable workshop sessions

Some specific examples of how country offices have used the learning from the Mega Workshops are cited below:

- ◆ One respondent from Ethiopia reported that staff replicated the training from the Mega Workshop for field staff.
- ◆ One WV Zimbabwe participant reported that "networks have been created and there is a better understanding of how different units work. The second Mega Workshop fostered better working relationships with the Design, Monitoring and Evaluation (DME) Team, Project Managers and Finance Teams".

- ◆ A respondent from Mongolia stated that there has been substantial tool dissemination from various ICB funded trainings and that “new concepts are applied every day” in their country office.
- ◆ A manager from WV Honduras stated that “sharing with M&E facilitators is enabling them to scale up their early warning community systems”, and that all documents and information from previous Mega Workshops have been shared with their staff.

Themes & Messages emerging from the Mega Workshops

- ◆ WV is now emerging as a supportive learning organization with a wealth of experience and support from which to draw on; a process requiring WV to learn from past mistakes rather than only highlighting successes.
- ◆ WV looks for synergies integrating food-assisted programming and other types of projects in order to promote and realize sustainable development.
- ◆ Development relief programming is being internalized into the organization.
- ◆ WV is sensitizing staff about the need to adapt to the changing food aid operational environment through multiple presentations.
- ◆ WV is also addressing cross-cutting issues [such as HIV/AIDS, gender, and conflict], which have implications for project design, the proposal process, and M&E systems, through skills training and knowledge dissemination.
- ◆ WV sees networking as a way to improve food-assisted programming.
- ◆ WV is systematically documenting lessons learned to stimulate innovation in WV programming. For example, this is done through promoting country office competitions on “better practices” and producing manuals.
- ◆ WV believes that the Mega workshop methodology and process can be replicated (in part) in smaller country or regional workshops to share the information and learning.

As stated earlier, the Mega Workshop experience has been overwhelmingly positive based on feedback from workshop participants both in WV management and field level staff positions, and from various key informant interviews with ICB management. Every questionnaire respondent described positive workshop benefits and listed very few if any negatives aspects of the Mega Workshops. It should also be noted that every respondent listed Mega Workshop-related benefits when asked about general ICB success.

Another positive benefit of the Mega Workshop has been the inclusion of financial managers. Financial managers were able to not only discuss better practices among themselves but were able to interact with programmers and commodity managers in the same forum. Such exchanges enabled staff from different parts of the organization to better appreciate the needs and perspectives of one another.

Nevertheless, workshop participants identified a few weaknesses. Most significantly, country office participants would like to see a systematic process to promote follow-up activities to take advantage of the newfound ideas and initiatives in order to maintain the enthusiasm and take advantage of new learning from the workshops. Too often, workshop participants have returned to their country offices to be confronted with work that has piled up, requiring attention to business as usual. The ability of country offices to initiate activities relating to workshop themes and topics has been highly uneven across the WV world. Some participants, who lack the authority to move initiatives forward, mentioned the lack of support or buy-in from national senior management teams (SMT).

The Mega Workshop process depends on inputs and participation of many individuals, which encourages cross-fertilization and sharing. Yet the size of the workshops can also alienate some participants who feel a bit lost in the complexity of workshop management, sometimes failing to retain the workshop lessons. The most common constraint of the Mega Workshop stated by respondents was that the workshop was either too large or that they had to choose only one topic or sector in which to attend sessions. Workshop participants mentioned their difficulty in forming or participating in small group discussions, which is a constraint due to the number of participants attending sessions in the Mega Workshop. Specifically, workshop participants would like to form discussion groups around specific sector activities or aspects of the food security programming process, such as commodity management, finance, and M&E; subjects discussed in plenary but not in small groups.

The exception to this has been the program management sessions held at the Mega Workshop this year. Efforts were made each day to have the participants work in small groups on specific aspects of the MYAP design process. This small group participation was highly valued by those who attended these sessions. Based on the feedback from the survey respondents, future workshops should

try to accommodate small group discussions whenever possible. This might be better managed by having regional workshops rather than one large mega-workshop.

2. Review of SO1 - Food Security Vulnerability Assessment, Identification, and Programming

The first strategic objective sought to accomplish the following:

Improved food security vulnerability identification and programming

SO1 was to be achieved through two intermediate results:

- ◆ IR1.1: Improved use of food security data for program design implementation and evaluation of programs.
- ◆ IR1.2: Establish and implement best practices in vulnerability targeting.

SO1 was to be realized through the following two general indicators:

- ◆ 90 percent of all new programs are meeting the WF/FFP standards in all aspects.
- ◆ 100 percent of all new programs now demonstrate integrated programming (see IPTT).

IR 1.1 - Improved use of food security data for program design implementation and evaluation of programs.

The following constitute the primary activities of IR 1.1, all of which have been achieved:

- ◆ CWISER framework and strategy developed in partnership with Tulane University (TU), which identified the types of information, specific indicators and methods required.
- ◆ CWISER system designed and implemented as pilots in two-three WV countries

- ◆ Tulane University hosted the GWISER Design Consultation in November 2004 which included participation of multiple partners (see AR for Year 1).
- ◆ Presented program resource information in maps, graphs, intelligent summaries and other tools

Secondary Activities carried out under IR 1.1 have included:

- ◆ Information Needs Assessments conducted for WV Mozambique and WV Angola (basis for the GWISER Information Needs Assessment (GINA)).
- ◆ Development of GWISER tools (hazard and vulnerability maps, CoBRA info-flashes) and food security/vulnerability database in Mozambique (in collaboration with Tulane).
- ◆ GWISER conducted a detailed risk and shock exposure analysis based on data collected by the Mozambique National Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition (AR 2005).
- ◆ WV Angola teamed with WFP to implement a Nutrition and Livelihood Baseline survey for the Plan Alto region.
- ◆ GWISER team provided technical support to WV's response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami, much of which was focused on efforts implemented by WV Sri Lanka.

Geospatial Warning, Information, Surveillance, Evaluation & Response System - GWISER

WV has adopted its Transformational Development framework with the aim of reducing risks and enhancing capacities of families and communities to cope with, mitigate, and respond to disasters, conflicts, and HIV/AIDS. SO1 of the ICB has sought to improve WV capacity to undertake food security risk and intervention monitoring, and extend its food security information strategy to focus on early detection and intervention, thus strengthening the pre-emptive effectiveness and efficient use of Title II resources to realize the Transformation Development Indicators (TDI) goal. To this effect, WV established a partnership with Tulane University to design an early warning and food security information strategy. Initially piloted in two countries - Mozambique and Angola - the GWISER prototype is one of the major ICB initiatives. It is not meant to duplicate FEWS NET but to complement it by supplying micro-level information to the higher-level FEWS network.

Grant funds were used to develop the prototype system to pilot in two–three countries and the capacity of WV to utilize the system through the development of tools, including multi–media training modules. The overall objectives of the GWISER are to:

1. provide timely information for early detection of an impending crisis;
2. establish a food security information system;
3. provide information that can be used in the design, implementation and evaluation of development and relief projects;
4. contribute critical food security information to national early warning systems, USAID/FFP systems, and other key clearinghouses of food security data.

WV has made strong progress in establishing GWISER as a community–based early warning system. GWISER completely meshes with WV's TDI framework. The project commenced with Tulane's production of a GWISER analytical framework, which assessed recent food security information systems approaches and their applicability to WV programming needs and systems. Tulane then worked closely with field staff in Mozambique and Angola – the two pilot countries – to analyze HIV/AIDS, food insecurity, and malnutrition, initially producing spatial data sets and maps as part of the process, which fed into information needs assessments for each country. The maps in particular gave the GWISER team, including WV field staff, excellent scope for resource allocation decisions. The assessments in turn formed the basis for the development of GINA, which identifies pertinent early warning, vulnerability, and food security information for WV programming. The process also included a Geographic Information Systems (GIS) capacity building and mapping exercise.

