

ISA ANNUAL REPORT: FY 2000

For

Cooperative Agreement #FAO-A-00-98-00056-00

Supporting

Food for Peace Strategic Objectives Nos. 1 and 2

Submitted on January 10, 2001 to:

USAID/BHR/FFP, Attn: Angelique Crumbly
USAID FAO Branch, Office of Procurement,
Attn: Loretta King
USAID Development Experience Clearing House,
Attn: Document Acquisitions

Counterpart International

**1200 18th Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20036**

**Authors: Gail Carlson and Irene Abdou
Relief & Food Security Programs
Telephone: 202-296-9676**

I. Introduction

Counterpart has made major gains in FY 2000 towards achieving our overall goal of: increasing the effectiveness of Counterpart and local development partners to carry out Title II development activities, and to meet food needs of targeted populations in sub-Saharan Africa and in other LDICs. Our results-oriented learning strategy has maximized impacts in the past fiscal year through major areas of emphasis such as:

- development of a DAP for Senegal in close collaboration with USAID, the government of Senegal, and local NGO partners
- increasing staff knowledge of diverse Title II food aid/food security topics
- adapting Counterpart's local capacity building approach to the proposed Senegal project, while simultaneously institutionalizing Title II programming within Counterpart.

Through active involvement and participation of junior, mid-level, and senior managers in a variety of types of activities and tasks, we have strived and made great advances towards achieving our intermediate results, outlined in Annex 1. The positive impact of the ISA grant is widely evident in Counterpart's enhanced overall ability to design, implement, and monitor Title II programs, and our increased effectiveness in improving food security conditions in targeted countries worldwide.

II. Individual Capacity Building (Strategic Objective 1)¹

A. IR 1.1: Monetization and Commodity Management

In order to achieve increased overall capacity in monetization and commodity management (IR 1.1), Counterpart focused on skills upgrading through two select activities:

- Attending workshops, trainings, and working group meetings
- Learning by doing²

FAM Working Group on Monetization

Since Counterpart joined Food Aid Management³ in 1999, Relief & Food Security Program staff have actively participated in the FAM Working Group on Monetization, attending 100% (2/2) of meetings held in FY 2000. (Please refer to Annex 2 for the

¹ Strategic Objective 1: To expand existing capacity in food security program elements in order to meet the requirements of Title II programming.

² Learning a skill by attending meetings and trainings is often insufficient to build one's capacity in program design or implementation. We define "learning by doing" as increasing capacity by acquiring hands-on, real-life experience through actual participation in ongoing activities.

³ Food Aid Management is a consortium of seventeen Title II Cooperating Sponsors.

Performance Indicator Tracking Table.) Meetings targeted freight planning, risk & liability, and commodity sales contract issues. The additional participation in several of the meetings by the CHAP Director of Transportation and Counterpart's attorney have allowed all staff involved in current food aid programs to build their knowledge and expand the breadth of their experience regarding current issues and questions related to Title II programming. The increased capacity is evident in our improved ability to articulate our point of view and in our increasingly active and effective role in the Title II PVO community.

Save the Children Workshop

The three-day SCF workshop was held in Guatemala in November/December 1999 and was attended by Counterpart's Relief & Food Security Program Director. Its real value was in its very methodical coverage of the responsibility and accounting aspects of commodity management, from initial food assessments to setting up accounting systems, all the while emphasizing commodity and risk management issues and exploring case studies. For example, in one exercise, participants were given information about a disaster in a mythical African country, e.g., what the seasons were, conditions of roads, warehousing availability, etc., and asked to set up a logistics distribution table that would fit the exercise. The facilitators then walked participants through the entire ordering and call forward process and through the initial receipt of the commodities. All forms such as the discharge survey sheet, reconstitution form, and perpetual inventory form were worked through.

The course then continued into the subject of warehouse management, with practice exercises on completing invoices and related paperwork. Field trips included a tour of the CARE warehouse in Guatemala, where participants performed a physical inspection of the building and learned about potential risks such as theft, infestation, water damage, and loading/discharge of trucks at the warehouse. Finally, the food distribution and reporting process, as well as general accounting procedures were addressed, again with a practicum on completing USG-required forms for these steps.

Counterpart's Relief & Food Security Program director left the course with a solid and improved knowledge of all aspects of commodity management and armed with a very important tool—the electronic version of the SCF commodity management handbook (see Section VI for further discussion of impact).

Grain Purchasing Short Course

The Relief & Food Security Program Director attended the two-week Grain Purchasing Short Course presented by Kansas State University's International Grains Program held in April 2000. The training covered a wide variety of topics related to commodity management, including:

- Global grain supply and demand
- Cash and futures

- Basic pricing in the world grain and soybean market
- Purchasing strategies
- Grain inspection and certification
- Grain grading, wheat milling, and bakery practicums
- Overview of ocean transportation
- Trade policy challenges for agriculture
- Catching and acting on price signals
- Commercial financing of grain purchases
- Genetically modified organisms

Sessions were complemented by field trips, including tours of feed and cereal food mills and an extrusion lab, a visit to a farm, and a trip to the Kansas City Board of Trade to observe the opening of trading and market closing. In addition to providing valuable knowledge and skills relevant to the management of Title II programs, participation in the course also provided an excellent opportunity to meet international grain traders, exporters, analysts, commercial brokers, and bankers. This network of contacts, as well as the information acquired on how to select appropriate grains for monetization/direct distribution, has been extremely useful in the development of Counterpart's monetization plan for Senegal, submitted to Food for Peace as part of the Senegal DAP.