Participating management and field staff¹ have been highly supportive of the process, which culminated in different specific recommended objectives for GWISER for each of the two countries. The GWISER analyses have been used to improve M&E systems as well as community–based early warning. GWISER conducted a detailed risk and shock exposure analysis and a thematic review of M&E for two project areas in WV Mozambique, and produced a nutrition and livelihoods baseline in partnership with WFP in the Angola Plan Alto region, where WV programming is centered.

¹ More than fifty staff were interviewed as part of the GINA analysis process in the two countries.

GWISER has begun to use the Mozambique and Angola experience to branch out to other areas of the world, supporting WV's response to the Indian Ocean tsunami. WV Ethiopia is now ready to work with the Government of Ethiopia to collect and analyze data for planning and evaluation purposes. Application of GWISER to other food security contexts in other areas of the world remains limited, however.

Although still relatively young as an initiative and ostensibly limited to two pilot country offices, the GWISER initiative is clearly successfully impacting on WV's programming strategy, giving programming staff new tools to analyze food insecurity, risk, and vulnerability, and potentially improve programming focus and relevance and management.

The GWISER pilot in Mozambique was a great success and leveraged additional funds for community-based early warning. Two Mozambique communities have developed emergency response plans following facilitated basic risk analysis and reporting structures. Senior management from WV Mozambique stated in an interview that they had used GWISER and management tools extensively. For example, GINA analysis in WV Mozambique and Angola offices yielded results applicable to a range of management issues in addition to early warning, as noted by staff and senior management. In addition to GWISER's influence in management decisions, GWISER in Mozambique features prominently in their new MYAP.

Based in interviews with WV Mozambique and WV Angola management and GWISER management the following outputs and outcomes were achieved:

- ◆ Maps from the practical workshop sessions at WV Mozambique on GWISER were "used almost immediately for resource allocation decisions and were a great success for the GWISER Team" (second annual report). Basic risk analysis and reporting in two communities in Mozambique was established as part of a multi-organization initiative.
- ◆ GWISER conducted a detailed risk and shock exposure analysis from a large government household vulnerability survey data set as well as a comprehensive dietary analysis. In conjunction with the development of

livelihood groups, these activities helped program management in understanding current vulnerability and was applied in decision-making.

- ◆ A major break through in information management resulted from the consultation with Outweb. Their information management design was picked up by WVI programs to be their corporate web presence and intraweb. This leveraged more than 1.5 million dollars in private funding to build better information management tools. The GWISER team was hired to lead this larger initiative.
- ◆ As mentioned under a general objective earlier, the first major mapping exercise of WV programs globally was done with equipment and staff from GWISER. Both consultants and Tulane staff on the GWISER team were the first to do this. The team has continued to work with WV in better organization of geographic information, again with additional private funds.
- ◆ In Angola, GWISER has begun with improving needs assessments. While some documents are still in progress, spatial analysis of indicators from a household and anthropometric survey has helped identify areas of greatest need, particularly in the Southern Plan Alto.

WV management and field staff who have had the opportunity to become exposed to GWISER express confidence in its potential future usefulness to the organization, noting that:

- ◆ Community early warning approaches have been introduced.
- ◆ Program quality is improving through information management for decision making, the use of nutritional information for hazard mapping, and community early warning systems.
- ◆ WV and Tulane have maintained a good working relationship, although communication between WV management and the Tulane University team was problematic after Katrina; for example, some reports were not finalized, hindering the progress of GWISER activities.

Although the GWISER initiative has made rapid progress during the first two years of this ICB, GWISER activities have more recently waned a bit, in part a result of the effects of Hurricane Katrina on Tulane University activities. Key partner staff were apparently deployed to Katrina. After reviewing the annual

reports, interviewing GWISER management, and reviewing Mozambique field staff response to questionnaires, it should be noted that WV staff are concerned that the overall project is under-budgeted and under-resourced, which could severely impede the momentum generated from initial pilot activities in Mozambique and Angola. The GWISER manager stated that adequate time, resources and attention are the primary constraints to continued successful implementation of GWISER in the pilot countries due to competing priorities. Basic data management appears to be another primary challenge to the initial implementation of GWISER in the national offices. The exit strategy for GWISER is unclear to the evaluator, nor was it raised by staff; WV should articulate its exit strategy for GWISER in the last two years of the ICB.

Regarding the dissemination of GWISER information and tools, another factor that could affect effective follow up has been the departure of the WV staff person overseeing this ICB activity. However, with this departure, the ICB GWISER leadership is now driven by WV/Mozambique staff in order to build local capacity of other Title II program's field staff with additional resources.

Finally, GWISER depends on IT - Internet Technology - which is not always feasible in developing countries and therefore inappropriate for some WV field offices. Country offices replete with advanced programming technologies are finding the GWISER experience to be rewarding. The program may be too advanced for other country offices lacking sufficient program technology wherewithal. Outside of the two pilot countries, few WV field Staff were able to discuss GWISER for this evaluation. Over 75 percent of the survey respondents were unable to respond to questions regarding GWISER due to lack of information. Little is apparently known about this initiative in other WV offices. In addition, some GWISER tools are still in progress.

Other Community Early Warning Efforts in Central America

Community early warning initiatives have also been implemented in Central America with support from Emory University. Efforts have been carried out in Haiti, Guatemala and Honduras. WV plans on making a presentation in mid-January on the WV/Honduras and WV/Guatemala Early Warning Systems

developed from this work. WV plans to make this presentation to OFDA, FFP, NGOs and FANTA.

In the last two years of the ICB, WV should consider consolidating the key lessons learned from GWISER and the Central America initiatives, for example, by pulling out useful tools to share with country offices.

IR 1.2 Establish and implement best practices in vulnerability targeting

Primary Activities in support of IR 1.2 have included:

- Implementation of best practices for integrating HIV/AIDS prevention/mitigation with food security programming.
- Vulnerability assessments.

Integration of HIV/AIDS Prevention & Mitigation with Food Security Programming through best practices

Supporting Activities: Through the initial two years of the ICB has:

- Hired an HIV/AIDS Specialist to broaden the HOPE Initiative (the initiative itself is not ICB funded) and link WV food-assisted programs with best practices related to HIV/AIDS programming.
- Paper presented by the ICB HIV/AIDS Coordinator at the June 2006 PEPFAR Implementers Workshop in Durban, South Africa on the topic of HIV/AIDS, food and nutrition. This gave WV greater visibility as a technical leader in the area of HIV/AIDS, food and nutrition programming as over 2000 USAID, NGO and other related stakeholders attended this workshop.
- Conducted an internal review of WV's experience and lessons learned in the area of food security and HIV/AIDS programming in 2004.
- Conducted an internal review of WV policy with regard to Title II Corn Soya Milk (CSM) and Corn Soya Blend (CSB) to HIV+ mothers in support of abrupt weaning in 2004.
- Developed Vulnerability Mapping and Programming tools.
- Implemented a nutrition group case study and an informational chart for dissemination to WV project staff and other NGOs.

- Developed a program exit strategy, drawing on WV Zambia program experience, in order to address the impact of HIV/AIDS on livelihoods in the context of programming cycles.
- Facilitated the adoption of the positive living approach.
- Produced a training module demonstrating the linkages between agriculture and positive living.
- Maintained the production of the ICB-funded HIV/AIDS, Food and Nutrition Newsletter, which was taken over from C-SAFE in September 2006.
- Sponsored an inter-agency workshop to review a manual addressing Food Assistance and HIV/AIDS Developed by FANTA and WFP.

With the hiring of an HIV/AIDS specialist and assumption of the role of lead agency of the C-SAFE Program, WV has moved aggressively forward in utilizing ICB to integrate HIV/AIDS programming into food-assisted programming strategies. Several initiatives have commenced during the first two years of this ICB. WV's efforts in piloting food aid programming and targeting in the context of HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation has included the incorporation of information dissemination at distribution points and the development of numerous programming tools cited above – reviews, case studies, program strategies, and training modules. HIV/AIDS mitigation efforts have included pilot testing of alternative food aid commodities in Zambia and exit strategies. Food security and MYAP programming in several contexts can now promote productive safety net program activities for chronically-affected communities.

WV has clearly demonstrated progress in integrating HIV/AIDS and food programming. Although the target of 55 percent integration has not been achieved, 40 percent of all WV's Title II food aid programs (73% of target) have integrated HIV/AIDS components, which still is a substantial accomplishment. In low prevalence countries, HIV programming tends to be given lower priority in relation to other needs. For example, in the Title II Honduras DAP, clean and safe drinking water is a priority so there are no HIV/AIDS funded activities. Other highly food insecure countries have a low prevalence of HIV, such as Sierra Leone, Honduras, Mauritania, and Indonesia. Other program priorities related to food insecurity take precedent in these countries.

In high HIV prevalence countries, high HIV prevalence areas and highly food insecure areas often do not overlap geographically. For example, in Ethiopia most of the high prevalence is in urban areas, not in rural areas where WV operates. WV Zimbabwe, where HIV/AIDS has been streamlined in most of the WV programs, including the agricultural recovery program, water and sanitation programs, and the food aid program, portrays a typical picture within the Southern Africa context, where HIV/AIDS prevalence rates are the highest in the world. Field staff note the progress, but also note the substantial work yet to be accomplished, particularly in understanding how to cater for various needs of the HIV/AIDS infected and affected populations. Only about half of the respondents responded to these questions. Roughly 70 percent of those who responded to these specific questions felt positive steps have been made to integrate HIV/AIDS into programming, yet 30 percent within that 70 percent felt unsure of whether there is real integration occurring and had mixed responses.

Other country offices, such as WV Rwanda, agree with this analysis, commenting that many projects have yet to specifically target affected households but have successfully begun targeting project areas with activities aimed at improving the food security of HIV/AIDS affected households. In countries with low HIV prevalence and other, more pressing context specific priorities, it is harder to integrate HIV/AIDS components in food aid programs. This may not necessarily be an issue of concern if in fact those countries are not highly affected by the HIV/AIDS pandemic. However, given the rapid and dynamic spread of HIV/AIDS on a global scale, this issue must be addressed accordingly in order to specify whether ICB indicators need to account for these country differences.

Institutionalization of the HIV/AIDS Food Program position, though relatively new, has elicited support from the field, who appreciate added impetus in facilitating, training, and implementing agriculture and food assistance activities on projects targeting HIV/AIDS-affected households. Food Programmers, who are placed at Area Development Program (ADP) sites, can facilitate targeting, beneficiary distribution, and screening. More ADP-based projects have begun to integrate activities such as home-based care, target HIV/AIDS patients for nutrition support, provide counseling and testing services, plan income-generating activities, implement kitchen gardening and small animal provisioning, and include HIV/AIDS messages in farmer and mother group promotion.

The integration process has, however, been challenging. As noted above, WV has not quite met the 55 percent HIV/AIDS food program integration goal. Many WV field staff continue to struggle to understand issues related to food nutrients, commodity type, quantity, and social network support systems. Some staff mentioned the lack of clear guidelines on how to integrate HIV/AIDS and food resources, nutrition needs, or ration types or sizes for HIV affected households. Coordination remains an issue. As the "F" process goes forward, new opportunities to integrate PEPFAR and Title II program resources may arise.

A common constraint revealed by WV's involvement in C-SAFE is the enormity of need relative to the amount of resources allocated, particularly given the prevalence of malnutrition and HIV/AIDS throughout much of Africa. WV has struggled to measure the food effects on the chronically ill, which is a common HIV/AIDS proxy, or to meet the increased commodity needs of HIV/AIDS integrated food aid programs. In Zambia, for example, WV programming has had to try to cope with severe limitations in the commodity pipeline, largely related to government Genetically Modified Organism (GMO) restrictions, which have limited the use of nutrient-rich commodities specifically, intended to support the nutritional needs of chronically ill individuals. Another challenge to integration relates to the contradictory nature of different types of programming. Food resources have frequently been targeted to rural food insecure households; HIV/AIDS programming however, is frequently targeted in urban regions of the country, providing little opportunity for geographic overlap.

Vulnerability Assessments

The current ICB has contributed to the skill development of WV programmers. Vulnerability assessments are contributing to increased and improved MYAP proposal designs. WV has conducted two vulnerability assessments per year during the mid-term review timeframe in 2004 and 2005, fully meeting the target for this IR. In 2004, ICB supported two assessments — the Honduras food security assessment and the Rwanda Development Assistance Program (DAP) assessment, which culminated in the approved Honduras DAP. Two additional food security assessments were carried out in Kenya and the DRC during the second year of the ICB. WV has begun to use the vulnerability assessment methodology as an input to program design, activity development,

and targeting for the DAPs and Multi-Year Assistance Program (MYAPs). In addition, WV regularly conducts rapid assessments for emergency response.

The quality and timeliness of the vulnerability assessments have received mixed reviews. Assessment findings have not systematically resulted in comprehensive analysis or solid program designs, a result partially of the short time frames devoted to the assessment process. Timely results for program implementation have also proven problematic. Field Staff mentioned the need for more comprehensive training, and awareness and promotion of assessment methodologies which help to address the underlying causes of vulnerability. Some of the assessments also lacked sufficient logistical and resource support to comprehensively analyze and target vulnerability and food insecurity. Finally, WV does not consistently participate in multi-agency assessments (outside of C-SAFE), applying standard methodology which might enhance resource inputs into the assessment process and allow for more holistic and comprehensive analysis.

Survey work carried out by WV in Asia provides valuable lessons that can be shared with other Title II countries. These lessons include the combination of qualitative and quantitative data collection methods, and the introduction of personal digital assistants (PDA) for data entry. The evaluator recommends that the FRT work with the M&E Coordinator based in WV Singapore to capture the lessons learned from recent assessments carried out in WV tsunami-affected program areas in Indonesia, India, and Thailand.

3. Review of SO2 – Comprehensive Management of Title II Programs

The second strategic objective sought to accomplish the following:

Improved comprehensive management of Title II programs

SO2 was to be achieved through three intermediate results:

- ◆ IR2.1: Identified & implemented best practices for impact evaluation.
- ◆ IR2.2: Institutionalized standards and best practices for food security program management.
- ◆ IR2.3: Upgraded & implemented best practices in commodity accountability.

SO1 was to be realized through the following two general indicators:

- 94 percent of all new programs are meeting WV standards for management.

IR 2.1: Identify and implement best practices for program impact evaluation

Primary Activities:

- Provide technical assistance to WV Title II programs.

Supporting Activities have included:

- The WVUS Food Resources Team hired a new M&E Officer.
- M&E officer conducted quarterly review meetings on evaluations, facilitated the ICB workshop sessions, and coordinated baseline surveys and other midterm data collection for quality control for Title II M&E systems.

WV has applied this ICB to improve M&E capacity in field offices implementing DAPs and MYAPs, emphasizing the importance of effective baselines and appropriate ways to carry out studies. Although initial progress was slow, the newly hired M&E officer is managing to provide technical support to field staff, complete review meetings, facilitate ICB workshop sessions, train and coordinate baseline studies, and oversee midterm data collection activities. Project management training has apparently improved monitoring performance and reporting, which have been helped by more systematic feedback.