B. IR 1.2: USAID/FFP Strategic Objectives, Guidelines, and Regulations

We increased our familiarity with USAID/FFP strategic objectives, guidelines, and regulations (IR 1.2) by

- Participating in FFP and FAM-sponsored courses and meetings
- Holding internal workshops
- Cooperating with other PVOs
- Learning by doing

Participating in FFP-Sponsored Courses and Meetings

During strategic planning sessions for FY 2000, Counterpart had planned for one or two staff members to participate in FFP's annual Food Aid Managers Course. Although two of our staff registered for the training several months in advance, insufficient spaces available to PVO representatives prevented Counterpart participation. Because the Food Aid Managers Course is essential to increased familiarity with FFP strategic objectives, guidelines, and regulations and also helps PVOs to understand internal FFP procedures and mechanisms, Counterpart highly recommends that FFP allow more PVOs to participate in the course in the future.

Nevertheless, Counterpart was able to pinpoint and focus on other relevant meetings. In FY 2000, Relief & Food Security Program and Counterpart Humanitarian Assistance Program (CHAP) staff actively participated in 83% (5/6) of Food Aid Consultative Group (FACG) semi-annual, ad hoc, and FACG/USAID meetings. Counterpart sent one individual to a Section 216 (Environmental Compliance) Training of Trainers (TOT), and

staff from all Counterpart divisions involved in Title II programming—Civil Society Division, Relief & Food Security Programs, Health Programs, Division of Enterprise Development—as well as Counterpart’s attorney, attended numerous one-on-one meetings with FFP and FANta staff, as well as group meetings with the entire Title II PVO community on such varied topics as:

- ISA Grant Information Sharing
- ISA Grant Baseline, Mid-term, and Final Evaluations
- New Draft Title II Guidelines
- Senegal DAP Reviews
- Senegal DAP M&E Plan Reviews

Attendance at these meetings has greatly contributed to the achievement of our SO1 (to expand existing capacity in food security program elements in order to meet the requirements of Title II programming). In particular, because Relief & Food Security Program staff has participated in *all* of these meetings, their overall knowledge of FFP guidelines and regulations, risk and liability issues, and their ability to draw up a strong ISA M&E Plan and meet other ISA reporting requirements has increased tremendously.

Counterpart also designed and distributed an internal survey in January 2001 to the following staff:

- Senior Vice President for Programs
- Director, Relief & Food Security Programs
- Program Officer, Relief & Food Security Programs
- Program Assistant, Relief & Food Security Programs
- Director, Enterprise Development Programs
- Chief Financial Officer
- Field Accountant
- Director, Transportation Programs

Fifty percent of those surveyed stated that they use the knowledge gained at internal and external meetings on Title II on a daily or weekly basis, and 75% on a monthly basis or more often. Those who use the knowledge monthly or less often are higher-ranking officers whose scope of work includes Title II but is not limited to Title II or those whose involvement in Title II is limited to only one aspect of food security programming. (See Annex 3 for the survey template.)

Holding internal workshops

The president of Solloway and Associates facilitated an internal two-part workshop in September and November 2000 on finance and budgets for Title II programming. The following staff participated in the activities and discussions:

- Chief Financial Officer
- Field Accountant, ISA Grant

- Senior Vice President for Programs
- Senior Program Manager for Health
- Director, Relief & Food Security Programs
- Ex-Program Officer, Relief & Food Security Programs

The objective of the workshop was to train staff to develop monetization and program budgets which meet FFP guidelines. Discussions at the September session included the difference between Title II charts of accounts and non-Title II accounts and uses of monetization proceeds versus Section 202(e) funds. Particular emphasis was placed on reading, understanding, and interpreting the required budget formats. Between the September and November sessions, Counterpart put the learned skills to use by actually developing an ISA chart of accounts, as well as a monetization and 202(e) budget for the Title II Ivory Coast concept paper. During the November session, the consultant facilitated an examination and critique of the resulting chart and budget.

Of the January 2001 internal survey participants, all individuals stated that their ability to draw up a budget that fits Title II guidelines has increased, and 50% of staff felt that their ability increased by 100% (doubling in capacity). In addition to the internal budget workshop, staff members (including those who did not participate in the workshop) attributed increases in finance/budget capacity to hands-on development experience, working one-on-one with a budget consultant, and budget guideline meetings.

Cooperating with other PVOs

Counterpart's active involvement in FAM has paved the way for an open and mutually beneficial, collaborative relationship with many Title II PVOs, allowing for Counterpart to contribute to and profit from best practices, lessons learned, and trainings sponsored by other organizations. Risk and Liability especially is a topic in which Counterpart has gained a lot from experiences of other PVOs on how we can best protect ourselves from the risks inherent in monetization and commodity management (e.g., the Latini affair). Furthermore, CRS provided to Counterpart their Bellmon Analysis checklist for West Africa, evidence of our close collaboration with other Title II PVOs.

In addition to the SCF Commodity Management & Accounting workshop discussed earlier, the Relief & Food Security Program Director also participated in the SCF workshop on Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E). We nominated the Division of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR) Forest Gardens Program Manager to attend the Regulation 216 Training of Trainers (TOT) that was organized by World Vision. To further this cooperation, Counterpart hosted the TOT, which was attended by more than 30 individuals from throughout the world, as well as other FAM meetings.