Almost all (95%) WV food-assisted programs now conduct participatory impact evaluations (PIEs), which are on target and reflect improved information and feedback flow, including reviews of lessons learned from the project monitoring cycles. Participation in a PIE allows staff to review lessons learned. Some mid-term evaluation participants mentioned that discussions occurred post-evaluation, revealing the need for more intensive follow-up in order to promote sustainability in the respective programs.

ICB Performance Indicators

Although considerable effort has been focused on strengthening the field office capacity to improve monitoring capacity and enhance M&E systems, less attention has been concentrated on monitoring the *impact*, in addition to the outcomes, of the ICB. WV's monitoring systems are successfully tracking a number of output indicators, but have placed far less emphasis on tracking program quality improvements, including outcome or impact measures for the ICB. One shortcoming of the Indicator Performance Tracking Table (IPTT) is that it does not have any measures of capacity building or quality program improvements. It primarily consists of indicators that track output.

To accomplish this, WV should consider in the future incorporating indicators that: reflect behaviour changes relating to the application of systems that staff are putting in place in their country office programs; indicate whether staff are engaging in knowledge transfer by passing on their learning from the Mega Workshops to other field staff, and introduce award or incentive systems for integrating better practices into program management. This type of indicator sequence would reflect the introduction of a new system, its application, and recognition of the system's application.

IR2.2: Institutionalize standards and best practices for food security program management

Primary Activities:

- Develop and accredit a competency and institutional framework.
- Develop and standardize effective training materials in order to develop the required levels of competency.
- Provide technical assistance to food aid programs via ICB Training Administrator.

Supporting activities to accomplish the primary activities have included:

- Enrolling staff in the diploma process.
- Conducting assessments.

- Developing the assessment tools and training materials.
- Providing monthly newsletters and other reading & training materials.
- Conducting field visits.

The purpose of this IR was to increase the competencies of WV field and headquarters personnel managing food resourced programs. To this purpose, WV applied the ICB to develop a "Competency Framework," consisting of eight management areas, including self management, team management, stakeholder management, operations management, information management, quality management, finance management, and one elective from a broad range specialized units such as evaluation, human resources, or relief. The training modules for the eight management areas are encapsulated in a highly user-friendly development practitioner's workbook entitled, *Are You a Competent Program Manager?* As indicated in the IPTT, half of all WV staff are participating in competency training, which should culminate in accreditation for the competency diploma based on a set of criteria for each of the eight management areas, determining "competent" versus "not yet competent." FANTA was very impressed with WV's corporate commitment to capacity building among its food aid staff, and sees this as a model which should be replicated by other NGOs.

This ICB set of activities has produced an invaluable and highly sustainable set of outputs for the organization and represents one of the major potential successes of the ICB. After receiving accreditation from the Australian National Training Authority, the Program Management Trainer is ostensibly able to confer Business Management diplomas from Melbourne University to Program Managers passing the competency requirements outlined above, although it remains unclear how realistic the diploma program will turn out to be. At any rate, the competency program activities entailing the workbook, set of competency criteria, and assessments are highly relevant, appropriate, and achievable for working field managers. Based on self-evaluation, "evidence", third-party input, and inputs from an external assessor or mentor, the assessments appear to accurately establish competency and proven initiatives. Managers actively participate in program management development activities by producing future work plans and budgets and demonstrating skills application.

Program management participants and ICB management have unanimously rated the inputs and outputs of the Project Management trainer as highly

effective, particularly in facilitating the training events and developing the training and assessment tools and materials. A sample of typical comments: "This trainer has successfully harmonized training, implementation, and reporting, which didn't exist before" and, "participants were equipped with tools to improve their performance". Program managers and staff appreciate the training products and tools, which are characterized as easily understood, applicable, and useful, allowing staff who devote time to this initiative the opportunity to gain new, applicable, accredited skills. Managers and staff perceive that improved standards, in conjunction with restructuring initiatives, have resulted in increased competence and professionalism at all levels of the organization, particularly in response to the changing landscape of food-assisted programming evolution. WV field staff expressed the opinion that this initiative will culminate in a "better way of doing business".

To supplement and accompany the competency framework, WV has developed a program management assessment and training tool. It is designed to rapidly assess various components of program management at the national office level and then subsequently develop and schedule national training workshops based on weaknesses discovered during the assessment. In addition as noted in the 07 work plan, the capacity building training staff conducted workshops in Year 3 in Kenya, Uganda, Zambia and South Africa. Newsletters and training materials are being circulated amongst Program Managers, maintaining information flow within the organization. WV established a web page comprising competency standards, assessment tools, and training materials. These are all for public access at www.developingmanagers.net. The additional capacity building resources and tools should result in more competent, confident program management and implementation staffing units. The evaluator suggests that WV should track how many of its staff are accessing the website.

Through this very ambitious ICB IR, WV has also facilitated workshops to assist country offices in establishing and implementing grant management effectively. Training modules include finance, administration, program administration, staffing, and regulation compliance. Yet another initiative is the monitoring systems tool for managers - comprised of a module including presentations, formats, a database, and facilitator's manual - which is now in place and already apparently used by the majority of food programs. WV Kenya, as well as

tsunami-related programs, has developed MIS based on the monitoring systems tool.

The diploma program appears appropriate and realistic, and has been praised by FANTA. The evaluator suggests that post-diploma impact should be measured through indicators that capture the impact on personnel competency, professionalism, and the application of the competency framework. WV could apply the same type of performance indicators as mentioned above for the ICB.

IR2.3: Upgrade and implement best practices in commodity management and accountability

Primary Activity:

- Provide technical assistance.

Supporting Activities included:

- Comprehensive training of food program staff on commodity accountability, donor requirements, commodity tracking, management information systems and internal review/audits.
- Updating the Commodity Manual to a web-based version.
- Conducting programming review audits along with the regular commodity audits.

The purpose of this ICB IR was to improve the management of food aid. The FPMG is committed to proper commodity management of all food-assisted programs, and has focused attention on commodity accountability and reporting. The Food Resources Management Group has conducted 75 training events over the initial two year period of this ICB (22 during Year 1, and 53 during Year 2) and responding to more than 150 requests for technical assistance to food resourced programs. Although these training events have been funded from many sources, the ICB grant has added value by enabling commodity managers to attend the Mega Workshop to exchange better practices on an annual basis, and to stay up to date with changes in programming. An updated version of the Commodity Manual was completed for FPMG in 2004 with non-ICB funding. The ICB will also facilitate access to the

Commodity Manual via the worldwide web. WV has yet to translate the manual into accessible web-based modules, a process planned for Year 3.

Some examples of changes in commodity management:

- ◆ A WV Zimbabwe respondent stated that "There has been an improved level and understanding of management, since commodity managers are aware of donor requirements and with support from FPMG, Zimbabwe has maintained a very high level of standards in commodity management".
- ◆ A respondent from Honduras noted that "real time interaction with the CTS team as well as several trainings have improved the commodity tracking system".

As a result of the update of the Commodity Manual, extensive training, and technical assistance efforts, WV food-assisted programs are now managing to complete 90 percent of commodity reports on time with sustained improvements in monthly CSRs, RSRs and LSRs. Late submissions are quite rare. Reports are now automated, timely and accurate for all WV offices. Commodity accounting and management systems are very effective. About 90 percent of those who responded to questions on these topics in the questionnaire felt very positively about the quality and efficiency of commodity management and improvements during the ICB. WV has maintained its low rate of commodity losses from the ISG, at 0.5 to 0.7 percent during the ICB mid-term period, which is remarkably good. Following the training regimen, staff can confidently manage and track commodities and complete and submit required commodity reports. Most of the internal and external audits report fewer discrepancies. Most country offices report that commodity management standards have increased substantially during recent years, a result of the ICB and FPMG capacity building initiatives and continuous close liaison with country offices.

IV. MIDTERM REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS

It is clear to this evaluator that WV staff in the field offices, as well as at organizational management levels, have used the ICB resources efficiently and effectively to strengthen food security programming. FANTA concurs with this

conclusion. Within three years, this ambitious ICB has been used to launch several initiatives that have helped maintain WV's competitive position in food-resourced programming, including GWISER, the Mega Workshops, and the competent program manager framework. From an external perspective, the program designs are of high quality and are based on a sound understanding of the current and changing food security context. The following recommendations are for the consideration of WV as the organization moves into the second half of the ICB five-year programming timeframe and constructs strategies for the future.

1. Continue to promote capacity building for field staff in the country offices

The ICB management team has done an excellent job at building capacity associated with the ICB initiatives at the upper and middle levels of the organization. It is important to continue to strengthen WV capacity in food security and vulnerability programming, including early warning and food security assessment methodologies, DME, and program implementation. It is suggested that WV develop a way of measuring whether systems are being put in place, and create incentive structures that recognize staff for adopting better practices. Staff who attend workshops should be held accountable for knowledge transfer once they return to their field offices.

2. Consider replicating the Mega Workshops in smaller fora at the regional level

As discussed above, the Mega Workshop experience has been overwhelmingly positive for participating field staff as well as management. However, the size of the workshops worked against ensuring full participation and engagement by all staff, some of whom failed to retain or ever apply workshop learning or lessons. Workshop output follow up has proven difficult to maintain as staff return back to their country offices to tackle business as usual. The ability of country offices to initiate activities relating to workshop themes and topics has been highly uneven across WV. WV might consider smaller workshops at the regional level, convened around specific themes that would include systematic ways to maintain momentum as participants return to their home offices and

field work. Such regional workshops would enable a larger number of staff with different sector expertise to attend and would allow for more small group work tailored to specific regional issues.

3. Maintain the functional partnership with Tulane University and Emory University in the remaining two years of the grant

As one of the most important initiatives of this ICB, WV established a partnership with Tulane University to design an early warning and food security information strategy. This strategy was created to strengthen the pre-emptive effectiveness and efficient use of Title II resources to realize the TDI goals, which form the basis of WV's overall programming strategy. Tulane was chosen due to its extensive expertise and practical experience in food security and development information systems. Tulane pioneered USAID's Famine Early Warning Systems (FEWS) program and is currently able to bring the latest information and communication technologies (ICT) to the design of GWISER and other WV information systems initiatives. Through their contribution to GWISER, Tulane has provided excellent services to both of GWISER pilot country offices, building relationships with other agencies and providing on the ground assessments and support, meta-analysis of evaluations, trainings, solutions to M&E requirements and direct decision support to managers. Through this direct support and creation of GWISER tools, WV Mozambique developed community-based early warning systems and disaster mitigation tools. Tulane students from the GWISER project are currently working for WV in Mozambique.

WV should make every effort to maintain a strong functional partnership with academic institutions such as Tulane University in order to foster an environment of continuous learning and the welcoming and infusion of new ideas. This would allow the organization to move forward and take advantage of state-of-the-art developments. This is especially critical since one of the key technical staff working on the GWISER initiative is no longer supported under the ICB. WV should in turn pass practical implementation issues back to Tulane and other academic institutions to promote the practical application of academic pursuits, which can benefit the development relief community over the long term. Learning lessons from these types of partnerships will promote the realistic development and application of practical, usable tools that field staff

will find useful. WV should designate someone within the ICB management team to provide follow-up and ensure the continued partnership or liaison.

4. Maintain proactive participation in inter-NGO Food Security fora and programming initiatives

WV should participate proactively in inter-NGO cooperation and coordination on programming issues of importance to NGOs involved in food security programming. WV should continue to be involved with initiatives emanating from groups such as the Food Aid Coalition, which has recently undergone a crisis of sorts resulting from differences of opinion over its focus and purpose, or FAM, which became defunct as result of a funding crisis. WV should encourage NGOs to share their products and learn from each other. A good example of this type of sharing took place in the Food Security Assessment Workshop organized by Save the Children (SC) on assessment approaches. WV is also promoting such sharing by hosting an interagency workshop to review a manual developed jointly by FANTA and WFP on food assistance programming and HIV/AIDS. This cooperation would also include participation in multi-agency assessments in country office settings. In addition, serious consideration should be given to the idea of supporting a multi-agency learning center in southern Africa that captures the lessons learned derived from the various inter-agency consortiums operating in several countries in the region. Similar to the previous recommendation, a designee from the ICB management team should be selected to ensure continuity for NGO food security cooperation and coordination efforts.

5. Capture lessons learned from GWISER and the early warning activities in Central America for application elsewhere

WV has made strong progress in establishing GWISER as a community-based early warning system in the two pilot countries of Mozambique and Angola. GWISER is a potentially powerful tool to define programming and targeting and prioritize activities and strategy based on good diagnostics, as has been demonstrated in the application of GWISER information collection in Mozambique's recent MYAP. GWISER has gone beyond its original scope of work

to contribute to the overall objective of Enhancing WV's Food Resources Global Information System.

Outside of the two pilot countries however, few WV field staff were able to discuss GWISER for this evaluation; little is apparently known about the initiative in other WV offices. It is not clear how GWISER is to be integrated with other programming so that field staff could become involved in ensuring its continued usefulness for WV. It is therefore incumbent upon WV to strategically capture lessons and pass on learning and tools for use by field staff. This will require simplifying some of the tools. GWISER is a highly sophisticated system with a number of important advantages, but the tools may require several modifications in order to promote their use by field staff. GWISER should also be translated into local or national languages in order to capture its usefulness for field staff. Continued support from Tulane University will be critical for this capacity building effort.

WV should try to consolidate the lessons learned from the tools that were developed by GWISER and the community early warning systems work in Central America and share these across all Title II countries. In addition, WV should articulate its exit strategy for GWISER in the last two years of the ICB.

6. Continue to take a leadership role in adapting NGO input for topical program manuals such as the HIV/AIDS program manual

WV has moved aggressively forward in utilizing the ICB to integrate HIV/AIDS programming into food-assisted programming strategies. WV is drawing from this important initiative to convene a forum to discuss programming approaches to HIV/AIDS. The FANTA/WFP HIV/AIDS program manual review workshop it is hosting in December has presented an excellent opportunity to demonstrate this leadership role. A variety of inputs from the experiences of other NGOs implementing HIV/AIDS programming will assist in the effort to develop clear guidelines on how to integrate HIV/AIDS and food resources, nutrition needs, or ration types or sizes for HIV affected households.

7. Consider incorporating additional measures to capture the impact of ICB initiatives

WV's ICB is successfully tracking a number of output indicators. More could be done to capture the outcome and impact of the ICB on WV's Title II food aid programming capacity by placing greater emphasis on tracking program quality improvements.

WV should consider incorporating additional indicators that: reflect behaviour changes relating to the application of systems that staff are putting in place in their country office programs; indicate whether staff are engaging in knowledge transfer by passing on their learning from the Mega Workshops to other field staff, and introduce award or incentive systems for integrating better practices into program management. This type of indicator sequence would reflect the introduction of a new system, its application, and recognition of the system's application.

Appendix A: ICB Mid-term Review Scope of Work

ICB MID-TERM EVALUATION FISCAL YEAR 2006

Background:

Over the past twenty years, World Vision (WV) has increased its food aid programs worldwide and enhanced institutional accountability for resources, both in commodity tracking and impact evaluation. WV has also expanded its institutional commitment to food programming, evidenced by the creation of two field and headquarters-based food resources teams comprising more than twenty staff, funded primarily with private resources. Given WV's historical profile and maturity, it is incumbent upon the organization to move toward higher levels of food programming excellence. Thus, WV submitted a request for funding to USAID's Office of Food for Peace in June 2003, to implement a five-year Institutional Capacity Building (ICB) Project. The WV ICB project proposal was funded by USAID for activities covering the period of October 1, 2003, through September 31, 2008.