Learning by doing

Direct hands-on participation of staff in *DAP development*, designed to maximize capacity building impacts, also markedly contributed to Counterpart's knowledge of

USAID/FFP strategic objectives, guidelines, and regulations, thus adding to Title II programming capacity:

- Increased capacity to perform field assessments was an added benefit of Counterpart's DAP development plan. In FY 2000, Counterpart Relief & Food Security Program, Health, and Enterprise Development staff performed field assessments in Senegal and the Ivory Coast, which included in-depth discussions with Mission staff, the FFP Regional Officer, agricultural attaches, and many host country government officials.
- Ability to write a successful DAP increased through the learning experience.
- Staff learned a great deal about FFP and USAID Mission policies, guidelines, and regulations through meetings with USG officials.
- In April 2000, Counterpart submitted the draft DAP for Senegal to the USAID Mission in Dakar. Very favorable comments, as well as some questions, were received several weeks later and were responded to in the body of a revised DAP. The revised version was submitted to FFP in June 2000. A DAP review meeting was held with Counterpart in August and a detailed list of issues provided to Counterpart immediately prior to the meeting. Several weeks later, FFP sent Counterpart a formal letter addressing the threshold issues. Counterpart responded to the issues in a 30-page document in September 2000.

The detailed conversations that took place during this process with FFP, especially the "one-on-two" meetings between FANta M&E Specialist, Dr. Alice Willard, and Counterpart, greatly promoted staff understanding of Food for Peace's purpose and expectations in terms of program design, monitoring and evaluation, monetization, and commodity management.

- Development of the DAP included the development of a new DAP budget. Counterpart staff worked closely with budget consultant Rick Solloway of Solloway & Associates to ensure that line items are allowed under Food for Peace monetization and 202(e) regulations.

In addition to the activities involved in DAP development, Counterpart's Relief & Food Security Program Officer worked closely with FANta's Dr. Willard over several months to produce an acceptable ISA M&E Plan. This collaboration was extremely valuable and played a major role in increasing staff capacity in monitoring and evaluation and aided Counterpart in understanding and developing capacity building indicators.

C. IR 1.3: Technical Knowledge of Other Food Security Program Elements

In order to enhance our technical knowledge of other food security program elements (IR 1.3), Counterpart selected the following activities:

- Participating in technical trainings, workshops and conferences
- Learning through other methods

Participating in technical trainings, workshops and conferences

Because of the rapid changes that occur every day in the international development field, participation in events which bring together individuals from different PVOs and countries throughout the world is imperative to keeping up to date with new events and technologies. With the ISA grant, in FY 2000, Counterpart was able to support Relief & Food Security Program staff participation in the:

- December 1999 Monitoring & Evaluation workshop sponsored by SCF
- April 2000 UN Administrative Committee on Coordination/Sub-Committee on Nutrition (ACC/SCN) conference
- September 2000 Advisory Committee on Voluntary Foreign Aid Conference

The M&E Workshop, attended by the Relief & Food Security Program Director and held in Guatemala from December 4-6, 1999, emphasized measuring and analyzing food security indicators in the context of baselines, mid-terms, and final evaluations. Its specificity to food aid and food security in the context of Title II programming made it particularly valuable, reinforcing staff understanding of overall food security M&E considerations. Great depth was provided in the training modules on assessing the nutritional status of children, assessment of agricultural activities, MCH/food consumption, and evaluation design, which focused on many of the FANta guides and United Nations guidelines. Attendance at the workshop played a crucial role in the enhancement of Relief & Food Security Program capacity in the M&E sector.

The Relief & Food Security Program Officer and Program Assistant attended two health/nutrition conferences, which provided exposure to topics such as:

- Food and nutrition as a human right
- Human rights-based community capacity development
- The state of food insecurity in the world
- Poverty and nutrition
- Combating the HIV/AIDS pandemic in developing countries

The knowledge gained from participation in these workshops and conferences will aid Relief & Food Security Program staff in designing and developing future food security programs. Attendance plays a special role for junior staff development, as it is crucial for junior staff to develop a sensitivity to hot issues and to form liaisons with other individuals and organizations belonging to the food aid community.

Other Learning Experiences

Counterpart also attends, as much as possible, other meetings, workshops, and conferences sponsored by FAM, SUSTAIN, the International Fund for Agricultural

Development, the Corporate Council on Africa, the Association for International Agriculture and Rural Development (AIARD)⁴, and other groups.

Learning Through Other Methods

ActivStats was recommended at the SCF M&E Workshop as a complete multimedia presentation on introductory statistics. In FY 2000, Counterpart's Relief & Food Security Program Director and Program Officer completed the CD-ROM, the latter in preparation for attendance at a FAM Data Analysis Workshop in FY 2001. Basic knowledge of statistics is often required for M&E-type discussions and has aided staff in understanding current issues in Title II M&E. The Relief & Food Security Program Assistant was not required to take the course since she has recent college-level training in basic and intermediate statistics.

III. Adapting Counterpart's Local Capacity Building Model to Title II Programming (Strategic Objective 2)⁵

Counterpart's success over the years is rooted in its central purpose—empowering local institutions through training, technical assistance and partnership, to better address self-defined community needs in a sustainable manner—which Counterpart refers to here as local capacity building. Since 1968, twenty-three local Counterpart partners have evolved as affiliates now located on five continents and many island nations, with more coming into existence this year, illustrating the success of Counterpart's evolutionary and powerful approach to capacity building—from mentor to partner to resource.