The goal of the ICB Project is *to promote institutional excellence in the design and implementation of US Title II food programs worldwide to reduce food insecurity in vulnerable populations*. Building upon past successes, working collaboratively with other PVOs where possible, and working in intentional partnership with Tulane University, the project will implement activities aimed at achieving two objectives that collectively seek to meet the goal:

- Improved food security vulnerability identification and programming.
- Improved comprehensive management of Title II programs.

As required by USAID, WV is conducting a mid-term evaluation of the grant during Year 3 of the project. Toward this end, WV proposes a scope of work for the external consultant, in order to meet the grant requirements, and to evaluate WV's grant.

Goal of Mid-Term Evaluation: To assess WV's progress in achieving planned results and to offer recommendations for the future.

Proposed Time Period: Maximum of 20 days.

ICB Mid-Term Evaluation Review Team:

- ◆ External Consultant – Tim Frankenberger
- ◆ ICB Grant Manager and Sr. Director, GAM – Carol Jenkins
- ◆ Food Team Director and ICB HIV/AIDS Specialist — Colette Powers
- ◆ WV International Food Manager – Walter Middleton
- ◆ ICB Capacity Building Manager – Brett Gresham
- ◆ ICB GWISER Manager – Nathaniel Morrow
- ◆ Food Team Contracts Attorney – Lisa Mondori
- ◆ Food Team Finance Director – David Alarcon

Specific Tasks to Be Conducted by the External Consultant:

1. Determination of progress toward targets (compare stated objectives and activities with actual progress and review progress toward targets on indicator tracking table, ensuring that indicators have direct linkages with activities) – recommend alternative indicators, if necessary and appropriate.
2. Determination of appropriateness of the activities in the ICB (compare problem statement of the ICB with activities and solutions being implemented under the ICB).
3. Identification of constraints and difficulties.
4. Identification of successes (key successes and particular achievements should be analyzed).
5. Recommendations for future capacity building activities.
6. Analysis of project management, including financial and programmatic.
7. Analysis of the ICB's impact on WV's capacity building and the sustainability for food aid programming.
8. Analysis of collaborative activities and analysis of any efficiencies achieved as a result.

Definition of Process:

Assessment techniques for data collection will include the following:

- telephone interviews
- on-site visits at HQs in Washington, D.C.
- relevant working file reviews, including annual reports and DIPs
- review of workshop evaluation folders
- focus group discussions with WVUS Food Team and other WVUS staff members – see names below
- M&E plan review, logframe review, and indicator tracking table review
- ICB tools review (review of tools developed under ICB)
- if possible, in-person interviews with field implementers can be held at the Annual Food Aid Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand, in August, funded by ICB grant

As noted, various techniques will be used for data collection. It will be through the phone interviews and on-site visits in Washington, D.C., where the key informant list will be used. The Review Team, led by the external consultant, will prepare a questionnaire for use in the informant interviews. Because the quantitative data methodology used to measure progress on the ICB is already established and has been used to prepare the baseline, the interview questionnaire will be used for qualitative analysis, in addition to the other indicators used in the M&E plan of WV's ICB. The informant interviews will help to provide greater insight regarding the ways in which WV's ICB is adding to institutional capacity beyond that already being measured and analyzed. The questionnaire will need to be focused in order to shed additional light on the key successes and constraints associated with implementation. The Focus Groups Discussions mentioned in the SOW, will involve the Review Team working with the WVUS Food Team and other staff members. The Focus Group Discussions will be used to further enhance the consultant's ability to qualitatively assess the impact of the ICB grant. These Discussions will use techniques associated with Participatory Appraisal and Appreciative Inquiry that seeks to build on the positive aspects of situations as the means to address problems.

Identification of Key Informant Interviewees:

WVUS

- Members of ICB Mid-Term Evaluation Team
- Ben Campbell, Food Team
- Anthony Koomson, GAM Africa Team
- Paul Karago, Food Team
- Hamid Mansary, Food Team
- Jim Lutzweiler, Food Team
- Mark Viso, VP IPC Operations
- Dorothy Scheffel, Sr. Director, Integrated Programs
- Polly Arnold, GAM Global Team
- Thomas Solomon, GAM LAC Team
- Lauren Sable, GAM Global Team
- Kote Lomidze, Food Team Finance
- Alek Mackowiak, Food Team Finance

WV International Offices

- Walter Middleton, Vice President, FPMG
- Bernie Fortes, Food Training Coordinator
- Leonard Maina, CTS Installation Specialist
- Edward Brown, WV Zimbabwe
- Brian Holmes, WVI and WV Mozambique
- Carlos Piedrasanta, WV Mozambique
- Others, as identified by the Review Team Members

External

- Fettig & Donalty (Mike Lagoon)
- USAID (Lisa Witte)
- FANTA
- Tulane University (Nancy Mock, Bill Bertrand)

Expected Outputs:

At the end of the SOW, the following outputs will be expected and will be the responsibility of the external consultant to produce:

- ◆ An MS Word document in 12 point font of no less than 15 pages that provides a review (as outlined above) of WV's progress in achieving planned results of the ICB, and a description of recommendations for the future. The

document will be presented in both hard copy and electronic copy, and will include a copy of the indicator performance tracking table (IPTT). It is the responsibility of the external consultant to coordinate all tasks, ensure completion of the scope of work, and prepare the document for submission to the ICB grant manager. The submission date will be no later than December 1, 2006. The submission to FFP by the ICB grant manager will be no later than December 31, 2006.

Appendix B: WV ICB Mid-Term Evaluation Topical Outline

World Vision
Institutional Capacity Building
Midterm Evaluation

Questionnaire for Field Staff

I General

- A. What are the principle successes and achievements of the ICB program? What factors influenced these changes?
- B. What are the major constraints and difficulties encountered in this program and its implementation?
- C. Have there been any gaps between the objectives and actual field experiences? Are the activities and information systems achieving these improvements goals?
- D. Have there been any tradeoffs *at the field level* during these ICB improvements?
- E. How do you feel that capacity building will be maintained after the ICB grant ends?

II Questions on Objective 1: Improved Food Security Vulnerability Identification and Programming

- A. *Improved Use of Food Security Data for Program Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Programs*

1. What were the strengths and weakness of the GWISER project?

--Framework established: explain the components and how it differs and has improved (changed?)

--Integration into WV Networks: are the information systems in sync?

How many countries/programs are operationalized?

--Data in use: has the data collection been strengthened in the field for actual use?

2. Training

--What were 3 major messages that were taken away from the mega workshops?

--If networks/collaborative relationships created through the participation in mega workshops, what sharing has occurred since the workshops?

--How has the training (all) that was given through the ICB grant been institutionalized? Has there been a lot of tool dissemination?

--Many people who have been trained in the mega workshops have been transferred to other countries. How has that affected your country operations?

B. Established and Implemented Best Practices in Vulnerability Targeting

1. Are There Issues Regarding Vulnerability Assessments?

--assessments—are they occurring in timely manner?
Communication and feedback issues?

2. How has the integration of food resources with HIV/AIDS interventions for livelihood Security been going?

--Food Programmer position: has this role been effective in facilitating this goal of food and HIV/AIDS integration?

--Integration Itself: what specifically has been done to integrate food assistance with HIV/AIDS programming and assessments--nutritional needs? For identification of vulnerability and criteria for programs on household/community level? Incorporation into non food security/health programs like agriculture etc....? Is HIV/AIDS truly cross-cutting all WV programs?

III Questions on Objective 2: Improved Comprehensive Management of Title II Programs

1. Have # of Title II programs increased and why/why not for:

--Standards: for commodity, program and financial management?

Targets--achieved targets?

4. What were the major changes in institutional organization felt at the field level?

A. Identified and Implemented Best Practices for Impact Evaluation

1. How effective is the new position of Project Management Developer/trainer?

Integration--into ongoing project management in the field and what were the outcomes? Was their presence felt in the field

Concurrent Products--useful? (i.e newsletters, databases, trainings)

2. Were the PIEs (Participatory Impact Evaluation) conducted as scheduled and were lessons learned communicated to field staff?

Any significant dialogue created based upon the PIEs?

B. Institutionalized Standards and Best Practices for Food Security Program Management

1. How successful was the "sharing" of this program/seminar series with other NGO's like SC and IRD? (Collaboration)
2. Are key staff involved in the workshops and benefiting? Glitches in this?
3. Have products truly become available to targeted user?

C. Upgraded and Implemented Best Practices in Commodity Accountability

1. What was the loss rate post ICB change and factors affecting this?
2. Where there real changes in monthly CRSs, RSRs and LSRs timely completions?
3. Training adequacy and achievements?

- commodity tracking?
- information systems?
- baseline surveys?
- overall commodity mgmt?

**World Vision
Institutional Capacity Building
Midterm Evaluation**

US-Based ICB Management Staff

I Questions: General

- F. What are the principle successes and achievements of the ICB program? What factors influenced these changes?
- G. What are the major constraints and difficulties encountered in this program and its implementation?
- H. Do there appear to be any tradeoffs thus far in the ICB program's attempt at improvement? If so, what?
- I. Are current activities and indicators appropriate for ICB objectives? Is there adequate qualitative data being collected?
- J. How will capacity building be maintained after the ICB grant ends?

II Questions on Objective 1: Improved Food Security Vulnerability Identification and Programming

5. Have # of Title II programs increased and why/why not for:

Integrated: demonstrating integrated programming?

Meeting standards: for targeting, impact measurement, good design and sound vulnerability targeting?

C. *Improved Use of Food Security Data for Program Design, Implementation, and Evaluation of Programs*

1. What were the strengths and weakness of the GWISER project?

--Framework established: explain the components and how it differs and has improved (changed?)

--Integration into WV Networks: are the information systems in sync?

How many countries/programs are operationalized?

--Data in use: has the data collection been strengthened in the field for actual use?

2. Training?

--How has the training that was given through the ICB grant been institutionalized? Has there been a lot of tool dissemination?

D. *Established and Implemented Best Practices in Vulnerability Targeting*

1. Are There Issues Regarding Vulnerability Assessments?

Assessments: are they occurring in timely manner?
Communication and feedback issues?

2. How has the integration of food resources with HIV/AIDS interventions for livelihood Security been going?

--Food Programmer position: has this role been effective in facilitating this goal of food and HIV/AIDS integration?

--Integration Itself: what specifically has been done to integrate food assistance with HIV/AIDS programming and assessments--nutritional needs? For identification of vulnerability and criteria for programs on household/community level? Incorporation into non food security/health programs like agriculture etc....? Is HIV/AIDS truly cross-cutting all WV programs?

III Questions on Objective 2: Improved Comprehensive Management of Title II Programs

1. Have # of Title II programs increased and why/why not for:

- Standards--for commodity, program and financial management?
- Targets--achieved targets?

D. *Identified and Implemented Best Practices for Impact Evaluation*

1. How effective is the new position of Project Management Developer/trainer?

Integration--into ongoing project management in the field and what were the outcomes? Was their presence felt in the field

--Concurrent Products--are they useful? (i.e newsletters, databases, trainings)

2. Were the PIEs (Participatory Impact Evaluation) conducted as scheduled and were lessons learned communicated to field staff?

Any significant dialogue created based upon the PIEs?

E. *Institutionalized Standards and Best Practices for Food Security Program Management*

1. How successful was the "sharing" of this program/seminar series with other NGO's like SC and IRD? (Collaboration)

2. Are key staff involved in the workshops and benefiting? Glitches in this?

3. Have products truly become available to targeted user?

F. *Upgraded and Implemented Best Practices in Commodity Accountability*

1. What was the loss rate post ICB change and factors affecting this?

2. Where there real changes in monthly CRSs, RSRs and LSRs timely completions?

3. Training adequacy and achievements?

--commodity tracking?

--information systems?

--baseline surveys?

--overall commodity mgmt?

Appendix C: List of Persons Interviewed

Name	Organization	Position
Carol Jenkins	WVUS	ICB Grant Manager and Sr. Director, GAM
Colette Powers	WVUS	Food Team Director and ICB HIV/AIDS Specialist
Brett Gresham	WVUS	ICB Capacity Building Manager
Hamid Mansary	WVUS	Food Team
Nathan Morrow	WVUS	ICB GWISER Manager
Lisa Mondori	WVUS	Food Team Contracts Attorney
Polly Arnold	WVUS	GAM Global Team
David Alarcon	WVUS	Food Team Finance Director

Comment [AC1]: Are these names all in the correct hierarchical order?

Lauren Sable	WVUS	GAM Global Team
Kote Lomidze	WVUS	Food Team Finance
Alek Mackowiak	WVUS	Food Team Finance
Walter Middleton	WVI	Vice President, Food Programming Management Group
Bernie Fortes	WVI	Food Training Coordinator
Brian Holmes	WVI and WV Mozambique	
Carlos Piedrasanta	WV Mozambique	
Nancy Mock	Tulane University	Professor, School of Public Health and Tropical Medicine
Peggy Sheehan	IRD	Director of Food Security
Themos Ntasis	IRD-Mozambique	Country Director
Jennifer Zhang	IRD	Finance
Anne Swindale	FANTA	Director

Several people identified as key informants in the TOR were unavailable, declined to be interviewed, or had left the organization. For this reason, some names on TOR do not appear on the list above.

In addition, questionnaires were obtained from 20 other program field and management staff who submitted responses anonymously.

Appendix D: WV ICB Indicator Tracking Matrix

OBJECTIVES/IR'S INTENDED	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	PLANNED SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES	FINDINGS/PROGRESS TO DATE
IR's/Activities Common to all Objectives		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Collaborate with PVOs on cross-cutting issues through participation in FAM for its duration -Enhance WV's Food Resources Global Information System -Provide formal workshop training 	<p>2005-FAM not achieved due to funding; collaborated to maintain FAM website and other key components of FAM</p> <p>2005-Development of comprehensive knowledge management system is in final stages of implementation, and should be in full use by year 3 via systems integration</p> <p>2005-2nd Mega Workshop in Bangkok, Thailand</p>
Objective 1: Improved food security vulnerability identification and programming	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. % of new WV approved Title II DAPs, TAPs, and EOPs over the five years which meet WV/FFP standards for targeting, impact measurement, good design, and sound vulnerability targeting 2. % of new Title II programs that demonstrate integrated programming 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -94 percent of new programs reaching standards, 104% of target -100 percent of new programs with integrated programming, 143 percent of target
IR1.1: Improved use of food security data for program design, implementation, and evaluation of programs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GWISER framework established 2. GWISER integrated with WV International TDI Network 3. GWISER is a highly sophisticated system with a number of important advantages 4. Number of WV Title II 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Hire GWISER manager -Information Needs Assessments conducted for WV Mozambique and WV Angola (basis for "GINA") -Develop GWISER tools and food security/vulnerability database in Mozambique (in collaboration with Tulane) -GWISER to conduct a detailed risk and shock exposure analysis based on data collected by the Mozambique National Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. -3 out of 2 (for framework established--meaning number of countries?) 150 percent of target 2. -2/2 integrated with TDI—100 percent of target 3. 2/1.5 of programs that use GWISER data—133 percent of target <p>2004-GWISER manager hired</p> <p>2004-Of GWISER initiative, two Information Needs Assessments for WV Angola and Mozambique.</p> <p>2004-GWISER framework established</p> <p>2004- Web based ftp site including documents, data sets, notes</p> <p>2004- Collaboration included outputs: Seminars by Tulane to WV staff in Mozambique, eight WV staff trained on GIS,</p>