In 1995/1996, Counterpart developed an institutional assessment tool, called the TTAP, which aids us in selecting local NGO partners and determines their current financial sustainability, products and services, interaction with the environment, governance, human resources, management, and products and services capacity. Once the tool is used and the partner(s) selected, the TTAP eventually results in a training and technical assistance plan for each individual partner NGO.

Our *Counterpart Alliance for Partnership* project has developed a similar tool in the form of a 100-question M&E survey instrument that results in an overall organizational development score for local partner NGOs, rating areas such as human resource, financial management, and governance.

Having identified these internal tools, all food security staff will receive appropriate training in them and in local capacity building in general, as a necessary prerequisite to achieving SO2 in the third year of the grant. The two intermediate results summarize the steps that will lead to realization of SO 2.

⁴ AIARD meetings focused on the upcoming changes in the US Farm Bill, including Public Law 480.

⁵ Strategic Objective 2: To adapt Counterpart's local capacity-building approach/structure in our areas of sectoral expertise to Title II programming in Sub-Saharan Africa and other LDICs.

A. IR 2.1: Increased Food Security Program Staff Awareness of the Counterpart Approach

The activity related to Intermediate Result 2.1, increased food security programs staff awareness of Counterpart's existing local capacity building approach/structure, is:

- Working with Counterpart's civil society division to understand Counterpart's local capacity building approach and how that approach fits within the food security program context

During FY 2000, Relief & Food Security Program staff met and worked closely with civil society staff on numerous occasions, but also to prepare two presentations on Counterpart's local capacity building approach. The presentations were given by Counterpart's Senior Vice President for Programs and head of the Civil Society Division to FAM's Local Capacity Building Working Group and to participants of the NGO Development Conference sponsored by Public Private Partnerships⁶. Because the FAM presentation was held at Counterpart headquarters, attendees included Counterpart staff from other divisions, as well as representatives of Title II PVOs and FANta.

Relief & Food Security Program staff involvement in the design and development of Counterpart's DAP for Senegal has also contributed to increased awareness of the existing local capacity building approach/structure. Relief & Food Security Program staff have been active participants of all DAP-related local capacity building discussions.

B. IR 2.2: Increased Food Security Programs Staff Awareness of Other Approaches

Staff will continue to increase their awareness of tools that other organizations utilize—a natural subsequent intermediate result is increased food security program staff awareness of other local capacity building approaches, tools, and structures (IR 2.2). The correlated activities are:

- Participating in local capacity building workshops, trainings, and working group meetings
- Cooperating with other PVOs—sharing tools

Relief & Food Security Program staff made an outstanding effort to attend as many working group meetings as schedules allowed—six out of ten (60%) FAM local capacity building working group meetings in FY 2000. Counterpart has attended all of the FAM PVO presentations on the local capacity building approach of their organizations, including American Red Cross's "Organizational Development: A global framework for facilitating local change" and Catholic Relief Services' "Principles of Partnership" presentations. In fact, in CY 2001, Relief & Food Security's Program Officer will serve as co-chair of the FAM Local Capacity Building Working Group, together with a colleague from ADRA.

⁶ Conference participants were third-world country nationals whose goal is to learn how their governments can work with local NGOs.

Cooperating With Other PVOs—Sharing Tools

The FAM Local Capacity Building Working Group defined information sharing and networking as one of three priority focuses for CY 2000, recognizing it as critical to identifying commonalities of approach between the member PVOs. Each PVO was assigned a date during which a representative would present to the working group their organization's approach to local capacity building. Counterpart's Senior Vice President for Programs's presentation in August 2000 (mentioned briefly above) encompassed community development approaches, civil society support centers, Counterpart's institutional self-assessment tool (TTAP), training modules, partnership development purposes, guidelines, and criteria, lessons learned, and local capacity building indicators.

C. IR 2.3: Using Counterpart's Local Capacity Building Approach

The main activity designed to lead to Intermediate Result 2.3, use of Counterpart's existing local capacity building approach/structure in all Title II initiatives, is: incorporating local capacity building components into Title II programs. Counterpart's Senegal assessment team performed TTAPs on six local NGOs, selecting two as our proposed partners.

Counterpart's local capacity building strategy differs from that of most other organizations in that it seeks to build the capacity of *local NGOs*. The majority of other organizations seek to meet the capacity building requirements of their own field staff or affiliate staff, rather than building a sustainable network of NGOs capable of meeting development needs after the project ends.

In Senegal, NGO capacity building through organizational and technical skills transfer to local partners will be critical in ensuring their effectiveness in delivering food security services to the targeted communities and to ensuring local capacity to continue interventions after Counterpart withdraws. This exit strategy has been fully developed in Counterpart's Senegal DAP⁷.

IV. Corporate Capacity Building (Strategic Objective 3)⁸

In order to develop a corporate memory for Title II programming, Counterpart focused on two themes:

- Development and utilization of a resource library
- Institutionalization of policies, procedures, and approaches

⁷ Counterpart International FY 2001-2005 DAP for Senegal—*The Fouta-Toro Project: Integrated Food Security Initiative in Senegal*, revised version submitted to USAID/BHR/FFP and USAID/Senegal on November 6, 2000, pp. 8-11,13.

⁸ Strategic Objective 3: To develop a “corporate” (vs. individual) memory on Title II programming.