OBJECTIVES/IR'S INTENDED	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	PLANNED SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES	FINDINGS/PROGRESS TO DATE
	<p>programs (in pilot countries) using data from GWISER system (to some degree)</p>	<p>(AR 2005) - WV Angola to team with WFP to implement a Nutrition and Livelihood Baseline survey for the Plan Alto region of Angola -GWISER team to provide technical support to WV's response to the Indian Ocean Tsunami, much of which was focused on efforts implemented by WV Sri Lanka</p>	<p>searchable database created, information tools (briefs) created, etc. 2004- Digital library created in WV Mozambique 2004-Design Consultation held at Tulane 2005-GINA (GWISER Information Needs Assessment) developed 2005-WV Mozambique established basic risk analysis and reporting, community emergency response plans 2005-HTML accessible document library, GIS maps, risk analyses, "flash" docs created 2005-Nutrition and Livelihoods baseline performed in Angola 2005-GWISER web portal, www.gwiser.org developed 2005-2006-GWISER fully integrated with international TDI Network (Transformational Development Indicator)</p>

OBJECTIVES/IR'S INTENDED	OBJECTIVELY VERIFIABLE INDICATORS	PLANNED SUPPORTING ACTIVITIES	FINDINGS/PROGRESS TO DATE
<p>IRI.2: Established and implemented best practices in vulnerability targeting</p>	<p>1. % Title II food programs integrating food resources with HIV/AIDS interventions for livelihood security</p> <p>2. Number of vulnerability assessments conducted each year (at 2 per yr)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Hire HIV/AIDS Specialist to broaden the HOPE Initiative and link WV food-assisted programs with best practices related to HIV/AIDS programming -Conduct internal review of WV's experience and lessons learned in the area of food security and HIV/AIDS programming -Conduct internal review of WV policy with regard to Title II CSM and CSB to HIV+ mothers in support of abrupt weaning -Establish Hope Alert site, allowing practitioners to access a wide range of external and internal documents relating to HIV/AIDS -Develop Vulnerability Mapping and Programming tools -Implement a nutrition group case study and an informational chart for dissemination to WV project staff and other NGOs -Develop program exit strategy, in order to address the impact of HIV/AIDS on livelihoods in the context of programming cycles -Encourage the adoption of the positive living approach -Produce a training module demonstrating the linkages between agriculture and positive living 	<p>1. 40 percent of programs integrating with HIV/AIDS interventions-only 73 percent of target</p> <p>2. 2/2 vulnerability assessments done-100 percent of target</p> <p>2004-HIV/AIDS specialist hired in February</p> <p>2004- Through C-SAFE, WV developed and piloted food aid programming/targeting with HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation-included and information dissemination at dist. points</p> <p>2004- Programming tools developed including: rapid review to integrate and collaborate between Title II and HOPE Initiative; summary of USG Funded HIV/AIDS Food Projects was developed in relation to which Title II's include some HIV/AIDS prevention; internal examination of milk policy; established Hope Alert site; nutrition group case study in WV Zambia; informational chart for Title II food backstop officers on HIV/AIDS lens for application; findings of C-SAFE program in targeting shared at numerous forums</p> <p>2004-conducted/supported two assessments-one in Honduras and Rwanda</p> <p>2005- Implementation included a food aid pilot test program in Zambia (fortified potato flakes) and pursued a regional HIV/AIDS sector strategy with FFP, including peanut paste as an alternative Title II food aid commodity.</p> <p>2005-C- SAFE(pilot food aid programming with HIV/AIDS prevention and mitigation within an approved Title II program with partners</p> <p>2005- Program exit strategy in areas with high prevalence of HIV/AIDS; link in Hope Alert site to C-Safe learning center's HIV/AIDS resources</p> <p>2005-WV Zambia program piloted fortified potato flakes</p> <p>2005- Conducted/supported two assessments in Kenya and DRC</p>

<p>Objective 2: Improved comprehensive management of Title II programs</p>	<p>1. % of new WV approved Title II DAPs, TAPs, and EOPs over the five years that meet WV standards for commodity, program, and financial management</p> <p>2. % of programs that achieve at least 70 percent of targets</p>		<p>-94 percent of new programs that meet mgmt standards-104% of target -75 percent achieve targets-only 94 percent of target</p>
<p>IR2.1: Identified and implemented best practices for impact evaluation</p>	<p>1. Technical assistance will have been provided in at least 90 percent of situations where it was requested by the field</p> <p>2. % of participatory impact evaluations conducted</p> <p>3. % of key WV staff aware of lessons from Title II programs</p>	<p>-Hire new M&E officer -M&E officer conducts quarterly review meetings on evaluations, facilitates the ICB workshop sessions, and coordinates baseline surveys and other midterm data collection for quality control for Title II M&E systems</p>	<p>-96 percent of TA provided upon request-107% of target -95 percent of programs conducting PEs-103% of target -78 percent of staff know lessons learned-142% of target</p> <p>2004/2005-M&E officer completed review meetings, technical support to FAM, facilitated ICB workshop sessions/training (see CD), and coordinated baseline/midterm data collections/surveys</p>
<p>IR2.2: Institutionalized standards and best practices for food security program management</p>	<p>1. % of key staff involved in ongoing competency development process</p> <p>2. % of key staff attending at least one workshop each year during the LOP</p> <p>3. # of e-training modules developed and accessible on the Internet</p>	<p>-Year 2 goals: Majority of the Program Management Framework in place and accredited; 6-10 trained and accredited assessors in the areas of commodity mgmt; commodity manual up on web -Enroll staff in diploma process -Conduct assessments -Develop assessment tools and training materials -Provide monthly newsletters & other reading/training material -Conduct field visits</p>	<p>-50 percent of staff involved in competency training-333 percent of target -90 percent of staff attending one workshop per yr-129 percent of target -2 out of 2 e-modules on web-100 percent of target</p> <p>2004-"Competency Framework" was developed with eight mgmt areas with criteria for diploma. Assessment methods established. 2004-1st Mega workshop in S. Africa; Commodity mgmt training workshop 2004- Accredited Program Management Trainer hired 2004- Commodity manual not yet updated but tools and modules within the manual developed through ICB funding. 2004- Monitoring system now in place 2004/2005-Capacity Building Admin circulates monthly newsletter and responds to requests for tech. assistance, to date in S.Africa, Mongolia and Indonesia; website hosting tools/training at www.developingmanagers.net 2005- Assessment tools developed and officially accredited by Melbourne University 2005- Monitoring system now in use by majority of food</p>

			<p>programs</p> <p>2005-Grant Start-up Workshop CD</p> <p>2005-Program Management Assessment and Training Tool</p> <p>2005-not completed yet: commodity manual on the web and 'how to set up a development program'</p>
<p>IR2.3: Upgraded and implemented best practices in commodity accountability</p>	<p>1. % of monthly CSRs, RSRs, and LSRS will have been completed on time</p> <p>2. % WV's commodity loss rate</p>	<p>-Develop a comprehensive commodities manual</p> <p>-Training staff on commodity accountability and commodity tracking</p> <p>-Conduct commodity audits</p>	<p>-90% of monthly reports on time-98% of target</p> <p>-loss rate of .6-67% of target</p> <p>2004- 7.9 million people with 824,000 MT of food at \$367 million; loss rate of 0.5%</p> <p>2005-10 mil people with 743,000 MT of food at \$350 million; loss rate of 0.6%</p>