A. IRs 3.1-3.3: Development and utilization of a resource library

Increased availability of resources (literature) necessary for food security program design (IR 3.1) has been achieved by establishing a food security resource library of books, journals, magazines, papers, etc. Four hundred resources were accrued by the end of FY 2000, which is 80% of the LOA target. Resources are divided into the following sectors:

- USG guidelines and regulations
- Counterpart proposals and other submissions
- Sectoral publications
 - Water/sanitation
 - Food security
 - Health
 - Microenterprise/business/economics
 - Commodity management
 - Environment and natural resources
 - Monetization
 - Capacity Building
 - Relief/Disaster
 - Agriculture
 - Monitoring & Evaluation
- Private sector, non-profit, and international organization publications
- Country-specific information

Contributing to IR 3.2, increased access to resources (literature) necessary for food security program design, and IR 3.3, improved ability to utilize available resources, two Relief & Food Security Program staff members (67% of staff) participated in a two-day beginning course on Microsoft Access in July 2000, thus exceeding our LOA target of 50%. One staff member also completed the two-day intermediate course. Development of a resource library database was initiated shortly thereafter, and by the end of the fiscal year, 91% of the 400 library resources collected were labeled and entered into the database. (Our LOA target is 30% of 500 resources.) We have no doubt that we will be able to reach the target by the end of the third year of the grant.

All Relief & Food Security Program staff participated in the development of the library, and other staff involved in food security programming contributed resources to the library.

According to the January 2001 Internal Survey for FY 2000, all surveyed staff were aware of the existence of the library, and 40% use it on a weekly basis⁹, if not more often. All staff stated that they find the resources they are searching for at least 60% of the time

⁹ The 40% figure excludes the Chief Financial Officer and the Field Accountant, since the library does not relate to their work. It also excludes the Senior Vice President for Programs since library research is delegated to mid-level and junior staff.

(average is 88%). In Year 3 of the ISA Grant, we will work to expand available resources in different sectors to make the library more useful for staff in all divisions.

B. IR 3.4: Institutionalization of policies, procedures, and approaches

Two activities were defined as steps to achieving institutionalization of Counterpart policies, procedures, and approaches to Title II programming (IR 3.4):

- Developing Counterpart policy and procedural resources
- Including developed resources in the food security library and corresponding database

Lessons learned have been developed for the Senegal DAP process, from the field assessment through the DAP development stage, but they have not yet been fully compiled and disseminated, since Counterpart is still in the process of revising and resubmitting the DAP. Once the DAP process is completed and the DAP approved/rejected, the lessons learned will be distributed to appropriate staff members, as well as placed in the food security library.

Lessons learned on commodity risk management at port have also been developed and presented to USDA. (Although this is not directly relevant to the ISA grant, increased capacity in commodity management will aid Counterpart's development and management of Title II programs.)

To date, Counterpart has created checklists on the following topics: (1) call forward procedure; and (2) loading and offloading commodities. Checklists are considered ongoing, and have aided in setting a foundation for institutional policies and the development of guiding principles.

V. Key Assumptions Met/Operating Constraints

The majority of key assumptions outlined in the approved M&E Plan have been met in FY 2000:

- *There will be minimal staff turnover (SO1 and SO2):* Of the fourteen staff members involved in food security programming in FY 2000, from those with occasional FFP support responsibility to direct responsibility to organizational managers, there has been a turnover of only two staff.
- *Funding will be available for: (1) staff participation in external trainings and workshops; (2) the organization of internal workshops; and (3) the performance of food security assessments:* With proper planning and budgeting, Counterpart staff were able to participate in several FAM and FFP sponsored courses, including the Kansas State Grains Course, the SCF Commodity Management Workshop, the SCF M&E Workshop, and the World Vision Regulation 202(e) Compliance TOT. Two internal workshops on Title II budgeting and finance

were held, and three food security assessments performed as a part of DAP development.

- *The external trainings and workshops attended are well organized and provide useful information:* All of the workshops and trainings have proven to be extremely valuable, as discussed in previous sections.
- *USG funding to FFP will not substantially decrease from baseline levels.*
- *Authority over Title II programs will not be transferred from USAID to another USG agency.*
- *FFP strategic objectives, guidelines, regulations, and operational procedures will remain relatively consistent throughout the LOA period.*
- *FANta staff will continue to have time to provide consultations regarding the ISA M&E Plan:* FANta has provided, on numerous occasions, technical assistance to Counterpart, both regarding development of the DAP M&E Plan and the ISA Grant M&E Plan. Great thanks especially to Alice Willard.
- *Senior management will continue to view local capacity building as a Counterpart priority:* Since its founding in 1965 as the Foundation for the Peoples of the South Pacific, Counterpart's central organizational purpose—of supporting the creation and development of strong local institutions and non-governmental networks capable of meeting local and regional needs on a sustainable basis—has not changed.
- *Senior management will continue to view food security as a Counterpart priority:* Food security is an integral part of all divisional strategic plans.
- *Development of a resource library continues to be a priority to Relief & Food Security Program management:* Expansion of the library and database is an ongoing process.
- *Funding is available to hire interns to assist with the development and maintenance of the library:* An intern was hired during the summer and fall of 2000, during which time she established the database and completed much of the work on the library.
- *The planned Microsoft Access training will proceed as scheduled.*
- *Training in database software is enough of a priority such that the holding of other meetings at the same time does not limit Relief & Food Security Program staff participation in the database training:* Two of three Relief & Food Security Program staff participated in the two-day beginning course, and one

staff member participated in the two-day intermediate course, exceeding target levels.

- *Continued senior staff commitment to FFP programming:* Staff at all levels committed extended periods of time to Title II field assessments and DAP development in FY 2000.

VI. Outcomes & Impact of Activities

Through active involvement in the FAM local capacity building working group and ongoing discussions with Counterpart's NGO capacity building experts, Relief & Food Security Program staff have substantially raised their level of knowledge regarding local capacity building approaches, strategies, M&E indicators, and "hot topics." A major step has also been taken towards the achievement of SO2 through the inclusion of local NGO capacity building as the main exit strategy of Counterpart's Senegal DAP. In addition, development of the resource library and database, as well as checklists and lessons learned documents have paved the way to the development of a corporate memory and institutionalization of Title II programming within Counterpart.

Overall, we feel that the active participation of our staff in the activities discussed above has greatly increased individual capacity in monetization and commodity management, and therefore, Counterpart's overall ability to implement and manage Title II programs. Keeping abreast of current issues, learning basic concepts, and active networking, activities which have been supported by the ISA grant, have all directly contributed to our increased capacity.

In particular, Counterpart gained two especially valuable tools through participation in commodity management workshops funded by the ISA grant. These tools have played a special role in Counterpart's food aid programs:

- The Grain Commodity Handbook, received at Kansas State University's International Grains Program course
- SCF Commodity Management Handbook, obtained at the SCF course

Counterpart's Relief & Food Security Program staff has referred to the Grain Commodity Handbook on numerous occasions to guide program planning for monetization and direct distribution programs, especially the Senegal DAP proposed to FFP.

The SCF Handbook provides a direct example of the positive impact of ISA activities on Counterpart's *Direct Food Distribution to Vulnerable Populations in Albania* project, funded by USDA and implemented in FY 2000¹⁰.

¹⁰ Although the Albania project is not funded by the ISA grant, it has similar goals and strategic objectives to those of FFP and also involves a similar component—direct food distribution. Increased ability to manage direct food distribution, when applied to non-Title II programs, demonstrates the extended positive effect of the ISA grant, specifically, ISA-built staff and corporate capacities to design and manage food security programs.

Relief & Food Security Program Director praise for the SCF Workshop:

“Immediately after completing the SCF Workshop, I traveled to Albania to supervise the offloading of our USDA flour shipment. With the SCF e-handbook in hand, I trained partner staff in warehouse management, including proper stacking of flour bags. Since the SCF handbook included all USG-required report formats, we were able to complete all appropriate forms, leaving a detailed record track of the commodities from the time they arrived in-country to end distribution to the target beneficiaries. Some time later, we discovered that neither the shipping subcontractor responsible for labor and transportation to the warehouse, nor the discharge surveyors kept records of the offload, leaving our partners and ourselves with the only written account. Counterpart later filed a formal complaint against the shipper for poor offloading procedures. The SCF Handbook provided supporting documentation.”

Participation in the FAM Working Group on Monetization has also provided a direct positive impact on staff capacity to manage Title II and other food aid programs. The involvement of not only CHAP and Relief & Food Security Program staff, but also our attorney, has both contributed to better planning and knowledge on our part, and has increased positive public perception of Counterpart. Freight planning and risk & liability meetings have exposed staff to ongoing “hot” issues and dialogues between shippers, surveyors, USAID, USDA, and PVOs on how to decrease the risk of loss at both the onload and offload ports, as well as the need to increase the sensitivities of the private sector on the importance of food aid.

Another example demonstrating Counterpart’s improved capacity in monetization and commodity management:

Counterpart’s Director of Transportation Programs traveled to Texas to monitor the loading of flour destined for Albania, where she talked to the port captain and the shipper, discussed offloading issues such as availability of pallets, and photographed how the commodity was loaded from pallets into loose packing into the hold of the ship. She returned from Texas and wrote a report to USDA with photos of the onload, complemented by photos taken by the Relief & Food Security Program Director of the offload in Albania. Thus, a complete photographic history from the time that the commodities were put on pallets at the warehouse to the time that it was offloaded into our warehouses in Albania was put together. In this manner, Counterpart was able to document where different activities were not done to industry standards.

In addition to increased commodity management and monetization expertise, one-on-one technical assistance from FANta has built individual staff capacity in monitoring and evaluation and led to the development of a strong ISA M&E plan that has been approved by FFP.

ANNEX 1: Summary of Strategic Framework

INDIVIDUAL CAPACITY BUILDING	ADAPTING CAPACITY IN LOCAL CAPACITY BUILDING TO TITLE II PROGRAMMING	CORPORATE CAPACITY BUILDING
SO 1: To expand existing capacity in food security program elements in order to meet the requirements of Title II programming.	SO 2: To adapt Counterpart’s local capacity-building approach/structure in our areas of sectoral expertise to Title II programming in Sub-Saharan Africa and other LDICs.	SO 3: To develop a “corporate” (vs. individual) memory on Title II programming.
IR 1.1: Increased overall capacity in monetization and commodity management.	IR 2.1: Increased food security programs staff awareness of Counterpart’s existing local capacity building approach/structure.	IR 3.1: Increased availability of resources (literature) necessary for food security program design
IR 1.2: Increased familiarity with USAID/FFP strategic objectives, guidelines, and regulations.	IR 2.2: Increased food security programs staff awareness of other local capacity building approaches, tools, and structures.	IR 3.2: Increased access to resources (literature) necessary for food security program design.
IR 1.3: Enhanced technical knowledge of other food security program elements.	IR 2.3: Use of the existing local capacity building approach/structure in all Title II initiatives.	IR 3.3: Improved ability to utilize available resources.
		IR 3.4: Institutionalization of Counterpart policies, procedures, and approaches to Title II programming

ANNEX 2: PERFORMANCE INDICATOR TRACKING TABLE

NOTES: The first column of this table outlines all performance indicators by strategic objective and intermediate result. The second column, which is bolded, shows our LOA target. The two columns under the heading, "FY 1999" show: (1) achievements per indicator in FY 1999, and (2) the % of the LOA target achieved (% Ach. Vs. LOA Target). For FY 1999, a "% Ach. Vs. LOA Target" of 33% for an indicator such as "No. of internal food aid workshops held" would show that we were on track to achieving the LOA target by the end of FY 2001. There are three columns under the heading, "FY 2000." The first column ("Achieved FY 00") shows achievements per indicator in FY 2000. The second column (Achieved FY 99-00) shows cumulative achievements for FY 1999 and FY 2000. The "% Ach. Vs. LOA Target" column compares the cumulative achievement for FY 99-00 with the LOA Target. Therefore, a "% Ach. Vs. LOA Target" of 67% in FY 2000 shows that we are on schedule to achieving the LOA target by the end of the grant period.

Performance Indicators	LOA Target	FY 1999		FY 2000			FY 2001		
		Achieved (FY 99)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target	Achieved (FY 00)	Achieved (FY 99-00)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target	Achieved (FY 01)	Achieved (FY 99-01)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target
Strategic Objective 1: To expand existing capacity in food security program elements in order to meet the requirements of Title II programming									
SO 1 IR 1 Increased overall capacity in monetization and commodity management									
Monitoring Indicators									
No. of monetization workshops attended	1	0	0%	0	0	0%			
% of FAM working groups meetings on monetization attended	75%	1	133%	2	3	133%			
No. of commodity management workshops attended	1	0	0%	1	1	100%			
No. of International Grains Programs at Kansas State U. attended	1	0	0%	1	1	100%			
% of staff members who attended workshops/trainings in monetization or commodity management who are actively using at least two tools learned	100%	N/A	N/A	100%	100%	100%			
Impact Indicators									
% of staff members who attended meetings on monetization or commodity management who feel that their capacity to manage monetization and commodity management programs has increased by at least 100%	100%								
No. of monetization programs successfully implemented	1								
No. of food distribution programs (using guidelines developed for FFP programs) implemented	2								
SO 1 IR 2 Increased familiarity with USAID/FFP strategic objectives, guidelines, and regulations									
Monitoring Indicators									
No. of staff members who have participated in the Food Aid Managers Course*	1	0	0%	0	0	0%			
No. of FACG meetings attended	80%	2	83%	5	7	97%			

* Although two of our staff registered for the Food Aid Managers Course several months in advance, insufficient spaces available to PVO representatives prevented Counterpart participation.

**Counterpart International Year 2 (FY 2000) ISA Grant Annual Report
Submitted January 10, 2001**

Performance Indicators	LOA Target	FY 1999		FY 2000			FY 2001		
		Achieved (FY 99)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target	Achieved (FY 00)	Achieved (FY 99-00)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target	Achieved (FY 01)	Achieved (FY 99-01)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target
% of food security programs staff who have participated in an environmental compliance (Section 216) training	50%	0%	0%	33%	33%	67%			
% of staff members who attended meetings on USAID/Title II guidelines, procedures, and regulations who use the knowledge gained on a daily/weekly basis	100%	100% *	100%	50% **	N/A	50%			
No. of internal food aid workshops taught by a food aid consultant held	3	1	33%	0	1	33%			
No. of internal workshops on finance and budgets taught by a financial management consultant held	1	0	0%	2	2	200%			
No. of staff members who have participated in an internal finance and budget workshop who feel that their ability to draw up a budget that fits Title II guidelines has increased by at least 100%	50%	0	0%	50%	50%	100%			
No. of trainings sponsored by other PVOs, which were hosted by Counterpart	1	0	0%	1	1	100%			
No. of trainings sponsored by other PVOs in which Counterpart staff participated	1	0	0%	3	3	300%			
No. of food security field assessments performed	3	3 ***	100%	3 ***	6	200%			
Impact Indicators									
% of DAPs submitted to FFP and funded by FFP	100%								
No. of Title II development activities programs successfully initiated	1								
Approval/disapproval by FFP of the ISA M&E Plan	Approval								
No. of integrated DAP budgets and charts of accounts developed (with assistance and advice from a financial management consultant), submitted, and approved by FFP	1								
SO 1 IR 3 Enhanced technical knowledge of other food security program elements									
Monitoring Indicators									
No. of days dedicated to participation in health, microenterprise, M&E, and data analysis trainings, workshops, and conferences	14	3	21%	7	10	71%			
No. of staff members successfully completing at least one CD-ROM course such as the "ActivStats" statistics course	2	0	0%	2	2	100%			

* In FY 99, only one staff member (the RFSP Director) was responsible for attending meetings related to USAID/Title II programming.

** 75% of the 8 staff surveyed stated that they use the knowledge gained at internal and external meetings on Title II on a monthly basis or more often. Those who use the knowledge monthly or less often are higher-ranking officers whose scope of work includes Title II but is not limited to Title II or those whose involvement in Title II is limited to only one aspect of food security programming.

*** Food security field assessments were conducted in Ghana, Mali, and the Ivory Coast in FY 99 and in Senegal, Benin, and Guinea in FY 2000.

Performance Indicators	LOA Target	FY 1999		FY 2000			FY 2001		
		Achieved (FY 99)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target	Achieved (FY 00)	Achieved (FY 99-00)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target	Achieved (FY 01)	Achieved (FY 99-01)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target
Strategic Objective 2: To adapt Counterpart's local capacity building (LCB) approach/structure in our areas of sectoral expertise to Title II programming in Sub-Saharan Africa and other LDICs									
SO 2 IR 1 Increased food security programs staff awareness of Counterpart's existing LCB approach/structure									
Monitoring Indicators									
No. of meetings between civil society and food security programs staff*	3	0	0%	2	2	67%			
SO 2 IR 2 Increased food security programs staff awareness of other LCB approaches, tools, and structures									
Monitoring Indicators									
% of FAM working group meetings on LCB attended	75%	N/A **	N/A	60%	60%	80%			
No. of presentations given by Counterpart to participants of the FAM LCB working group on Counterpart's approach and experiences with LCB	1	0	0%	1	1	100%			
SO 2 IR 3 Use of Counterpart's existing LCB approach/structure in all Title II initiatives									
Impact Indicators									
% of Title II activities incorporating an LCB component	100%								
Strategic Objective 3: To develop a "corporate" (vs. individual) memory on Title II programming									
SO 3 IR 1 Increased availability of resources (literature) necessary for food security program design									
Impact Indicators									
No. of food security resources accrued	500								

* During FY 2000, RFSP staff met and worked closely with civil society staff on numerous occasions, but also to prepare two presentations on Counterpart's LCB approach. for other NGOs. This performance indicator refers to meetings held to prepare the presentations and to internal meetings held to discuss the FAM LCB Working Group.

** The FAM LCB Working Group was not formed until FY 2000.

Performance Indicators	LOA Target	FY 1999		FY 2000			FY 2001		
		Achieved (FY 99)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target	Achieved (FY 00)	Achieved (FY 99-00)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target	Achieved (FY 01)	Achieved (FY 99-01)	% Ach. Vs. LOA Target
SO 3 IR 2 Increased access to resources (literature) necessary for food security program design									
Monitoring Indicators									
% of food security library items accrued which are labeled and entered into a food security library database	30%	0%	0%	91%	91%	333%			
% of Counterpart staff who are aware of the food security library and database	80%	N/A	N/A	100%	N/A	125%			
% of time that a searched-for resource is found	50%	N/A	N/A	88%	N/A	176%			
Impact Indicators									
% of Counterpart staff involved in food security programs that use the resource library on a weekly basis	50%								
SO 3 IR 3 Improved ability to utilize available resources									
Monitoring Indicators									
% of food security programs staff that have participated in a two-day course on Microsoft Access	50%	0	0%	67%	67%	134%			
SO 3 IR 4 Institutionalization of Counterpart policies, procedures, and approaches to Title II programming									
Monitoring Indicators									
% of major food security activities for which "lessons learned" were documented	100%	0	0%	100%	100%	100%			
No. of checklists and manuals which have been created on topics such as "through bills of lading," "how to meet food commodity shipments in the field," etc.	3	0	0%	2	2	67%			
% of developed resources which have been labeled and entered into the food security library database	100%	N/A	N/A	0% *	0% *	0% *			
Impact Indicators									
% of Counterpart food security programs staff who utilize at least one of the developed resources at least twice a year	100%								

* Relief & Food Security Program staff accumulated 400 resources for the food security resource library in FY 2000, of which 91% were entered into the library database. Checklists and manuals created on the call forward procedure and on loading and offloading commodities will be entered in FY 2001.

ANNEX 3: FY 2000 ISA Grant Internal Survey
conducted January 2001

NOTE/INSTRUCTIONS: It is important to complete every question as thoroughly as possible. Please do not leave a question blank. If you do not remember how many meetings you attended, provide an estimate, and note that it is approximate. If a question is not applicable, write "N/A" and explain why not. If you don't know the answer to a question, write "DK." When asked to rate something on a scale of one to ten, one is the lowest score, and ten is the highest.

1. How many internal/external meetings on USAID/Title II guidelines, procedures, and regulations have you attended? _____

2. How often do you use the knowledge gained?

- 1 Daily
- 2 Weekly
- 3 Monthly
- 4 Several times a year
- 5 Rarely
- 6 Never

3. If you don't use the knowledge gained very often, why not? (Is the information not useful? Why not?)

4. Did you participate in the Title II internal finance and budget workshops held in September and November 2000?

- 1 Yes
- 2 No

5. Since you became involved in ISA activities, by what percent has your ability to draw up a budget that fits Title II guidelines increased? _____

6. Rank order the top two activities that contributed to your change in ability since you became involved in ISA activities?

- 1 Internal finance and budget workshop
- 2 Hands-on budget development experience
- 3 Other training/workshop (specify) _____
- 4 Other (specify) _____
- 5 No change in capacity

Activity 1: _____

Activity 2: _____

7. What do you find most difficult about complying/understanding USAID/Title II procedures/regulations?

8. Are you aware of the existence of a Counterpart food security library and library database?

1 Yes

2 No

9. How often do you use the food security library?

1 Daily

2 Weekly

3 Monthly

4 Several times a year

5 Rarely

6 Never

10. If you don't use it often, why not?.

11. What percentage of the time do you find the specific resources or types of resources that you were looking for? _____

12. Rate the usefulness of the library on a scale of one to ten. _____

13. If you don't find the library very useful, please explain.

14. In what sectors do you think we need to hold more trainings/concentrate formal capacity-building exercises?

1 _____

2 _____

3 _____

15. What can we do to improve your understanding of Title II programming?

16. What resources could we provide you to improve your capacity to design and manage Title II programs?

1 _____
2 _____
3 _____